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Abstract

City as Writing: Textual Dublin in *Ulysses*

Nguyen Thi Hanh Quyen

2016

This thesis explores how the odyssey of style in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* multifariously renders the literary representation of Dublin. Rather than focusing on the realness of the city, I challenge the assumption that the fictive Dublin is wholly overlapped with the real geographical one and seek to destabilize the polarization of a textual city as being either real or unreal. Employing an atomist notion of style in which dominant and recessive features of the text are considered the crucial factors constituting its being, I advocate for the existence of a plurality of styles, arguing that Joyce shifts through various modes in portraying his native habitat. As a result, Dublin appears as a compendium of differing texts in “Proteus,” a semantic field of stimuli in “Lestrygonians,” an unconnected urban space in “Wandering Rocks,” and a parareal city in “Circe.” By examining the multiform textuality of Dublin, this study demonstrates that Joyce’s arbitrary styles do not offer an absolute representation of reality but interpretations of it. I posit that *Ulysses* defies any imposed orders of literary criticism and Joyce’s Dublin is a de-centred city resisting totalization.
Abbreviations

References to Joyce’s writings are abbreviated and cited parenthetically. Standard editions and abbreviations used are as follows:
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- **Letters**  

- **P**  

- **SL**  

- **U**  
Introduction

A text is not a text unless it hides from the first comer, from the first glance, the law of its composition and the rules of its game. A text remains, moreover, forever imperceptible. Its law and its rules are not, however, harbored in the inaccessibility of a secret; it is simply that they can never be booked, in the present, into anything that could rigorously be called a perception.

Jacques Derrida, “Plato’s Pharmacy” (69)

In *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Ludwig Wittgenstein notes in proposition 2.022 that, “It is clear that however different from the real one an imagined world may be, it must have something – a form – in common with the real world” (7).

Wittgenstein’s observations on the necessary similarities of worlds real and worlds imagined certainly apply to the fictional Dublin created by James Joyce throughout his career. Since leaving his “fatherland”¹ to lead the life of a voluntary exile, Joyce repeatedly made spiritual homecomings by an imaginative reconstruction of his native habitat, urban Dublin. With unprecedented hyper-realism, yet with a peculiarly Joycean verve and originality, he obsessively rebuilt Dublin with each new volume of his oeuvre. Consequently, the reader experiences, in turn, a Dublin as a drab centre of paralysis reflected in Joyce’s “nicely polished looking-glass” in *Dubliners*, an internalised Dublin in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and a collection of kaleidoscopic Dublins seen in the fragments of several shattered mirrors in *Ulysses*.

Writing about the preoccupation with urban life in Modernist novels, Malcolm Bradbury proposes that, “Modernist writing has a strong tendency to encapsulate experience within the city, and to make the city-novel or the city-poem one of its main forms” (100). Naturally, as a city represented with the utmost care in the *magnum*

¹ Stephen Dedalus in *A Portrait* calls Ireland his fatherland (*P* 208).
opus of the dominant figure of literary modernism, Joyce’s urban space has been a
preoccupation of critics of all persuasions: geographical-cartographical, psychoanalytic, sociological, post-structural and post-colonial\(^2\). However, Joyce scholarship dealing with the portrayal of Dublin in *Ulysses* is mostly concerned with factuality in Dublin, including maps, railway timetables, and so forth. The real places have too often been the hinges upon which scholars analyze how Joyce’s Dublin resembles the historical city, and how he utilizes *Thom’s Official Directory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland for the Year 1904* to recreate his habitat\(^3\).

Frank Budgen was the first author to comment on the specifics of how Dublin is depicted. In his memoir of their days together in Zurich throughout 1918 and 1919, *James Joyce and The Making of Ulysses*, published in 1934, Budgen discusses aesthetic matters concerning the writing of *Ulysses*, and offers an accurate appraisal of how the city takes shape: “But it is not by way of description that Dublin is created in *Ulysses*. There is a wealth of delicate pictorial evocation in *Dubliners*, but there is little or none in *Ulysses*” (69). The book is a profuse source of great worth about Joyce’s overall intentions as well as insights into his meticulous methods. For example, Budgen informs the reader that:

> To see Joyce at work on the “Wandering Rocks” was to see an engineer at work with compass and slide-rule, a surveyor with theodolite and


\(^3\) Many recent articles discuss and compare Joyce’s Dublin to Dublin in 1904. See Duffy 81-94, O’Connell (2014), Killeen 133-36, Laffan 25-35. Earlier works on this topic are discussed in this chapter.
measuring chain or, more Ulyssean perhaps, a ship’s officer taking the
sun, reading the log and calculating current drift and leeway. (121)

It could be said that Budgen sowed the seeds of a geographically focused approach in
Joyce criticism, as Eric Bulson remarks: “There is a strong critical tradition in place
that relishes Joyce’s topographical precision” (“Topics and Geographies” 52).
Following his lead, Dublin in Ulysses has been consistently compared and conflated
with the real city. The topographical criticism of Joyce’s novel very often inclines to
an interpretation that the model city intertwines closely with and is superior to its
textual representation, that truthful reflection of the real city takes higher priority than
creativity.

The first Joycean reconstruction of Dublin in Ulysses through Thom’s Official
Directory was Fabulous Voyager: A Study of James Joyce’s “Ulysses” published in
1947 by Richard Kain. Attempting to evoke the Dublin of Bloomsday that he had
never seen, Kain used maps, Thom’s Directory and Ulysses itself. Moreover, he
examines the correspondences between the fictional addresses and the real ones listed
in Thom’s Directory. At the end of the book, in Appendix C, Kain compiles an
appendix of “a directory of shops, offices, and public buildings, professional and civic
personages” (270). One of the important discoveries made by Kain is that in 1904 the
house that the Blooms lived in, 7 Eccles Street, was vacant; and Joyce conveniently
put the Blooms in this address (121-3)⁴.

⁴ Another example of the geographical approach is John Henry Raleigh’s article, “Afoot in Dublin in
Search of the Habitations of Some Shades” in 1971 in which the author carried out a meticulous
research on the places in Dublin where Bloom and the Blooms were supposed to have lived.
Following in Kain’s footsteps, Robert Martin Adams in *Surface and Symbol: The Consistency of James Joyce’s “Ulysses”* (1962) studies the relationship between Joyce's 1906 declaration of an intentional “scrupulous meanness” of style for *Dubliners* with the later execution of a more complex manner of treating the source-materials of his native city. He demonstrates that Joyce uses facts to serve his artistic objectives and offers great insights into the difference between surfaces as “social history, local colour, or literal municipal detail” and symbols as the things that “represent abstract concepts of special import to the patterning of the novel” (xvii). About the nature of numerous facts that Joyce incorporates into his text, Adams concludes, “close reading of *Ulysses* thus reveals that the meaningless is deeply interwoven with the meaningful in the texture of the novel” (245).

In 1975, the topographically focused method of reading *Ulysses* with Kain’s Appendix C as the first typical representative is expanded in *James Joyce’s Dublin – A Topographical Guide to the Dublin of “Ulysses”* by Clive Hart and Leo Knuth. A thorough revision of the 1975 Guide is published in 2004 by Ian Gunn et al. In this book, the authors examine Dublin in its physical facts and analyse how Joyce uses *Thom’s Directory*. The book contains useful tools for readers to navigate the real Dublin: it includes a list of all the addresses of places in *Dubliners, A Portrait* and *Ulysses*, together with 121 illustrations, and 81 maps.

However, in my opinion, this scrutinizing and comparing of fact and fiction in *Ulysses* method as a methodology, a research tradition that has taken deep roots in the Joycean industry in the last eighty years, remain incomplete, technically as well as aesthetically. First, Eric Bulson notes how “critics have not been unanimous in their

---

5 On the topographical strategy of reading of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait*, see Bidwell and Heffer 1981.
praise of Joyce’s geographical realism” (“Topics and Geographies” 53) and lists a number of articles showing that “the historical geography of Dublin in his works is biased, incomplete, fictional, and forever lost” (53). Specifically, the blueprint of Dublin in *Ulysses* is imperfect since Joyce was unfair in choosing certain parts of Dublin to recreate. In addition, as recently pointed out by Sam Slote in “The Thomistic representation of Dublin in *Ulysses,*” the original source, *Thom’s Official Directory,* is flooded with errors itself and thus renders Joyce’s Dublin “ineluctably errant” (200).

Proposing a sceptical angle towards the topographical precision of Dublin, Bernard Benstock in “*Ulysses* without Dublin” suggests that this main concern with topography is not really helping the reader to read *Ulysses.* He warns that, “too much familiarity with Joyce’s Dublin might indeed be dangerous in attempting a balanced reading of *Ulysses*” (101). “Balanced” is the operative word here. Textual Dublin and topographical Dublin will be forever at odds. Continuing along these lines, Jeri Johnson in “Literary Geography: Joyce, Woolf and the City” acknowledges the writer’s geographical exactitude, but also proposes that Dublin is “both insistently itself and persistently something other” (211). These two essays play an important role in shaping my views about the representation of Dublin in which I find Benstock’s and Johnson’s suggestions about going further than the overlap of real and imagined worlds in the works of James Joyce useful and applicable. Being not entirely satisfied with the factual and geographical approach, which refuses to acknowledge the existence of the textual Dublin, an artefact both different from and equivalent to the real one, and ignores the stylistic alterations that sweep through the narration and

---

6 See Lyons 6-2, Mays 83-98, and Brady 10-32.
shape the countenances of Dublin in *Ulysses*, I focus my work on aspects of the city that are unreal thanks to Joyce’s radical experiments in style to subvert the dichotomy (and hierarchy as well) of being either real vs. less real. More importantly, I will further argue that realness and unrealness are interdependent and mutually affecting and demonstrate that *Ulysses*, as a double writing, brings about an oscillation between and a shattering of these two polarizations. In this dissertation, I propose that Joyce’s reconstruction of Dublin is effected under several decisive constraints, apart from topographical accuracy. Having let go of his Dublin, at least physically, Joyce seems to have reclaimed it, holding his home-centre up to his gaze, getting at the heart of his city by methods unprecedented.

Firstly, taking full advantage of prior works by Budgen and other aforementioned scholars, I suggest that the flood of accurate proper names and concrete details in *Ulysses* serves as the stimulus to bring about the effect of reality, “to reproduce the look and feel of the real thing” (Brooks 3). To achieve his aim of creating “a chapter of the moral history” of his city and nation, Joyce expands upon the techniques of nineteenth-century literary realism. Neither comprehensive nor panoramic views of Dublin are offered in *Ulysses*; and the third-person narrator, utterly engrossed in paring his fingernails, to use Joyce’s own analogy, deliberately leaves the reader adrift in a Dublin that is, at first glance, a jumble of names for barely explained streets, buildings, and waterways. Thus, Joyce’s extreme use of realism through the representation of Dublin with the spillage of proper names exhausts realism itself and turns it into an outdated convention. Moreover, to destabilize the relationship between the textual city in *Ulysses* and Dublin, I will read the city via the theory of Jacques Derrida on language, representation as well as style. Derrida raises a suspicion over the referentiality of signs and advocates the free play between the
signifier and the signified. This approach can help to liberate the textual Dublin from perceived inferiority to the real city. Specifically, by challenging the referentiality of the fictional place, I contest the purist assumption that there is a straight line from words to objects (and worlds) and shed light on the ontology of the fictional city.

Secondly, I argue that, while representing Dublin, Joyce also toys with the city by placing it under ever-changing points of view of his characters as well as an odyssey of style, transforming it into a metropolitan simultaneity of the Real and the Unreal, and thereby challenging our perception of the Real. In other words, the novel compels the reader to ponder at how the textual Dublin is mediated and changed by language. It could be observed that the Joyce industry more often than not treats Dublin as a unique one-dimensional object and overlooks its numerous countenances in *Ulysses*. Rather than a fixed city, Joyce presents a revolutionary montage of “Dublins” through a range of historical juxtapositions and varied naturalist, hyperrealist, and surrealist styles (Bulson, “Topics and Geographies” 52). He addresses several Dublins with multifarious narrative and stylistic modes: each of his Dublins is set on a small stage within the view of one or two characters, or from a collective angle, and written in a particular style. Thus does *Ulysses*, once read from start to finish, comprise a vast panorama of intersecting planes not unlike those constructed in the plastic arts during the years of its composition (1914-1921): Cubism, Futurism, and Vorticism. Perhaps to help maintain control of his ever-increasingly complex city, he provides a montage for each Dublin, all staged, reflected, and re-reflected as if by shattered looking-glasses, a collection of simultaneously symmetric and chaotic kaleidoscopic Dublins.

I venture to offer the proposition that Dublin itself, more than any human character in *Ulysses*, undergoes the most transformations. If style, as John Middleton
Murry argues, “[i]s a quality of language which communicates precisely emotion or thoughts, or a system of emotions or thoughts peculiar to the author,” (71) Dublin is very emotional indeed. Dublin is a liquid-like creature taking numerous forms through the incessantly moving styles. To strengthen my argument about the multiform styles in *Ulysses*, I will rely on Karen Lawrence’s analysis of diverse stylistic transformations in *The Odyssey of Style in “Ulysses,”* an essential secondary text, to illustrate how Dublin dons multiple masks. However, I also challenge Lawrence’s notion of one single narrative norm in the early chapters and the way she only focuses on rhetorical masks of the late chapters to demonstrate that *Ulysses* is undoubtedly written in 18 different styles as Joyce once boasted. I propose how Gérard Genette’s atomist notion of style and Derrida’s reading of plurality in style can be useful to read the montage city of Dublin in *Ulysses* in which the city is “a de-centered artefact” and “defies any attempt to designate a ‘meaning,’ ‘signified,’ or ‘center,’ eliding its own signification at every turn” (Harding 9).

In my reading, *Ulysses* is a book that constantly changes its strategy of writing about place: it perpetually breaks its contract with the reader about Dublin. In each chapter, the text builds up a convention only to quickly abandon it in the next chapters. The reader of *Ulysses* experiments from an objective world through the conventions of 19th century realism in “Telemachus,” to the overwhelmingly internalized Dublin in “Proteus,” from the city devoid of descriptions in Bloom’s episodes to one abundant in details in “Nausicaa.” In “Wandering Rocks,” various personae are flung about the streets of the Hibernian Metropolis and in those pages, Dublin is represented through 19 sections whose denizens are portrayed mostly as strangers disengaged from the main action of the novel; while the brothel district in “Circe” is portrayed via a 150-page stage-play that, like Goethe’s *Faust Part Two,* is
meant more for reading than performing, the copious stage directions notwithstanding. The text simply refuses to stay consistently in one single style and undertakes radical changes to offer various renderings of reality. The city is metamorphosed into a semantic field, a “hospitable field of play, a paradigm of différance, of linguistic freeplay, defying unity, wholeness, and the authority invested in a unified subject” (Harding 9).

Of the many theoretical essays about city, space, and its denizens, Roland Barthes’ “Semiology and Urbanism” may be the most relevant to my project. He suggests that a “city is a discourse, and this discourse is actually a language: the city speaks to its inhabitants, we speak our city, the city where we are, simply by inhabiting it, by traversing it, by looking at it” (195). Applying this theory of city as discourse, I will undertake a reading of Dublin in *Ulysses* as a discourse between the city and its “users” - author and reader. I will argue that Dublin speaks to Stephen, Bloom, and Molly via a cityscape that they themselves, as Dubliners, interpret from three different perspectives. Stephen, apparently on the verge of homelessness, is first seen outside the city, and then enters it. Bloom is first seen within his home, he then traverses the city that surrounds it. Finally, Molly never departs number 7 Eccles Street on 16 June 1904, but travels far abroad in her imagination, as so much of her Dublin is mingled with memories of her childhood and adolescence in Gibraltar.

Additionally, it could be argued that there is a transfiguration of Dublin in *Ulysses* thanks to Joyce’s considerable expansion of the forms that the interior monologue can adopt. A new way of reporting on human consciousness has appeared

---

7 Jeri Johnson clearly differentiates “interior monologue” as a technique from “stream of consciousness” that is “[d]escriptive only of fictions which share a preoccupation with representing character through
and it transports the focus of the narrative from the outside to an inside world, rendering reality transfigured by the psyche of each character. We are no longer treated to a realistic presentation of Dublin per se, but to a Dublin of successive universes of thoughts that render the city personal, unreal, and complex. The interior monologue method and the odyssey of style are two devices transforming Dublin: one triggers the internalized process in which Dublin is transferred into characters’ minds; the other perfects the transmuted object by dyeing it with various colours of language and style. Reality is not an outer entity any longer, but blends itself into personalized and momentary memories, thoughts, moods, and feelings of characters. The city in *Dubliners* lingers within the reader as an authentic artefact of the city, while in *Ulysses* it transforms into surreal artificialities. As Ann Rigney explains, Dublin becomes “part of a fictional world that, as a whole, has no counterpart in the actual one” (17-18).

Ultimately, my hope is that the analysis of the representation of Dublin’s landscape in *Ulysses* could serve as an instrument to read the book differently, as a meta-text where Joyce’s bravura “play” of language seems to shake up and reassemble Dublin itself. As Jeri Johnson insightfully proposes, “it seems to show a self-conscious awareness of its own status as a text. *Ulysses* moves from work to text to meta-text with exuberance and panache; it flaunts its ability to prompt questions about the very processes of making meanings” (“Introduction,” *Ulysses* xxvii). Other authors have done this, most notably François Rabelais (1500s) and Lawrence Sterne (1700s), but Joyce went even further than those exuberant innovators. The dissertation focuses, thus, on the textuality of the novel, on the process of reading, of producing pre-verbal or unspoken ‘thoughts’” (“Introduction” xx-xxi). I use “stream of consciousness” to describe character’s flow of thoughts. See more about this technique in Humphrey (1954).
meanings, as well as of failing to do so. In this dissertation, *Ulysses* will be my primary text and closely scrutinized. I will also cite *Dubliners* and *A Portrait* when the representation of Dublin from the earlier works could be served to support my arguments in comparing the writing techniques Joyce utilizes to reconstruct the city.

**Dissertation Overview**

After situating the thesis within the long tradition of Joycean criticism occupied with the representation of Dublin, I proceed to lay down several theoretical preliminaries for the dissertation in the first chapter. The discussion of how Joyce’s textual Dublin could be and could not be the real Dublin is framed by the studies of Ian Watt, Michel Foucault, Plato and Jacques Derrida. In the latter section of this chapter, I examine Gérard Genette’s deconstructive notion of style as well as Derrida’s reading of Nietzsche’s plurality of style to dictate how a discourse’s style is constructed from remarkable rhetorical features as well as less obvious ones. These critical stances, along with Monica Fludernik’s study on the narrative developments in *Ulysses*, support the assertion that there is no initial style in the early chapters of this novel and *Ulysses*’s odyssey of style transforms the textuality of Dublin.

In the second chapter, I analyse three often overlooked characteristics in the narrative of the first three episodes of *Ulysses* that are third-person narration, free indirect discourse, and interior monologue. I posit that these key components of the so-called “initial style” change drastically from “Telemachus” to “Proteus,” rendering the style flexible and varied. I will then look at how Dublin is transfigured by this style and internalized in the mind of Stephen. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how Stephen produces a differing and deferring text in the poetic interior monologue, a land rich in references to history, mysticism, philosophy, and literature.
By pointing out how Joyce significantly modifies the proportions of the three above-mentioned features in Bloom’s episodes and adds the distancing and defamiliarizing effect as well as the deployment of place names, I argue in the second chapter that Dublin is represented differently by a variation of the initial style. The chapter then studies how Dublin is portrayed from the point of view of Leopold Bloom as a practical Dublin-User and how the city inundates Bloom’s mind with torrents of stimuli, transferring the reader to multiple planes of thoughts, conflating the past, present, and various places together. As a result, the city transforms into a discourse, a signifying field in which place names and what they trigger become signifiers and signifieds and in which Bloom reads the textuality of Dublin through his footsteps around it.

In chapter four, attempting to offer a complementary discussion of style to the reading in the two earlier chapters, I scrutinize how various remarkable features in the narrative build the styles of episode seven, ten, thirteen, and fifteen of *Ulysses*, thus producing different images of Dublin. The chapter focuses, in succession, on how the city becomes the “Heart of the Metropolis” with constant interruptions by the mock-newspaper headings and its sub-narratives in “Aeolus,” Dublin as an unconnected urban milieu formed through a technique of interpolation and montage in “Wandering Rocks,” how the physical world of Dublin is transformed into two opposing realities via the style of borrowed language in “Nausicaa,” and how the metropolitan becomes a stage for pararealism in “Circe.”

In the last chapter, continuing the analysis of the playful features of *Ulysses*’s language, I examine how Dublin is metamorphosed in Molly’s unique style of interior monologue without punctuations. Molly dons an assortment of masks with corresponding voices, transforming Dublin into a performing stage on which flicker
random sites without specific addresses throughout the city; they are triggered by memories of various homes in the city since marrying Leopold as well as several places of sexual encounters from her past. The blurred images evoked of Dublin are starkly different from the exactitude of addresses swarming in the previous episodes of *Ulysses*. Moreover, I posit that “Penelope” runs through a melange of styles, rendering Dublin a collection of altered montages.
Chapter One

Ceci n’est pas Dublin – This is not Dublin

What do we know about what we put into anything? Though people may read more into Ulysses than I ever intended, who is to say that they are wrong: do any of us know what we are creating? Did Shakespeare know what he was creating when he wrote Hamlet; or Leonardo when he painted ‘The Last Supper’?

Arthur Power, Conversations with James Joyce (112)

The title of my first chapter is an allusion to a painting by René Magritte, “Ceci N’est Pas Une Pipe” – This is not a Pipe. Magritte advocates the idea that there is always a gap between reality and our perception of it. Similarly, Alfred Korzybski coins a very famous dictum, “The map is not the territory” (58), offering an explanation that languages and maps belong to the formulational system, and despite their similar structures, are not the objects that they present. Thus, the object in Magritte’s painting is not a pipe, and I argue in this chapter that the textual city in Ulysses is not the real Dublin. The discussion starts from an observation of how the common reader is inclined to conflate a fictional place, like Dublin for example, with its geographical equivalent due to identical naming. This tendency appears in 19th century realist literature, where an objective account of reality is promoted, and a shift from universality to individual experience and the penchant for particularity in a character’s background is preferred. Following that argument, the second section explores how mimesis in literature can be considered faulty and how literature is regarded as inferior to real life, especially in the case of the fictive Dublin. Countering the realist assumption that words can refer directly to things, the next section elucidates how meanings in the language system are not stable but constructed to be interpreted in different ways and how representation renders the original model
altered. This argument is supported by a consideration of the never-ending interpretations of *Ulysses* due to its flamboyant styles. The last section addresses the problem of the first six episodes of *Ulysses* being simplified into an “initial style” by critics, and advocates a more complex reading of style as being both denotative and expressive. Finally, I posit that the heterogeneity of *Ulysses*’s styles diversifies the representation of Dublin.

**This could be Dublin**

Towards the end of “Circe,” a big brimstone fire breaks out in Dublin:

**DISTANT VOICES**

Dublin’s burning! Dublin’s burning! On fire, on fire! (555)

If the reader correctly recalls, there is also a blaze noticed by Bloom at the beginning of the chapter: “*Aurora borealis* or a steel foundry? Ah, the brigade, of course. South side anyhow. Big blaze” (413). A first-time reader might make a mistake and jump to the conclusion that there was indeed a fire in Dublin without realizing that the second fire is only in Stephen’s imagination. However, what about the first fire? Suppose there is this hypothetical, obsessive reader who wants to check whether there was a real fire at the south side of Dublin on the night of 16th June 1904 and takes measures to read all the Dublin newspapers published the following day to see if it was reported. He definitely could raise such a question. After all, the Trinity Races of 16th June, 1904 did turn out in *Ulysses* as it did in real world Dublin. James Joyce himself was careful enough to choose a vacant home on 7 Eccles Street to put the Blooms in in
1904. Is there a possibility that on his date night with Nora\textsuperscript{8} he might have noticed a fire and mentioned it in his encyclopedic novel? If the Trinity College bicycle race in *Ulysses* is a real event, along with plenty of real historical people \textsuperscript{9} and real landmarks, why is it not the same with other states of affairs in *Ulysses*?

Such a truly attentive, if not to say hyperactive reader of Umberto Eco raises this very question about a possible incident in his famous novel, *Foucault’s Pendulum*. In this book, one of the characters, Casaubon, rambles the streets of Paris on the night of 23\textsuperscript{rd} and 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1984. Casaubon is constructed as a typical Bloomian wanderer who goes along rue Saint-Martin, crosses rue aux Ours, turns to rue des Lombards, walks to rue du Temple, reaches rue Saint-Antoine to hail a taxi (Eco, *Foucault’s Pendulum* 115-116). After the publication of the novel, Eco received a letter from a reader who went to the Bibliothèque Nationale in order to check all the newspapers in 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1984 and discovered that “on the corner of the rue Réaumur […] after midnight, more or less at the time Casaubon passed by, there had been a fire – and a big fire at that, if the papers had talked about it” (Eco, *Six Walks in the Fictional Woods* 76). Unsurprisingly, the reader questioned Eco on how his character could have not seen it. Eco, a vivid reader and scholar of Joyce, confesses that he once took a literary pilgrimage to find the house of Leopold Bloom at 7 Eccles Street in Dublin as if he was a historical figure. Yet he answers his reader maintaining that “my reader was exaggerating when he pretended that a fictional story should wholly match the actual world it refers to; but the problem is not quite as simple as that” (*Six Walks in the Fictional Woods* 77).

\textsuperscript{8} Joyce chose the date 16\textsuperscript{th} June 1904 for the events in *Ulysses* to commemorate the day Nora Barnacle and he had their first romantic meeting.

\textsuperscript{9} See the latest research on this topic in *The Real People of Joyce’s Ulysses: A Biographical Guide* by Vivien Igoe (2016).
The two readers with mild preoccupation on details I discussed above are the common reader: they are seduced wholeheartedly by the truthfulness of the novel and duped to believe that the story of *Ulysses* happens in the real city of Dublin of our world, as does the story of *Foucault’s Pendulum* in the real city of Paris. Whilst the first case is an attempt to impose an event from inside the imaginary land onto reality, the second is the other way around. In both cases, the proper names of the literary cities are identical to those of the real cities. In both cases, the line between fiction and the reality of real life is blurred; they are subsumed into each other and it is difficult to distinguish between aesthetic and real Dublins and Parises.

The ―facts‖ of Dublin, understood as ―something that [have] really occurred or [are] actually the case‖ (OED), are Joyce’s obsession in his creative writing process. The flood of exact proper names and concrete details in *Ulysses* serves as the vehicle to bring about the effect of reality. As a result, an authentic-seeming Dublin, with real places (pubs, streets, pawnbrokers, post offices, churches, railway stations) and real people with actual names emerges, and the reader is lured to this fictive city convinced of its verisimilitude. In a manner not unlike the process of creating and revising *Dubliners* concerning facts, when writing *Ulysses*, the detail-driven Joyce relies on the 1904 *Thom’s Official Directory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland* to recreate Dublin. He once boasted, ―I want to give a picture of Dublin so complete that if the city one day suddenly disappeared from the earth it could be reconstructed out of my book‖ (Budgen 67). Even though this bragging was probably made after the 1916 Easter Rising, which destroyed major parts of the city, Joyce brings into the textual presence the absent Dublin. With a style more intensive than *Dubliners*, Joyce floods *Ulysses* with raw materials including real names of places and people to the extent of confounding critics as to the author’s artistic intentions.
Joyce’s Dublin has notoriously swallowed up parts of the city of Dublin. In real life, a Joycean fan who makes a literary pilgrimage to Dublin nowadays can trace the steps of Bloom by following 14 bronze plaques commemorating Joyce. In the 1988 Dublin Millennium, these were embedded in the pavement from the *Evening Telegraph* Office on Abbey Street to the National Museum on Kildare Street. Furthermore, Joyce enthusiasts can visit numerous places in Dublin including houses the Joyce family once occupied, as well as real landmarks in *Ulysses* such as the Martello Tower in Sandycove, 7 Eccles Street, or the Nighttown district, to name a few. There is not only a *Ulysses* Map of Dublin in which these places are marked, but also countless literary guidebooks that readers can utilize. These are *James Joyce’s Odyssey: A Guide to the Dublin of Ulysses* by Frank Delaney, *Faithful Departed: The Dublin of James Joyce’s Ulysses: Recaptured from Classic Photographs and Assembled* by Kieran Hickey, *James Joyce’s Dublin* by Patricia Hutchins, *Dublin in Bloomtime: The City James Joyce Knew* by Cyril Pearl, *James Joyce and His World* by Chester G. Anderson, and *James Joyce’s Ireland* by David Pierce. These materials all provide real pictures and routes of the places in Dublin that appear in Joyce’s works. In other words, the fictional Dublin is conflated with the real one. Clearly, the tendency to impose a fictional place upon its real counterpart is a practical and urgent need of common readers, which is satisfied by the above-listed literary guides. These diverse materials range from the old-fashioned type of reaching out to a literary place by following the characters in guidebooks to the most modern and high-tech product such as *JoyceWays,* an iOS app launched in 2012, right after the works of Joyce.

---

10 The website of the app, https://joyceways.com/, states that: “*JoyceWays* carries you back to the Dublin of 1904, taking you to over 100 locations.”
entered public domain, which aims to help readers of Joyce trace his characters’ footsteps by using Global Positioning System to navigate Dublin.\footnote{There are other digital web-based projects that visualize Joyce’s Dublin such as Walking Ulysses, the precursor of JoyceWays, and Dislocating Ulysses that maps Ulysses’s locations in 3D.}

At the face of all these facts, I cannot but be reminded of W. B. Yeats’ question in the poem “Among School Children”, “How can we know the dancer from the dance?” How can we differentiate the Dublin of Joyce from the real Dublin? In turn, it entails a series of questions: Does the Dublin of Joyce in *Ulysses* possess its own ontology? How does referentiality work in literature in general and in Joyce’s works in particular? In this section, I will try to demonstrate the problem of referentiality through literary theories’ explanations of the tendency of imposing fiction onto reality.

In supporting the idea of the novel form, Ian Watt argues in *The Rise of the Novel* that the novel is marked as distinct to other genres thanks to two factors: “the individualization of its characters and […] the detailed presentation of their environment” (17-8). Quoting John Locke and David Hume, Watt discusses the transition from classical literature to the rise of the novel, in which the major trend is the rejection of universality and a preference for particularity. There is a shift from the Renaissance onwards from a tradition of collectivity to individual experiences as “the ultimate arbiter of reality” (Watt 14). In simple words, what makes a character an individual in the novel is his specific circumstances, woven closely and deeply to an explicit place and time (Watt 21). Expounding on the particularized background of a character, Watt encounters the problem of how proper names function in modern realism. He states that, “[I]logically the problem of individual identity is closely related to the epistemological status of proper names” (18). Watt supports his argument with
Thomas Hobbes’ idea that proper names evoke only one thing in our mind as opposed to universals, which recall many. Watt concludes that “[p]roper names have exactly the same function in social life: they are the verbal expression of the particular identity of each individual person” (18). Consequently, there is a shift in place names in 18th century fiction where the authors gradually convert from imaginary, fabricated names to real and specific ones: for instance, in constructing Tom Jones’ itinerary to London, Henry Fielding fills it with many named places and exact locations (Watt 26).

Realistic proper names in the novel are the production of realism because they purport a genuine report of the authentic experiences of characters. The reader is accustomed to realistic place names and considers the act of conflating a fictional place onto its real counterpart a matter of course. In fact, he might never think of them as two separate worlds.

The preference for particularity is accentuated more powerfully with the preference for what I call the known knowledge, the type of knowledge previously acquired and used to obtain new knowledge. In order to explain this, I would like to borrow an idea from *The Order of Things* by Michel Foucault to illuminate the cognitive process of reading about a place: Proper names, or in this case, identical naming, are the nodes where “the space where one speaks” and “the space where one looks […] fold one over the other as though they were equivalents” (9-10). Due to identical place names, such as Dublin in the literary work and Dublin the capital of Ireland, as with London, Paris, New York, and Saint Petersburg, the reader takes for granted that they are the same. He refuses to accept the thought that book London might be set in another London. The proper name “London”, although strangely familiar, points from the space where one reads to the space where one knows. Consequently, literary London folds over the real London as though the two were the
same. One might simply ask, how could the reader manage differently, when proper names are such unique and powerful pointers? The idea of a different London is outrageous and nonsensical.

Desiring not to be a bold man attempting to alter the world as he sees it in the art of representation, Joyce asserts his resolve to be realistic through a style of “scrupulous meanness.” Through his determination-to-the-extent-of-stubbornness, his style of presentment stands out; that is, the employment of facts and proper names in order to induce the sense of verisimilitude in a fictional work. Not surprisingly, this style is maintained from his early works throughout his process of writing *Ulysses*, in which Joyce’s insistence on being close to facts is recorded in his conversation with friends: “In realism you are down to facts on which the world is based: that sudden reality which smashes romanticism into a pulp” (Power 98). (An examination of an array of proper names in *Ulysses* will be carried out thoroughly in chapter 3.) Under Watt’s lead, it is evident that Joyce’s characters attach to their physical environments through the place names much more strongly than any other novel. The city of Dublin becomes the ultimate outer reality that the reader could refer to in the process of reading.

So far, I have attempted to give an explanation for the tendency to treat a fictional place as an entity corresponding wholly to the real place due to the persistence produced by the mode of reading realism. Another explanation from the theory of mimesis and representation might illuminate the reduced ontology of the fictional world compared to that of the real.

**This is a lesser Dublin**
In pointing out the different degrees of how other literary forms imitate real life compared to realism, Ian Watt avers convincingly that realism provides a more direct simulation of individual experiences and hence narrows the distance between life and art (32-33). One of the consequences of realism, accordingly, is that the reader is trained and conditioned to consider art as an imitation, a representation, and a copy of life. Art is thereby positioned “along the axis of truth, verisimilitude, and falsity” (Bertrand 77). Literature is not only pushed into a forever unfair comparison with life, but also occupies an inferior status. Derrida observes in “The Double Session” that verily, “the whole history of the interpretation of the arts of letters has moved and been transformed within the diverse logical possibilities opened up by the concept of mimesis” (187). Accordingly, it would be useful to revisit the theory of mimesis which, along with the theory of signs, has haunted us since the philosophy of Plato, in order to break out from the chains of traditional thought on representation in which the hierarchy between the model that is life and the copy that is art as well as the stable relationship between the signifier and the signified are always maintained.

First, I would like to paraphrase Plato’s theory: there are three cities; one is the idea of it created by God; another created by men; and the third by James Joyce in literature. The hierarchy is like this: the highest position is for God, the ideal creator of the city, in a lower position will be men, also the creator; the lowest position is for James Joyce, merely the imitator of what God and men create; his creation is thrice removed from reality. Literature offers bad mimesis because it only creates false resemblances. By outlining the schematic law that structures Plato’s discourse, Derrida’s discussion on mimesis might offer a valuable comment on the long tradition of Joyce criticism preoccupied with the representation of Dublin. If the reader reads the representation of Dublin in the light of traditional mimesis, a series of
consequences surface, which may illustrate Derrida’s argument. Derrida argues that:

“1. Mimesis produces a thing’s double. If the double is faithful and perfectly like, no qualitative difference separates it from the model” (“The Double Session” 186, footnote 14). According to him, there are three consequences of this:

(a) The fictional Dublin is the double, which has no value in itself.

(b) The value of the fictional Dublin is based solitarily on its model, therefore, the fictional Dublin is good when the real Dublin is good, and bad when the real Dublin is bad.

(c) Mimetic Dublin is itself negative; therefore, to imitate Dublin is bad in all cases.

Besides, there are three more consequences:

(a) in adding to the real Dublin, the fictional Dublin becomes a supplement and its status as “nothing” is changed.

(b) the fictional Dublin and the existing real Dublin are not the same, “and even if the resemblance were absolute, the resemblance is never absolute. And hence never absolutely true.” (Derrida, “The Double Session” 186, footnote 14).

(c) the fictional Dublin, being a supplement, can replace real Dublin but never become its equivalent; the fictional Dublin is essentially inferior.

Because of mimesis, the Dublin of Joyce is always positioned alongside the real Dublin; and the model Dublin is always superior, whilst its copy is fake. Since the fictional Dublin is the “proliferation of doubles”, Joyce deserves to be cast out of the city for bringing out any dangerous semblances to the real in his work.
It could henceforth be said that the tradition of Joycean criticism focusing on the realness of the city and comparing the fictional Dublin with the real one is greatly haunted by the ghost of Plato’s theory. To liberate representation from the rigid framework that aims to confine it within the holy trinity of arts being either faithful to, inferior to, or a double of reality, we need a theory in which differences are valued and meanings disseminated.

**This is a different Dublin**

Derrida does offer another stance towards mimesis and representation and how Dublin can break free of this logic to acquire its new status of being not lesser than, but different from the model. Instead of reversing the hierarchy between the model and the copy and privileging one over another, he suggests how we could displace the traditional representation in realist fictions, which primarily concerns itself with the correspondence of words to things and embraces the stylistic tradition of language as a transparent medium. As Watt rightly observes, realism faces “[w]ith the semantic problem. Words did not all stand for real objects, or did not stand for them in the same way.” (28) Derrida advocates for wariness of the referentiality of signs as he emphasizes free play between signifier and signified. In the chaotic system of language, words do not have intrinsic meanings or values but their values are dependent on other words, thanks to their differences. Words do not correspond directly to fixed meanings but there is an incremental chain in which a signified in turn becomes a signifier in the next link, thus delaying reaching a final signified forever. For instance, the very title of the book, the signifier *Ulysses*, does not correspond solely to its signified, but entails a series of possible signifieds: it can evoke a mythological hero, a literary fiction called *Ulysses*, a poem named “Ulysses”, a character named Ulysses Bloodstone in the Marvel Comics universe, an American
indie rock band, and a city in Kansas, United States. It glides between mythology, literature, music, comics, people and places. Consequently, representation is not only “rendering present, of a summoning as a power-of-bringing-back-to presence,” but also “sending,” of being forward presence, and of being the mutability and multiplicity of representation itself (Derrida, “Sending” 303). Mimesis, thus, is a process of proliferation of meanings. The text belongs to an undecidable space, always evades comprehensibility and closure.

By examining the textuality of Dublin, the reader understands that Joyce’s arbitrary styles do not offer an absolute representation of reality but interpretations of it. Moreover, it suggests how the text of *Ulysses* becomes an open text with its never-ending interpretations as well as an excellent proving-ground for various methods of reading and explaining literature, as Derek Hand wisely observes:

> De Saussure’s dismantling of the traditional connection between word and world inaugurated the modern theoretical turn in literary studies, and as that field of study expanded and developed through the twentieth century, James Joyce’s *Ulysses* became the theoretical text par excellence. (145)

The play of language, the undecidability of meanings, and the multifarious styles are the very cruxes of *Ulysses* that highlight the suspicion about the referentiality of signs. The reader of *Ulysses* encounters much more complex problems when reading about Dublin. If other fictions gesture to real life, *Ulysses* gestures to real life to a perplexing degree. Joyce’s hyperrealism so tightly connects Dublin to reality that the reader might start suspecting the textuality of real life as well as the authenticity of fiction. The huge number of proper names employed by Joyce keeps referring to the real to such an extreme that they become giant empty signifiers. The whole narrative is transformed
into a vast uncertainty, from which the reader cannot easily retrieve any reasonable readings without being frustrated at being offered too much data. Moreover, *Ulysses* flaunts its stylistic features to the point that an early reviewer was moved to hostility. Edmund Wilson’s review of *Ulysses* in July 1922 (the one that Joyce reputedly appreciated as one of the best) might point us to another problem apart from Joyce’s hyperrealism. Despite his general appreciation of the book, Wilson nonetheless finds fault with the overall structure: “What is wrong is that Mr. Joyce has attempted an impossible genre. You cannot be a realistic novelist in Mr. Joyce’s particular vein and write burlesques at the same time” (qtd. in *Deming I* 229). The odyssey of style in *Ulysses*, when almost every chapter is written in a different style, is what stands out to perplex the reader. Hugh Kenner offers this insight:

> The famous Style became performance, began eying itself, imitating itself […] [r]ooted in numerous realities including the multiple voices of Dublin gossip, styles proliferate and take over the Bloomsday Book. *(Joyce’s Voices 89-90)*

The manifold styles evade any coherent and comprehensive reading of reality, voice, and characters. The goal of reading to follow the plot or characters is always ruptured and denied by the text, and *Ulysses* keeps changing its masks and flaunts its genius to play with language. The dual ontology of Dublin is evoked by the mere act of implementing proper names, which goes hand-in-hand with the novel’s multifarious styles and is by all means troublesome for the reader. On the one hand, the Dublin of *Ulysses* hints at being the same Dublin in 1904, on the other hand, it might be a different and fabricated city conjured up by Joyce. The text simply refuses any absolute affirmation.
This is not Dublin: To write is not to Affirm\footnote{I borrow Michel Foucault’s title of his chapter “To Paint is Not to Affirm,” translated literally from “Peindre n’est pas affirmer” in This is Not a Pipe (1968).}

In the previous section, I discussed how a new theory of mimesis could push Dublin out of a dualism of truth and untruth and subvert the hierarchy between them. Instead of upholding the unreality of Dublin in Ulysses, I propose a reading that identifies problems that help contest the stable, binary relationship between the real and the unreal Dublin. This will be done by analyzing how the unreality is always in the presence along with the realness, by explicating how language and styles in Ulysses in one way promote the predication that “this is Real” and is at the service of referentiality, but in another way conflict with the earlier predication. In Ulysses, realness and unrealness are perpetually at odds. The rejection of the notion of language as a purely referential medium and the acknowledgment that the play of language and styles are responsible for multiplied meanings in constructing different textual Dublins will be my focus in this thesis.

In charting the evolution of criticism apropos Joyce’s literary playfulness, Laurent Milesi in James Joyce and the Difference of Language summarizes its evolvement from focusing on the mimetic power of language to the text as a work-in-progress shaped by irony, parody, self-reflexivity and self-referentiality. In other words, it changes from product to process, “and reveal[s] the essentially historical constitution of our joint processes of reading and writing” (8-9). Despite this recent development in criticism, which focuses more on linguistic performance, the predisposition to treat book-Dublin as a copy of the real city of Dublin is as rampant as ever. To challenge this tradition, a reading of Dublin as represented by the playful
language going beyond mimetic, no longer referential but self-referential, with an emphasis on the spillage and exuberance of styles, might be fruitful. This could urge scholars in the direction of reading Joyce’s exercises in style, one of his main concerns in writing. Joyce once reproved his brother Stanislaus: “Don’t talk to me about politics. I’m only interested in style” (qtd. in Iser The Implied Reader 184). His main interest clearly informs his experiments in Ulysses. In a letter to Harriet Shaw Waver, he boasts about his techniques:

The task I set myself technically in writing a book from eighteen different points of view and in as many styles, all apparently unknown or undiscovered by my fellow tradesmen, that and the nature of the legend chosen would be enough to upset anyone’s mental balance.

(Letters I 167)

In order to cover all the wanderings of Bloom and Stephen as well as a host of other characters in one day in Ulysses, Joyce employs eighteen styles. Many Joyce scholars have propounded the stylistics of Joyce’s Ulysses¹³, with The Odyssey of Styles by Karen Lawrence being the most notable. She groups the first six chapters of Ulysses as well as “Lestrygonians” together as employing the so-called “initial style” and focuses on radical stylistic changes that disrupt the narrative stability in the text. Lawrence classifies and names numerous styles in the various chapters, for instance, “Aeolus”: Interruption and Inventory, “Wandering Rocks” and “Sirens”: The Breakdown of Narrative, “Cyclops,” “Nausicaa” and “Oxen of the Sun”: Borrowed Styles, “Circe”: The Rhetoric of Drama, to name a few. Her stylistic discussion centers mostly on the

“successive rhetorical experiments” that causes “the discontinuity of the narrative as it dons various stylistic ‘masks’ ” and “successive breaks in narrative contracts” (Lawrence 6). Even though Lawrence does not offer any definition of “style” in her research, it could be deduced that according to her, style is constructed from the remarkable features of a text, which are so pronounced that they strike the reader as the dominant aspect, drowning the content itself. Her treatment of the style of the first six episodes, thus, has a critical oversight. Firstly, it does not detect other unnoticeable features eclipsed by the presence of the dominant, for instance, the employment of free indirect discourse14 and proper names. Secondly, it fails to identify how these recessive styles produce uncertainty and disruption in the narrative from the onset of the novel. In this fashion, the almost unanimous agreement among critics on a uniform early style15 brings about an oversimplified reading of the six chapters, missing many complex features. Not only do they not distinguish the style in Stephen’s episodes carefully differentiated from that in Bloom’s, but they also overlook how “Proteus” is in stark dissimilarity with “Telemachus,” or how the style of “Calypso” style is incomparable to the one of “Lestrygonians.”

I want to stress that we should not ignore Joyce’s statement about how he wrote *Ulysses* in 18 different styles. As Monica Fludernik brilliantly asserts in “Narrative and its development in *Ulysses,*” “[t]here is no ‘initial style’ for the

14 Weldon Thorton argues for a different reading of the “initial style” by rejecting other critics’ simple overemphasis on “voices” in the first six episodes. He notes that: “The most distinctive feature of Joyce’s initial style, then, is his adapting and blending a number of techniques, so as to simulate the inextricable unity of various aspects of reality and of human experience” (67). However, Thornton does not point out differences between styles in the early episodes, thus more or less, he still considers them as belonging to a group. See more in *Voices and Values,* chapter 2 particularly.

15 Marilyn French states that, “Since the initial style is virtually the only one used in the first six chapters, it sets the decorum of the novel; the reader experiences the advent of any new style as a violation of decorum, a breaking of ground rules” (54). Other critics share French’s opinion; see Litz 7-13 (1964), Groden 17, Lawrence 38-54.
episodes one to six” (17). In her examination of narrative strategies in *Ulysses*, Fludernik contends that there is an evolution in Joyce’s technique in the first six episodes. “Telemachus” founds basic conventions, and Joyce gradually revises his style in “Nestor” and “Proteus” with a more concentrated figurative perspective. In “Calypso” Joyce introduces a distant voice in presenting Bloom and this style evolves to one of distanciation in “Lotus Eaters,” “Hades,” and “Lestrygonians.” The reading and naming of styles in *Ulysses* encounter difficulties and attract vastly diverse opinions due to various uncertainties inherent in every chapter. Any particular scholar when picking up these remarkable features is simultaneously ignoring other features. The act of classifying and putting expressive features into categories, then sticking a label named “style” on it, is an act of violence attempting to fit various differences into an order while suppressing uncontrollable features. These much muted elements are irreducible into a neat scheme or order: they are the misfits, the redundant. In naming a style, in picking out and promoting certain remarkable features, a theory could run the risk of privileging some parts over the others. More importantly, it fails to appreciate the very absence of remarkable features and disallows the text a nameable style.

I would like to advocate for a more complex reading of style(s) in which all details of prose are taken into consideration to make up what according to Gérard Genette is a “style.” Genette proffers how style can function as a Janus convention that thrusts the reader simultaneously into two directions. His exclusive analysis of style in “Style and Signification” helps me deal with those flexible and protean textualities of *Ulysses*. Being dissatisfied with the concepts of style as simply either denotative or expressive, Genette exhorts that they are not mutually exclusive but rather voicing
their presence at the same time\textsuperscript{16}. The discord between these elements happens throughout the discourse. Genette attempts to prove that style “simultaneously designates its object in the mode of denotation and something else in the mode of connotation” (95). In discourse there are always two competing factors jostling with each other to call the reader’s attention to each one:

any element of discourse may be taken, according to the contexts and types of its reception, as either literal or figurative. The largely conditional, or attentional, character of figurativeness makes it – as people have always known – a perfect emblem of style. (121)

This deconstructive reading explains why the reader picks out several outstanding features of a discourse and accordingly names them its style. These features share the advantage of beckoning louder to the reader compared to other recessive, overlooked ones. Renouncing this conception of style, Genette asserts that style is not only in the details but also “in all the details, and in all their relations,” and “the phenomenon of style is discourse itself” (141). Whether dominant or recessive, all details are equal in their construction of a discourse. More importantly, the accumulation of all the unnoticeable subtleties can call attention to themselves, converting their status to dominant, pushing the very struggle between these features to the forefront of the narrative. Take the mimetic reading of Dublin in \textit{Ulysses} for example. This interpretation underscores how the style of hyperrealism in Joyce puts the realness of Dublin at the centre of the narrative and proclaims vehemently to scholars, concomitantly revealing that the unrealness is pushed to the margins and

\textsuperscript{16} Genette examines various notions of style by several notable scholars such as Charles Bally, Mikel Dufrene, Hands Reichenback. See Genette 85-142 (1993).
unacknowledged. At the very moment of denoting realness, the narrative also connotes unrealness. My reading of style suggests that the event of unrealness breaks out in the middle of the narrative in every chapter, that unrealness is always there, and that the game between the real and the unreal is ever ongoing in the playful text. I insist on a revision of mimesis by which the reader could push Dublin out of the dualism of truth and untruth. It is not that we should now transition to the next phase, upholding the unrealness of Dublin in *Ulysses*, but to identify the problems that challenge the stable dualistic relationship between the real and unreal Dublin. This reading can reveal the absolute interdependency of these two concepts, real and unreal.

By employing Genette’s notion of style, I propose a new way of reading Dublin in Joyce. Not only is it an extremely real city, which is affirmed by traditional criticism, but also a tremendously unreal urban space: it is a textual artefact oscillating between various poles of interpretation. However, as Milesi observes, Genette’s “atomist” conception of style runs the risk of encountering troubles in deciding which elements are noticeable, and “above all, of privileging, even if involuntarily, a mannerist aesthetic for which the most remarkable style will be the one that is the most highly charged with features” (235). In order to read style not as a single phenomenon or artefact but a plural one, not a final representation of truth but rather an ongoing process, I propose a complementary way of studying Joyce’s stylistics by combining Genette’s theory with Derrida’s reading of Nietzsche’s style. Similar to Joyce, Nietzsche in *Ecce Homo* advocates that he must employ “the most multifarious art of style” to accommodate the various inward states (265). A genealogy of styles is employed, not to help the reader reach a comprehensive understanding of the text, but rather to experience the process of seeking for the truth. Reading Nietzsche’s styles, Derrida concedes that “if there is going to be style, there can only be more than one”
Therefore, “style” cannot exist in singular because style itself emerges out of differentiations; since plurality is the mother of all styles, it is a must. Not only do the enigmas and puzzles that Joyce put into his text become a matter of controversy, but his styles also engender many battles of interpretation. His multifarious styles are “one attempt at a holding action against the impossibility of breaking out of the enclosure of ‘interpretation’ ” (Spivak, “Translator’s Preface” xxix). Accordingly, another possible definition of style is outlined:

Style, then, might be what chances to remain when one has given up all fetishistic hopes and claims of potency and essential appropriation, so that, through the “atomystics of the letter” [...] language would come and [...] it would dictate to the writer as an arrivant and an event. (Milesi 231)

Joyce’s styles work similarly to a metaphor, a translation that take the reader beyond, “a pure means (of transport) without destination and with only transitory passengers” (Milesi 241), true to Joyce’s idea of the reader as a wanderer, a modern Ulysses. To arrive at a final truth, a final vision of Dublin or life in Ulysses is not what the text teaches us. If anything, its multifarious styles deny an absolute truth or knowledge in order to advocate a deeply engaging understanding of writing and reading.

Conclusion

The theoretical frameworks discussed in this chapter helps me offer an understanding of how to renounce mimesis as a truthful approach to writing and reading and suggest how representation comes with the dissemination of meanings. There exists an indeterminate space between the real and fictional Dublin in which the Dublin of Joyce is both adamantly itself and tenaciously something other. Reading the
textual Dublin while keeping in mind *Ulysses*’s multifarious styles makes the process of reading, far from a simple procedure privileging remarkable features while pushing unnamable ones to the margin, an act of exploring textuality; and textuality – the process of reading – is what constitutes the text.

Taking these critical cues, the next chapter will validate Genette’s notion of style by a meticulous textual analysis of Stephen Dedalus’s episodes that focuses less on dominant aspects of the narrative. It subverts the widely accepted notion that throughout the early chapters of *Ulysses* there is a single so-called “initial style” by elucidating the differences between the styles of “Telemachus” and “Proteus.” The chapter then goes on to explore how the style of “Proteus” represents Sandymount Strand: from the act of metamorphosing the semi-circular Dublin Bay into a bowl of his mother’s green bile, to the process of reading the Strand, Dublin emerges through Stephen’s experiments in visibility, audibility and words. The real city gradually becomes highly intertextual rather than objective and truthful.
Chapter Two

“Proteus”: A Differing-Deferring Dublin

The activity or productivity connoted by the *a of différance* refers to the generative movement in the play of differences. The latter are neither fallen from the sky nor inscribed once and for all in a closed system, a static structure that a synchronic and taxonomic operation could exhaust. Differences are the effects of transformations, and from this vantage the theme of *différance* is incompatible with the static, synchronic, taxonomic, ahistoric motifs in the concept of structure.

Jacques Derrida, “Semiology and Grammatology” (27)

The reader steps into “Proteus” and is abruptly transported to Sandymount Strand, a large shore in the suburb of Dublin. The hour is 11 A.M., and instead of finding Stephen amongst his friends as in “Telemachus” or his pupils in “Nestor,” the episode features Stephen all alone, “walking into eternity” on the coastline. This chapter will focus on how Dublin is transfigured into an internalized textuality that keeps denying a final and absolute definition by means of a differing and deferring style. The discussion starts by pointing out the protean characteristics of the seascape in “Proteus,” which is reflected in the multiple alterations of reality, and how this external world smoothly morphs into Stephen’s mind. This leads to an observation of the uncertainty in the narrative due to the shattered wholeness of voices and the blurred boundary between the objective and figurative representation of Dublin’s seascape. I will then investigate how undecidability is generated by an analysis of the styles in “Telemachus” and “Proteus,” which consist of three main narrative features: authorial narration, free indirect discourse, and interior monologue. They are often considered less noticeable compared to the rhetorical masks in later episodes and reductively termed the “initial style.” Based on the result of the comparison, I propose that “Proteus” employs a highly problematic device, the free indirect discourse, to acquire a unique style with an intense concentration on the character’s stream of
consciousness and thereby creates a subjective Dublin. The last section examines the presentation of city as a mutable text produced by Stephen, who becomes the storyteller in “Proteus.” It posits that his multiple attempts to precisely represent reality in language reveal his awareness of the impossibility of capturing it by relying entirely on a mediated system of representation.

Noonday Walking on Sandymount Strand: Protean Reality in “Proteus”

Before tackling the representation of Dublin in “Proteus,” it would be useful to look at the Homeric parallel in this episode. In book four of the *Odyssey*, Telemachus travels to meet Menelaus to seek information about his father Odysseus. In his court, Menelaus tells Telemachus the story of when he was stranded in Egypt and was helped by the goddess Eidothea, a daughter of the sea-god Proteus. She told him Proteus would tell him how to go on his voyage only if he could pin him down. True to the episode title, which Joyce himself later deleted from all manuscripts, reality in “Proteus” is ever-changing over diversified states and the metamorphoses of objects and words: Dublin’s seascape repudiates a static and final form.

There is no panoramic view of Dublin Bay presented in this episode, as if Joyce has exhausted his repertoire of big pictures of the sea in “Telemachus” and arrives at the third episode with only concrete niceties left. The details rule over and their transformations sweep through the text. As Joyce told his close friend Frank Budgen, “That’s all in the Protean character of the thing. Everything changes: land, water, dog, time of day. Parts of speech change too. Adverb becomes verb.” (Budgen 34) In this way, “Proteus” presents the reader with an influx of reality where everything keeps shifting its appearances. J. Mitchell Morse offers a wonderful
summary of all the transformations taken place, from the alteration of Stephen himself (37) to other conversions:

a porter bottle on Sandymount becomes a sentinel on Pharos; the boulders on the beach become mammoth skulls, shells of dead Behemoths; [...] the sea weeds become women... and a loom. (39-48)

Morse also records varieties of word variations in “Proteus” (47). Regrettably, the transformations of the sand, sea and tide fail to make it into this list. Whilst walking, Stephen constantly gets in touch with the sand. Through a close reading of all the patterns of sand, the reader realizes that it plays such a vital role in this episode. Not only is it the stimulus that triggers the stream of consciousness in Stephen, but also, along with water, it serves as a threatening force to his body. Many critics have pointed out the importance of water in “Proteus” and Ulysses17, nonetheless, the role of sand is still neglected. I would like to offer a discussion about the metamorphoses of sand18 to highlight the on-going transformations in reality’s forms.


17 Robert Adams Day argues that, “The idea of water, being an infinity of things, doing an infinity of things, dominated Joyce’s creation” (7). For more insightful analysis of this topic, see Day 3-20, Blamires 18, Igrutinović 55-66.

18 I would like to thank Sameera Siddique for pointing this out to me. I further develop the idea to illustrate my own thesis on reality depicted in “Proteus.”
“loose sand” (47), “green-goldenly lagoons of sand” (49), “quaking soil” (44), “lows of sand” (45). Besides, the image of sand is not only factual but also metaphorical. It goes hand in hand with “sink” and generates an intimidating atmosphere in the narrative: the word “sink” appears 4 times (“feet sinking in the silted sand” (38), “his feet beginning to sink slowly” (44), “his feet sinking again slowly” (44), “my feet are sinking” (44)), and “sunk,” 2 times (“sunk in sand” (44)). Further, sand is depicted as laying siege to Stephen, for instance: “Unwholesome sandflats waited to suck his treading soles” (41), and “wet sand slapped his boots” (44). These recurrent images of objects and humans sinking in sand constitute an intimidating motif, and sustain the reader’s feeling of being overwhelmed in the repetitively fluctuating external reality.

Additionally, the alterations of reality come about not only in sand but also in the sea, tide, and shells: the reader experiences the transformations of all of these objects mirrored in an assortment of linguistic formations that Joyce continuously adds to this episode: “wild sea” (37), “a winedark sea” (47), “livid sea” (48), “crackling wrack and shells” (37), “a damp crackling mast” (41), “razorshells” (41), “squeaking pebbles” (41), “a loose drift of rubble” (49), “silly shells” (49), “the nearing tide” (37) “the crested tide” (45), “the tide flowing quickly in on all sides” (45), “the lacefringe of the tide” (46), “a tide westering” (47), “upswelling tide” (49), “purling, widely flowing” (49), “floating foam-pool” (47), “flower unfurling” (49), “whispering water” (49), “molten pewter surf” (45). Those formations, stemming from both English and foreign languages, are continually inserted in the text by both the narrator and Stephen himself to express his observance of the kaleidoscopic reality. As J. Mitchell Morse remarks, “the whole technique of the chapter is the pretence that things change when words change – though some things do in fact change” (44). The reader experiences a
relentless language chase, where he goes catching external conditions through corresponding words, as many and as accurately as possible. This is not the first time the text labors to mirror reality: in the first episode, Joyce already implements a subtle narrative strand to grasp Buck’s and Stephen’s emotional conditions, which I will later return to. Therefore, through language and its apparently strong mimetic power, Dublin’s seascape seems constantly mutable.

Furthermore, at the beginning of the episode, Stephen declares, “Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes” (37). As Fritz Senn contends, “Proteus” discusses the relationship between illusion and reality and how the eyes trick us into being certain that “What we see is what we think we know. [...] ‘Proteus’ is full of forms for seeing and knowing” (Inductive Scrutinies 122). Stephen tries to hold on to the truth that lies behind the “signatures” of reality – the signatures that we have access to through eyes and ears. What Stephen sees, hears and touches is what he solely recognizes. No wonder the word “see” appears 20 times, and “eye” 15 times in “Proteus.” The task of pinning down the protean reality is an impossibility, as humans can only discern its numerous facets by appearances. I will return to this crucial matter in the last section of this chapter.

**Body as Threshold of Stephen’s Consciousness**

Not confining his descriptions of the multifaceted reality to the boundaries of outer appearances, Joyce weaves aural and tactile with visual perceptions by depicting through Stephen’s perception the patterns of the strand and his walking movements. His eyes are upon the beach, his ears hear the waves, and his feet touch the sand. The descriptions of feet and boots stamping on the beach are constant in “Proteus,” in order to show that the character’s body is in a continuous interaction with reality: “his boots
crush crackling wrack and shells” (37), “his boots trod again a damp crackling mast” (41), “wet sand slapped his boots” (44), “my feet are sinking” (44), “he lifted his feet up from the suck” (44). As a result, the narrative establishes a direct contact between Stephen’s body, mind and reality. His body exists as the threshold connecting reality to the consciousness. The moment the character’s body gets in contact with sand, water, or any element of the seaside, the narrative effortlessly shifts from third-person narration to interior monologue. Stephen keeps entering and exiting his contemplation, and reality continues being gushed and re-gushed into his thoughts with outer objects serving as stimuli. The cycle of reverie-reality-reverie-reality keeps going on, without beginning or end. Here is an illustration of how a change in reality pushes Stephen out of his stream of thoughts back to the physical world where he moves to be engulfed by his thoughts again:

The grainy sand had gone from under his feet. His boots trod again a damp crackling mast, razorsheells, squeaking pebbles, that on the unnumbered pebbles beats, wood sieved by the shipworm, lost Armada. […] A porterbottle stood up, stogged to its waist, in the cakey sand dough. A sentinel: isle of dreadful thirst. […] Ring-send: wigwams of brown steersmen and master mariners. Human shells. (41)

Previously, the walking Stephen is in a continuous mental conversation with his former self, and from the present vantage point, he realizes his erstwhile vanity and fatuity and divulges his bitter disenchantment. Suddenly, the grainy sand is taken over by the assorted shells and pebbles, thrusting him back to reality. Then, seeing wood littered on the pebbles, Stephen fancies them pieces sieved by shipworm from the lost Armada, a Spanish fleet defeated in the Channel. In this short passage, the reader encounters a cycle of thoughts-reality-thoughts. The principle triggering this process is
free association. A pattern for his associations can be found in some cases, but not all. For instance, the image of the “porterbottle” standing in the sand points to a standing soldier and at the same time to a bitter thought of his motherland as an isle of dreadful thirst, which is easily explained. However, calling the houses of mariners “wigwam,” a Native American type of tent, is very far-fetched, as is the act of transforming them into “human shells.”

These endless cycles in “Proteus” completely blur the boundaries between thoughts and reality. The reader cannot distinguish a sudden comment made by Stephen from descriptions by the narrator. Such a line as “the grainy sand had gone from under his feet” is an announcement by the narrator to both the reader and Stephen. Right after that, there is a suspension in meaning, a muddy territory mixing both the narrator’s and Stephen’s voice at the start of the clause: “squeaking pebbles, that on the unnumbered pebbles beats.” Before they have time to trudge through this area, the reader is immediately pushed into Stephen’s mind. The mode of paralleling the physical world and Stephen’s mind (imagination, thoughts, feelings, memories) is one of the prominent features in this episode. The outer world is correlative with the inner world of the character. I would like to examine another example to demonstrate the correspondence between these two worlds:

Turning, he scanned the shore south, his feet sinking again slowly in new sockets. The cold domed room of the tower waits. Through the barbacans the shafts of light are moving ever, slowly ever as my feet are sinking, creeping duskward over the dial floor. (44)

Stephen looks to the south where the Martello Tower is, and his feet sink into the sand (this is stated 3 times in this very short paragraph), and this incident makes him think of the “cold domed room” of the tower where he is staying. This description recalls the
first chapter, “in the gloomy domed livingroom of the tower” (11) as if the text remembers its own textuality. In addition, there is an emotional comparability between the feet sinking into sand sockets and Stephen being in the “cold domed room”: the narrowing and shrinking of space in the beach invokes the suffocation in the room, and the oppressive fear of being engulfed. In three sentences, Joyce juxtaposes vastly distant spaces and places, making them emerge simultaneously. The verb is noticeably in the present continuous tense, to emphasize that the two facts are happening at the same time: slowly Stephen’s feet are sinking, and the shafts of light are moving duskward. Both are about to end and hint at a decayed future. The transition between the inner and outer worlds is effortless, creating an effect where gaps between the body and the mind and reality are limited. Accordingly, there is a fusion between Stephen’s mind and the outer world: Stephen, more often than not, mingles his thoughts with reality. He has great dexterity in reshaping reality according to his inner mood. Another example can be cited:

His feet marched in sudden proud rhythm over the sand furrows, along by the boulders of the south wall. He stared at them proudly, piled stone mammoth skulls. Gold light on sea, on sand, on boulders. The sun is there, the slender trees, the lemon houses. (42)

In his recollections about his Paris student days, Stephen recalls his father’s telegram about his mother’s death, which in turn reminds him of Buck’s words: “The aunt thinks you killed your mother” (35). Stephen then invents a stanza in a parody-song and plays it in his head. The rhythm of the song gets out of his mind and becomes the rhythm of his feet, synchronizing his movement with his thoughts: “His feet marched in sudden proud rhythm over the sand furrows” (42). The song continues to affect Stephen’s behavior, making him stare at the boulders “proudly.” Not stopping at that,
the internal rhythm evolves and spills over into the balanced syntax of authorial narration: “Gold light on sea, on sand, on boulders. The sun is there, the slender trees, the lemon houses” (42). The structure of this sentence mirrors the invented stanza. Reality is now recreated as a rhythmical artefact.

The tendency to conflate the physical world with his mind is clearly shown in the examples above. This inclination is one of the themes in Joyce’s first novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, in which Stephen is portrayed as a fantasy-driven hero who tilts against the windmills of reality. A scrupulous reading of Dublin in *A Portrait* might be useful to illuminate my point. The next section will concentrate on how the city initially morphs into *A Portrait* Stephen’s mind, and a discussion on free indirect discourse in this novel will be the starting point for my examination of this technique in *Ulysses*.

“Crossing Stephen’s, that is, my green” (*P 210*)

From the very first reported action of his infanthood, Stephen shows a knack of filtering and transforming reality according to his own perception and is inclined to treat his consciousness as a self-contained entity. This tendency is vividly illustrated in the opening words of the novel, “Once upon a time and a very good time it was there was a moocow coming down along the road and this moocow that was coming down along the road met a nicens little boy named baby tuckoo” (*P 5*). In his imagination, little Stephen identifies himself with baby tuckoo, a fictional character, though he may not yet quite understand the distinction between fact and fiction. He sings the song he hears and recasts it in his own lisping language: “O, the wild rose blossoms, On the little green place” is condensed, inverted, and lisped into “O, the green wothe botheth” (*P 5*). Hugh Kenner justly remarks that “the whole book is about the encounter of baby tuckoo with the moocow” (“The *Portrait in Perspective*” 33). In other words, it is a
meeting of an evolving person with an evolving outer world. This is demonstrated throughout the novel: in the course of the first four chapters, Stephen is depicted as a human being bumping against an external reality, gradually asserting control over it, and undergoing a series of psychological transformations to become an artist-in-the-making who rejects no small number of social norms. Stephen is an exemplar of a transitional Modernist-Romantic, extolling individualism and the mind. The inclination to blend actuality with fantasy in Stephen’s psyche is his life-approach, one hardly unique to him but clearly and repeatedly echoing the structure of a typical Bildungsroman. The act of walking-to-encounter exemplifies his reaction to outer influences: instead of being passively smothered, he takes them in and merges into his psyche. For Stephen, at least some precincts of Dublin are “no longer ‘out there’ in the world but inside his imagination, something that he is free to name, order, and give shape to” (Bolson “Topics and Geographies” 58).

The reader might notice that the interaction between Stephen and Dublin is often exemplified by his wandering-to-meet and Joyce lets Stephen ramble around the city frequently: the baby tuckoo meets a moocow on his journey (P 5), Stephen walks every Sunday with his father and Uncle Charles (P 51); he wanders alone in Blackrock seeking Mercedes (P 52); he takes aimless strolls in the city when his family relocates to Dublin (P 55); he strays into the back streets of the city and blindly satisfies his lust (P 84); he drifts from home to school when lost in faith (P 147-8); he moseys to Dollymount Strand and experiences an epiphany (P 139); and he roams with Cranly (P 201). All of his sentiments, thoughts, and desires are mirrored in his wanderings of

19 Similarly, Seamus Deane remarks that Dublin in Portrait is “a site of linguistic self-consciousness […] Above all, it is a place that is named” (xii).
Dublin’s maze-like streets\textsuperscript{20}. As Eric Bulson rightly notes, the city in \textit{A Portrait} is confined to and transformed accordingly to Stephen’s moods (“Topics and Geographies” 60). For instance, at the end of chapter two, when his body is on fire by lustful desire, Dublin lures his body into its arms and becomes “a maze of narrow and dirty streets” (84). At the end of chapter three, Stephen suffers because of his sins and Dublin is transformed into a seductive person trying to capture him. When ridden with guilt, he sees Dublin as an eternal hell that he can never overcome (117). However, right after his confession in a chapel, a place on the hellish streets that he wanders by, Dublin is, as if, absolved: “The muddy streets were gay” (122). The most important example illustrating how Stephen transforms Dublin through his walk is a scene in chapter five:

His morning walk across the city had begun, and he foreknew that as he passed the sloblands of Fairview he would think of the cloistral silver-veined prose of Newman; that as he walked along the North Strand Road, glancing idly at the windows of the provision shops, he would recall the dark humour of Guido Cavalcanti and smile […] (147-148)

This very city which was, not so long ago, a dangerous, tempting devil possessing dark streets like a maze, is now his partner, stripping away his miseries and making him feel calm and fresh: Stephen’s body is bubble-wrapped in “the grey morning light falling about him through the dripping trees,” (147) and “the strange wild smell of the wet leaves and bark” (147). He no longer hears his father’s complaints, his mother’s mumblings, and his own bitterness and heartache. The reader should notice how Joyce

\textsuperscript{20} See Herr 415-29 (2016) for a detailed discussion of Stephen’s walking in \textit{A Portrait}, in which with a phenomenal reading of the act of walking, Herr argues convincingly that “the streets of Dublin and the practice of walking in the city not only constantly transform Stephen’s sense of the world but also materially shape his emergent Being-in-the-world” (416).
adds many details to conjure up a refreshing and romantic atmosphere of this therapeutic city compared to the bare streets described by such words as “dark, slimy” (83) in the previous chapter. The streets of Dublin are transformed into a land of classical literary landmarks: with every step that Stephen makes, the city is metamorphosed further into the world in the poems and fictions he has read and memorized. “The sloblands of Fairview” becomes “the cloistral silver-veined prose of Newman”; the windows of the provision shops along the North Strand Road triggers reminiscence of “dark humour of Guido Cavalcanti”; “Baird’s stonecutting works in Talbot Place” grows into a wind blowing “the spirit of Ibsen” (148). Dublin is totally eclipsed and overshadowed by the “spectral words” of Aristotle and Aquinas (148). Even though his body interacts with reality, with Dublin, its wet morning and streets and shops, Stephen’s mind is in conversation with various famous philosophers and writers. He does not seek for beauty in the streets of Dublin but the eternal beauty amidst Aristotle’s teachings. The reader while taking a walk along the city with him takes a literary journey through his mind. This very act of transferring reality into the character’s mental landscape, which is abound with literary, philosophical, historical allusions, will become the most important feature of “Proteus” when Stephen, once again, takes a walk on Sandymount Strand. As a result, the reader can be easily misdirected, gulled, and lured into Stephen’s mental world. This very life-approach of Stephen plays out, though not without ambiguities, as self-explanatory, exposing his tormented personality: he is sensitive, intelligent, and thoughtful; he is egocentric and suffering from self-delusion; he is a fledgling eager to soar, to conquer and recreate the world; he is an artist-in-progress.
The technique used prominently in those above-quoted passages is free indirect discourse\textsuperscript{21}. It is also known as the Uncle Charles principle, a term coined by Hugh Kenner (Joyce’s Voices 15-38). The narrator adopts Stephen’s lexicon to colour his story about Stephen and yet does not totally withdraw. He remains ready at hand to comment on Stephen’s actions and thoughts, to produce an ironic stance from which various signals are sent out to the reader signalling that this story might be a narrative in “Stephen’s idiolect but the narrator has appropriated it to his own ends” (Johnson, “Introduction,” A Portrait xx-i). Owing to this device, in which the syntax of the sentences are mimetic to Stephen’s inner moods and thoughts, “[w]here in letting the style grow as Stephen grew Joyce lets us perceive in style a system of limits within which Stephen is somewhere to be found” as remarked by Hugh Kenner (Ulysses 67-8). In A Portrait, Dublin is still kept under a mixture of narratorial and figural voices, creating a stylistic system that keeps the reader under its constraint. In Ulysses, Joyce builds another style mirroring the city directly through the character’s mind. These two features work together to produce a stronger teller in command of his own tale. Joyce goes further than free indirect discourse to compose a whole first chapter of stream of consciousness. If in A Portrait authorial narration can still be detected beside Stephen’s idioms, in Ulysses the boundary between third-person narration and interior monologue is extremely blurry.

The examination of the process of becoming an artist in A Portrait yields results that are more evident when Joyce leaves Stephen Dedalus at the start of his wanderings on 16 June 1904 and shows how his character masters the art of language by skilfully playing with it to recreate reality. In A Portrait, it stops at his desire to

---

\textsuperscript{21} The first scholar who spotted this device is Charles Bally in 1912, who termed it, “Le style indirect libre.” See more on this matter in Pascal, especially chapter II.
mould reality to his own whims, but in *Ulysses*, it develops to Stephen’s “almosting” it and telling his own story with his own reflective style: not only does Stephen internalize reality, he also remarks on it; more than that, he recreates it in his own language and text.

“**White breast of the dim sea**” (*U*9): **Initial Style and Uncertainty**

In a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver on 6th August 1919, Joyce explains his purposes when employing various styles in *Ulysses* and calls the early style as “the rock of Ithaca”:

I understand that you may begin to regard the various styles of the episodes with dismay and prefer the initial style much as the wanderer did who longed for the rock of Ithaca. But in the compass of one day to compress all these wanderings and clothe them in the form of this day is for me possible only by such variation which, I beg you to believe, is not capricious. (*Letters I* 129)

The initial style, a label Joyce himself casually uses, becomes the celebrated trademark that critics are eager to attribute to the first six (or ten in some opinions) chapters. More or less, there is an agreement that the first half of the novel is written in one unique style. This point of view is mostly not challenged, but strengthened by genetic scholars. Michael Groden, in his famous and influential work, *Ulysses in Progress*, defines this style as “what appears to be a relatively uncomplex ‘third-person, past-tense narration and direct first-person, present-tense depiction of the characters’ thoughts’” (15). The chapters written in this style still have a streamlined plot, in which the narrative contract between the reader and the narrative is strong enough to help the reader keep track of all events happening in the story. The “initial style” is a simple
term encompassing all of Joyce’s early experimentations with free indirect discourse and interior monologue.

The style of “Telemachus” is quite tame and conventional compared to other revolutionary chapters such as “Aeolus,” “Sirens,” or “Oxen of the Sun.” In the schema that Joyce produced for Stuart Gilbert to help him understand the essential structure of the novel, the technic for “Telemachus” is “Narrative (Young).” Inheriting traditional narrative techniques, the voice of “Telemachus” is the dominant third-person narrator’s telling a story from a third-person point of view. Interior monologue, in its inchoate form, already appears for the first time but is totally overwhelmed by third-person narration. An examination of the amount of interior monologue and third-person narration in the episode reveals a ratio of 1:7 in this 7375-word chapter, where interior monologue accounts for 962 words and third-person narration for 6413 words\(^\text{22}\) (see Appendix C).

To further analyze this style, I will specifically discuss two important factors: namely, the housekeeping sentences and the free indirect discourse in “Telemachus.” I must point out that even though on the surface, “Telemachus” seems to be keeping the contract between the reader and the text and provides a clear plot, at a deeper level, uncertainty and irony are already at work. First of all, “Telemachus” includes a considerable amount of descriptive sentences documenting characters’ activities. They are voiced by the third-person narrator; they are simple, detailed, realistic, and neutral in tone. For instance:

\(^{22}\) The ratio is one of the important factors that contribute to the differences between various types of the “initial style,” and I will return to this later.
Buck Mulligan peeped an instant under the mirror and then covered the bowl smartly. (3)

Stephen, an elbow rested on the jagged granite, leaned his palm against his brow and gazed at the fraying edge of his shiny black coatsleeve. (5)

Stephen stood up and went over to the parapet. (5)

The grammatical structure of these sentences is conventional, moderate in adjectives and adverbs, rendering the world as objectively as possible. Abundant details are offered about the way Buck Mulligan covers a bowl of leather, to how Stephen leans his palm against his brow, to Stephen going over to the parapet. The prose is well-balanced to truthfully convey the image of Dublin to the reader.

Beside these sentences which resemble traditional prose, there are a small number of significantly short sentences that end with an adverb. These sentences create a sense of imbalance in the way they end, and their strange shortness feels abrupt compared to the housekeeping sentences above. For instance, “he said sternly” (3), “he cried briskly” (3), “he said gaily” (4), “Stephen said quietly” (4), “he said frankly” (4), “Stephen said with energy and growing fear” (4), “he cried thickly” (5).

The third-person narrator employs numerous adverbs to depict Stephen and Buck’s projections of emotions. Reading them side by side with the housekeeping sentences, the reader could spot a suspicious feature in Joyce’s prose: that is, the parodistic nuances in the way his narrator constructs the world. On the one hand, he follows basic conventions; on the other hand, the text introduces another subtle narrative strand, as Karen Lawrence notes, “[t]o upset the stability created by these conventions

---

23 In this very sentence, Karen Lawrence spots a dislocation in the narrative when Joyce wrote “rested” instead of “resting,” thus surprising the reader. (44)
and to point to their inadequacy. As the normative style asserts its ability to capture reality in language, this narrative voice advertises its own incompetence” (45-6).

“Telemachus” is an early signal of how the world might not be truthfully and successfully represented through language, an awareness that Stephen will soon acquire in “Proteus.” This tendency is clearly mirrored in the constant oscillation between seriousness and irony that abounds in the way Joyce depicts Dublin Bay in “Telamachus.” When Arthur Power expressed his admiration at the phrase “Thalatta! Thalatta! She is our great sweet mother,” (5) Joyce’s told him to “‘Read what I have written above: ‘The snotgreen sea. The scotumtightening sea’ ” (44-45).

Moreover, from a narratological perspective, the irony is inherent in another type of sentence that also belongs to the so-called initial style that Joyce introduces in “Telemachus,” that is, the highly complex and educated prose constructed out of Stephen’s lexicon. I will look at sentences describing Dublin Bay and pick out three notable examples to compare them with the two aforementioned types of sentences. They also show how the Bay is the space that Stephen first attempts to mould with his own thoughts, memories, and imagination. The three passages are the following:

Across the threadbare cuffedge he saw the sea hailed as a great sweet mother by the wellfed voice beside him. The ring of bay and skyline held a dull green mass of liquid. A bowl of white china had stood beside her deathbed holding the green sluggish bile which she had torn up from her rotting liver by fits of loud groaning vomiting. (5-6)

The first sentence of the first example is simple enough: it is narrated by the third-person narrator: he tells us how Stephen sees the sea which is earlier praised as a “great sweet mother” (5) by Buck Mulligan. However, from very early on, irony glimmers in the contrast between “the threadbare cuffedge” of Stephen’s shirt and the
“wellfed voice” of Buck. Things start to get complicated in the second sentence when
the narrator borrows Stephen’s dictions and transforms the bay into the image of “a
dull green mass of liquid.” This sentence is a transition to as well as a reflection of the
third sentence thanks to the free indirect discourse technique: it introduces Stephen’s
stream of consciousness: the dull green mass is linked to the green bile of his mother.
There is an analogy between the ring of the bay and the bowl of white china, as if
Stephen is showing us Dublin Bay in miniature. There is no longer a simple third-
person narration but instead an infection, an intrusion, an invasion of the figural voices
into the third-person voice’s province. Additionally, the bay is transformed from “a
great sweet mother” into a dying mother. The writing technique becomes more
complex when we come to the second example:

Woodshadows floated silently by through the morning peace from the
stairhead seaward where he gazed. Inshore and farther out the mirror of
water whitened, spurned by lightshod hurrying feet. […] A cloud began
to cover the sun slowly, shadowing the bay in deeper green. It lay
behind him, a bowl of bitter waters. (9)

The words of the song that Mulligan sings before leaving downstairs, “Who will go
drive with Fergus now,” (9) tint Stephen’s impressions of the sea. “The shadows of the
wood” from Yeats’ poem is now shortened simply into “woodshadows”; “white breast
of the dim sea” is quoted directly from Yeats. Additionally, the inshore spurned by
hurrying feet also springs from “dance upon the level shore” of Yeats, and the “dim”
pattern goes on to another sentence to become “the dim tide.” The shadowy tinge of
the whole song spills onto the image of the sea. One important note about the bay
image that makes me wonder about descriptive language’s capacity to present an
objective reality is where the word “woodshadows” comes from. Is this from
Stephen’s imagination or the omniscient narrator’s? The song that Stephen once sang to his mother comes back to his mind with its lyrics, “love’s bitter mystery.” Consequently, Stephen’s vision of Dublin Bay changes: it has earlier reminded him of the bowl into which his mother vomited, and now the image returns tinged by the language of the song – “a bowl of bitter waters” (176). “Bitter” takes a journey of three stages, transferred through Yeats’ poem to the memory of his mother to the image of the sea.

The first and second examples are connected: the first serves as a transition to the second. The second image of the bay is limned from a much longer stream of consciousness. It could be said that the first prepares for the increase in the volume of interior monologue in the second due to the focusing of the narrative on Stephen’s perspective. In short, Dublin Bay in this example is thus transformed: the Yeats’ song triggers his memory about his mother, so Stephen merges the bay into a mixture of Yeats’s song and the memory of his mother’s death. In the third example, Stephen again hears another song that Mulligan sings, “Coronation Day” (“O, won’t we have a merry time” (11)), and the song immediately alters his perception of the sea, spurring him to turn it into “warm sunshine merrying over the sea” (11).

A vigilant reader may notice an ambiguous flag in these famous passages: a subtle signal by the text to make the reader detect the ironical voices in this duplicitous narrative and wonder whose story it is, the narrator’s or Stephen’s. Just moments before, the sea is seen as “a bowl of bitter waters” (9), the atmosphere is cold and the sky domed with a cloud shadowing the bay; Dublin Bay is then converted into a cheerful and warm image. The metamorphosis swiftly takes place, leaving the reader in absolute uncertainty. “Merry” is repeated twice in the song and once more in the image of the sea, creating a strong impression of how the song has affected Stephen.
The phrase without a verb, “warm sunshine merrying over the sea” (11), may intrigue the reader: is this phrase narrated by the narrator, or is it Stephen’s interior monologue, or is it Stephen’s diction narrated by the third-person narrator who uses the free indirect discourse technique? Who is the teller in this story? Is language a mimetic system that faithfully renders Dublin Bay as it is or is it abused by figurative devices? The ambiguity is strong and palpable.

At first glance, the style of “Telemachus” is basic and conventional: with mostly third-person narration and verbs in simple past tense, it is a chapter dominated by exterior narration with dialogues and the odd insertion of interior monologue. However, Joyce adds a significant amount of free indirect discourse into this narration and colours the prose with Stephen’s vocabulary; furthermore, it is the first time interior monologue is introduced, paving the way for its later accumulation. In “Telemachus,” there are a considerable number of complex sentences written in a style that is highly poetic and educated, rich in rhythm and abundant in allusions. This kind of prose, occupied mostly by free indirect discourse, strikes the reader as a highly affected product by Stephen-narrator; being the fundamental component of the style of the first episode, it is distinguished from the distancing style of Bloom’s episodes. Even in the episode where Joyce employs basic conventions, there are subtle hints of traits that will become more evident in the course of the novel: the undecidability of the narrative voices due to free indirect discourse; the uncertainty of the narrative written in the vein of traditional conventions but also rich in parody and irony; the features that call attention to the textuality of the text; the oscillation between teller and tale; and the challenge to the ability of language to provide a trustworthy, competent and faithful representation of words and things. Ulysses as a double writing starts as early as in the first chapter.
The three examples I have just discussed prove true to the hypothesis that ambiguities and ironic vibes resonate in the first episode. The image of Dublin Bay is not objectively reported but mirrored in a prose style written from several points of view, from a disarrangement of time in which past and present are set side by side. It is impossible to deduce an objective reality of the Irish seascape that constantly changes according to the prose and its techniques: it is a sweet great mother, a dull mass of bile, a merrying sea, and a bowl of bitter waters. The referentiality of language is significantly challenged due to the rhetorical and stylistic devices and intertextuality that Joyce employs. The sea image is a narrated product oscillating between third-person narration and Stephen, who is a character of the tale but at some moments bursts out of the narrative boundaries to become the teller.

Despite the realism evoked by the housekeeping sentences, the blending of different devices in the style in “Telemachus” opens up what Dermot Kelly rightly calls “a matrix for the later narrative experimentation, but… also featur[ing] abrupt shifts and departures from external reality” (7). These shifts and departures is mildly abrupt in “Telemachus” and will become surplus in the third episode when the narrative wholly focuses on interior monologue to present Stephen’s mind. One important note needs to be made here: even though the internal psyche of Stephen is the most prominent in “Proteus,” the outer world does try to get into the spotlight of the narrative at every chance it gets. This is one of my main points in the next section when I discuss the struggle between outer and inner worlds in “Proteus.”

Blur of Boundaries, Mixture of Voices: Modified Initial Style in “Proteus”

Kelly remarks that declaring the initial style as consistent runs the risk of overlooking many features because it “is not a monolith of uniformity” (7). In
complement to Kelly, in her examination of Joyce’s style from the narration technique approach, Monika Fludernik states that the first episode establishes essential conventions, which Joyce then modifies in “Nestor” and “Proteus” “in accordance with the increasing concentration on Stephen’s perspective” (“Narrative and Its Development in Ulysses” 17). There is a switch from “objectivity and pseudo-objectivity to an actual adoption of Stephen’s vocabulary” (“Narrative and Its Development in Ulysses” 17). It could be asserted that one of the devices that Joyce introduces to amend the conventions in the first episode is the technique of free indirect discourse. This troublemaker ruptures the simple form of the initial style but also creates flexibility and brings about uncertainty. It muddles the style, producing a polluted area in the supposedly uncontaminated narrative, since it imbues vagueness to voices, destabilizes and subverts any intentions of language to create a stable story with a straightforward rendering of reality. A discussion of the relationship between third-person narration and free indirect discourse as well as between free indirect discourse and interior monologue is greatly needed. Take a passage from “Proteus”:

They came down the steps from Leahy’s terrace prudently,
Frauenzimmer: and down the shelving shore flabbily their splayed feet sinking in the silted sand. Like me, like Algy, coming down to our mighty mother. Number one swung lourdily her midwife’s bag, the other’s gamp poked in the beach. (38)

This passage describes two figures under Stephen’s gaze. The reader is unable to distinguish where the interior monologue begins and ends. “Down the shelving shore flabbily” may belong to the main narrative but also to Stephen’s thoughts; a word like “flabbily” is possibly Stephen’s word. “Number one swung lourdily her midwife’s bag, the other’s gamp poked in the beach” sounds like the way Stephen distances
himself from foreign-seeming people. Is he sticking numbered labels on two human beings? Yet the third-person narrator is at hand. The infection of the narrative in Fludernik’s opinion is the product of the Stephen-narrator who adapts to sound like Stephen as Dorrit Cohn notes in *Transparent Minds* (72). Moreover, “lourdily” is an important keyword to discern the uncertainty of the prose. This hybrid word of English “heavily” and French “lourd” is both adverb and adjective. This very word sends mixed signals to the reader who is confused because of the blend of voices, as well as of referential and phonetic significations in two languages, as pointed out by Taylor-Batty (137-8).

Kelly, going along with Dorrit Cohn’s remark about Stephen-narrator in Stephen’s episodes, concludes, “Stephen seems able to make the narrator do his bidding and beautify or vilify whatever troubles him” (11). By releasing the character out of the limited space of the domed tower room onto the open space of the strand in “Proteus,” Joyce is able to present reality from an increasingly Stephenish perspective. Joyce’s narrator manages to create an intimacy between him and the character by letting his narrative be pervaded by the character’s vocabulary and tone. There is a momentary suspension when these two voices are conflated. Another passage might usefully illustrate this technique:

> Across the sands of all the world, followed by the sun’s flaming sword, to the west, trekking to evening lands. She trudges, schlepps, trains, drags, trascines her load. (47)

The narrator in *Ulysses* recounts how Stephen fabricates the image of a gypsy woman, but the story is coloured by his own sophisticated mastery of foreign languages: he freely adds five synonymous verbs, “trudges, schlepps, trains, drags, trascines.” They
have the same meaning in different languages to depict the heaviness in the woman’s feet, making her traverse through multilingual signifiers, English, Yiddish, French, English, and Italian. Joyce himself explains the effect of the five consecutive verbs to Budgen as “the crescendo of verbs,” and “the irresistible tug of the tides” (55). This might be Joyce’s words, or Stephen’s project, or even the implied author’s. As a result, this technique is greatly useful and versatile in blurring the lines between the narrator and character and creating, according to James Wood, “an intersecting plane” (11) where both the character and the narrator reside. Additionally, “the technique leaves a subtle gap for the reader to balk at or bridge and freely interpret” (Wood 11). The gap that in Wood’s opinion lets in free interpretations is the suspension in the narrative I mentioned earlier. This deferral is the contaminated area of mixed voices. Because the ironic distance between the author or the narrator and a character can be never made clear, the reader can choose to be limited in a character’s eyes or to see beyond of them. This dual voice24, originally coined by Roy Pascal in The Dual Voice, serves a double purpose (74). On the one hand, it helps depict how the world is constructed, and on the other, it has an anti-mimetic potential when yielding to the idiolect of the character. When merging characters’ and the narrator’s discourse and thus expanding Stephen’s perspective, the free indirect discourse technique renders third-person narration, in this case, unreliable, swinging back and forth between many possibilities of voices. Joyce amplifies the indirect technique device in the prose in “Proteus,” which pushes the text more strongly towards Stephen’s viewpoint and simultaneously creates more unstable points in the production of meaning.

---

24 I will return to this problem later in chapter 3 with a discussion of how mixed voices shatter the coherence of an authoritative voice in the traditional novel.
Another factor that complicates the initial style is the employment of interior monologue in “Proteus.” The episode can be considered the first episode of *Ulysses* featuring this technique in its densest form. Joyce expertly juxtaposes memories and immediate comments in Stephen’s mind to represent his inner world. He randomly tosses in a few details to construct the vivid stories in the past, his imagination, or reverie; this writing technique tends to create an impression that the reader is flung into the character’s stream of consciousness to relive his experiences. Chunks of text written in a dense prose abound with complexity and allusions in Stephen’s thoughts, engulfing the reader in Stephen’s mind. The ratio of 6.7:1 of interior monologues vs. third-person narration as shown in Appendix C reveals that Stephen’s stream of consciousness takes up a larger part of the episode: it accounts for 87% of the episode, while third-person narration takes up only 13%. Compared to the ratio in “Telemachus,” there is a significant increase in the amount of interior monologue. Specifically, Joyce introduces interior monologue in “Telemachus” in its simplest form, at first with only one or two words. For instance, in the beginning Stephen’s thoughts contain just one single word: “Chrysostomos” (3). Joyce then slowly increases the number of words to full sentences. For instance, “Hair on end. As he and others see me. Who chose this face for me?” (6). In “Proteus,” Joyce constantly dumps Stephen’s monologue into the text and these materials account for 4952 words. There are numerous paragraphs wholly dedicated to Stephen’s mental process, running from 600 to 800 words, spilling over pages (for instance, the passage in which Stephen imagines himself visiting his aunt runs from page 39 to page 42, and the passage in which Stephen recollects his Paris days runs from page 42 to page 44, without a single
narratorial interruption)\textsuperscript{25}. These very passages make it unrecognizable as the style of the first chapter.

Is it the case then when compared to \textit{A Portrait}'s devious narrator, \textit{Ulysses}'s narrative will be more reliable? In “Proteus,” interior monologue runs for paragraphs on end, commenting on a narrated situation and sometimes even relating the action solely through the character’s eyes. Joyce hardly uses the third-person mode at all, reducing those reports to mere sentences in the vicinity inside paragraphs otherwise devoted to Stephen’s thoughts. External reality is buried within massive sentences of inner memory and fantasy. It will be helpful to look first at the relationship between free indirect discourse and interior monologue in “Proteus.” My assumption is that free indirect discourse acts as premise for the employment of interior monologue. In “Proteus,” the technique of free indirect discourse serves as a transition into stream of consciousness. Stenberg offers an interesting suggestion that by bestowing third-person narrative with the features of interior monologue, thus making the shift less obtrusive, the narrator attempts to efface himself (121). The changeover is not sudden but smooth due to the close collaboration between free indirect discourse and stream of consciousness.

However, this characteristic of the narrative makes “Proteus” problematic to the reader, because of their ironic distance and immediacy. Due to the assimilation of third-person narration into first-person narration, the whole narrative is now transformed and bears all the advantages as well as tricky points of its components and creates what I will call undecidability in the dual persisted voice. First, due to the high

\textsuperscript{25} See Steinberg (1973) for a more thorough examination of omniscient narration and interior monologue in “Proteus”.
immediacy of the narrative in “Proteus,” the reader is held hostage in the language and system of Stephen (the very same thing happens in A Portrait but to a lesser degree). At the same time, third-person narration still functions independently in a small scale and can disturb the reader by pointing out here and there the inconsistency or presenting the kind of knowledge that Stephen is unaware of. Consequently, irony may arise. Secondly, because of the smooth transitions, it is not easy for the reader to distinguish between interior monologue and third-person narration: it is impossible to know which sensations or descriptions belong to the narrator or Stephen. The reader always hears a dual voice, is stuck facing a dual position and struggles with an ongoing undecidability. Take an example when Stephen glances to the sea:

> Under the upswelling tide he saw the writhing weeds lift languidly and sway reluctant arms, hising up their petticoats, in whispering water staying and upturning coy silver fronds. (49)

There is a sudden intrusion in the passage: the expression “hising up their petticoats.” This kind of intrusion is the sign for the reader to recognize unstable points in the narrative. This is an echo of the song about “old Mary Ann” (13) which Mulligan has sung in the Martello Tower, springing up amid a poetic description of seaweed all of a sudden. One of the interpretations might be: the narrator depicts Stephen recalling a phrase from the song which Mulligan has sung and makes an authorial decision to insert it in the description. However, is it possible that this is Stephen’s voice imposing upon the outer narrative? For an instant, there is a power struggle to claim the narrative; sometimes Stephen’s voice takes over and thrusts itself into the narrative. A similar thing happens with Bloom in “Lestrygonians”: “Mr Bloom smiled O rocks at two windows of the ballastoffice,” (147) or in “His hand looking for the where did I put found in his hip pocket soap lotion have to call tepid paper stuck” (175). Even
though this is subtler in Stephen’s case, the vacillation between these two viewpoints is strong enough in “Proteus.”

In my opinion, whilst *A Portrait* is still a novel about a character who *wants* to write a story about himself, in *Ulysses* Stephen has grown into character who *can* indeed write a text out of the reality that he encounters. Whilst Stephen is still a passive character in “Telemachus,” the text seemingly creates a performing theatre for Stephen in “Proteus” by letting his stream of consciousness run freely, permitting the character more autonomy as teller. The narrative moves from being moderately flavoured by Stephen’s idiolect yet still narrated by the third-person narrator in “Telemachus” to greatly in “Proteus” with a prose consistently occupied by the character’s stream of monologue. That is the pivotal difference between the style of the first episode and its modification in the third episode. As mentioned above, Stephen’s frequent and uninterrupted flow of thoughts in “Proteus” makes him “a narrator-within-the narration,” blurring the boundaries between inside and outside perspectives, Stephen’s and the narrator’s voices (Riquelme 54). The modified initial style is what induces the reader to an “active recreative rendering of the narration” (Riquelme 54). As a result, Stephen is likely perceived as the teller in the tale.

Through the discussion above, I have concluded that the initial style is not a coherent but rather flexible arrangement constantly evolving under Joyce’s hand. Moreover, I want to show that the narrative techniques such as third-person narration, stream of consciousness, and free indirect discourse cannot neatly and clearly be distinguished as we always assume. There is always a point that can destabilize these notions, contaminate the oppositions and open up to a sea of interpretations. Now I want to explore one of the results of the subverting act that makes these boundaries blurry: the boundary between the outer world and the inner psyche, the body and the
mind. There are broken boundaries between third-person narration and interior monologue, where reality is blended into the mind and Sandymount Strand becomes an internalization of reality. Nevertheless, there is also the externalization of the mind, in which the thoughts uncontrollably get out of the mind and become the outer reality. This is exemplified in the way Stephen sometimes casts his thoughts outwards onto his gesture or walking movements. We have in “Proteus” the porous boundary between outside and inside when inside gets outside and outside gets inside, and this process goes on to one point where there is no real outside or inside any longer but only a textual artefact which is awash in a discourse of the character’s language. The very same goes to the opposition between body and mind. Many critics, when discussing “Proteus,” more often than not focus on Stephen’s mind and assert how it is an autonomous object from the physical world. My examination proves that his body acts as a threshold to the mind. Additionally, it exists and plays a very important part in his thoughts – it triggers, it prevents and aspires, it boosts up his mind and hinders it as well. Body also dissolves into mind and vice versa. Through this interplay, Joyce defies the Cartesian dualism that divides reality into dichotomies such as mind and body, mind and outer reality.

“I am almosting it” (U 46): Dublin as Differing Textuality

This section will discuss how Stephen considers Sandymount Strand a textual reality to read and simultaneously creates his own text from it. The way Stephen incorporates many philosophical, historical, literary ideas into his reading reveals one of his pivotal characteristics that I would like to term “Cannibalism.” When contemplating how his being independently exists from his parents and the doctrine of

---

26 See Caste (281-296) for a thorough analysis of Stephen’s will to power and the ability to shape nature.
the divine Father and Son and their consubstantiality, Stephen thinks of Arius and creates a neologism: contrasmagnificandjewbangtantiality (38). The compound includes: consubstaintiality, transubstantiality, magnificent and jew. The very word “transubstantiality” summarises one of Stephen’s habits, that is, the incorporation not only of God’s body, but also his words: “The figures of incorporation that are to be found in speculative thought—the very notion of comprehending as a kind of incorporation” (“An Interview with Jacques Derrida on the Limits of Digestion”).

Stephen digests and internalizes the external in order to incorporate everything into his mind. He assimilates other philosophers’ and writers’ ideas as well as motifs from music and mythology, and then reproduces them when creating his own text, his own personal space and subject. Accordingly, his text is the remainder as well as the reminder, and includes traces of the others. His text is pushed into an intertextual position with other sources by constantly echoing them, and yet is not totally one of them. By reading Dublin’s seascape through Stephen’s cannibalistic mind, first of all, the reader perceives it by way of the references that Stephen makes. In the introductory passage, Stephen is reading the Strand through the arguments of Aristotle, Jakob Boehme, and George Berkeley. For instance, “seaspawn and seawrack, tide, that rusty boot” (37) are considered signatures of things, which is the way he applies Boeheme’s theory; additionally, “snotgreen,” “bluesilver,” “rust” (37) are considered coloured signs, which is the result of his application of Berkeley’s theory; finally, the “crush crackling wrack and shells” (37) are considered “bodies,” which is the result of his application of Aristotle to prove their existence. Thus, the beach is evoked through philosophical language and ideas. I would like to examine two examples to illustrate how Stephen incorporates other people’s words and ideas into his own reading of
reality to digest and internalize them. The first instance is the way Stephen conceives the tides by transforming them with the help of a poem:

Under the upswelling tide he saw the writhing weeds lift languidly and sway reluctant arms, hising up their petticoats, in whispering water staying and upturning coy silver fronds. Day by day: night by night: lifted, flooded and let fall. Lord, they are weary: and, whispered to, they sigh. (49)

The tide is converted into a human, with a human body, “reluctant arms,” expresses its feelings languidly, and knows how to whisper. The narrative borrows and appropriates a line from a bawdy Irish song as I mentioned earlier. They also remind Stephen of Saint Ambrose’s verse. Stephen transposes the groaning as well as the manner of the Creation to the waves. They become another kind of Creation, eternally groaning. There is an almost identical description of the waves as “weary” and “languidly,” helping cushion the reader over the shock when the narrative changes from outer to inner world. The physical world alters its appearance all the times, and Stephen makes every effort to catch these changes by his alteration of language. Joyce forms very well balanced sentences to depict these cyclical processes. Besides, reality also undergoes certain cyclical patterns and the style of prose of Stephen’s stream of consciousness is another attempt to imitate them. Specifically, the repeated words, “day by day,” “night by night,” “waiting,” “awaiting” (49) suggest the repeated pattern. The well balanced structure with many commas indicates many periods, and then brings these periods to an end only to start all over again. The reader gets an impression that the whole paragraph is swept through by numerous waves: “lifted, flooded and let fall,” “released, forth flowing, wending back” (49). The prose of these paragraphs may be
considered the best imitation of reality that Stephen can arrive at. I would like to add one note: the reader easily notices that the structure of this chapter is presented by Stephen’s walking patterns. He keeps going in and out of his reverie, and nature keeps being coursed and re-coursed into his thoughts. The above-analysed circles in nature closely interlink with Stephen’s recurrent thoughts. There is a high possibility that these cyclical patterns of the physical world acts as a Viconian symbol in “Proteus.”

James Joyce was influenced by the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico and used The New Science to structure Finnegans Wake. Vico proposes a cyclical view of history which Joyce possibly incorporates into Stephen’s reading of the outer world. Let us examine another highly intertextual paragraph in which Stephen writes his own lines of poetry:

> Across the sands of all the world, followed by the sun’s flaming sword, to the west, trekking to evening lands. She trudges, schlepps, trains, drags, trascines her load. […] His mouth moulded issuing breath, unspeeched: ooeephah: roar of cataractic planets, globed, blazing, roaring wayawayaway-awayawayawayaway. (47)

A series of improvisations is carried out in Stephen’s mind: he appropriates the image of the flaming word placed at the gate of the Garden of Eden after God banished Adam and Eve in the Bible (Genesis 3:24) and transforms it into the sun’s sword; he amends the last phase of the lyric drama Hellas by Percy Shelley, “to the evening land,” to end the first sentence. Seeing the gypsy woman, Stephen employs numerous biblical and literary allusions to create a mythical setting for the walking: the phrase “Across the sands of all the world” depicts not only her pattern but his as well. From referring to allusions, Stephen gradually progresses to compose his own text. The
poem with the onomatopoeic word is his own creative product, providing proof that
Stephen has shifted from being engulfed in other people’s words to incorporating and
altering them.

In her essay “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” Julia Kristeva lays out her definition
of intertextuality as “a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and
transformation of another” (85). Stephen’s text is a collage of creatively revised
citations and correspondingly interwoven ideas. We could think that Stephen’s writing
is, perhaps, a locus of recreating, reworking, and rewriting where all stories and texts
are bound in ways that may not be apparent, and that every work echoes a host of
other works in a deep, wide intertextual web. Stephen’s Dublin is extremely textual
and inextricably caught up in this “differential network.” The seascape in “Proteus” is,
on the very first layer, a realistic representation of the real Sandymount Strand. This
effect is brought about by the employment of many proper names with which Joyce
fills the text. By my own count (see Appendix A), in “Proteus” there are 14 place
names, such as Leahy’s terrace, the Howth tram, Ringsend, Pigeonhouse, the south
wall, Malahide, Poolberd road, Maiden’s rock, Cock Lake. These toponyms create the
effect of realism, even though their frequency is moderate, sending a signal that
Stephen walks on a real beach in Dublin. Joyce will add a significant number of them
in the next chapters, creating a totally different level of reality. On the second layer,
this realistic effect is soon challenged and overwhelmed by the intertextual Dublin that
Stephen creates in his own mind. His text is no “longer a finished corpus of writing”
but a “fabric of traces referring endlessly” (Derrida, “Living on” 84) to the Bible, Irish
mythology, Shakespeare and so on. The beach that Stephen walks on constantly and
significantly transforms, not only in sands and tides as I propose in the first section of
this chapter, but also in the shifts in Stephen’s thoughts: Sandymount Strand becomes
a Shakespearean beach in *King Lear*; the air nipping at his ears is the air in *Hamlet* and also the wind in Virgil and Greek mythology; the waves become humans yet assume Viconian patterns and the Creation’s groaning; and the sand dunes become a background for the departure of Adams and Eve in the Bible. These allusions contribute to the surplus of meanings, and Stephen’s text is always “[a]n excess of signification always remaining ‘unsigned’ (a lack of signification) which allows new readings in new contexts” (Phillips, “Derrida and Deconstruction”).

Stephen not only appropriates other texts, but also produces his own text. Earlier I discussed how reality in “Proteus” is in a flux of changes. In order to capture that reality, Stephen constantly alters words as well as supplements from foreign languages to keep up with the numerous facets of the physical world. Steinberg, in his study of Stephen’s interior monologue, observes in his thoughts a pattern of accumulating sentences which “are composed of parallel items in series, usually in threes – a characteristic of formal prose” (103). These sentences, which are well balanced, reveal how Stephen thinks and produces his thoughts in words in a careful and meticulous manner (Steinberg 103). “Proteus” begins and ends with these balanced accumulating sentences, for example:

Gold light on sea, on sand, on boulders. The sun is there, the slender trees, the lemon houses. (42)

Blue dusk, nightfall, deep blue night. (44)

Day by day: night by night: lifted, flooded and let fall. (49)

Stephen intentionally composes these sentences that are rich in rhythms in his mind. He meticulously chooses details to add in his sentences, and arranges them in a nice order, highly poetic and opulent in metaphors. The way Stephen casts his glance
around reality is also mirrored in the appearance of physical objects. In Stephen’s prose, reality is neatly arranged and resonates with lyrical vibes. Along with accumulating sentences, “Proteus” has what Steinberg spots as the appositive, that is, “a grammatical construction in which two usually adjacent nouns having the same referent stand in the same syntactical relation to the rest of a sentence” (88). Stephen employs this type of noun and noun phrase to explain for, to rename the noun right beside the appositive. For example:

Snotgreen, bluesilver, rust: coloured signs. (37)

They came down the steps from Leahy’s terrace prudently,
Frauenzimmer. (38)

They are coming, waves. (38)

“Coloured signs,” “Frauenzimmer,” and “waves” are comments Stephen adds to his sentences. His sentences have an extended part, as if the text cannot bear to stop yet. The pattern in Stephen’s mental landscape is exposed: he encounters reality first, and then proceeds to fasten it by putting a name to it, in English as well as in German.

Lastly, Steinberg shows how Stephen uses colons in his text as an internal divider, a sign of supplement. In “Proteus,” there are 58 colons in total; all appear in Stephen’s stream of consciousness. Steinberg also cites Porter G. Perrin in Writer’s Guide and Index to English to explain the function of colons: “The colon is a mask of anticipation, indicating that what follows the mark will supplement what preceded it” (537). In Stephen’s text, two or more supplementing clauses separated by the colons to the rest of his sentences serve as an “illustration of the first, a restatement in different terms, or an amplification of the first” (Perrin 537). Specifically, right from the beginning of the chapter, Stephen uses several colons to illustrate his ideas:
Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes. (37)

Five, six: the Nacheinander. (37)

No, agallop: deline the mare. (37)

In short, the three features I mentioned above reveal Stephen’s thinking patterns which Steinberg notes: this is a mind with a tendency to group objects and peoples, then neatly categorize them in well-formulated phrases (106). They are evidence of the verbalizing tendencies of a writer, who is sensitive about words and meticulous with punctuations. They also divulge Stephen’s endeavor to grasp the world through language: he builds his own system of text, his structure, rhythm, punctuation, to correspond precisely to the objects and states he perceives in reality.

Moreover, there is an effect of deferring in these techniques that Stephen uses, and this effect resonates with his cannibalistic tendency that I have discussed above. Stephen is always in an urgent quest for an absolute signifier: he continuously inserts information, comments, and observations into his sentences. Everything in reality keeps changing and to keep up with it, he incessantly adds supplements. As a result, the language carries on shifting as well, and there is a double transformation: of reality and of language. The moment the reader takes a rest at a temporary final meaning, Stephen adds a word that changes everything. Dublin’s landscape is incessantly differed and deferred due to a relentlessly shifting of signifiers; the final meaning of the text is put off until forever. For instance: in these sentences, “They are coming, waves. The whitemaned seahorses, champing, brightwindbridled, the steeds of Mananaan” (38), Stephen pushes “waves” to the end of the sentence, creating an eagerness in the reader to see what “they” are in the first place. The sentence that
follows acts as the modifier, which includes 4 parts: as if these phrases continuously materialize in Stephen’s mind. The reader cannot yet reach a final description of the waves because of this accumulating effect. The waves are compared to “the whitemaned seahorses,” a description of their appearance with white colour recalling the manes of seahorses; and the meaning does not stop there, these seahorses are “champing,” making the noise that is also the noise of the waves; and finally comes an extremely ambiguous “brightwindbridled.” How can the reader understand that the seahorses are bridled with bright wind? Moreover, what does that make the waves? Another modifier, “the steeds of Mananaan,” is piled on top of the already dense modifiers. Another level of similes, the waves as seahorses, and these seahorses as “the steeds of Mananaan” is presented. The process of digesting these descriptions means that the reader is awed by Stephen’s mind: he keeps finding words; his mind keeps fluctuating and supplementing. Another example is cited to illustrate how Stephen keeps accumulating supplements in his prose:

Vehement breath of waters amid seasnakes, rearing horses, rocks. In cups of rocks it slops: flop, slop, slap: bounded in barrels. And, spent, its speech ceases. It flows purling, widely flowing, floating foam-pool, flower unfurling. (49)

The reader encounters several appositives: “slops: flop, slop, slap: bounded in barrels”: “slop” expresses “waters mov[ing] around in a container, often so that some liquid comes out over the edge” (OED); “flop” means falling heavily, and “slap” means putting down with a sharp noise. All of these express the act of flowing with noises, varied noises. Stephen is trying to recreate the breath of waters in language itself; however, he cannot stop at one word and has to constantly seek for something better.

He even adds a final description at the end: “bounded in barrels.” The way Stephen
repeatedly alters his choice of words reveals his awareness of language as a constructed system of representation and his struggle to find a satisfactory medium to accurately represent his ideas.

Stephen’s labour with language leads me to consider the onomatopoeia that he creates in this episode. Onomatopoeia is another way to prove how Stephen fights the battle of representing reality. I list here three examples of this endeavour:

1. Crush, crack, crick, crick (37)

2. unspeeched: ooeeeehah: roar of cataractic planets, globed, blazing, roaring wayawayaway-awayawayaway (47)

3. a fourworded wavespeech: seesoo, hrss, rsseeiss ooos (49)

Obviously, Stephen is trying to create an unmediated imitation of reality in these words. Derek Attridge suggests two kinds of onomatopoeia in *Ulysses* in his paper “Joyce’s Noises.” Lexical onomatopoeia, true to their names, are formed from the known vocabulary to “suggest a more than usually strong link between the sounds of speech and the non-speech sounds (or other physical features of the world) being represented” (Attridge “Joyce’s Noises” 473). As for non-lexical onomatopoeia, “the letters and sounds of the language are used for a similar purpose, but without the formation of words” (Attridge “Joyce’s Noises” 473). According to his analysis, in the first case, Stephen is trying to imitate the sound of his boots treading on shells and breaking them; “crick” can be considered non-lexical, but it is familiar enough because it is based on common onomatopoeia such as “crack” and “creak.” The second case is more complex: Stephen imitates the unspeeched breath from a moulded mouth of a man: “ooeeehah.” “[W]ayawayaway-awayawayaway” is, problematically, considered
to be onomatopoeia. It imitates how the roar goes a long way by a quintuple repetition of “away.” The third case is the most complicated: here, Stephen imitates waves’ noise by four words: seesoo, hrss, rsseeiss, ooos. These innovations are called by Stephen “wavespeech” and yet not only unpronounceable but also meaningless. Attridge proposes that Stephen’s “extravagant” product is only a “partial success”, because “the reader can imagine a repeated fourfold sequence of watery noises but can hardly read it directly off this sequence of letters” (“Joyce’s Noises” 477). These unsuccessful four words suggest how strongly the ambiguity is inherent in Stephen’s textual product. Interestingly, it raises a question about Stephen’s intention: Is this wavespeech a real exercise to imitate sound or just a play in language by Stephen? More importantly, it suggests that Stephen’s language is not a transparent medium that can connect the sounds that he receives to the words that he creates. The obvious gap between these two alerts the reader to the unreliability of Stephen’s text.

Attridge contends, “Non-lexical onomatopoeia is as much a matter of interpretation as any other use of signs or system of notation” (“Joyce’s Noises” 474). Clearly, there are numerous attempts of imitating sounds in Stephen’s text. Whether they are real products of earnest endeavors or just whimsical results of flaunting linguistic skills to express his mental state, the text appears to immobilize sounds in words. Through Stephen’s effort to give shape to the outer world via language, we understand how he tries to put a pin on language “to fix fleeting thoughts, ideas, and inspiration, into the stability of letters” as Senn wisely notes (Inductive Scrutinies 135). In the text there are always these processes running against each other, the constant mutation of words to reflect the constant mutation of reality (this very
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27 Sidney Feshback is the only scholar who tries to decipher what these onomatopoetic words mean (557) even though I think his explanation is too far-fetched.
changing of signifiers aims at stabilizing reality itself thus limiting the performance of language) and the slippage, proliferation of signifiers in which the final meanings of reality are always deferred.

Stephen struggles with the God Proteus of reality and Joyce designs many stylistic devices to depict this process. In his ventures, Stephen does not only employ rhythmic structures, appositives, and colons to create his own commentary style, but also invents his own language. Stephen is well aware of language as a system of representation and strives to break out of its fixed values by frequently producing differences in his choices of words. While the reader is more than ready to accept Stephen as the teller in “Proteus,” I would like to point out a subtle trait in the narrative that can subvert this assertion. On the one hand, the narrative tries its best to maintain an episode controlled and told by Stephen by bridging the gap between third-person narration and Stephen’s interior monologue, destroying the boundary between outer and inner spaces. On the other hand, this very technique goes against itself because the narrator is always at hand: the language that he uses is always ready to assert its old venerable authority. This entails a series of questions: Is Stephen the teller who tries to tell about his struggle with reality through an impenetrable prose, or is it the narrator who tries to tell a story about Stephen’s struggle? Is “Proteus” a product of the internalization of reality or the exposition of the mind? Is the character individualizing the text or the text externalizing Stephen? In this manner, the reader questions Stephen’s intention of reading reality. Is it really the case that Stephen the teller is endeavoring to read reality, or is he trying to play with it by way of his own language and allusions, or is he trying to read but failing due to the very system of language itself? The oscillation between these possibilities is maintained and uncertainty prevails. Wolfgang Iser rightly notes this ambivalence about Stephen:
He knows he is inescapably restricted to observation, and he knows that things change the moment one observes them. Every approach changes them into something different [...] the knowledge that he is bound to his own forms of perception leads to an endless delving into the ultimate constitution of the world. (The Implied Reader 211-2)

Without doubt, the harder Stephen tries to grasp Proteus, the more distinctly he alienates himself from the outside world, and the more firmly he nestles into his subjective mind. The more Stephen struggles with reality, the more linguistic transformations he creates, the more reality becomes out of reach. Similarly, my own reading of intertextuality as well as the onomatopoeia in Stephen’s text is a labor to pin down his text. Fritz Senn also remarks how the reader easily “entangle[s]” himself “in an inherent contradiction” (135): by pasting a note, an explanation, a link onto an allusion, a word, because, “Notes have a way of securing and fastening their objects, treating them as objects. Such fixation is often betrayed in the wording of a note: ‘this is an allusion, a reference to…’” (Inductive Scrutinies 135). The moment we try to pin down a word, we limit its meanings and its endless references to other signifiers.

Stephen’s mutable text is a hopeless endeavor to imitate reality but also a hopeful performance. We are reading Stephen’s text through a multiple network of traces, where every reading is a possibility and every trace could lead to a chase of meanings. Patrick McGee in Paperspace shares a similar view to mine about Stephen in his episode:

Between world and text, between the signatures to be read and the trace of what has been read, lies a process containing both terms of the opposition, a gesture which empowers Stephen as a subject without centering on him. (17-18)
The question of finding the signifier is undoubtedly an ongoing pursuit. In “Proteus,” there are two chases for signifiers: the first chase is carried out by the author, Joyce himself, to find the right signifiers for the protean reality through various lexical variations of sand, water and tide as I analysed earlier; the second is executed by Stephen. The text of “Proteus,” through this quest for a signifier, gestures to a bigger problem of literary language and the production of meanings. The effort of pinning down reality is never-ending and Stephen incessantly struggles with language to find the right words to match up with reality. But this process is always contested the very moment it produces a reference through language.

Conclusion

The examination of the styles of “Telemachus” and “Proteus,” with a particular focus on free indirect discourse and interior monologue, rejects the assumption that the first three episodes of *Ulysses* maintain a consistent initial style. Dublin’s seascape is depicted in a style mingling third-person narration and figurative perspective, creating a dissemination of identities in the narrative voices. As a result, Dublin emerges as a differing-deferring textual Proteus, as Stephen Dedalus the artist transfigures the external world with the non-ceasing internal and highly intertextual metamorphoses of words. The textual Sandymount Strand that Stephen walks along does not wholly and faithfully refer to the real shore in Dublin’s suburb. The slopes of verbalizing about real places are slippery, in which the text of “Proteus,” abundant in playful language and intertextuality, “both heightens and undermines referentiality” (Attridge, *Joyce Effects* 49) and disrupts a static representation of Dublin.

The next chapter will focus on how Dublin is transformed into a network of inducements, a semantic field of conflated places, through a style rich in multipolar
voices. Employing a similar method illuminated by Genette’s theory, I will continue the examination of the initial style, arguing that proper names and the distancing effect are overlooked features that produce uncertainty and disrupt the contract between the text and reader. I will investigate how the text employs a style of hyperrealism and abandons the intelligible world of the classic novel in favour of an urban space rejecting totalization, bringing about a fictive montage of Dublin.
Chapter Three

“Lestrygonians”: A Semantic Field of Conflated Places

When you remember that Dublin has been a capital for thousands of years, that it is the “second” city of the British Empire, that it is nearly three times as big as Venice, it seems strange that no artist has given it to the world.

James Joyce, *Letters II* (111)

The text of *Ulysses* leaves Stephen Dedalus on the outskirts of Dublin after exposing him to Dublin Bay in episode 3 and starts a new narrative in episode 4 with a different character, Leopold Bloom, on an early morning in June, in the very heart of the city, 7 Eccles Street. The reader experiences a change in the plot as well as in the spatial and narratorial perspectives. This chapter will centre on how Dublin serves as a vibrant cobweb of stimuli that triggers floods of thoughts in the character’s mind, simultaneously rendering the city real and unreal by revising the initial style. The discussion starts by identifying two cruxes of the text, namely the surplus of place names and the lack of descriptions, and argues that they on the one hand give the effect of reality and on the other hand problematize the production of meanings. Complementary readings of the cities in Balzac and in *Dubliners* help to illuminate how Joyce abandons the traditional mode of portraying the city. This leads to an observation of the defamiliarizing style that depicts the Bloom walking around Dublin rather than the city itself. Additionally, I will examine free indirect discourse in Bloom’s episodes and argue that it generates the ambiguous multipolar narrative voices. The comparison of the ratio between interior monologue versus third-person narration and the examination of the employment of the distancing effect prove that the style of Bloom’s episodes is different to Stephen’s, thus confirming that there is no initial style in the early episodes of *Ulysses*. In the last section, I will discuss how the
city of Dublin becomes a site of significations, where the character’s mind is fluxed by the modern city with a deluge of impressions in which proper names and thoughts become signifiers and signifieds. Finally, I conclude how Dublin rejects a definitive reading of it to become a city of collage.

**Factual Dublin and Place names: Word as Thing and Book as World**

In a letter to Grant Richards in 5th May, 1906, Joyce explains his purpose of writing *Dubliners* as “a chapter in the moral history” because the city is the centre of paralysis and he employs a style: “[…] of a scrupulous meanness and with the conviction that he is a very bold man who dares to alter in the presentment, still more to deform, whatever he has seen and heard” (*Letters II* 134). Joyce vows to be realistic: he will serve what he believes, what it calls itself the truth. Not being able to write “without offending people,” Joyce’s struggle with his publishers when being asked to replace vulgar words and proper names of real places with fictional ones in *Dubliners*, however, was his challenge against social conventions. Similarly, facts were Joyce’s preoccupation when he incessantly queried his brother and his Aunt Josephine about Dublin’s minute details in the process of writing *Ulysses*:

> Is it possible for an ordinary person to climb over the area railings of no 7 Eccles street, either from the path or the steps, lower himself from the lowest part of the railings till his feet are within 2 feet or 3 of the ground and drop unhurt. (*Letters I* 175)

Sticking with realism and producing the effect of reality are still Joyce’s aims: “In *Ulysses* I have seen life clearly, I think, and as a whole.” Realism, in Joyce’s opinion, is “the key to the world” (Power 41). With a style more intense than in *Dubliners* – Hart and Knuth observe that the vagueness of “a little cakeshop near the Parkgate” (16) in *Clay* never exists in *Ulysses* – Joyce inundates this novel with raw
materials including real names of places and people from *Thom’s Directory*. As one of the earliest Joycean scholars on this topic, Robert M. Adams explains in *Surface and Symbol* that “Frequently he copied down the details of store fronts and street addresses, number by number from the pages of *Thom’s Directory*” (243). Ian Gunn et al. in their extensive and well-researched publication on topographical Dublin compile a list of all the addresses and place names that Joyce uses from *Thom’s* and the total number is 541. While *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens, one of the greatest realists and city writers, with London as its basic setting, has only 193 place names in total (Bowers et al. “Mapping Literary London”), the proper names in *Ulysses* are almost triple those of *Oliver Twist*. *Ulysses* is seemingly more realistic than any work of realism that precedes it. The novel flaunts its realism on every page and strongly claims for itself the objectivity of modern Dublin. I will consider the function of the torrent of place names in *Ulysses* from three prominent theoretical perspectives of Roland Barthes, Philippe Hamon, and Benjamin Hrushovski. I argue that place names in Joyce serve not only as the cultural code to bring about the effect of reality, thus creating a fixable and locatable realness in the text, but also to strengthen the referentiality of literary signs in which the illusion of the fixity of words is highlighted: Words directly and straightly refers to things and book can be considered as world.

As Roland Barthes observes in “The Effect of Reality,” the real is “supposed to be self-sufficient [...] strong enough to belie any notion of ‘function,’” and without any “need be integrated into a structure” because the “having-been-there of things is a sufficient principle of speech” (147). Reality is inherent in meaningless, random events and objects where no one questions their functions, whereas fictionalized, constructed life is always under pressure to be of plausibility, and self-interrogation
seems to be eternally haunting the writer: is it convincing enough? Does it reflect life as it is? One of the possible techniques by which the writer attempts to bridge the tricky gap between the fictive and the real is the deployment of superfluous details. The deluge of exact proper names and concrete details in *Ulysses* manifests the desire to present how life is, in all its chaos and unsystematic assortment of random objects. As Jonathan Culler points out, despite the lack of meaning, proper names do have a signifying function, “they signify ‘we are the real’” (“Barthes, Theorist” 440). The place names in *Ulysses* gesture to the objectivity that realism strives to attain. Barthes in *S/Z* provides a name for the excessive details that create this effect of reality: cultural and referential code, beside four other codes\(^{28}\) that the reader must decipher when reading a novel. This term designates any element in a narrative that refers “to a science or a body of knowledge” (Barthes, *S/Z* 20). In other words, the cultural code gestures the reader to “the way the world works,” to the type of knowledge that we categorize as historical, literary, physical, and geographical (Barthes, *S/Z* 20). This referential code works perfectly in Joyce’s text to point to the topographical knowledge of the city of Dublin. It informs the reader of not only places, notable or trivial, in Dublin but also the city’s routes, districts, and landmarks. As Kain claims, after the reader follows the characters’ steps around the city, along the streets, visiting the cemetery, entering the hospital, newspaper office, and bars, he acquires the common knowledge of Dublin shared by all Dubliners (*Fabulous Voyager* 20).

Philippe Hamon in “On the Major Features of Realist Discourse” shares Barthes’ opinion about proper names, contending that geographical proper names denote stable semantic entities. Place names in *Ulysses* function like academic
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\(^{28}\) They are proairetic code, hermeneutic code, connotative code, and symbolic code.
quotations and an economically descriptive tool, and “guarantee mooring points, re-
establish the performance […] of the referential statement” (168) by coupling the
textual Dublin with the extratextual Dublin. This is how Joyce secures the
verisimilitude of Dublin: by infusing the text with proper names, he produces “an
overall effect of reality which even transcends any decoding of detail, an effect of
reality often accentuated in topographical descriptions” (Hamon 168).

Furthermore, by citing Benjamin Hrushovski, I want to point out that the
reason most critics mix the fictional world with the real world is that the text of
_Ulysses_ provides no signals at all warning the reader away from conflating them.
Hrushovski calls the real world the “External Field of Reference,” while the fictive
world is the “Internal Field of Reference.” He suggests that in the text there is always
at least one signpost of fictionality “to separate the text from a description of the
External FR”:

> though the month and the hour are mentioned precisely, one specific
> indicator, the day, is floated. This device indicates that the fictional time
> and space, however closely located in relation to the real world, is
> somehow suspended above it, has its own, “floating” coordinates.
>
> (“Fictionality and Fields of Reference” 244)

The omitted signal may take various forms, for instance, to follow Hrushovski’s
suggestion, _Ulysses_ could have such floating pointers as “on one June morning of
1904,” “in the year 190*,” “the city D.”. _Ulysses_ at the very beginning anchors the text
to a specific place: the author never passes any opportunity to strengthen the link
between his Dublin and the real Dublin by accumulating as many Dublin landmarks as
possible, post offices, pubs, stations, streets, and churches. Although Joyce offers
many floating forms by not giving a specific time to the story, the withholding of
fictional time is slowly lifted and this very process problematizes the way the reader perceives the relationship between the two worlds in *Ulysses*. The text deliberately introduces the month, then the time of the month, then the day, then the year to the novel, one clue at a time. In the end, it kills off any “floating” coordinate and disallows any floating forms thereafter. The very first time a time signal for the year appears is in “Aeolus,” where the reader gets a kind of signpost of fictionality with “HORATIO IS CYNOSURE THIS FAIR JUNE DAY” (143). Chapters later, in “Scylla and Charybdis” the reader hears from Stephen: “It is this hour of a day in mid June” (180). The ambiguity of time is slowly minimalized and now we know it is either 15 or 16 of June. The final anchoring comes from Joyce in “Sirens” when the reader gets: “Miss Dunne clicked on the keyboard: -16 June 1904” (220). As if the information about the day and the month and the year is not enough, in “Oxen of the Sun,” Joyce offers one more signal, “So Thursday sixteenth June Patk” (378). The text provides a last confirmation in “Ithaca” in the list of expenses composed by Bloom: “Compile the budget for 16 June 1904” (664). With the place fixed and time up in the air for the first six chapters, the text still lets the reader believe that this could be a fictional world. However, the more place names of Dublin are added to the text, the more the reader gets the impression that this might not be a fictional world, and the more specific the time is offered, the more playful the text becomes: this is not the fictional world, not a single signal is available to prove so. With the employment of the place names and the density of the information, the referentiality of signposts becomes the utmost priority of Joyce in *Ulysses*.

In an attempt to rebuild Dublin, Joyce brings the absent place into presence through place names in which each place name could successfully replace its equivalent place, as Martin Heidegger notes in *What is called thinking?*, “Naming
consists by nature in the real calling, in the call to come, in a commending and a command” (119). Dublin, thus, is commanded to emerge, to appear, to take shape in the forms of place names. Through this calling, the text supports the naïve assumption that words can stand for objects and language is a purely transparent and satisfactory system of references. Joyce brings real Dublin objects into his text with a determination that his system of place names will not face any semantic problems, and real objects will be locatable and reproducible in text. Nevertheless, as Terry Eagleton observes in The English Novel, “[t]o call something ‘realist’ is to confess that it is not the real thing” (10). Proper names in Ulysses have a double bind inherent in them because of their condition of possibility: they are unique and repeatable; they are specific and uncertain; they are signifiers and sigfinieds; they are real and fictional: They negate themselves and recreate themselves in Joyce’s writing. The accumulation of them is the key to create the uncertainty in the novel.

**Surplus of Facts, Deficiency of Descriptions, and Failed Production of Meaning**

According to Karen Lawrence, facts are the “the rock of Ithaca”: they maintain the reader’s feeling of consistency and security, that there still exists a concrete, stable city in which characters dwell and move around. As in the second half of the book, there is a shift of focus from the plot to “the drama of the writing” (Lawrence 12). In my opinion, long before the employment of rhetorical experiments, the process of violating narrative contracts starts as early as “Calypso” with the play on the place names in Bloom’s first walk in the city, when Joyce fills the route with real localities; and the act of breaking contracts comes more frequently in the course of the novel, especially with the introduction passage in “Lotus Eaters.” My examination of this technique is based on Jonathan Culler’s brilliant reading of the works of Gustave Flaubert in Flaubert: The Use of Uncertainty. In this book, Culler shows how Flaubert
uses uncertainty as his primary method to upset the production of meaning and challenges the assumption that Flaubert is a true realist. Joyce applies a very similar technique when dealing with place names and places. I would term the technique “the age of the captain”: a nonsensical way to write about places.

In a letter to his sister Caroline in 1841, Gustave Flaubert wrote:

Since you are doing geometry and trigonometry, I will give you a problem: A ship is on the sea, it left Boston laden with cotton, it is of 200 tons burden, it sails towards Havre, the mainmast is broken, there is a cabin boy on the fore-peak, the passengers are twelve in number, the wind blows N.E.E., the chronometer reads a quarter past three in the afternoon, the month is May. Required the Captain’s age. (Qtd. in Tarver 21)

In this puzzle, the reader is offered abundant information about the voyage: the number of passengers on the ship, the weight of the goods, the time of the day and the month; and to make the journey more realistic, Flaubert arranges that it sails from Boston to Havre. The reader absorbs all the details and expects a problem that is related to all these data. The problem is far from pertinent to them: the puzzle asks for “The Captain’s age.” Immediately, the reader falls into a chaos of emotions: surprise, inability to guess at an answer, amaze and frustration. Flaubert creates a big gap between the introduction and the ending of the puzzle, in which the ending is not only irrelevant to the introduction, but also challenges the purpose and meaning of the introduction. The ending pushes the whole puzzle into a crisis of epistemology. Similarly, the reader of Joyce when reading the introduction passage of “Lotus Eaters”
experiences a similar thing, with one difference: the ending is never reached. *Ulysses* is an ongoing and never-ending process about Dublin:

> By lorries along sir John Rogerson’s quay Mr Bloom walked soberly, past Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, the postal telegraph office. Could have given that address too. And past the sailors’ home. […] El, yes : house of : Aleph, Beth. And past Nichols’ the undertaker’s. (68)

It is odd enough that the whole route that Bloom takes lacks descriptions and is nothing but data, albeit abundant data of place names and details. What could be said if a question at the end of this passage reads, “Required the city’s characteristics”? The trouble with producing meaning is inherent very early. Simply put, literary work is traditionally considered a meaningful product and every sentence and detail has to nudge the reader to some “significance,” towards a direction where everything in the novel must belong to such a scheme or an interpretation that the drive to squeeze meaning out of a literary text is powerful. When reading a work of literature, the reader can never avoid basic questions such as “what does this story mean?” “what is the purpose of this detail?” and “what is the function of this character?” Everything must signify something, the text is a collection of numerous codes to decipher, of numerous rules that the reader must learn, and this very nature of reading is problematic for the process of producing meaning. Although the function of details, the symbolism, and the coherence of the novel are criteria that every reader is trained to expect, and apply to assess a novel’s literary values, this very thirst for meaning and order may frustrate and demoralize the reader with more unconventional works.
Discussing the role of details in Flaubert’s descriptions, Culler hypothesizes that: “In one sense there is nothing remarkable about them; they present a series of details which the reader may take as realistic ‘filler’ and pass over quickly” (Flaubert: the Uses of Uncertainty 60). Bloom is walking past multiple unremarkable places, and a series of place names informs the reader about his movement. This is “realistic” since all the place names are real. There truly exist John Rogerson’s quay, Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, and Townsend street in Dublin. However, Culler notes how these details breach fundamental laws of composition:

A sentence, we are told, is essentially a proposition, composed of a subject and a predicate which makes a statement about that subject. Therein lies its coherence. And subordinate clauses amplify, explain, or restrict the main proposition. (Flaubert: the Uses of Uncertainty 60)

In the first sentence of Joyce’s passage, after the main proposition “Mr Bloom walked soberly,” the reader finds four prepositional phrases, “by lorries along sir John Rogerson’s quay,” “past Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, the postal telegraph office.” A third-person narrator supposedly narrates this sentence and the reading process is smooth. By the second sentence, the trouble begins. “Could have given that address too.” There are two bizarre things: first, the change of direction in subject matter: the narrative abruptly stops to talk about a topic that has nothing to do with the first sentence; second, the change of viewpoint: the sentence is not narrated by the third-person narrator any longer but by the character and the figural perspective is introduced. As Culler asserts, “the point of arrival has nothing to do with the point of departure” (60); there are the irrelevant and arbitrary jumps between the sentences. In the third sentence, as if suddenly remembering that the character is still walking, the text offers an odd phrase: “And past the sailors’ home.” Whose voice is it? Who is
telling the reader that Bloom was passing the sailor’s home? Is it Bloom himself or the narrator just coming back from somewhere? The third sentence deepens the trouble generated in the second one.

In the same vein, troubles are aggravated and accumulated along Bloom’s walk. Joyce would jot down one sentence to filter reality and abruptly switch to limn figurative thoughts, and then offer again another realistic description with a place name. This cycle of troublemaking returns repeatedly in the episode as the author constantly creates a realistic portrayal of the city then interrupts it by an internal turn into the character’s mind. Furthermore, Joyce creates two layers of troubles in reaching at some final meaning in the text. Firstly, there is a surplus of facts and yet the text is deficient of descriptions, as Joyce provides a wealth of mere place names to fill up the routes of Bloom. According to the recently discovered diary of Sean Lester, an Irish diplomat and an acquaintance of Joyce, when being asked why he did not return to his Ireland, Joyce answered, “I am attached to it daily and nightly like an umbilical cord” (McConville, “Co Antrim-born diplomat’s encounters with James Joyce revealed”). It could be said that the place names serve as Ireland’s cord to child baby Joyce and his work. My examination of the number of Dublin place names used in Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes unveils his writing method (see Appendix A): In “Calypso,” Joyce uses 9 place names, “Lotus Eaters” 20, “Hades” 34, “Lestrygonians” 73. The sheer numbers speak volumes. The density of place names makes the reader pay full attention to the fact that he is reading to a text fully attached to Dublin, like with an umbilical cord. By providing a surplus of place names, the text constantly reminds us of the absence of Dublin and the hollow presence of place names. The more place names are added, the more bizarrely they affect the reader’s reading.
Several theorists and critics have offered their discussions on proper names in literary works. Julian Wolfreys in his phenomenal reading of place names in Dickens’ works contends that place names function with indifference to details in the images by giving “[t]he signature of ‘things past’” (105), and apart from creating the mapping effect, they invoke a memory of place, of a city, or to signify a site of memory thanks to mnemotechnic associations. Roland Barthes in “Proust and Names” also shares a similar opinion on the evocative potentiality of proper names. In his examination of how Proust builds a suggestive system of proper names in *In Search of Lost Time*, Barthes considers them a special kind of sign, “a voluminous sign, a sign that always has a thick density of meaning which no use can diminish or flatten, unlike the common name, which only offers syntagmatic meaning” (“Proust and Names” 125). Michael Seidel in *Epic Geography* also asserts how in *Ulysses* names of some particular locales and streets “can expand the world of the narrative” because of their suggestiveness (124). Nonetheless, Seidel opposes any attempt to impose significance on them, which is “more quixotic than rewarding” (Seidel 125).

Similar to Seidel, in my opinion, place names in *Ulysses* do not possess evocative power, except as flags that signal to the reader that they are the real. Rather, they become details, a special kind of details that is inauthentic and hollow because the fictive Dublin is decorated with the spillage of proper names without their imaginative descriptions. Besides, they evoke personal memories rather than collective ones. Mnemotechnics is the way place names activate figurative memories and convert the whole city into a semantic field: they transcend the city, which normally functions as the setting, an extraneous being, an unrelated physical entity that exists unconcerned with characters and plot, to another level: the city now acts as an abundant source of incentives inducing the stream of consciousness of its citizens. On the other hand,
these hollow details run the risk of becoming giant empty signifiers due to the pervasiveness of proper names, titles, and lists. It turns Dublin into a proliferation of signifiers, yielding nothing to reach final significations. Additionally, the surplus of facts, combined with the underprovided details in *Ulysses*, denies the reader any chance of imaginative enactment. Budgen rightly observes how Dublin’s places are provided “without explanations or introductions”:

> Streets are named but never described. Houses and interiors are shown us, but as if we entered them as familiars, not as strangers come to take stock of the occupants and inventory their furniture. Bridges over the Liffey are crossed and recrossed, named and that is all. (70)

While details play the role of stimulating the reader to construct and develop mental pictures, Joyce hardly instructs the reader on this process. It is not surprising that Elaine Scarry’s brilliant study *Dreaming by the Book* on how literature helps readers imagine and dream via its language, absolutely ignores James Joyce and there is not a single image or scene that could make it into her examination. The vividness of objects and places in Joyce are never allowed because he denies the “imaginary vivacity [which] comes about by reproducing the deep structure of perception” (Scarry 9). The only instructions that the reader receives are the movements of the character in the city. Although Dublin is reflected through Bloom’s walking steps and his eyes, the unembellished place names enfeeble the reader’s power of imagination. The lack of details leads to desperate attempts to re-produce the interior of various sites in *Ulysses* by Joyce experts. In “Visualizing Joyce,” Ian Gunn and Mark Wright construct a 3-dimensional model of the house at 7 Eccles Street to understand its fictional furnishings. This attempt and numerous sketches of Dublin places from Ormond Hotel’s bar in “Sirens” to the interior of Martello Tower are profuse in Joycean
scholarship. They are strong proof for the argument that Joyce strips off any instructions to spur the imagination about the city.

Commenting on the Joyce’s listing proper names without descriptions, Clive Hart asserts that Joyce’s habit of naming places but omitting explanations reveals how he writes about Dublin for his fellow Dubliners, to create an effect of belonging “that we are able to move easily in our imagined urban landscape” (“Wandering Rocks” 188). Countering this argument, Eric Bulson argues that if Joyce treats readers like his fellow locals, he would not mention streets signs since “[l]ocals do not read street signs” (Novels, Maps, Modernity 69). He further asserts that modernists name streets rather than describe them, including them into an itinerary for the very reason that naming is the novelistic way of being cartographic: “it is a way of pointing out a location without getting bogged down in extraneous details” (Novels, Maps, Modernity 69).

I concur with Bulson that the inclusive effect of naming without descriptions is never accomplished in the text, and that it is more disorienting than orienting for the reader. Nevertheless, the way Joyce lists proper names makes the text a double writing: It is true that Joyce might treat the reader not as locals since Dubliners do not read street signs. However, they do recognize streets, silently, without vocalizing names as the third-person narrator does. What Joyce does is giving voices to these silent thoughts. Still, it could also be the case that Joyce might treat the reader as foreigners. Joyce’s intentions and the text’s meanings are equally equivocal. If we consider place names as part of an itinerary as Bulson argues, whether the reader is

29 Harald Beck offers a detailed explanation of the location as well as interior design of the Ormond Hotel in this link: http://www.jjon.org/joyce-s-environs/ormond.

30 See Bulson’s “Disorienting Dublin” (125-144) for a detailed analysis of this effect.
local or foreign does not make any difference. As when narrating a story about movement of a person around the city to a listener, local or not, the teller would make sure to state in the text that the character travels to X, the character passes by Y, the character enters Z, in which X, Y, Z are real.

The second layer of the problematizing strategy is the denial of symbolic meanings in Joyce’s writing, which goes hand in hand with the first layer. In the course of reading the passages swamped with place names in *Ulysses*, the reader has two options: to ignore them all, or stop by each place name every time he encounters it to ponder on its function. Whilst in a classical novel the reader will simply consider them the realistic effect and move on with the story, in Joyce, this option costs the reader more time and energy: he has to find a way to incorporate all the details in his reading and try to make sense of them. The more place names accumulate, the more ambiguity and perplexity occur in the reader. Place names deeply interfere with the structure of the story and the narrative: they wage a war against the plot with all these details bugging the reader and violating the narrative contracts. The surplus of facts is one of the main features problematizing the process of reading. Discussing the very same idea, Robert Martin Adams offers great insights by pointing out the fusion of the meaningless and the meaningful in many facts that Joyce incorporates into his text (245). *Ulysses* is a novel imposing its structure onto an epic background and the reader is entangled in a network of Homeric parallels, schematic correspondences, ironies and parodies. In consequence “he cannot run down each tiny irony, each buried error, and sort out the significant from the insignificant” (Adams 245-6).

As I have argued before, place names in *Ulysses* are not merely decorations on the surface. They are functional in a more complex way in the process of reading. I
will now discuss how they are not symbols, since they yield no specific symbolic meanings useful to the recuperation of the reader. According to Culler,

Recuperation is a process of making details into *signifiants* [sic] and naming their *signifies* [sic]. The drive towards meaning on the reader’s part is extremely powerful, and, as we shall see, the ubiquity of the cultural models and symbolic codes which guide it makes it a difficult process to disrupt. (*Flaubert: the Uses of Uncertainty* 62)

Place names, apart from the signification that they are the real, do not provide any more clues about reality; they do not yield themselves to become material for symbolic interpretation either; neither do they help us to understand Bloom’s predilections. With the norm in classical novels in which “the world is fundamentally intelligible,” Culler frequently reminds us that there are “causal theories of the relationship between environment or appearance and personality or atmosphere” (*Flaubert: the Uses of Uncertainty* 72), whence the text of *Ulysses* simply makes a fundamentally unintelligible world. In *Ulysses*, Joyce abandons the symbolic, intelligible Dublin and goes beyond this norm to challenge the reader’s ability to make sense of the city. By breaking the conventions of describing places, Joyce problematizes the production of meanings for Dublin. The reader never gets any clue to help him at least imagine how the house at 7 Eccles Street is, let alone deducing from this habitat a single characteristic of Bloom’s personality. Similarly, the routes that Bloom takes in “Lotus Eaters” or “Lestrygonians” yield us no single understanding of Dublin. Starkly contrary to the technique of portraying the city in *Dubliners*, in which as Ezra Pound observes Joyce keeps every element at a minimum, extruding superfluous details (68), *Ulysses*’s style requires that those elements must be spilled to maximum. It also defies realism by simply charging the discourse with ostentatious knowledge that Philippe
Hamon calls “the descriptive note, which it wants to show (to the reader) by circulating it (in and through a narrative) (172)” then denies what Brooks explains how “[t]he descriptive imperative points to the primacy of the visual in realism” (17).

The text of *Ulysses* goes beyond the conventions of 19th century realism, rich in preparing visual effects, yet does not bother to justify irrelevant and unnecessary details; and it flaunts its knowledge while still denying the register of appearances.

The narrative contract between author and reader is drastically violated in another aspect as well: the inward turn of the text. In Stephen’s episodes, the text sets up a narrative norm with the sudden appearance of Stephen’s interior monologue in the first chapter, then gradually moves from the physical world to the figurative mind and reaches its apex in “Proteus.” Parallel in structure, “Calypso” begins in a new setting, then transits to Bloom’s mind, with literal records of his thoughts existing co-dependently with rigid depictions of his movement. Take another example from “Lestrygonians”:


He walked on past Bolton’s Westmoreland house. Tea. Tea.

Tea. I forgot to tap Tom Kernan. (154)

Apart from violation of the function of details - which compels the reader to ponder a series of questions, as I discussed earlier: What is the point of all the place names that Joyce mentions in Bloom’s movement? What is the purpose of telling the reader the exact whereabouts of Bloom? Why does he not get any descriptions of the Fleet Street crossing, or Bolton’s Westmoreland house?, “Lestrygonians” challenges the
seriousness of the discourse with its flux of thoughts and lack of descriptive details, yet abundance of instructive directions.

The advent of a place name always brings out a stream of thoughts in Bloom, sometimes directly related to the place, sometimes wildly irrelevant. On the one hand, the problem of relevance and irrelevance is still at work; on the other hand, interior monologue now occupies the centre of the narrative and defies the seriousness of the discourse, the purpose of presenting the character’s movement is demolished. The text carries the reader out of Dublin into another space: the space of the mind. Even though the drive towards meanings is very strong, the text sets up obstacles to frustrate the reader’s attempt, and the search for coherence is crushed. As Culler points out, the text, at one level, signifies “this is reality” with proper names, tempting the reader to a second level, a metaphor of reading. As a result, the reader follows the text’s recording of Bloom’s movements all around the city, attempting to find significations in them and understand the world and yet “experiencing defeat” because his wanderings is a journey without end (Flaubert: the Uses of Uncertainty 75). The text is invaded by the cultural code and bearing too many signifiers, thus it exhausts semantic exploration (Barthes, “Semiology and Urbanism” 416). Place names in Ulysses are nearly empty and they negate themselves the moment they appear in the text because of their illusory effect of reality. They produce the objectivity of Dublin but do not provide a symbolic meaning. They lead the reader in following the character’s steps not to encounter the outer reality, the city of Dublin, but the figurative mind. The act of listing proper names becomes the act of deferring meaning and the production of meaning is delayed.

Paris in Balzac: The Totalizable City
In order to understand general expectations of readers of classical novels about
descriptions of place, an examination of the notable representatives of 19th century
realism might illustrate my argument. The city of Paris in Honoré de Balzac’s fictions
is often limned with details that enrich the reader’s power of imagination, evoking
vivacity of places. In addition, these descriptions always gesture strongly to symbolic
readings of the characters’ backgrounds and personalities. Peter Brooks’ acclaimed
book on realism, Realist Visions, cites Oscar Wilde’s statement that the 19th century is
Balzac’s invention to point out that literary realists give form to the newly “emerging
urban agglomerations, its nascent capitalist dynamics, its rampant cult of the
individual personality” (21). Since “the inevitable context of the new was the city”
(21-2), Balzac is undeniably a city writer. Many of Balzac’s novels are based in Paris
and the city becomes one of the most delineated realistic urban spaces.

The representation of Paris in Old Man Goriot exemplifies the conventions of
realism: the text aims at the objectivity of the city by a display of knowledge as well as
abundant imaginative stimuli. Moreover, the reader has no problems in reaching a
symbolic reading of the city. Set in Paris in 1819, the novel tells the story of three
characters: the old man Goriot, a criminal named Vautrin, and a law student
named Eugène de Rastignac. The passage that I am quoting here introduces the reader
to the boarding house where Rastignac and Old Man Goriot are amongst the residents:

The building stands at the foot of the Rue Neuve-Sainte-Geneviève, just
where the ground shelves into the Rue de l’Arbalète so sharply and
inconveniently that horses rarely go up or down it. […] Every passer-by –
even the most carefree man in the world – feels dejected here, where
the sound of a carriage is a momentous event, the houses are drab and
the walls make you feel boxed in. […] No district of Paris is less
attractive, nor, it must be said, so little known. [...] just as, step by step, the daylight fades and the guide’s patter rings hollow, when the traveller descends into the Catacombs. A fitting comparison! Who is to say which sight is the more horrible: shrivelled hearts, or empty skulls? (Balzac 4)

The text is straightforward and candid in its portrayal: the narrator employs a variety of adjectives to depict the boarding house and the alley: “sharply and inconveniently,” “dejected,” “drab,” “tedium,” “wretched,” “gloomy.” The sentences are flat and instructive: they direct the reader to cast their eyes not only on the boarding house but also on the district around it. The descriptions conjure up a desolate area, where neither horses nor people have set foot. The place, limned by gloomy colours and permeated with the sense of old age and the threatening feeling of death, lacks vitality. Despite its proximity with the city’s landmarks such as the Val-de-Grâce and the Panthéon, its atmosphere is suffocating. The third-person narrator is more than willing to comment on the place and he even compares the place to the catacombs. He neatly prepares all the clues to urge the reader to the obvious conclusion: the boarding house is dull and dirty, situated in a poor and unknown area, starkly contrast to the splendid and luxurious Paris. The disparity is intentionally set up to create two poles in the city of Paris: one is dejected, the other is anything but.

Immediately, the reader could deduce from these descriptions the background of the characters. They belong to a lower class, are poverty-stricken, unattractive and miserable. Their life is as drab as the walls that box them in. Isolated and receiving no attention from others, they live like shadows in their struggle with life in a big city. They are stuck in their environment and, gradually, lead themselves to the catacombs. They are reduced into the equivalence of their habitat; they are conquered, dominated
by their conditions. They are the extreme opposite of Paris. The novel employs the technique of relating the environment to the character’s social status as well as personality. Hillis Miller in his reading of realism in Dickens’ work uses Roman Jakobson’s idea on metonymy and metaphor to point out the metonymical texture of realistic prose:

The metonymic reciprocity between a person and his surroundings, his clothes, furniture, house, and so on, is the basis for the metaphorical substitutions so frequent in Dickens’s fiction. (296)

This metonymy is clearly inherent in Balzac’s realistic prose. There is a string closely attaching the characters with their life conditions. The opposition set up from the introduction is maintained throughout the novel, especially in the passage that depicts the encounter between Rastignac with the Parisian high society: coming back from a luxurious party, he suddenly realizes that the dining room is “unsavoury,” and the room’s wretchedness makes him hesitate (Balzac 75). Furthermore, the introduction also subtly anticipates other parts of Paris that the characters have never known, and in order to survive this big city, they have to learn about it. The journey from the dejected home of the old with people like Old Man Goriot to join the high society with its youthfulness and luxuries is obviously hinted. To conquer it or to be conquered by it becomes one of the main themes in the novel.

As Brooks proposes, one of the notable features of Paris in Balzac’s novels is “Paris itself is initially a lesson in things” (24). In a letter to his mother, Rastignac wrote, “For life in Paris is an eternal battle” (78). Without doubt, Paris is a labyrinth and the hero needs to learn his way around to survive. The third-person narrator

31 See Brooks, especially chapter 8 for a brilliant analysis of Paris in Balzac as a legible city.
often compares Paris with an ocean, “But then Paris is an ocean. Heave in the lead as 
often as you like, you’ll never sound its depths…” (12). As a result, the text leaves its 
hero “at liberty to sail across the ocean of Paris for fifteen months, to throw himself 
into bartering for women or fishing for his fortune” (79). The passage that best 
presents the idea that Paris is a battle is when Old Goriot, deep in destitution and 
abandoned by his very own daughters, dies miserably and is buried at the Père 
Lachaise Cemetery by Rastignac:

   Alone now, Rastignac walked up towards the cemetery’s highest point 
and saw Paris below him, winding along the banks of the Seine, its 
lights beginning to sparkle. […] He gave the droning hive a look that 
seemed to drain it of its honey in advance and pronounced these grand 
words: ‘Now let us fight it out!’ (256-7)

A panoramic view of Paris is offered from the top of a hill in the cemetery: a splendid 
and sparkly Paris, full of lights, indifferent to an ill-fated old man’s passing. Standing 
before this Paris, the hero utters his challenge: “Now let us fight it out!” This speech 
strengthens the definition of Paris as a jungle, an ocean, a labyrinth, through which the 
hero must find his way, to survive in it. “Paris is this,” “Paris is that” are synthetized 
labels that the reader could deduce from the text and stick on the imaginary city, for 
the text highlights not a figurative image of the city but a truthful one: a Paris of 
totalization. 

**Dublin in *Dubliners*: “a wealth of delicate pictorial evocation” (Budgen 68)**

   In order to understand the evolution of Joyce’s technique, I would like to 
examine the representation of Dublin in *Dubliners*, which is written in a scrupulously 
realistic style constructing an authentic “objective” city. As I previously discussed, 
*Dubliners* is the vehicle by which Joyce displays his obsession for facts that plays a
crucial part in creating the verisimilitude of the fictive Dublin. The author floods the stories with place names in order to bring about the objectivity of the city. In my examination of the number of Dublin real place names in this collection, the story with the least number is “Eveline,” 2, and the one with the most number is “Two Gallants,” 31 (see Appendix B). These numbers are inevitable proof that Joyce has always fastidiously included real localities in his stories.

While aiming to create “a chapter of moral history” of his city and nation, with “a scrupulous meanness,” Joyce employs the techniques of 19th century literary realism. As Peter Brooks stresses:

> Realist literature is attached to the visual, to looking at things, registering their presence in the world through sight. Certainly realism more than almost any other mode of literature makes sight paramount—makes it the dominant sense in our understanding of and relation to the world. (3)

Indubitably, sight is paramount, an “ineluctable modality,” in *Dubliners*, specifically in the ways Joyce describes streets, crowds, buildings, and weather. As his friend, Frank Budgen comments in a memoir written under Joyce’s watchful eye, “there is a wealth of delicate pictorial evocation in *Dubliners*” (69): it is by way of description that Dublin is created in this collection. A randomly picked passage in *Two Gallants* easily illuminates how Joyce’s early style focuses on sight and description to conjure up such candid, graphic scenery in Dublin’s cityscape:

> The grey warm evening of August had descended upon the city and a mild warm air, a memory of summer, circulated in the streets. The streets, shuttered for the repose of Sunday, swarmed with a gaily
coloured crowd. Like illumined pearls the lamps shone from the
summits of their tall poles upon the living texture below which,
changing shape and hue unceasingly, sent up into the warm grey
evening air an unchanging unceasing murmur. (36)

The narrator rather conventionally begins his narrative by depicting weather and the
atmosphere enveloping the whole scene. He then casts his camera-like eyes on the
streets, to focus on details such as the gas lamp-lights. Numerous adjectives related to
vision swarm before our eyes, evoking the picturesque, bordering on romantic excess:
grey, gaily coloured, illumined, tall, changing, unchanging, etc. This is classic realistic
observation evoking feelings appropriate for a quotidian scene of any city anywhere.
Joyce constructs not only an idiosyncratic Dublin with characteristics known by
Dubliners, but a parochial object bestowed with universal features. These meticulous
descriptions - offered up mostly by a third-person narrator, unlike the first three stories
narrated from an anonymous, first person point of view - consolidate the argument for
the factuality of Dublin in *Dubliners*: it is susceptible to objective observation and
description. Discussing Joyce’s narrative voice, Weldon Thornton points out several
criteria by which authorial narrative can be categorized as third-person perspective:

if it can move freely among locales or characters […]; if it provides
information or exposition that does not come through the characters; if
it presents the characters’ thoughts and feelings in more depth than they
themselves could; and if it involves value judgments and qualitative
descriptions that do not stem any “plausible observer.” (28)

I argue that there is a continuity from the narrative traditions of 19th century realism to
Joycean techniques, since all of the features Thornton mentions are evident in
Dubliners. Even with considerable uncertainty about, and an inscrutability of the characters’ conduct existent in Dubliners, even though the free indirect discourse technique presenting the inner thoughts from the characters’ perspective is deftly handled in some stories, Joyce never abandons realist description in his first book of fiction. He presents things as they are, a series of banal everyday experiences instead of their romanticized or embellished visions, to create a physical and spiritual milieu resembling life itself. Consequently, the realistic effect in the collection is consolidated, and the representation of Dublin treated with objectivity is indubitable.

When Dublin is limned as an objective totality, symbolic meanings can be induced in the ways Dublin’s cityscape mirrors its denizens’ psyche to exemplify the rule of classic novels according to which the world is fundamentally intelligible: the city’s bleak, suffocated streets and spaces provoke the reader to empathize with the smothered and paralysed minds of its inhabitants. Joyce, more often than not, constructs vivid descriptions of the city’s cityscape in which the condition a character dwells in, in a way, is conducive to his pining for a certain kind of place: in a cramped space, he projects his desires onto somewhere else out of it, beyond the confines of Dublin. The characters, in their quiet, invisible attempts to break out of the well-worn environment, dream about new lands, embark on a trip to a freer landscape, or climb a hill to take in a panoramic view of the place in which he is suffering as if to liberate himself. These two layers of meanings are closely intertwined with each other. It is the Wild West destination disguised in the Pigeon House trip in “An Encounter,” where the boys go north to experience an unrestricted space to avoid a dull day at school; it is the Araby bazaar in “Araby” for the boy who wants to get out of the suffocating air in blind North Richmond Street; it is Buenos Aires in “Eveline,” a faraway land to free Eveline from her dusty, exhausting home in the avenue invaded by nightfall, where
paralysis is claiming not only her body but also her mind; it is London for Little Chandler, to escape his own dull and mediocre life in “A Little Cloud.” It is the crest of the Magazine Hill for Mr. James Duffy in “A Painful Case” to meditate on his lost love and lost life, this man who chooses to live stoically in the outskirts of Dublin, far away from the city centre, physically and emotionally isolating himself, rejecting any strings of attachment and, aware of his mechanized soul, identifying with the mechanic train. It is outside in a park for Gabriel in “The Dead,” who being stuck in a party, repeatedly confesses to himself that he longs to be alone in an open space. The way the text fleshes out symbolic associations between the places where characters are confined in with those they long for illustrates how Joyce adheres to realist conventions in creating a meaningful world. In Dubliners, the reader finds a strong relationship between environment, place and personality, the city and its citizens.

Even though Dubliners consists of 15 short stories with different characters and situations, they share a common characteristic: Dublin’s environment and the historico-specific situation, as represented by the realistic techniques and conjured up in the common reader’s mind, serves as a suffocating atmosphere opposing on the citizens’ lives. This shared experience of Dubliners vanishes once we set foot in the land of Ulysses. There is a move from a strict realism to hyperrealism or a new realism in Ulysses: the scrupulously realistic style constructing a presumedly authentic and objective Dublin is heightened. In addition, several subjective Dublins are produced in the characters’ mind, and the city is transfigured in various styles, rejecting any specific and definite reading of it.

**Walking in “Lotus Eaters” and “Lestrygonians”: Distancing Style**

Continuing with the examination of the development of Joyce’s technique, in this section, I will first consider Dublin as portrayed by a defamiliarizing style that
reflects the walking patterns of Leopold Bloom. One of the most important characteristics of Dublin represented in Bloom’s episodes is that the city is seen from a moving viewpoint and limned not from static eyes but in the walking motions. An examination of walking in *Ulysses* would be useful to the discussion of the city. It can also shed light on how the initial style contorts itself into a distancing and defamiliarizing one. Comparing the image of Dublin Bay written in a highly poetic and educated style like this: “Woodshadows floated silently by through the morning peace from the stairhead seaward where he gazed” (9) in “Telemachus,” to the way Dublin is mentioned in this sentence in “Lestrygonians”: “He crossed at Nassau street corner and stood before the window of Yeates and Son, pricing the fieldglasses” (158), the reader can see the stark differences between these two styles.

Firstly, I would like to focus on Bloom’s movements through Dublin in “Lotus Eaters” and “Lestrygonians.” Most critics have emphasized the role of stream of consciousness to point out the differences between Stephen’s and Bloom’s interior monologues. Instead, I will concentrate on third-person narration in order to see how Joyce employs third-person narration to depict Dublin. Most third-person narration in “Lestrygonians” is written in a very basic style: the sentences are often short and flat, the meanings are clear and straightforward, and the vocabulary is simple and accessible. I have picked out 5 sentences that can be considered as representatives of this technique:

He passed the Irish Times. (152)

He stood at Fleet street crossing. (153)

---

32 See Steinberg (1973) for a meticulous analysis and comparison of Stephen’s, Bloom’s and Molly’s stream of consciousness.
He walked on past Bolton’s Westmoreland house. (154)

He went on by la Maison Claire. (159)

He entered Davy Byrne’s. (163)

The syntax is tremendously simple: Subject + Verb + Prepositional phrase. Bloom walks around Dublin, and the reader finds numerous examples such as “he walked,” “he passed,” “he crossed,” “he turned” etc. When counting the keywords of “Lestrygonians,” I find that the episode includes a remarkable number of verbs that depict the movement of the characters: “passed/passing” appears 16 times, “walk/walked/walking” 23 times, “went/going” 21 times, “come” 13 times, and “came” 8 times. In addition, the word “street” appears 27 times.

Besides, one of the special characteristics of these sentences is the presence of place names. Bloom is always passing a place, standing at a place, or entering a place. In the textual space, he is constantly in a “place.” The positing of Bloom in the urban city is constantly reminded to the reader. By my counting, in this episode alone, 73 Dublin real place names are mentioned. The more movement the character’s body makes, the more place names are provided. “Lestrygonians” is the most walkable chapter in *Ulysses* and the reader can be instructed by these virtual stage directions to follow Bloom’s footsteps in the real city of Dublin. The simplicity of style employed in “Lestrygonians” is not a first for Joyce. In *Dubliners*, another character has done a similar walk around Dublin and in that 4,000-word story, 31 Dublin place names are mentioned: Lenehan in “Two Gallants.” When comparing the syntax of Bloom’s

---

33 This is true in the first 17 episodes of *Ulysses*, and “Penelope” with motionless Molly yields a counter argument.
movement in *Ulysses* with the one of Lenehan’s, I found them to be surprisingly analogous, as if Bloom were writing his own Dubliner’s story about himself. There are countless sentences mirroring Lenehan’s walking movements as in the following:

He walked listlessly round Stephen’s Green and then down Grafton Street. (41)

He went into Capel Street and walked along towards the City Hall. (42)

Then he turned into Dame Street. (42)

He left his friends at a quarter to ten and went up George’s Street. (43)

The character roams about Dublin to pass the hours until he meets his friend again, and streets are named to orient the reader as to where he is. The reader also finds the same grammatical structure in these movements, each including a subject, a verb and a prepositional phrase. What I indicate here is that Joyce falls back into his old style of writing about walking. In *Ulysses*, the style is modified in several cases when Joyce adds verbal phrases to describe the way Bloom walks. For example:

Mr Bloom, quickbreathing, slowlier walking, passed Adam court. (159)

He passed, dallying the windows of Brown Thomas, silk mercers. (160)

I want to explore here the way these bare sentences listing the facts of Dublin work like stage directions and their effects in building a system of instructions for the reader which indicates movements, positions, or attitudes of Bloom. As pointed out by Steinberg, “Lestrygonians” shows a strong pattern of omniscient sentences appearing at the beginning of paragraphs or as full paragraphs, operating much like stage
directions in a play, to orient the reader (95). In Bloom’s episodes, it could be said that Joyce provides the stage directions or even that he directs Bloom how to walk, where to walk, and how fast to walk. The third-person narrative becomes an impartial camera: it offers no description of the feelings of the character; it strips off adjectives and adverbs; it just captures the movement of the character and the signposts on the way. The narrative employs a very regular and monotonous style, with legalistic precision. In her argument about how the mind receives instructions to build the giveness of an object, Scarry hypothesizes that it is the “mimesis of giveness,” through the quality of overt instruction in prose, that helps change from daydreaming to “vivid image-making” (31-36). Under Scarry’s direction, the mind of the reader is asked to follow these instructions in the walking sentences of Bloom:

(Look closely at the walker’s legs) His slow feet walked him riverward, reading. (144)

He passed, (look closely at the way of the characters’ walk) dallying the windows of (hear the name) Brown Thomas, silk mercers. (160)

Mr Bloom, (hear the sounds of his breathing) quickbreathing, (look closely at the walker’s legs) slowlier walking, passed (hear the name) Adam court. (159)

Consequently, what is conjured up is not the “giveness” of the places that Bloom passes but rather of his walking movements. In most of the cases, the bare grammatical structure of Bloom’s walking movements occupies most of the third-person narration, creating an effect of distanciation and defamiliarization in Bloom’s episodes. Bloom is presented from a distance and the impassivity of the walking
sentences renders Bloom a mechanized object, a chessman on the chessboard of Dublin. The narration is narrowed down to the street-level and exactly states the places Bloom passes by. Dublin is immediately reported, as if the character were wearing a Global Positioning Device informing the reader in real time where Bloom is. This style persists throughout the narrative, creating a heightened effect of immediacy and yet strangeness. From the third-person perspective, Bloom is presented in a defamiliarized style: the more he walks, the more detached he becomes. This basic style also reveals how the text aims at a straightforward rendering of reality: by stripping off figurative language and employing realistic language, it suggests a transparent system in which there is no trouble producing meanings. Although the style functions perfectly in depicting Bloom’s movements in Dublin with detachment, this very aim betrays itself with the narrative inundated with monotonous and simple sentences like: “Mr Bloom moved forward,” (147) “He walked along,” (148) “He crossed under,” (155) “He gazed after” (155). What kind of literature employs the most basic sentences worthy of beginner-level students of English? These simplistic sentences reveal how the narrative “parodies its own ability to tell a story” (Lawrence 45). They are repeated as if being automatically produced.

The slight irony is evident in the bare prose of “Lestrygonians,” and the text undoubtedly quotes itself by repeating the bare grammatical structures as I mentioned above. The reader constantly encounters “he walked, he came, he crossed,” as if churned out robotically from a writing machine. These sentences alert the reader to the author’s intention. They give out a warning as to how they might belong to a complex consciousness, and not simply be identified as the work of a third-person narrator. Fludernik also spots this tendency of aloofness in Bloom’s episodes. She notes an “independent narrative,” with a distancing effect, is a result of the “tendency towards
pedantry and the furnishing of circumstantial detail,” hence “establishing a distinct narrative voice emancipated from Bloom’s point of view” (“Narrative and Its Development in *Ulysses*” 17). However, her survey is of Bloom’s and Stephen’s consciousness and how free direct discourse is employed differently in their respective episodes. Fludernik notes that in “Telemachus,” free indirect discourse is employed in “lengthy and poetical” sentences, facilitating transitions between third-person narration and interior monologue (“Narrative and Its Development in *Ulysses*” 22).

Starkly dissimilar with this style, in Bloom’s episodes, free indirect discourse functions differently, charged with distanciation and is much shorter (“Narrative and Its Development in *Ulysses*” 22).

I advocate a complementary, and yet more conclusive method that will examine both third-person narration and interior monologue to find out and compare the ratio of interior monologue to third-person narration in both Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes. This has been a neglected area in Joycean scholarship and I am grateful to Eric Bulson’s “*Ulysses* in Number” because it is the first paper providing an analysis of this ratio. While Bulson carries out his examination on *The Little Review Ulysses*, I conduct my research on *Ulysses 1922* so the results are different. Comparing the ratios in Appendix C and D, we can see that in “Telemachus,” Joyce establishes the narrative norm with the dominance of third-person narration and the introduction of interior monologue, and the ratio of interior vs. third-person is 1:7. In “Nestor,” when the reader is starting to be comfortable with the appearance of interior monologue, Joyce gradually increases it to the point that the ratio is 1:2. In “Proteus,” Joyce significantly enlarges the amount of interior monologue to a ratio of 6.7:1. Based on these findings, it can be seen that there is a sudden and drastic surge of interior monologue in “Proteus.” However, this is not the case in “Lestrygonians.” The
data (see Appendix D) show that in “Calypso,” the ratio is 1.1:1. The narrator shares space equally with Bloom and this tendency persists in “Lotus Eaters” as well as in “Hades.” In “Lestrygonians,” Joyce does increase Bloom’s interior monologue, but not too drastically, to a ratio of 2.4:1. This ratio reflects Bloom’s notable characteristic of paying attention to the outer reality and significantly basing his inner world on it.

Steinberg, in a careful examination of the third-person narrator’s sentences in “Proteus” and “Lestrygonians” with a different method from mine in which he compares the number of the sentences buried inside the paragraphs, discovers that in “Proteus” 43.5 percent of the omniscient author’s sentences are buried inside the paragraphs, while in “Lestrygonians” the number is only 12.3 percent (95). The external reality in Stephen’s mind holds a more disadvantageous position compared to the one in Bloom’s. Bloom is more practical and alert to his physical world than Stephen and thus his occupied space in the narrative is equivalent to the narrator’s. Even though both characters receive various stimuli from Dublin, Stephen’s stream of consciousness seems more fluid.

Another aspect should be discussed in distinguishing the style of Stephen’s episodes to the (yet) unnameable style of Bloom’s episodes: that is, whether there is a single persona, the same narrator, for both Stephen and Bloom. David Hayman in his highly influential *The Mechanics of Meaning* coins an oft quoted term: “The Arranger,” that is, “the persona behind the action of the first eleven analysis of the first eleven chapters” and that “narrator’s particular brand of exuberance” (88-9). According to Hayman, the Arranger is the one in charge of the omniscient authorial sentences that frequently contain “rhetorical gestures which add point, interest and humor to what might otherwise be bland descriptive passages connecting bits of dialogue or monologue” (75). Thus in his opinion there is a single persona behind both
Stephen and Bloom’s episodes. Hugh Kenner also shares the idea of “the Arranger” and argues for a two-faced narrator that I will return to in the next section of this chapter. In short, Kenner suggests that in Stephen’s episodes, this narrator “flaunts skills such as Stephen covets, hence [possessing] a somewhat misleading likeness to Stephen’s idiom” (*Joyce’s Voices* 72). In Bloom’s episodes, this narrator transforms into a “less flamboyant craftsman whose Uncle Charles sensibilities respond to the pressure of Bloom’s presence, and who takes us deftly in and out of Bloom’s mind” (*Joyce’s Voices* 72). In this very important passage, Kenner discusses the difference between Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes, and yet he still maintains that they share the same narrator, blaming the differences to the ambidexterity of the narrator.

Countering this argument, Steinberg’s examination proves that in the omniscient sentences of “Proteus” and of “Lestrygonians,” the “rhetorical gestures” are different and they could not be “the utterances of a single persona” (121). I strongly share Steinberg’s opinion: in my analysis, the monotonous, pedantic third-person narration, going hand in hand with interior monologue in Bloom’s episodes calls attention to itself as using a definitely different style. The persona behind the “Woodshadows floated silently” passage in “Telemachus” could not be the same person with the hair-splitting style in Bloom’s episodes. This style creates an unobtrusive transition to interior monologue, as pointed out by Fludernik, thanks to the reinforcement of the emphasis on Bloom’s perspective “while at the same time considerably strengthening the distanciation from it” (“Narrative and Its Development in *Ulysses*” 24). This very technique forms the multipolar narrative style that I will discuss in the next chapter. The distanciation becomes stronger and appears more consistently, creating short phrases that are cut off from an identifiable narrative voice, from a subjectivity. They are voices without bodies and this is the premise for the sub-
headlines in “Aeolus.” Although they are also product of the troublemaker, the free indirect discourse technique, they work differently in Bloom’s episodes compared to Stephen’s episodes.

In short, from Fludernik’s observations as well as from my analysis of third-person narrated sentences and the ratio between third-person narration and interior monologue, I want to maintain that the well-established notion of “the initial style,” which consists of only third-person narration and dialogue and interior monologue, positively neglects the existence of free indirect discourse, the most prominent feature of the style in my opinion. Moreover, if the reader insists there is a single style in the first 6 (or 9) chapters of Ulysses, he has to accept that it is a dramatically flexible, porous, and spongy style. In Stephen’s episodes, it is remarkable how the density of interior monologue changes, as well as the distribution and characteristics of free indirect discourse, from the first chapter to the third chapter as I have pointed out earlier, and the same case is applicable in Bloom’s episodes.

I also would like to make an observation on the noteworthy combination of proper names and the distancing style in this chapter. With the accumulation of place names taken to extreme levels, the narrative sends out a signal to the reader that it is not only realism but also hyperrealism in the way the text aims directly and straight to the geographical Dublin. The distancing style works in a very similar way, mirroring the walking patterns of Bloom, in Dublin’s places, evoked specifically by place names. They aim to be a competent medium of representation in which there is no gap between the reference and referent. However, in my analysis, the proper names hollow themselves out, becoming empty signifiers and the narrative becomes the vehicle of them, alerting the reader to the parody of it. This goes hand in hand with the distancing
style, portraying reality on one hand, but on the other hand, ironically repeating its
structural and highlighting its defamiliarization. The text imitates hyperrealistic
style and yet undermines it at the very time of its employment. The inadequacy of the
narrative in grasping reality will be carefully analyzed in the next section, which
centres on how the style is profuse in uncertainty, making the task of identifying a
definite voice in this double writing absolutely impossible.

“Duke Street” (U 161): Multipolar Narrative Style

I would like to discuss how free indirect discourse plays an important role in
establishing the multipolar narrative style in Bloom’s episodes, in which “it is not
strictly delimited by the consciousness of any one individual” (Slote, “Loving the
Alien” 138). Inherent in this style is the elusiveness of the narrator: the reader cannot
identify who is the one behind short phrases flung about from nowhere to inform the
reader about the locations of Bloom. Starting from the introductory passage in “Lotus
Eaters,” there are independent short phrases standing apart without verbs and subjects,
cut off from a narrator and ostensibly displayed on the page. These phrases report the
places Bloom is passing by, describing Dublin from the perspective of a moving
subject. The reader immediately runs into a problem when trying to decide whose
voice these two phrases, “and past the sailors’ home,” “and past Nichols’ the
undertaker” belong to, the third-person narrator or the interior monologue?

At first glance, although these phrases appear to belong to the third-person
narrator since they are similar to the previous phrases in the first sentence: “past
Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crush-
er, the postal telegraph office,” it is entirely
possible as well that they are Bloom’s thoughts. Two observations here are worthy of
note: first, tracking the location of the character is definitely an act of the narrator’s;
second, the character is very well aware of the places that he is passing by and
continuously comments on them. The trouble from these two phrases is: is the narrator showing us where Bloom is passing by or is Bloom himself noticing the places that he is passing by? The problem of identifying the narrator is worsened in “Hades,” when Joyce adds a significant number of these phrases. Bloom travels by carriage with Martin Cunningham, Jack Power, and Simon Dedalus to Glasnevin cemetery. Due to “a fine old custom,” the funeral procession runs through Dublin in order for people to pay their last respects. The carriage passes by many Dublin landmarks, places, and buildings on its way. Dublin’s landscape is presented from the carriage’s window, even significantly widened. The number of place names that Joyce incorporates in this episode also reflects this broadened area of Dublin: it is increased from 20 in “Lotus Eaters” to 34 in “Hades.”

In order to portray this moving Dublin from a horse carriage, which is very different from a walking person as in the case of “Lotus Eaters” and “Lestrygonians,” the text needs plentiful landmarks that are special enough to be easily spotted from a far distance such as statues, squares and buildings. While a walker can spot various small details of the city landscape, a horse carriage easily blurs urban objects with its quick movement. Accordingly, place names in this chapter are used differently in other chapters: Dublin is represented through important place names, similar to the way the image of the city can be pointed out from important landmarks as discussed by Kevin Lynch. He proposes that the mental maps of the city consist of five kinds of elements: path, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks (Lynch 1960). Unsurprisingly,

34 This scene also recalls the horse carriage scenes in Charles Dicken’s *Oliver Twist* and Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary*, in which the carriages run through London and Rouen and a series of street names is recited in the narratives. Both narratives attempt to capture how a flux of places and sensations impinges on the mind of the characters in the quick movements around the urban space.
paths and landmarks of Dublin do exist in “Hades,” such as Watery lane, Ringsend road, the Grand Canal, Rutland square, Farrell’s statue, and Liberator’s statue among many others.

There are two types of reporting of the places that the carriage is passing by in “Hades”: the first comes directly from the carriage riders themselves. One such case is of Bloom announcing: “—Where are we? Mr Bloom put his head out of the window. —The grand canal, he said” (87), and another case by Mr Power: “—Dunphy’s, Mr Power announced as the carriage turned right” (95). The second kind of reporting comes from a seemingly third-person narrator: such as “In silence they drove along Phibsborough road,” (95) “They drove on. past Brian Boróimhe house,” (96) “The carriage rattled swiftly along Blessington street” (93). Still having the manners to keep the reader aware of the exact whereabouts of its characters, apart from the full sentences written in a basic structure and monotonous tone I have discussed above, the text offers abundant place names in verb-less, subject-less phrases as underlined in three following examples:

They waited still, their knees jogging, till they had turned and were passing along the tramtracks. **Tritonville road.** (85)

Mr Bloom smiled joylessly on Ringsend road. **Wallace Bros the bottleworks. Dodder bridge.** (85)

Mr Power’s choked laugh burst quietly in the carriage.

**Nelson’s pillar.** (92)

It is not easy for the reader to recognize whose voice is speaking in these examples. Firstly, if we insist that all these phrases belong to the third-person narrator, it will cause conflict in the cases when Bloom does cast his eyes outside the window several
times, notices a place, and comments on it. Secondly, it might be also possible that several short phrases are from Bloom’s interior monologue. However, I should point out that Bloom is always listening and replying to other characters’ conversation; and it is impossible that he keeps his eyes on the road all the time to keep track of the places through which the carriage is carrying them. The assumption that Bloom is the single enunciator of these phrases is not reasonable enough. Thirdly, even though up till this moment in “Hades,” apart from Stephen’s and Bloom’s consciousness, there is not another single character’s mind represented, other characters in the carriage do pay attention to the route that the funeral procession is passing by and they also discuss people and places met on their way. In the third example above, is it possible that it is Mr. Power’s thought? Despite the fact that the reader has been conditioned by the conventions of interior monologue from the earlier chapters, is there a possibility that Bloom is not the only person in the carriage capable of putting forth his stream of consciousness?

The argument could always swerve towards each direction, proving that the narrator is without doubt elusive. The possibility of casting any person into the role of narrator of these phrases is open. The reason is that these phrases are short and without a verb, as if they come straight from a character’s consciousness when he encounters a place. They are the closest approximation of monologic language. Free indirect discourse in this case appropriates the place names in its simplest form and ostensibly occupies the text. The voice in “Hades” is no longer a dual voice like in “Proteus” but metamorphoses into a multipolar voice that the reader can freely attribute to different characters’ consciousness. In “Lestrygonians,” the dual voice is reinstated in the narrative because the episode features Bloom alone. Yet, the multipolar voice still sticks around, as strong as ever, for example in this passage:
He passed, dallying the windows of Brown Thomas, silk mercers.


Duke street. Here we are. Must eat. The Burton. Feel better then. (160-1)

Bloom is passing a silk store and the content of the store is described. The reader encounters again noun phrases cut off from a body, a voice without a subject: “cascades of ribbons,” “flimsy China silks,” “a tilted urn poured from its mouth,” “a flood of bloodhued poplin.” If he follows the pattern about which Steinberg argues in his research that omniscient sentences in “Lestrygonians” tend to appear at the beginning of a paragraph, then all these phrases belong to the narrator. However, he can also argue that “a flood of bloodhued poplin” is Bloom’s interior monologue because it might be what his eyes register, and right after that there is a comment, possibly by Bloom: “lustrous blood.” The sentence after the comment is definitely Bloom’s thought: “The huguenots brought that here.” These verbless phrases are very similar to the monologic language of Bloom’s consciousness, creating smooth transitions to interior monologue. A double writing is in progress in these phrases: “Gleaming silks, petticoats on slim brass rails, rays of flat silk stockings,” (160) and “High voices. Sunwarm silk. Jingling harnesses” (160). They may be uttered from Bloom’s mouth to reflect what his eyes and ears register in the world outside; they may be the third-person narrator who is reflecting on the objects in the store; they may also be the third-person narrator reflecting on how Bloom sees and hears reality. This
double writing happens again when the reader meets another place name that is appropriated by free indirect discourse: “Duke Street.” This may be read as an announcement by the third-person narrator that Bloom is at Duke Street, or it may also be considered as a phrase uttered by Bloom when he realizes he has reached Duke Street.

Hugh Kenner in *Joyce’s Voices* argues for a double-eyed narrator in *Ulysses*, with “a double attitude” and “has a repertory of impersonations,” hence, “reality exacted a doubling” (81). Kenner demonstrates that these two narrators are well-versed in different lexicons and duties: the housekeeping narrator does the job of informing the reader about the whereabouts of the characters as well as what is going on in the narrative, using pedantic vocabulary, while the second narrator flaunts his skills through exuberant language. Yet, Kenner does not recognize the second narrator’s skills in those very short, seemingly dull and lackadaisical features. I rather hypothesize that, if we agree to believe in a double-faced narrator, we must be extra cautious and vigilant in detecting his traces even in places devoid of any rhetorical devices. More importantly, we must be prepared to accept that any trace may belong to any or all number of narrators, and that there is always a slight degree of uncertainty in our judgment.

Additionally, these phrases present a problem of the mixed voice. Benjamin Hrushovski wisely examines the combined discourse and explains how in the reading process the reader is always deciphering the mixed voice. That is where “linguistic indicators are lacking,” the reader has to separate the mingled voices “according to general hypothetical constructs which he makes about the possible positions of the intersecting voices” (“The Structure of Semiotic Objects” 369). The place names that I
underlined are examples of a double voice, simultaneously being signposts from the narrator’s point of view reporting the location of the character, and a possible thought of the character recognizing the familiar landmarks passing by him. In the discourse, there is a postponement, a deference of meaning, of identifying the speaker, the consciousness, the authorship of these phrases until the advent of verbs and pronouns. Until then, “the text remains ambiguously suspended” (Cohn 73). This suspension is an ongoing feature in Bloom’s episodes since the text indiscriminately leaves all these phrases alone, never adding any clue to clarify.

Besides, as Vincent Pecora notes, the intermingled voice of the elusive narrator also calls attention to a “larger problem in modernist narrative”: that is, how it subverts the “coherent, authoritative voice of nineteenth-century realist fiction” (235). Pecora goes further to explain how voice in the modern text, normally considered as “the sign of all presence and identity-in narrative and in consciousness,” undergoes a challenge of being “tested, strained, or destroyed”:

Instead of simply allowing the multiplication of voices to achieve a pluralistic consensus, modern narrative may be subtly questioning the efficacy, or what Jacques Derrida has called the “hold,” of voice as the sign of the unmediated, essential presence of consciousness, its purest identity, uncontaminated by conditional reality. (235)

_Ulysses_, as an exemplar of the modern text, shatters the coherence of voice by posing countless instances in which voice is multiplied, undecidable, and porous enough to absorb any subjectivity as well as deny a definite one. Instead of one single voice dominating the narrative, the multipolar voice persists in the text, bringing its wholeness, authority and seriousness into question. This multipolar voice is similar to
polyphony, or multivocality, which Mikhail Bakhtin discusses in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, that the narrative

is constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other. (18)

Along with the novelistic disruptions to the unity of voice, the arbitrariness, and capricious styles in *Ulysses* render the idea of coherence obsolete. The next section will discuss how coherence of narrative is suspended by interior monologue and how interior monologue transforms the city into a site of memories and thoughts.

**Dublin as a Cobweb of Stimuli and a Semantic Field of Conflated Places**

The doubleness of voice opens up a possibility for the doubleness of place, of being able to exist in two different narrations, and being able to depict a narrator in two or more places at once. I will discuss the significance of place in initiating copious planes of thoughts in Bloom and how more than two places can be conflated into a single one in Bloom’s mind. Leopold Bloom’s odyssey on 16th June, from eight A.M. at home, through a long day in the streets and private spaces of Dublin, then back to his dark bed far past midnight, offers not only ample opportunity for him to interact with the outer reality, but also a reconsideration of his distant past and vivid internal present. Bloom experiences and re-describes “his” world in fragmentary memories and impressions that are combined to represent Dublin as a cityscape simultaneously real and unreal.

Virginia Woolf’s haughty declaration, “On or about December, 1910, human character changed” (*Collected Essays* I 320), aptly describes the evolution in Joycean
technique between 1904 and 1914, from the beginning of *Dubliners*, to the
commencement of *Ulysses*: a new way of reporting on human consciousness is born.

There is a transformation from a focus on the outside to on the inside in the
narratological point of view, bringing a change from the objective treatment of reality
to a subjective one seen only infrequently in *Dubliners*. Reality is transfigured by the
psyche of the character. We are no longer treated to a studied presentation of reality
per se, but to successive universes of thought of a series of baffled characters that
render reality personal, and unreal. Joyce himself once claimed how writers of
previous generations were engrossed in “externals,” and one result is the one single
plane of mentality. He clearly voices a contrary attitude, recorded his conversation
with Arthur Power, that,

> the modern theme is the subterranean forces, those hidden tides which
govern everything and run humanity counter to the apparent flood:
those poisonous subtleties which envelop the soul, the ascending fumes
of sex. (Power 93)

Joyce suggests that we should think in multiple planes, and literature should become a
“new fusion between the exterior world and our contemporary selves, and also to
enlarge our vocabulary of the subconscious” (Power 93). Being well aware of the fact
that the concept of literature is limited to a fixed idea, Joyce challenges classical
literature and distorts it by diving into stream of consciousness (Power 93).

On a deeper level, Dublin has dramatically changed from the very moment
Joyce introduces interior monologue: readers unwittingly enter and re-enter the fictive
flow of a Heraclitan river-of-reality, a Protean, shape-shifting Dublin, or in other
words, an atlas-worth of Dublins. Joyce incorporates various raw materials from the
unlimited resources of city life into Bloom’s consciousness, creating a sea of
sensations and impressions. Concisely, the interior monologue narrative mode is an important one of stylistic devices transforming Dublin: it triggers the internalizing process in which Dublin is transferred into characters’ minds, perfecting the transmuted object by dyeing it with various colours of figurative language. Reality is not an outside entity any longer, but blends itself into personalized momentary memories, thoughts, moods and feelings of characters. Dublin in *Dubliners* lingers on in the reader as an authentic artefact; in *Ulysses* it transforms into surreal one(s).

In a conversation with Frank Budgen, Joyce made a remark about Dublin being a big village rather than a metropolis, where everybody on the streets could casually start a conversation with another person about someone else (69). “That gossipy, leisurely life” of Dublin is best seen in Leopold Bloom’s walkabout (Stephen Dedalus also traverses miles of Dublin pavement, yet we rarely spot him doing so). Bloom bears much in common with both the Parisian flâneur, the man of leisure, the urban explorer, the connoisseur of the street, and George Simmel’s blasé citizen who is anonymous and alienated in the modern city. In the footsteps of Bloom, a wanderer about Dublin in a normal warm summer day, one encounters a network of Dublin acquaintances while Dublin’s cityscape serves as a vibrant cobweb of stimulants, triggering multiple intersecting planes of thoughts in the reader’s mind.

In his essay “Semiology and Urbanism,” Barthes observes how the city is a discourse and a language: “[t]he city speaks to its inhabitants, we speak our city, the city where we are, simply by inhabiting it, by traversing it, by looking at it” (195). I suggest a reading of Dublin in *Ulysses* as a discourse between the city and its “user,” Leopold Bloom. The city is the writing and the citizen its reader. Each reading is unique and different to another reading, not only in the sense that everyone is an individual but also that each route the citizen takes renders a different reading. The
citizen could become a reader of an avant-garde work such as Raymond Queneau’s *100,000 Million Poems*, creatively producing different verses and meanings, while moving in a city (“Semiology and Urbanism” 199). Dublin speaks to Bloom via its cityscape with a conviction that he, a Dubliner, can constantly and freely interpret and generate Dublin from his personal and collective memories, from local knowledge as well as popular culture. The everyday life in Dublin is turned into the trivial inventions of Bloom: that is, his obsession with his wife’s infidelity, his paltry daily life activities, his failed job, and practical science knowledge, to name a few. The city, thus, “is rendered legible, then, by multiple acts of the imagination” (Wirth-Nesher 53).

The method of sketching Dublin in *Ulysses* is very different from that in *Dubliners* I have discusses earlier. Neither comprehensive nor panoramic views of Dublin are offered in *Ulysses*. The narrator with the utmost detachment through the distancing monotonous style intentionally leaves the reader alone to navigate and interact with the city. The character then participates in a reading of the city by speaking back to the city-discourse: each recognized familiar place in Dublin’s cityscape prompts a stream of consciousness, and he rewrites actuality in his mind. The associations between places and thoughts in Bloom’s consciousness are metonymic: one thing evokes another in a network of things that are related to each other, both in specific ways such as cause and effect, space and time, and in other, mysterious ways. The passage from the beginning of the “Lotus Eaters” episode once again helps to illuminate this kindling process between reality and Bloom’s mind:

> By lorries along sir John Rogerson’s quay Mr Bloom walked soberly, past Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, the postal telegraph office. Could have given that address too. And past the sailors’ home. He turned from the morning noises of the quayside and walked through
Lime street. By Brady’s cottages a boy for the skins lollled, his bucket of offal linked, smoking a chewed fagbutt. […] He crossed Townsend street, passed the frowning face of Bethel. El, yes: house of: Aleph, Beth. And past Nichols’ the undertaker’s. At eleven it is. […] Her name and address she then told with my tooraloom tooraloom tay. (68) Bloom passes the postal telegraph office, which triggers a thought that he could have given Martha Clifford this post office as a blind address, instead of the one at Westland Row. A piece of information about his correspondence is revealed. By Brady’s cottages seeing a boy smoking a chewed cigarette prompts Bloom to think that it might be harmful to his health. Crossing Townsend street, he thinks this is the Salvation Army hall and Aleph, Beth are also the first and second Hebrew letters. At Nichols’ the undertaker’s, a stream of thoughts materializes in Bloom’s mind: he remembers the time of Paddy Dignam’s funeral that he is going to attend; he guesses for sure that Corny Kelleher works for O’Neill the undertaker; then he thinks of Kelleher’s singing manner, which in turn evokes an unknown song associated with Kelleher. In this passage, the reader encounters Joyce’s typical treatment of Dublin in Ulysses: Dublin appears as a real city, with specific places such as sir John Rogerson’s quay, Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, the postal telegraph office, the sailors’ home, Brady’s cottages, Townsend street, Bethel, Nichols’ the undertaker’s, but simultaneously innumerable territories of Bloom’s psyche also show up, blurring the line between reality and mind: remembrance of his private correspondence, random comments about the smoking boy, explanations of a Hebrew word, thoughts about attending the funeral, and judgments on a man. Furthermore, there is an oscillation as well as irony between third-person narration and inner monologue: in certain parts of the narrative Ulysses announces itself as a stoic, indifferent, objective
text, while in other parts equally dominated by the rather passionate Bloom with a chaos of emotions and commentary.

The rambling monologue and the hard-to-follow fragmentation result in continuous disruption of the spatial narrative. Being introduced to the familiar space of Dublin at first, the reader is then transferred to very strange spaces in Bloom’s mind. The external reality is mixed with the internal one, while Dublin is being transmuted into an intermingled entity, simultaneously real and unreal. An example from “Lestrygonians” could serve to illustrate how this technique works:

He crossed at Nassau street corner and stood before the window of Yeates and Son, pricing the field glasses. Or will I drop into old Harris’s and have a chat with young Sinclair? Wellmannered fellow. Probably at his lunch. Must get those old glasses of mine set right. Goerz lenses, six guineas. Germans making their way everywhere. Sell on easy terms to capture trade. Undercutting. Might chance on a pair in the railway lost property office. Astonishing the things people leave behind them in trains and cloakrooms. (158)

In the skeleton outline below, I chart out the movements of Bloom’s thoughts controlled by the free association principle. Robert Humphrey explains the three factors that govern this technique: they are the memory, the senses, and the imagination (43), and they are obviously present in Bloom’s interior monologue: Dublin is firstly evoked by a place name, and then transferred into Bloom’s world of imagination and recollection.

See Yeates and Son, a store selling glasses

1. Imagine he stops by a store of jewellery
2. Reflect on the good manners of young Sinclair

3. Imagine Sinclair is having lunch

4. Remind himself of his old glasses that need to be repaired

5. Imagine the lenses cost six guineas

6. Reflect how German goods are traded everywhere

7. Reflect how Germans sell goods on easy terms

8. Reflect how Germans offer lower prices than the competitors do

9. Wonder about buying a pair at the railway lost property office.

10. Reflect on the things that people tends to forget in trains and cloakrooms

The real place name, Yeates and Son, informs the reader of Bloom’s locality, and immediately he is transferred to the jewellery store in the character’s mind to meet Sinclair and imagine him having lunch, then to a series of Bloom’s plans and reflections such as the intention to buy a new glass, or the quality of German goods. The stream of thoughts shatters the real Dublin, and leaves its traces to lead the reader into the unrealness. The skeleton indicates how the outer world impinges on Bloom’s inner life mostly through the register of the eyes. Unsurprisingly, when counting the keywords of “Lestrygonians,” the results I get heighten the importance of the eyes and the act of seeing in the urban space: “see/saw” appears 51 times (3.4%), “eyes” 30 times (2.2%), and “look” 17 times (0.8%).

Innovative literary techniques arise out of experimentation due to the need to catch up with the unpredictable reality, and Joyce’s interior monologue proves true his
statement that changes in life lead to changes in style. The ousted classical style with its “fixed rhythm and fixed mood” is like a “mechanical device” whereas “a living style should be like a river which takes the colour and texture of the different regions through which it flows” (Power 99-100). The changes in life that Joyce is well aware of spring from the modern city with its numerous facets and the way it affect the human mind. In his influential analysis of the effects of the metropolis on the mental life, Georg Simmel proposes that:

   The psychological basis of the metropolitan type of individuality consists in the intensification of nervous stimulation which results from the swift and uninterrupted change of outer and inner stimuli. (409)

The new “rhythm of life” with its “onrushing impressions” affects the mind of the citizen tremendously\(^\text{35}\). With each passing by streets, stores, squares, Dubliners by Bloom, the modern city of Dublin, “with the tempo and multiplicity of economic, occupational and social life,” (Simmel 410) a contrast to the rural life, strikes his mind with tremendous force and creates a flood of interior thoughts. While walking, Bloom receives thousands of stimuli on his sensory system and interior monologue is invoked to report these mental processions. The technique reveals how the human brain records quick and immediately departing impressions, creating in the character’s mind a running flow of thoughts. Franco Moretti in his reading of *Ulysses* as a modern epic also discusses both Simmel’s and Benjamin’s theory to propose his explanation about how interior monologue is an technique invented by Joyce, a city writer. That style consists of “a weaker grammar than that of consciousness; an edgy, discontinuous

\(^{35}\) This is also one of the important analyses of the shock factor in the modern city by Walter Benjamin (“On Some Motifs in Baudelaire” 1968).
syntax: a cubism of language,” and “simple, fragmented sentences,” “paratactical paragraphs” (Moretti 134-5). Beyond any doubt, Bloom’s inner mind is represented by a collection of sentences of broken syntaxes: for example “God. Save. Our.” (144), “Torry and Alexander last year” (144), “Rough weather outside” (145), “If he...? O! Eh? No... No” (147). These subjectless sentences are jotted down as if coming straight from Bloom’s mind.

Furthermore, interior monologue works side by side with third-person narrator and the montage technique, deftly employed by Joyce to depict Bloom’s movements and to blend them with his mind, underlining their coexistence. Humphrey identifies montage as

a class of devices which are used to show interrelation or association of ideas, such as a rapid succession of images or the superimposition of image on image or the surrounding of a focal image by related ones.

(49)

As can be seen in the outline of Bloom’s consciousness above, the successive ideas that run through Bloom’s mind are situated one after another in interrelated broken sentences. This method reveals how one subject is seen from “composite or diverse views,” and highlights the multiplicity of life in general. This diversity of both reality and mind is carried out by the repeated changes of focalization that progress from third-person narration into interior monologue. In a very short time, the reader is shown Bloom watching the Yeats and Son store, then suddenly considering a new pair of glass, then turning his thoughts to how German goods are traded everywhere. The city of Dublin is no longer an objective thing set up in a linear sequence of realist descriptions, but is now dissected into numerous images simultaneously presented. No
longer borne of static representation, Dublin is depicted in moving montages, calling attention to its textual heterogeneity.

This is “the simultaneity of perception” that Joseph Frank notices in his readings of *Madame Bovary* and *Ulysses* in the influential essay “Spatial Form in Modern Literature” (231). Despite “the additive nature of language” (Steinberg 52), Joyce still manages to create the “the effect of multidimensional reality” by continuously jamming in a series of visual and aural descriptions. Moreover, textual multiplicity is produced by the rise and fall of Bloom’s emotions that informs the style. As the result, Joyce not only incorporates several thoughts and words from the perspective of the character as in *Dubliners*, but he re-creates whole new Dublins corresponding to Bloom’s currently reigning condition: a vegetal Dublin in “Lotus Eaters,” a food-related Dublin in “Lestrygonians,” and so on. Specifically, Bloom’s states of mind are attuned to his states of body, explaining why Joyce himself calls his book “the epic of the human body”: “In ‘Lestrygonians’ the stomach dominates and the rhythm of the episode is that of the peristaltic movement” (Budgen 21). Similar to how Bloom walks toward his lunch thinking of his wife’s legs as “out of plumb,” (160) subtly referring to the plum fruit, Bloom’s hunger furnishes the prose with suitable language. At this “worst hour of the day,” (157) food allusions are everywhere and the physical world of Dublin is transformed into an edible and hungry city as in Charles Peake’s sharp discernment: the “famished” gulls flying between the “gaunt” quay walls (145); the houses in Western Dublin become “mushroom” (157); the stone of the National Museum has “cream curves” (175); poplin in Brown Thomas’ store is transformed into “a flood of bloodhued” and “lustrous blood,” (160) and a clock in Davy Byrne’s throws Bloom a “bilious” look (164) (Peake 200).
The minimal third-person narration written in a basic structure as I have previously discussed paves the way for stream of consciousness: it contains the stimuli and prepares free space for memories induced, in the story as well as in textuality. It juxtaposes the present reality with the world of the past. By several quick details, the mind is pushed to various territories, and reality is engulfed in the world of thoughts. The city shrinks into each place name listed by the narrator, but the very next moment it spans out tremendously impelled by memories. Stream of consciousness challenges the realness of the discourse, preventing the narrative of realness from taking centre stage: the moment a real place name gets mentioned, the reader is promptly taken to the space of internal thoughts. The world of Dublin slips away to somewhere else, to the space of heterogeneity and multiplicity. As a result, there is a process of assembling experiences: The past, with numerous reminiscences of his works, endearing memories of his wife and daughter, and tumultuous events such as his father’s and son’s deaths, casts huge shadows over Bloom’s mind. The reader of Ulysses quickly realizes that as it unfolds, the life story of Bloom emerges in a drastically different way to a typical life story told in a linear narrative in a classical novel: memories are evoked more randomly, and the reader is forced to assemble the puzzle pieces of reminiscences into a big picture of Bloom’s psychological mindscape. Instead of introducing the reader to each successive chapter of Bloom’s life as with a third-person narrator, interior monologue transfers the reader into the character’s mental discourse. Consequently, the fictional Dublin consistently intertwines with and drastically contorts the real one.

In Ulysses, the process of Dublin being transferred into the psyche of the character happens smoothly, due to the gracious blending of third-person narration and interior monologue. The fluidity by which the narration moves between fictional
and historical geography, internal and external reality, is strengthened in Bloom’s episodes by the use of interior monologue with its incomplete sentences, verbless phrases, and broken syntaxes to render non-logical free associations mimicking the way impressions of the world fall upon and are randomly caught in the character’s mind. Previously, I discussed how place names render the city of Dublin a site of memory and perception. Bloom’s journey in Dublin is the journey to meet himself, and walking plays such a pivotal role in shaping the fictive Dublin. As Stephen rightly contemplates in “Scylla and Charybdis,” “We walk through ourselves, meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love. But always meeting ourselves” (204). Bloom wanders only to encounter his old self, old homes, bitter as well as happier days in the multiple spatial planes of Dublin. The city touches and explores Bloom’s private buried corners, activating, awaking deep dormant feelings, submerged thoughts, and concealed memories. In Getting Back into Place, Edward Casey analyses the role of place in constructing our identity and asserts that:

Journey thus not only take us to places but embroil us in them. […] The inherent localism of memory also obtains for narration, in which places, instead of being merely settings or scenes, are active agents of commemoration. (276-7)

Local places in Dublin have the ability to contain personal memories of its citizens and each meeting prompts a series of reminiscences. The city becomes the site of semantic chains of signification, in which place names serve in turn as signifiers and signifieds. Specifically, from a theoretical stance, Barthes discusses how signifieds and signifiers work in the site of a city:
the signifieds […] always become the signifiers of something else: the
signifieds pass, the signifiers remain. […] the signifieds are always
signifiers for other; and reciprocally. In reality, in any cultural or even
psychological complex, we find ourselves confronted with infinite
chains of metaphors whose signified is always recessive or itself
becoming a signifier. ("Semiology and Urbanism" 417)

Following this cue, the reader witnesses this chain of signification in Dublin in every
passage:

He crossed Westmoreland street when apostrophe S had plodded by.
Rover cycleshop. Those races are on today. How long ago is that? Year
Phil Gilligan died. We were in Lombard street west. […] Happy.
Happier then. Snug little room that was with the red wallpaper,
Dockrell’s, one and ninepence a dozen. Milly’s tubbing night. (Ulysses
148)

Westmoreland starts as a signifier, a signification in the free association system.
Crossing it, Bloom thinks of Rover cycleshop, a signified. In its turn, the Rover
cycleshop becomes a signifier, referring to the races, and in this way, places refer to
places refer to people refer to events refer to times in the past refer to places in the
past. Signifiers become signifieds and signifieds become signifiers. "Lombard street
west" is the signified of the signifier that is "Year Phil Gilligan died," in its turn it
signifies multiple memories in Bloom’s past, the most important of which is the
happier time of his life. The golden time of the Blooms before the death of their son is
revived and re-performed onto present vividly thanks to the mere act of crossing a
street. Thereby, within interior monologue itself, there is a chain of signifiers and
signifieds. The device, with its initial and primary function being to reflect reality,
develops beyond to create a semantic field. The signifieds chain, facilitated by the language of interior monologue, stops corresponding to reality at some point: it cuts itself off from the source in reality and becomes floating signifieds and signifiers. Dublin is transformed into a site of signification, “in which the topographical features of the physical city combine with the mental landscape created by its inhabitants to create a complex - and paradoxical - world of signification” (Harding 34-5).

More importantly, Bloom’s “world of signification” is where the past and the present are conflated. Due to the technique of simultaneously blending third-person narration with interior monologue, an encounter with the present mnemonically induces a remembrance of things past. The body of the character receives a stimulus and the mind works in a mysterious way to make two distinct worlds subsume each other. The body of the character exists in two worlds: it makes the reader (and the character himself) experience an illusion, a perception disorder; for a split moment, he is in the past and yet not in the past, he is in the present and yet not in the present. The stimulus might be a sound, a sight, or a smell. In the above passage, while the Bloom of the present is crossing Westmoreland street, the Bloom of the past occupies his stream of consciousness where his happier days are performed and come full circle in his mind. Momentarily, the happier days with Milly as a kid, the rabbit pie, Molly’s dress and the present world of Bloom passing a street absorb each other and are conflated into one. The signifiers become signifieds and the chain goes on forever until the reader cannot distinguish which triggers which any longer. The world of Lombard street west is evoked once more when Bloom is passing Adam court: “I was happier then. Or was that I? Or am I now I? Twentyeight I was. She twentythree when we left Lombard street west something changed” (160). In addition, Bloom asks himself: “Can’t bring back time. Like holding water in your hand. Would you go back
to then?” (160). He cannot bring back time, but his involuntary memory receiving several cues in his ramble in the city can bring back the vivacity of the past in full force.

In another example, when Bloom is inside Davy Byrne’s having a sandwich and drinking wine, he sees two flies stuck in a glass panel. The Howth of the old days slowly descends onto the pub, conflating two worlds into one: Bloom is still there, the flies are still there, the wine working on his palate, but he is under the sky and below him the bay is sleeping:

Stuck on the pane two flies buzzed, stuck.

Glowing wine on his palate lingered swallowed. Crushing in the winepress grapes of Burgundy. Sun’s heat it is. Seems to a secret touch telling me memory. Touched his sense moistened remembered. Hidden under wild ferns on Howth. Below us bay sleeping sky. No sound. The sky. […]

Me. And me now.

Stuck, the flies buzzed. (167-8)

The two worlds are blended together. “Stuck” repeats 3 times in a short passage. The flies are trapped in the glass panel, similarly to the “me” who seems held inside the pane of memory and now. A sight recalls a situation of present Bloom. Additionally, glowing wine lingered on his palate, evoking “softly she gave me in my mouth the seedcake warm and chewed” (167). The passage exemplifies the madeleine motif in Proust’s *In Search of Lost Time*. The remembrance of things past is generated, awakened by a touch of wine, “Touched his sense moistened remembered.” Edward S.
Casey in his examination of self, body, language and the relationships between them contends that place can become identity of self and embeds itself into self. Based on the ideas of Proust, he concludes “the essence of a place can be compressed into a single sensation, which, being reawakened, can bring the place back to us in its full vivacity” (Body, Self, and Language 415). Dublin of the past randomly and sporadically emerges, as if words that suddenly appear in Bloom’s mind due to some stimulus are hastily jotted down, “The sky. The bay purple by the Lion’s head. Green by Drumleck. Yellowgreen towards Sutton. Fields of undersea, the lines faint brown in grass, buried cities […]” (168). Not seeking the mot juste but “the perfect order of words in the sentence, […] an order in every way appropriate” (Budgen 20), Joyce reconstructs the happiest Howth day in Bloom’s mind with disorderly sentence structures and phrases to evoke precious fragments of the mind. For a moment, the past wholly occupies and clouds over the present.

In “The Limits of Joyce’s naturalism,” Ellmann offers an amazing interpretation of Molly and Bloom in this Howth scene by pointing out how Howth momentarily fades into the Garden of Eden, Bloom and Molly become Adam and Eve, and the seedcake is metamorphosed into an apple; very quickly Bloom is back to his present self (571). This is the very idea I have discussed in my study: Dublin as stimulus that transfers the reader to another plane of space. There is a spatial dimension of experience and Ulysses itself moves the reader in and out of various mental “planes” from moment to moment. The Dublin montage defies any pure and single dimension of space and advocates for a multiplicity of places, objective as well as figurative.

Not only places but also the past and the present are conflated. The notion of time as a linearity is contested when memories are revived and performed onto the
present. Reading this moment of simultaneity requires the notion of duration, proposed by Henri Bergson, even though he privileges time over place and space. Bergson opposes the notion of time as a succession of fixed and unalterable moments. This notion imagines time as a spatial construct, resulting from “superimposing spatial concepts onto time” (Phipps “Henri Bergson and the Perception of Time”). Instead of a continuous flow, Bergson suggests, various moments, fluxes of memories and experiences, exist together in a duration. The notion that there are separate discreet points in time is rejected. I suggest that even the perception of place and space is also influenced by a notion of a fixation in time in which Howth and Davy Byrne’s are immovable and changeable. As the narrator at the end of Swann’s Way rightly contends:

The places we have known do not belong solely to the world of space in which we situate them for our greater convenience. They were only a thin slice among contiguous impressions which formed our life at that time; the memory of a certain image is but regret for a certain moment; and houses, roads, avenues are as fleeting, alas, as the years. (Proust 430)

The places in Bloom’s memories are of changeable impressions, of Howth being under the sun and a seedcake sharing in Molly’s mouth, of Davy Byrne’s being stuck in two glass planes and a gulp of wine awakening fleeting moments and places. They are not distinguishable and sharply separated moments and places as we might think. Howth and Davy Byrne’s, the happy courting day and now, all dissipate, are no longer specific, material, and separate places and time as we often conceive of them. Rather, in a moment, they absorb each other, crystalizing and becoming ephemeral. To paraphrase Casey’s assertion, just as duration is not the time of the clock but “the time
of your life” in Bergson’s argument (Getting back into Place 326), so Dublin’s landscape is not the space and place of the map but of Bloom’s life, veiled fragments of transitory memories and feelings, involuntarily reawakened and contorted.

_Ulysses_ challenges the wholeness of time and place as conventional constructed concepts. It shows how our perceptions drift together, aimlessly and momentarily. In his famous essay “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” Jacques Derrida elaborates on the death of totalization, an idea worthy of decentralized Dublin, whose nature is “[l]anguage and a finite language — [thus it] excludes totalization” (Writing and Difference 365). Joyce’s textual city with its numerous problems in producing meanings about places reveals how Joyce’s writing defies imposed traditions of literary reading and criticism, as well as meaning and coherence. Dublin in _Ulysses_ is a city of multiplicity resisting totalization.

**Conclusion**

My examination of various factors in Bloom’s episodes asserts that the text exhausts realism (and hyperrealism) by an extreme gesture to reality through the employment of proper names; the free indirect discourse problematizes the unity of voice in the narrative, suggesting a powerfully elusive narrator. Moreover, I also suggest that there is an evolution in the representation of Dublin from _Dubliners_ to _Ulysses_: from a scrupulously realistic style constructing an authentic objective Dublin to several subjective Dublins incorporated into each character’s mind. Realism in _Dubliners_ allows reader to have a shared experience of Dublin, whilst interior monologue and Bloom’s distancing styles turn Dublin into a product of imaginative recollections in the character’s mind: references to the real city is suppressed in the text, creating a gap between reference and referent. The style of Bloom’s episodes also
challenges the wholeness of space and time. Instead of an objective city, the reader probes into multiple planes of the collage Dublin.

The analysis conducted in this chapter also situates the reading of Bloom’s episodes amongst other critical stances that I will presently mention. The near consensus amongst critics that the first six (in some opinions, nine) episodes are written in an “initial style” and that *Ulysses* is a book that changes its mind in the middle stems, in my opinion, from two important genetic studies by A. Walton Litz and his student Michael Groden. A. Walton Litz, in a highly influential book, *The Art of James Joyce* (1961) on Joyce’s methods of composition, argues that Joyce changed his aesthetic aims during his writing process. He divides the text of *Ulysses* into two so-called styles: basic and complex, and asserts that, “Joyce wrote the later episodes of *Ulysses* directly into his final ‘complex’ style, then revised the earlier episodes to harmonize with them” (13). Hence, in the process of revising *Ulysses*, Joyce transformed the opening episodes that had been written in a plain style into the later “intricacy” to create a stylistic unity (*The Art of James Joyce* 7). Additionally, Litz claims that Joyce later superimposed the schema, which includes the elaborate correspondence of each episode to a particular scene, hour, symbol, technique, onto his text and accordingly revised the text, “to transform the entire novel into an ‘epic’ work” (*The Art of James Joyce* 33).

Following Litz’s lead, Michael Groden in *Ulysses in Progress* also emphasizes such changes and avers that the first nine episodes are written in an “initial style.” Groden believes there is a radical swerve in technique in “Sirens” when Joyce distorts

---

36 Ezra Pound was the first who complained about and spotted the changes in styles when reading a draft of “Sirens.” In a letter of 10th June 1919 to Joyce, he wrote: “Also even the assing girouette of a postfuturo Gertrudo Steino protetopublic don’t demand a new style per chapter” (Pound/Joyce 157). However, Litz’s book popularizes the awareness of Joyce’s evolution out of the initial style.
the early style “practically beyond recognition” (17). Moreover, he argues that reading for plot is now obsolete and is replaced by a dominating technique where “parallels and correspondences override specific incidents, and the story seems buried under the surface” (17). Taking up these cues by Litz and Groden, many studies of Joyce’s style in Ulysses cleave the text into two halves and proceed to elaborate on how Ulysses changes its aesthetic direction. For instance, Karen Lawrence in her seminal Odyssey of Style suggests there are a number of narrative conventions abandoned after the first six chapters in favour of self-referential and playful language.

Examining the Homeric schema for each chapter to counter the above argument, Monika Fludernik points out that the correspondence between the schema and the episodes are already evident “to a considerable extent” before Joyce’s proof revisions. For instance, “[‘Aeolus’ contained enough blowy rhetoric to symbolize ‘Rettorica,’ and ‘Lotus-Eaters’ did already include references to plants even if they were not as prominent as in the later version]” (“Ulysses and Joyce’s Change of Artistic Aims” 179). Denying that Joyce abruptly changes his plan midway in the composing process, Fludernik proposes that the author had had an initial plan which he slowly elaborated “to the extent that the schema later necessitated readjustments in earlier episodes.” She further states that “[a]t no point did Joyce ‘impose’ the schema on the text. In most instances it seems to have served as a guide for composition or rearrangement” (“Ulysses and Joyce’s Change of Artistic Aims” 186).

To counter Litz, if the reader learns anything from the text of Ulysses, it is that it is not an organic whole and can never be neatly divided into two halves with definite
identifiable styles and an intended schema perfectly corresponding to each chapter\textsuperscript{37}. The intentions of the writer should be separated from the reading of the text. Additionally, as I have discussed in chapter 2 and 3, the “initial style” is not consistent and there is no so-called narrative norm in the first six chapters. The genetic studies of \textit{Ulysses} prove that Joyce revised “Aeolus” after finishing the whole book and left “Lestrygonians” rather intact. The change in aesthetics is thus not convincing enough because it is not logical for Joyce to renounce this style in “Aeolus” then immediately return to the broken convention in “Lestrygonians”.

The discussions in this and the previous chapter argue that Joyce gradually revises his narrative conventions in “Telemachus” and “Nestor,” in which third-person narration and dialogue are dominant. In “Proteus,” Joyce subverts this convention by cramming a significant volume of interior monologue into the text, totally changing its structure. Moreover, the fluidity of the third-person narrator’s and figurative voice is enhanced more than ever. The totality of the consciousness of the text is thus challenged greatly in this episode. In “Calypso,” Joyce returns to the first basic linguistic form and maintains a balance between interior monologue and third-person narration, but adds an important feature to the structure of the text: the distancing effect. In “Lotus Eaters” and “Lestrygonians,” Joyce increases the amount of Bloom’s interior monologue but still preserves the balance by adding the multipolar voice. Additionally, proper names are used extensively, a device that plays an important role in exhausting and breaking any seriousness in the narrative.

\textsuperscript{37} Charles Peake offers a wise and fair analysis of the role of the schemas and how they are relevant as well as irrelevant to the story and techniques of \textit{Ulysses} in \textit{James Joyce, the Citizen and the Artist} (1977).
In terms of the troubles in the production of meanings as well as the quest for united consciousness, *Ulysses*’s text is problematic from the beginning. Joyce’s styles make use of not only interior monologue and third-person narration, but also numerous devices such as free indirect discourse, the intensification of certain motifs in one episode, the employment of proper names, to name a few. They can all undermine language as a system of representation and challenge the naïve belief in language as a transparent medium. Hence, the reader easily misconstrues the text of *Ulysses* as having only one single style until “Aeolus.” Genette’s conception of style which encompasses all details, dull or remarkable, is applied to recognize from all these numerous narrative and linguistic devices that there is no single consistent style in the first six episodes. Even though the reader cannot easily detect the recessive features in the midst of the dominant features, they exist tenaciously. Both dominant and recessive features contribute to this particular style, not least with their on-going struggles. Moreover, as Baechle Nicholas points out, one important feature of style is that “[t]he absence of a stylistic phenomenon can call attention to itself” (34). The so-called dichotomy between recessive and dominant can be contested and shattered when the first becomes the latter and vice versa.

In the latter episodes, distinct stylistic devices, their rhetorical masks, speak louder to the reader, so styles are identified much more easily. Thus in the next chapter, the discussion will center on the playful devices in four notable episodes, “Aeolus,” “Wandering Rocks,” “Nausicaa,” and “Circe.” Textual analysis will be carried out to thoroughly investigate how these episodes’ styles differ from the ones of “Proteus” and “Lestrygonians,” while still sharing some similarities. Most importantly, the chapter will address how these various styles transmute the representation of Dublin, producing a city of montage and mutability.
Chapter Four

“Æolus,” “Wandering Rocks,” “Nausicaa,” “Circe”: Multifarious Dublin(s)

What, then, is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms—in short, a sum of human relations which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are; metaphors which are worn out and without sensuous power; coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins.

Friedrich Nietzsche, “On Truth and Lies in A Nonmoral Sense” (46-7)

In the previous two chapters, I examined the often-overlooked features of Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes such as free indirect discourse and proper names. They produce uncertainty in the text along with a fusion of voices, and disrupt the stability of the plot. From these analyses, I conclude that Dublin is internalized into the characters’ minds as various imaginative recollections. The first two episodes are my proof that there is no unique style for the first six episodes and “Lestrygonians,” and reading the novel according to a critic’s scheme always runs the risk of neglecting various complex characteristics.

The focus in this chapter is the outstanding features, i.e. the rhetorical masks that call attention to themselves more than the content, eclipsing other recessive features and disrupting the stability in the narrative. Due to their conspicuity, the reader easily spots them in an episode and fixes a name for its style. I will examine four episodes with nameable styles to see how they render the representation of Dublin differently. Specifically, the text imitates the style of the press in “Æolus,” is broken down into mini-fictions in “Wandering Rocks,” borrows the language of popular discourses in “Nausicaa,” and is transformed into the parody of a drama in “Circe.” As a result, Dublin takes on various facets in these episodes: with the intrusion of the
headlines that divide the text into columns consisting of two different kinds of narratives, Dublin stands between the struggle of two discourses; or because of the interpolations that destroy the linearity in time and the coherence in space, Dublin is constructed from unconnected places; or the language of clichés renders Dublin kitschy and sentimental; finally, the city becomes the stage where realness and unreality are situated in the same plane of reality. I also point out the struggle to get to the forefront of the narrative of these two binary groups of features.

“Aeolus”: The Heart of Interruption in the Metropolis

Before tackling the representation of the city in “Aeolus,” an archival reading of it from The Little Review to Ulysses might help to illustrate how the text evolves. The reader’s initial encounter with Dublin when reading the seventh episode in the magazine in 1919 is vastly different from the one in Ulysses of 1922. The first thing catching the reader’s attention on the page of the seventh episode is two almost-identical sentences:

GROSSBOOTED draymen rolled barrels dullhudding out of Prince’s stores and bumped them up on the brewery float.

Grossbooted draymen rolled barrels dullthudding out of Prince’s stores and bumped them up oil the brewery float. (Joyce, The Little Review Ulysses 101)

The reader at that time must have been puzzled by this monthly instalment of “Aeolus.” These sentences read like an error and an automatic product by a machine.

---

38 See Sigler 73-88 for a thorough discussion of errors in Ulysses in the Little Review. See Ferrer and Rabat 139 for an analysis how Joyce took advantage of this unintentional mistake and made the error into a playful repetition.
As Amanda Sigler points out, “The printer of the *Little Review* seems to have repeated the sentence by mistake; though this time he corrects ‘dullhudding’ to ‘dullthudding,’” and prints “GROSSBOOTED” as “Grossbooted” (80). Still, this remarkably unusual feature is too insignificant when compared to the text of *Ulysses* of 1922: a different level of shock and unintelligibility overwhelms the reader. Suddenly a newspaper-like headline in capital letters breaks out on the page, plunging the reader into a totally strange text:

**IN THE HEART OF THE HIBERNIAN METROPOLIS** (112)

This headline is followed by a big chunk of text about the Dublin Tram System with numerous place names. From the specific description of the people of Dublin and its rolling barrels of Guinness to an overstated declaration about the centre of the city, the reader gets two separate images of Dublin. The text in episode 7 abandons both Stephen and Bloom in the introduction passage to start from the centre of the city where Dublin is described neither figuratively nor collectively. The city itself becomes one of the characters.

With the help of Joyce’s letters and Joycean genetic studies, the reader could get a glimpse into his writing process and understand what happened to the first version of “Aeolus” in the *Little Review*. In a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver on 7th October 1921, Joyce wrote, “*Eolus* is recast. *Hades* and the *Lotus-eaters* much amplified and the other episodes retouched a good deal. Not much change has been made in the *Telemachia*” (*Letters I* 172). It turns out that, according to Michael Groden in *Ulysses in Progress*, the headlines of “Aeolus” were not inserted into the text until August 1921 (60). In his revision process, Joyce refashioned all of “Aeolus” by adding 61 headlines and a considerable number of words into his earlier version of
Ulysses. These headlines run from the beginning to the end of the episode in big capital letters. The newly reshaped text behaves like a newspaper with each headline belonging to a column. The only difference between these columns and real newspaper columns is that they are written horizontally on the pages instead of vertically. By adding headlines and columns in the episode, the “novel” genre is transformed into an undecidable one.

As a result of this revision, the city of Dublin undergoes a great transformation. The headline “In the Heart of the Hibernian Metropolis” suggests both a new beginning and an emphasis on the city and its inhabitants (Groden 66-67). The recently added text creates a completely new position for the city of Dublin. While Dublin exists dully and quietly in the Little Review with the portrayal of the activities at the newspaper office, the life of the urban metropolis perks up and flourishes with numerous details reflecting its modernity in 1922 Ulysses. Owing to the image of two women climbing Lord Nelson’s pillar in Stephen’s parable, the introduction of the tram system as well as the descriptions of sounds in the city, Dublin is fully depicted from multiple angles as a modern metropolitan.

In order to grasp the difference the headlines can make to the textuality of this episode, I would like to offer a reading of the added passages without the headlines to examine their functions. At the beginning of the episode, a passage of 126 words is adjoined with place names to create the image of the tram system in Dublin, as well as the activity of the mail cars at the General Post Office:

Before Nelson’s pillar trams slowed, shunted, changed trolley started for Blackrock, Kingstown and Dalkey, Clonskea, Rathgar and Terenure, Palmerston Park and upper Rathmines, Sandymount, Green
Rathmines, Ringsend, and Sandymount Tower, Harold’s Cross. The hoarse Dublin United Tramway Company’s timekeeper bawled them off. […]

- Rathgar and Terenure!

- Come on, Sandymount Green! (112)

The exact locations of the activities are indicated as “Before Nelson’s pillar,” “Under the porch of the general post office,” along with 18 other place names referring to the real world of Dublin. The terminal announcements signalling the beginning of a tram journey create an animated and bustling atmosphere at the central station. The three repeated place names in separate lines make the scene livelier and the reader gets a realistic sense of various trams starting their journeys. At the end of the episode, the reader bumps into places with names identical to the tram stops from the opening passage. Even though they are listed in a similar style, they bring about very different effects:

At various points along the eight lines tramcars with motionless trolleys stood in their tracks, bound for or from Rathmines, Rathfarnham, Kingstown, Blackrock and Dalkey, Sandymount Green, Ringsend and Sandymount tower Donnybrook, Palmerston Park and Upper Rathmines, all still, becalmed in short circuit. (142-3)

In the 67-word column, there are 11 place names: Rathmines, Rathfarnham, Blackrock, Kingstown and Dalkey, Sandymount Green, Ringsend, to name a few, and 8 kinds of transportation jammed together (143). The accumulation of proper names on the page produces visual density. Additionally, it depicts the real condition of
paralysis. The style is powerful in creating an impression of being stuck and crammed, not only in the fictional world but also on the physical page of the novel.

Joyce not only reconstructs the sight of Dublin centre but also depicts urban noises. While eyes and sights are predominant in other chapters, the narrative lends the city an ear and noises are pushed to the forefront of the discourse in “Aeolus.” Until this episode, the only noises in the urban space that the reader gets are from a honking tramcar in “Lotus Eaters” (71) (Joyce does visit this noise later in “Lestrygonians” with clanging incoming and outbound trams (156)) and from the clattering, creaking and rattling carriage in “Hades” (85). “Aeolus” becomes a cacophonous hubbub with “clanging ringing” trams that are departing and terminating before Nelson Pillar, mail cars receiving “loudly flung sacks of letters” in North Prince’s street, and barrels rolled “dullthudding out of Prince’s stores” (112).

The scenes of tramcars offer a realistic image of Dublin, and this verisimilitude is produced by the real place names listed in the text by the reality effect I have analysed in the previous chapter. Treating the noise world of Dublin and the tram system as a product of mimetic writing is common in Joycean scholarship. For example, Julie McCormick Weng in the article “Dear Dirty Dublin to Hibernian Metropolis” asserts that realistic representation can “allow readers to experience in Ulysses […] an accurate picture of Dublin’s successful acquisition of technological modernity” (44). This kind of reading, while exploring the technological aspect of the urban city and highlighting its modernity, overlooks two notable factors challenging the objectivity of the discourse: the special effects of the headlines as well as the playful devices that interrupt the linearity in the narrative.
Firstly, the sudden emergence of the headlines problematizes the meaning of the whole episode in general and the representation of Dublin in particular. Now, before the Nelson’s Pillar passage, the reader encounters “IN THE HEART OF THE HIBERNIAN METROPOLIS,” (112) before the post office passage, “THE WEARER OF THE CROWN,” (112) and before the rolled barrels passage, “GENTLEMEN OF THE PRESS,” (112) and again before the short circuits of the tram system, “HELLO THERE, CENTRAL!” (142). The neat and ordered world of Dublin is flung about and dissected into two structures: “micro” and “macro” narratives as Wolfgang Iser in “Indeterminacy and the Reader’s Response in Prose Fiction” terms them: the headlines serve as the macrostructure and the narrative beneath them are the microstructure (23). Clearly, the traditional order of the world in the classical novel, in which coherence is upheld and intelligibility is strengthened, is destroyed. A new order of fragmentariness and arbitrariness is constructed as there is a huge incongruity between the micro and macro narratives and the reader hardly detects any serious relevance between the two.

If the reader deletes or ignores the headlines from the text in the same manner I did above, he will find that the narrative technique of the microstructure is traditional with an easily identifiable third-person narrator. For instance, he describes the way the trams and mail cars start and finish their journeys as well as the noises of the beer barrels. The narrative has a clear plot and the contract between the reader and text is

---

39 My reading of the headlines develops from Iser’s terms as well as from Karen Lawrence’s analysis of this chapter’s style in *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses* (56). Iser explains that: “The microstructural level consists of a large number of allusions which basically can be divided into three different groups: (1) those dealing with the immediate situation, Bloom’s effort to place an advertisement at the newspaper office and the events connected with it; (2) those referring to completely different episodes outside the chapter itself; (3) those passages that seem to hide into obscurity when one tries to work out exactly where they might be heading, […] The macrostructure of the chapter lends itself to this need for “grouping,” though in a peculiar way” (23-4).
maintained. With the advent of the macro narrative, the whole meaning-production process is ruptured.

A headline is supposed to be a short summary of the most important items of news, creating an intimate link between it and the following content in a newspaper column: they are interdependent, compatible with and supportive of each other. In “Aeolus,” the headlines behave in a different way: in some columns, they are irrelevant to the ensuing content while in other columns, they ironically comment on the content. For example, the irrelevance is underlined in two passages: the short circuit of the tram system at the end of the episode is summarized in a headline about a distant extraneous telephone conversation with Central (142), and the description of the dullthudding noisily rolled barrels is summarized in a headline about the gentlemen of the press (112). These two headlines bizarrely bring two separate events together. The text does not even bother to arrange a suitable function for a headline or pretends that it might link in some subtle way with its content. It flaunts its discordance and oddness.

The headlines intrude into every corner of the text and shatter the harmony as well as the supposed wholeness of the narrative. After six episodes featuring either Stephen or Bloom, “Aeolus” is the first episode in which Joyce lets Stephen and Bloom perform together. The so-called initial style is still in play: the characters appear separately from the depictions of the third-person narrator, who is now merging both Stephen’s highly poetic style with Bloom’s distancing style; their interior monologues are both voiced (of course not as long as they are in their own episodes); and free indirect discourse is still ongoing at some points. However, a significant change in style is implemented into the text: it no longer belongs to a pure literary genre because the text denies its status as fiction and imitates the style of journalistic
writing with all its distinguishing features. In this very blended genre, the paradox is revealed that while the headlines run consistently through the episode, the seriousness of the discourse cannot be maintained due to the headlines’ incompatibility with the content. Specifically, a headline does not signify a new story but interrupts the linearity of the narrative. The interruption is blatantly inserted, in third-person narration as well as in interior monologue, splitting the text into different parts. For example, when Bloom notes that Hynes is also at the newspaper office, a headline suddenly appears to intersect Bloom’s thoughts:

Hynes here too: account of the funeral probably. Thumping. Thump.

WITH UNFEIGNED REGRET IT IS WE ANNOUNCE THE DISSOLUTION OF A MOST RESPECTED DUBLIN BURGESS

This morning the remains of the late Mr Patrick Dignam. Machines.

(114)

The incongruity between the headlines and the contents is worsened to a higher degree. For while the micro narrative is still pretending that it tells a fictional story, sending a signal that it belongs to the literary genre, the headlines pompously flaunt “We are the press.” The characteristically attention-grabbing headlines speak more loudly to the reader compared to the micro narrative’s features. The micro narrative still behaves quietly: instead of gathering maximum effort to accurately report the facts to support the headlines, it fictionally unfolds its own tale in the course of storytelling.

Textual Dublin is in a struggle between two competing discourses. The absurdity between them renders the city alienated as the micro structure makes for a
seemingly realistic story while the headlines make it bizarrely press-like. Dublin is twisted in two different directions where one is with the gentlemen of the press in the heart of the metropolitan and the other is a trivial story about the tram system and rolling beer barrels. As Lawrence proposes, the reader encounters a kind of double writing in “Aeolus”: “the narration of the story continues, but it is now punctuated with boldfaced phrases that seem to come out of nowhere” (55). The headlines disrupt the reader’s smooth interpretation of the Dublin world and push it into a problematic process of reading. Once again, the effort to acquire a totalizing representation of Dublin is denied.

Secondly, the headlines interrupt the representation of Dublin in the way they challenge the reader to find their authorship, subverting the ontological status of the narrative. Dublin is represented neither collectively nor figuratively, but mechanically. As I discuss above, just as the headlines and their contents are incompatible, it would be illogical to think that the identifiable third-person narrator in the micro narrative – similar to a narrator in a classical novel – is the same narrator of the headlines. Even though the mingled voices in Bloom and Stephen’s episodes challenge the unity of the narrative, the reader is still able to attribute the voice to either Bloom or the third-person narrator. In “Aeolus,” the headlines obliterate any identifiable consciousness of the text.

David Hayman’s argument that the Arranger, who first appears in “Aeolus,” is the persona behind this stylistic departure is not convincing enough because he conflates the two distinct narrators into one single person. Karen Lawrence challenges Hayman’s opinion by pointing out that Hayman’s argument still admits the existence of a consciousness (64). She wisely identifies that the language of the headlines does not belong to any characters and thus asserts that they “destroy the notion of a
coherent narrating self” (62). She further argues that “The headings represent a discourse generated in the text that advertises the fact that it is ‘written,’ anonymous, and public—that is, cut off from any single originating consciousness” (62). Even though I agree with Karen Lawrence that the headlines behave as if “divorced from a single consciousness,” I do not agree that it can be dubbed into an anonymous, collective discourse because “the language of the headings is the borrowed language of that agency of collective authorship, the press” (64). In my reading, *Ulysses* does not bother to borrow the linguistic journalistic style, but rather copies and ironically parodies the stylistics of headlines only. It does not attempt to become a press but flaunts its pretence of being a fake press, as if to exclaim, “Please look at my pretentious game.” Specifically, the headlines range from one word to a phrase to a whole sentence, and to several sentences with various linguistic games, such as “clipped message, wealth of clichés, forced alliteration, bad puns, and occasional pretentiousness” (Richardson, “Bad Joyce”). For instance, these following headlines, “SAD” (120), “ONLY ONCE MORE THAT SOAP” (118), “ERIN, GREEN GEM OF THE SILVER SEA” (119), “SOPHIST WALLOPS HAUGHTY HELEN SQUARE/ON PROBOSCIS. SPARTANS GNASH MOLARS. ITHACANS VOW PEN IS CHAMP” (142), “PLUMPS FOR OLD MAN MOSES; DIMINISHED DIGITS PROVE TOO TITILLATING FOR FRISKY FRUMPS. ANNE WIMBLES, FLO WANGLES - YET CAN YOU BLAME THEM?” (143) go beyond the press style with its exaggerated phrases into an undecidable genre. The act of imitating the journalistic genre of “Aeolus” to create the false impression of being a newspaper disconnects Dublin from having a definable style and voice. Whose consciousness is it that comments at liberty on every single detail in the above-quoted headlines?
Lawrence goes further in her argument to point out how the headlines are a product of writing that is cut off from the writer as well (63). Roland Barthes’ idea of the death of the author, in which the meanings of the text are independent of the intentions of the author, is vehemently elaborated in Jacques Derrida’s “Signature Event Context.” Derrida states, “[t]o write is to produce a mark that will constitute a sort of machine which is productive in turn” (180). In other words, the meanings of the texts are free from any intentions or sources. Dublin in this episode, under Derrida’s theory, is “cut off from all absolute responsibility, from consciousness as the ultimate authority, orphaned and separated at birth from the assistance of its father” (“Signature Event Context” 180-1). The idea of Ulysses as a self-conscious text is emphasized. It flaunts its own features, while aware of itself as a constructed textual object, to the reader; it exhibits its ability to pose ironies and critically comments on its own genre and content. As Lawrence suggests, “the book begins to ‘interpret’ itself. [...] Although the plot continues, the novel begins a radical questioning of the authority of its writing” (59). The representation of Dublin in “Aeolus” is synonymous with the process of writing and reading Ulysses. Dublin has divorced itself from the literary and press genre. It falls into mimicry, being similar to both of them but not quite the same. It cuts itself off from an author or a voice. Dublin constructs itself in the micro-narrative and yet being ironically commented on its own construction by the macro-narrative.

Another uncertain Dublin is represented in the episode. Towards the end of “Aeolus,” Dublin emerges as a fragmented space centre with Nelson’s Pillar in Stephen Dedalus’ parable. The parable could be considered a kind of story within story where the story of Bloom and Stephen is the frame. There are two intertwined images of Dublin: the Dublin of the frame story and of the parable. There are also two
parallel walks: in the frame story, Stephen and others walk around the city centre; and in Stephen’s parable, two old women travel from Fumbally’s lane to Nelson’s Pillar (140-143). The text blends these two Dublins together perfectly: one is narrated by Stephen with the intrusion of all the happenings in the frame story; and the other is in a battle between micro and macro narratives as I discuss above. In its turn, Dublin in the micro narrative is narrated by a third-person narrator, and fuses itself with Stephen’s interior monologue, various conversations between Stephen, professor MacHugh, and other people. The narrative of the parable is not linear but interrupted and disintegrated: the reader has to gather many shards flung about in the frame narrative to piece them together. It is continuously intruded with multiple factors that I listed above: the commentaries of people who are hearing Stephen’s parable, his own thoughts, and scenes of Dublin with newsboys and tramcars. Joyce deftly puts these intersections side by side in his narrative. The process of gathering information in the parable is the process of reading which is always deferred and always in progress. An example illustrates how Dublin is played under several narrative techniques:

**DEAR DIRTY DUBLIN**

*Dubliners.*

— Two Dublin vestals, Stephen said, elderly and pious, have lived fifty and fiftythree years in Fumbally’s lane.

— Where is that? the professor asked.

— Off Blackpitts.
Damp night reeking of hungry dough. Against the wall. Face glistening tallow under her fustian shawl. Frantic hearts. Akasic records.

Quicker, darlint! (139)

In the passage above, the underlined lines are the beginning of the parable, the italic lines are Stephen’s interior monologue, the bold line is the headline, and the regular lines are third-person narration including conversations and two descriptions of Dublin. The traditional narrative with the contract between the reader and the text is voided. The narrative dons a stylistic mask that renders the city ambiguous. The image of Dublin in the parable is situated in a matrix of signals where multiple directions of interpretation are offered. The parable begins with two elderly women who want to see the city from a high point, the Nelson’s Pillar. They save money, don nice clothes, buy food, travel to the destination, give some pennies to a beggar, and slowly start climbing up the pillar. When reaching the top of the column, after much grunting and encouraging, they settle down to eat plums, and spit the plum stones over the rails (142).

Being a story within a story, the parable invites many unresolved answers. I would like to discuss how the parable might be read as a story of irony about a realistic place, and how this reading is challenged by the intrusion of various stylistic features that create double layers of irony. With the number of place and tram station names employed by Joyce in the introduction of the episode, the reader has a reason to believe that this is the real world of Dublin. In total, the chapter provides 56 place names, 2.8 times that in “Lotus Eaters” and 1.65 times that in “Hades”. In Stephen’s

---

40 Hugh Kenner interprets this puzzle as “a parable of infertility” (Dublin’s Joyce 251), Charles Peake considers it the first “characteristic creative act” by Stephen (198). See Begnal 355-357 for an extensive list of discussions of the parable by various scholars.
parable, this style is still maintained with the matter-of-fact prose and real place names: the two women live in Fumbally’s lane, they buy “four slices of panloaf at the north city dining rooms in Marlborough street” (139) and they climb up the winding steps of the column. Similar to the style in “Lestrygonians,” Joyce keeps the technique of omitting descriptions of the cityscape.

Samuel A. Ossory Fitzpatrick in Dublin, A Historical and Topographical Account of the City offers the following about Nelson’s Pillar:

The pillar forms a landmark, and is the starting-place of the several lines of trams […] and can be ascended from the inside, […] by a flight of 168 steps, and commands, on a clear day, a magnificent panorama of Dublin and its surroundings. (298-299)

The Pillar becomes a symbolic presence in the city, historically as well as practically.\(^{41}\) It is the very place for fellow Dubliners to take a grand look around their habitat, just as the parable’s journey depicts. This is the first time Joyce provides an image of Dublin from high up in Ulysses and the second time in his oeuvre.

The first time is in Dubliners in the story “A Painful Case” with Mr. Duffy at the end of the story climbing the Magazine hill overlooking Dublin (D 89-90). The reader is offered a panoramic view of the city from the hilltop: the grey gleaming winding river, the redly burned lights, and the human figures lying. Dublin’s landscape from his position seems to totally absorb his melancholy and is metamorphosed by his own language. There is a sharp contrast between the position where he stands and the “redly” (D 89) lights of Dublin and the “fiery head” (D 90) of the train, between the

\(^{41}\) See Thacker, chapter 4, 115-151 for a brilliant postcolonial reading of Nelson Pillar’s space in “Aeolus” (121-2).
“shadow of the wall of the Park” (*D* 89) with “venal and furtive loves” (*D* 89) and his own condition in which he is “outcast from life’s feast” (*D* 89) – a twice-repeated phrase that imitates Mr. Duffy’s language. The repetition of “winding” three times in the description of the river and the train suggests that things seem to wind away from him, becoming out of reach, and leaving him behind with an evidently regretful, acrimonious aftertaste, like the way the delayed shock of her death lingers on him. At the top of the hill, the sound of the train echoing back to his ears is not an actual noise anymore; it is the “drone of the engine” (*D* 90) being Duffy-ized to reiterate the syllables of his dead lover’s name. Mr. Duffy suddenly realizes the hollowness of his life looking at the city’s landscape from atop Dublin. Contrary to this symbolic reading in *Dubliners* is the failed panoramic view in *Ulysses*.

The parable slowly builds high expectations and tensions in the text providing all the concrete details of the journey, from the preparation of money to the act of buying food, and to the climbing of the pillar itself. The elaborate style reflects the very content. The style vividly depicts how these two women mount the pillar, with one phrase for one activity, arranged one after another, such as “grunting, encouraging each other, afraid of the dark, panting,” (139) and mimetically records their talks: “one asking the other have you the brawn, praising God and the Blessed Virgin, threatening to come down, peeping at the air slits. Glory be to God” (139). The sentences, “have you the brawn” and “Glory be to God” are the women’s own words. The interwoven third-person narration with free indirect discourse makes the journey seem like it is being told by the two old women themselves. At the end of the parable, the reader gets a sneak peek of Dublin’s surroundings through a listing of the churches: “Rathmines’ blue dome, Adam and Eve’s, saint Laurence O’Toole’s” (141). But the panoramic picture of the city ceases right there, just as the women get giddy. The old women,
ironically, have acrophobia. The desire to look at the city from high above is thwarted by the body’s condition. Instead of a symbolic conquering of the city from up high, as in the case of Balzac and Paris, the reader of *Ulysses* gets the failed act of looking down, as well as another failure of “peering up at the statue of the one-handed adulterer” (142) because this act brings about “a crick in their necks” (142). Neither looking down nor up, but slowly spitting the plum stones out between the railings ends the parable. Being denied the panoramic view of Dublin and any description of its cityscape, the city of classic novels is rendered obsolete. Once again, the text plays with the reader’s expectations and production of meanings: it prepares a conventional story in which the reader follows the plot and is expected to see the overview of Dublin but provides nothing. The text reduces the whole city centre to the act of climbing the pillar and the condition of the body exhausted by the place itself: the citizens are overwhelmed and engulfed by the city. What is left of the whole journey is not a refreshed mind or magnificent image of Dublin but the plum stones falling over the rails.

The second layer of irony comes from the intersecting fragments: the commentaries of Professor MacHugh, the headlines, Stephen’s interior monologue and third-person narration. The parable is continuously interrupted, from the beginning when Stephen states the women’s home address: MacHugh barges in asking, “Where is that?” (139), and then by Stephen’s memory about the whisper of “Quicker, darlint” (139) by a girl who was making love with her partner in the dark. When the storytelling resumes with the old women being ironically labelled as “wise virgins” (139), it is interrupted again by MacHugh who subtly hints to the parable of wise and foolish virgins. Additionally, all these interruptions appear in a column with the headline “DEAR DIRTY DUBLIN” (139). This sentimental expression referring
nostalgically to the city of Dublin creates a discrepancy between itself and Stephen’s parable. The intersections aiming to interrupt the wholeness of the narrative continue till the end of the parable, challenging its seriousness and maintaining the discrepancy. The ending of the parable is written under another cryptic headline:

DAMES DONATE DUBLIN’S CITS SPEEDPILLS VELOCITOUS AEROLITHS, BELIEF (142)

The plum stones spit from the women quicken their speed and turn into speed pills and velocitous aeroliths. The exaggerated language in the headlines parodies and ironizes the newspaper style. Furthermore, the women’s highly anticipated journey not only ends in their disappointment and the reader’s frustration, but also leads to another failure: the out of action of the city’s tramways. The failure slowly evolves in the parable, spilling onto the frame story and creating three layers of frustration.

“Aeolus” is an episode full of incessant problems in making sense of reality. Although the accumulation of proper names engenders a realistic effect, this effect is challenged throughout the whole episode by the intrusion of the headlines, pushing these features to the periphery. Even though the linearity of the story is maintained in the micro narratives, it is unsettled due to the mock press style in the macro narratives. Despite the monumental space provided in the parable, neither a vertical nor horizontal nor symbolic aspect of Dublin is offered to the reader. Only the hollow place names, disappointments, and disruptions overwhelm the text.

“Wandering Rocks”: Unconnected Urban Milieu

After nine tranquil episodes featuring either Stephen or Bloom, the reader of “Wandering Rocks” is plunged into “a small-scale labyrinth” (Blamires 75) of 19 mini sections between the hour of three and four in the afternoon: an assorted cast of
characters is flung about the streets of the Hibernian metropolis, all making brief appearances with their unique voices. Dubliners officially become cameos in this episode. Apart from “Circe,” all other episodes are inferior in terms of number of people when compared to “Wandering Rocks.” Another kind of Dublin is featured in this episode: a metropolitan capital. Joyce prepared an earlier schema for this episode in September 1920. It is “Sense (Meaning) = The Hostile Milieu” and as Clive Hart rightly proposes, the episode “is Joyce’s most direct, most complete celebration of Dublin, demonstrating succinctly his conception of the importance of physical reality, meticulously documented” (181). Accordingly, Dublin does dilate, in terms of urban space as well as of the length of the episode, to encompass both the characters and their interior monologues. Not only is it superior in the number of people, “Wandering Rocks” is also the second longest episode in the first ten with 12,516 words: only 133 words shorter than “Lestrygonians.”

On the fabric of Dublin, slices of Dubliners’ lives are ostentatiously displayed and the text becomes “a miniature of the whole” (Blamires 75). The sections report daily activities of a series of citizens: a former rector of Clongowes Wood College, John Conmee, on his journey from the presbytery to Artane; Corny Kelleher closing his daybook and examining a coffin lid; a onelegged sailor walking from MacConnel’s corner to Eccles street singing an English song; the Dedalus sisters coming home discussing their household situation; and a blonde shop girl preparing a basket of fruit for Blazes Boylan, to name a few. Stephen and Bloom are integrated into the urban Dublin along with other Dubliners. William B. Warner in “The Play of Fictions and Succession of Styles in Ulysses” suggests the epic scale of the city in which “the whole variegated life of the city has entered in” (25). In “Wandering Rocks” there is undoubtedly the enlargement from the number of voices to the number of words. What
“enters in” is both Dublin’s bricks and mortar and her human actions. However, in this very inflated chapter, the plot coherence is shattered and instead of reading for the plot, the reader is directed to the spatiality that will also be destroyed. I will return to this problem later.

For the first time, the reader gets a chance to step into other Dubliners’ minds: this is the reverend Conmee thinking, “Just nice time to walk to Artane” (210), or Miss Dunne’s “Is he in love with that one, Marion?” (220), or Dilly Dedalus calculating the value of her furniture, “Those lovely curtains. Five shillings. Cosy curtains” (227). Besides, for the first time, Joyce employs reported indirect discourse, for instance, “He thought, but not for long, of soldiers and sailors, whose legs had been shot off by cannonballs” (210). These reported thoughts present the character’s mind but still maintain a space between the narrator and the characters. In addition, Joyce deftly keeps these interior monologues and reported discourses at a minimum and it is not the case that every one’s mind is featured in the episode. Instead, Dubliners are mostly reported from a distance by a cold unemotional camera eye. In “Wandering Rocks” various characters with unique names, voices and habitats are put into an apathetic urban space. Even though they are individuals, the characters are incorporated into a chase narrative with disparate interpolations that render them invisible and blasé. The city as an unconnected milieu is my focus in this chapter.

In this episode, the distanci ng style portrays denizens as strangers with a “blasé” attitude. Taking full advantage of the monotonous sentences with basic grammatical structures that Joyce deftly develops in “Lestrygonians,” the author in “Wandering Rocks” employs this walking writing style with a much stronger effect: the text increases third-person narration and cuts down interior monologue. Even though the minds of the characters are still explored on a milder scale, the narrative
focuses more on the characters’ outer activities. Still keeping the dull grammatical structure of a single subject, verb and object, the text moves from portraying Dubliners in their walking patterns to other activities in a mechanical style. For example:

Boody cried angrily. (U217)

Miss Dunne clicked on the keyboard. (220)

Ned Lambert cracked his fingers in the air. (222)

Lenehan linked his arm warmly. (225)

Mr Kernan glanced in farewell at his image. (230)

The reader again experiences a strange style when the characters are portrayed in harsh sentences. This dominant sentence pattern describes all the characters from the paring-fingernails narrator’s viewpoint as Stephen hypothesizes in A Portrait about the narrator working as a God figure. The high density of these sentences renders the episode an unfriendly space.

Additionally, the characters are unemotionally listed performing trivial everyday actions and the assortment of details seems arbitrary and meaningless. The reader starts to question why these people with these actions are included to make sense of the capriciousness of the text as well as to seek “some underlying significance” (Johnson, “Explanatory Notes” 866). He interrogates not only the raison d’être of a character, but also the reason why these senseless activities are provided in such a concrete style. The terse sentences depicting random people and dull events demoralize the reader and make the production of meaning obsolete. As I discussed earlier in chapter 3 about how place names without descriptions make difficult the process of recuperation by the reader, this process is pushed to an extreme degree in “Wandering Rocks” with its diverse collection of characters and a much higher density
of facts to create the ostentatiously complete picture of Dublin. This deceptive simplicity spots Karen Lawrence is similar to the avoidance of totalization that I proposed earlier, for “it catalogues facts without synthesizing them. It documents the events that occur but fails to give the causal, logical, or even temporal connections between them” (83). I suggest that there is an effect of accumulation from all the factors I have discussed above, ranging from the deadpan sentences to the proper names. While only a part of Dublin is walked in Bloom’s episodes, Dublin in this episode is extended to cover more areas and routes. Dublin localities fill up the episode and the number of place names reaches an extreme: 181 place names, which is 2.5 times that in “Lestrygonians”. On the one hand, Dublin is evoked from the raw materials, rendering it physical and meticulous. One the other hand, the realistic city under the combined effect of the distancing style and facts that are deficient in descriptions becomes bizarre and defamiliarized: the more place names that the reader encounters, the more the city resembles the real Dublin. The more real Dublin becomes, the stranger the reader’s experiences are because of its purposeless people and activities. This accumulation effect works hand in hand with the breaking of the narrative into small sections, bringing about a chapter of unconnectedness.

Additionally, not only are place names overwhelming but the proper names of Dubliners are also abundant in the narrative. In the 19 mini-narratives, the text is infused with various people from Dublin: not only are their localities mentioned in the same manner the narrator reports the whereabouts of Bloom, but their identities are also specifically listed. The total narrative, thus, is a combination of all these proper names and place names. The reality effect is vehemently evoked: these signifiers call attention to themselves, signalling that these people are real people of Dublin. These names include William Humble, Second Earl of Dudley, Lieutenant Colonel Heseltine,
and Mr. Dudley White, B.L., M.A. The density of these proper names means the narrative in the ending passage of the last section is a mere container of them rather than a signifying text. Lord Lieutenant William Humble and his cavalcade are driven through the streets of Dublin and their ride is “variously seen by, stared at by, saluted by, ignored by, or missed by” (Blamires 85) fellow Dubliners that the text gathers from previous sections:

William Humble, earl of Dudley, and lady Dudley, accompanied by lieutenantcolonel Heseltine, drove out after luncheon from the viceregal lodge. In the following carriage were the honourable Mrs Paget, Miss de Courcy and the honourable Gerald Ward A. D. C. in attendance. (242)

Thither of the wall the quartermile flat handicappers, M. C. Green, H. Thrift, T. M. Patey, C. Scaife, J. B. Jeffs, G. N. Morphy, F. Stevenson, C. Adderly and W. C. Huggard started in pursuit. Striding past Finn’s hotel, Cashel Boyle O’Connor Fitzmaurice Tisdall Farrell stared through a fierce eyeglass across the carriages at the head of Mr M. E. Solomons in the window of the Austro-Hungarian viceconsulate. (244)

In these two passages that consist of only 110 words, there are 19 proper names. The sentences are seemingly extended to carry more facts, becoming more winding with a profusion of signifiers. More importantly, the proper names are in a special form: the honourable Gerald Ward A. D. C., M. C. Green, H. Thrift, T. M. Patey, C. Scaife, J. B. Jeffs, G. N. Morphy, F. Stevenson, C. Adderly and W. C. Huggard, Mr M. E. Solomons. They are rife with “initials and acronyms […] all contributing to the focus
on titles and labels” (73) as Anna Snaith notes. Besides, Snaith also rightly observes how these proper names are the components of lists, and how “lists present a crisis of nomination for the reader, a ‘gigantism’ of the mere word” (73). The proper nouns not only become giant empty signifiers but also flaunt their identity. These amassed proper names on the page refer to the crowd of Dubliners gathering to salute the carriage of the earl. The style is once again the same with its content: they refer to a compendium of facts, or signifiers highlighting only the titles and labels. The Dubliners are portrayed as mechanically produced things rather than humans and in this strange reality, they only exist nominally.

The strangeness of reality in the episode is also reinforced by the techniques of interpolation, montage, juxtaposition, and fragmentation. Frank Budgen’s insight into Joyce’s writing process could help the reader understand how these techniques are handled. Budgen compares Joyce to an engineer with “compass and slide-rule, a surveyor with theodolite and measuring chain” (121) and:

Joyce wrote the “Wandering Rocks” with a map of Dublin before him on which were traced in red ink the paths of the Earl of Dudley and Father Conmee. He calculated to a minute the time necessary for his characters to cover a given distance of the city. (125)

Predictably, the art symbol in the schemas of Ulysses is “mechanics.” The episode is metaphorically and literally a meticulous product done with the scrupulousness of a designer. The verisimilitude of the city is just one of the aims of Joyce. He meticulously listed the routes, measured the distance of walking, as well as counted the time consumed to travel between the various destinations in order to arrange them all into an extreme exactitude. While Father Conmee is walking “along Mountjoy
square east” (211), Mr Denis Magninni is passing “lady Maxwell at the corner of Dignam’s court” (211); while Corny Kelleher is chewing “his blade of hay” (215) and idly looking out, Father Conmee is stepping “into the Dollymount tram” (215). All these events happen simultaneously and the only link between them is that they are relative to each other in time. Based on the text’s details of the whereabouts of the characters as well as their destinations, Clive Hart even composed a chart of the spatio-temporal facts with “an attempt to show what is happening, minute by minute” (199).

This effect of simultaneity is the result of the interpolations that interweave throughout the whole episode. The simultaneous events create a forged linearity in the plot. Based on the traditional notion of events happening in time in classical novels, in which the event in page 2 happens after the event in page 1, the reader gets an impression that the event of Father Conmee walking along Mountjoy square is previous to the event of Magninni passing Lady Maxwell. As William B. Warner explains, Joyce splits the narrative into 19 small sections and “[d]isrupts the temporal illusion of the narrative, and leaves the reader without any sense of an integral connection between one time, place, or event and another” (24). Although the broken illusion of linearity in time is replaced by the plurality in space, because of the excess of Dublin localities as Shan-Yun Huang notes (594), the spatial plurality, in my opinion, is another illusion created in the text. The accumulation of facts along with the interpolated prose reveals how Dublin is not depicted from the plurality of spatial aspect but rather falls into a collection of wandering unrelated places.

In order to understand how an interpolation works in the narrative, Kathleen McCormick in “The Pleasure of ‘Cruising,’” offers a definition of this term: “An interpolation [...] is a line that appears out of context in one vignette and that generally
belongs somewhere else in the text, frequently in another vignette” (276). For example, in a section, the text depicts the one-legged sailor walking up Eccles Street and singing:

He swung himself violently forward past Katey and Boody Dedalus, halted and growled:

—home and beauty.

_J. J. O’Molloy’s white careworn face was told that Mr Lambert was in the warehouse with a visitor._

A stout lady stopped, took a copper coin from her purse and dropped it into the cap held out to her. The sailor grumbled thanks and glanced sourly at the unheeding windows, sank his head and swung himself forward four strides. (216)

In the passage above, the italic lines belong to an interpolation that suddenly emerges out of nowhere and refers to irrelevant characters as well as places. Right after this, the text continues with the sailor story. There are no linking words, no warnings, and the abrupt advent of these lines interrupts the narrative. There is also no relationship whatsoever between the story of the sailor singing a patriotic English song with the story of J. J. O’Molloy being told that Mr Lambert visits the warehouse. The bizarreness as well as arbitrariness subtly arises from this early-introduced interpolation.

An interpolation can happen in-between passages as in the example above, or appear right in the middle of a sentence with the word “while” employed as the connection word:
Corny Kelleher sped a silent jet of hayjuice arching from his mouth

while a generous white arm from a window in Eccles street flung forth a coin. (216)

“While” is a conjunction normally used to state a contrast of facts or relevant events happening at the same time between two clauses in a sentence. In Joyce’s case, “while” is a hollow conjunction stating no whatsoever interlink between the first and second clauses. The bizarreness gradually increases with the amassing of interpolations in the course of the story. Additionally, when interrupting the wholeness of a sentence and rendering the narrative fragmentary, an interpolation could be considered an alienating factor at best: there is no relation between the event of Kelleher spitting “hayjuice” and the coin flung from an arm from a house in Eccles Street, except that they happen at the same time. The estrangement between two passages is now transferred into a single sentence, causing the narrator’s choice of events to go from arbitrary to reckless. Joyce goes further in his interpolation technique when arranging three successive interpolations to depict three simultaneous events:

The disk shot down the groove, wobbled a while, ceased and ogled them: six.

Miss Dunne clicked on the keyboard:

—16 June 1904.

Five tallwhitehatted sandwichmen between Monypeny’s corner and the slab where Wolfe Tone’s statue was not, eeled themselves turning H. E. L. Y’S and plodded back as they had come. (220)
These interpolations exist independently in the narrative and it is not easy to attribute them to any ongoing story. They present random events with random people in random places. These events are irrelevant to the ongoing plot, referring to something happening simultaneously elsewhere. The “elsewhereness” becomes the prominent characteristic of the urban space in this chapter as Fritz Senn observes. While third-person narration describes an event, it interrupts its own narrative by transferring the reader to somewhere else. While characters are mentioned, they immediately become redundant because they are undermined by other characters. Senn rightly notes that these “elsewhere” interpolations are the prominent feature that breaks the homogeneity of this episode that is dominated by a deadpan style. They also shatter “the habitual unity of place” (Senn, “Charting Elsewhereness” 160), since interpolations are considered “alien elements” that transform the text into a double bind because:

[b]y linking different places or people (or objects like a crumpled throwaway), they connect items that are scattered about. They both disorient and coordinate and thereby in turn reinforce the Joycean extremes of chaos and kosmos. (“Charting Elsewhereness” 160-1)

While Clive Hart and Kathleen McCormick count thirty-one interpolations, the number by my examination is thirty-two. The more interpolations that appear the greater arbitrariness there is in the narrative. They mirror the unpredictable relationships between citizens and places in the city. The activities and the persons are unrelated in the plot; the place where Kelleher spits the hayjuice is unrelated to Eccles Street; the place where Miss Dune is typing is similarly unconnected to the Monypey's corner. The act of finding a cue to squeeze the meaning out of the plot of “Wandering Rocks” is doomed to failure due to the purposelessness in everything presented. As Lawrence points out, “[t]he apparently arbitrary and accidental connections between
events and people in ‘Wandering Rocks’ deepen the skepticism about any absolute idea of order introduced in ‘Aeolus’” (84). Undoubtedly, the text becomes an assortment of mini-narratives, rather than providing any meaningful plot for the reader.

Knuth and Hart in their research suggest that the interpolations have not been strewn in at random. There seems to exist what Hart calls “casual relationships between the interpolations and their contexts” (193). I rather propose that the very attempt to find a link between interpolations, thus seeking an order in the narrative, still belongs to a traditional reading in which symbolic significances are the utmost priority. The text of “Wandering Rocks” defies any such attempt. Interpolations, and similarly, places in “Wandering Rocks” behave like wandering objects, true to the Homeric allusion of this episode. They interrupt the narrative whenever they come along, and they wander aimlessly in the text, similar to a floating signifier. They signify that “we happen simultaneously” in the space of the city but provide no meaning of this signification: they never give out an answer to “why does the reader need to know that these two events are happening at the same time?” They become elusive because it is not easy to cast them neatly in a story. Additionally, places float in the air because they are flung about in different interpolations with no specific relationship to pin them down. McCormick rightly asserts that “Elusive interpolations such as these send out conflicting signals to the strong reader: their recurrence hints that they might be significant; their apparent arbitrariness and unconnectedness suggest that they may not be” (286). The interpolations push the reader to a game of chasing significations. He is left in a labyrinth of interpolations and stories and is urged to use a red thread to connect them into a meaningful unity of events. The options are varied; the goal of arriving at an absolute order is never in sight for
“Wandering Rocks”; it gives readers no solution and readers do not master this text (McCormick 286). Furthermore, each interpolation closely attaches to a person and his/her locality in the city. The wild goose chase is not only about finding a suitable context for an interpolation but also the purpose behind putting an interpolation in a specific locality. In this process, Dublin becomes a space of disconnected wandering places. Apart from being an inventory of place names and proper names, the text offers no clue for any interpretation of the stories that are being told. Dublin as a hostile milieu is indifferently rendered from an apathetic camera eye immediately reporting everything happening on the streets. The unconnectedness of places and people are heightened due to many factors and the episode “suggests the purposeless activity of the Dublin streets” (Peake 214). Instead of a logical and overall plot that the reader can follow, the episode makes the reader probe at various disjointed stories, all irrelevant to each other. The lives of Dubliners are described and yet no symbolic reading can be deduced from them. Joyce denies any attempt at totalization to produce a text opulent in fragmentariness: the wholeness whether of time, space, place, and plot is shattered.

In “The Metropolis and Mental Life,” Georg Simmel discusses the “blasé attitude,” one of the surviving skills that the city dwellers learned in order to cope with the downpour of stimuli in the modern metropolis (409). While the reader gets a glimpse of a modern city with its rushing torrent of stimuli striking on one character’s nerve in “Lestrygonians,” the city of walking citizens is mostly depicted from the outer perspective in the third-person narration in “Wandering Rocks”. The characters move around the urban space and are portrayed in a monotonous distancing style, rendering them estranged and impersonal. Dublin, thus, is represented as a compendium of blasé citizens and unconnected random places.
The overwhelming unconnectedness in the narrative begs a question: is Dublin in “Wandering Rocks” with its isolated citizens and places a community, even an imagined one? In my opinion, Dublin in “Wandering Rocks” is not a community but rather a collection of people and places on the monitors in a Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) or surveillance video control room. Dublin becomes a spectacle, a surveillance society while the reader becomes the watcher. The text ostentatiously displays its collection of facts that are listed in a legalistic and minutial style, never failing to record any single detail in the private life of the citizens. The city is exposed and observed as if it is a prepared performance of a show.

The text with its documentary style explicitly casts its camera into every corner of the city and gathers as much data as possible. Earlier in the narrative, the text consists of short sentences covering everyday activities and street life, and an average sentence has around 12 to 15 words. For example, “Father Conmee stopped three little schoolboys at the corner of Mountjoy square” (211). The sentence pattern slowly changes from short and terse to long cumulative sentences. In the final scene, the author even gathers all the random characters into one single section. The sentences tend to extend to 6 to 7 times the average quoted above. The span of sentence is also extended mirroring the way facts are accumulated. For instance, the following sentence consists of 78 words:

A charming soubrette, great Marie Kendall, with dauby cheeks and lifted skirt, smiled daubily from her poster upon William Humble, earl of Dudley, and upon lieutenantcolonel H. G. Hesseltine, and also upon the honourable Gerald Ward A. D. C. From the window of the D. B. C. Buck Mulligan gaily, and Haines gravely, gazed down on the viceregal equipage over the shoulders of eager guests, whose mass of forms
darkened the chessboard whereon John Howard Parnell looked intently.

The oversized passages span three continuous pages, assembling Dubliners from various places into crammed sentences profuse in proper names. Rather than describing the scene, they signify that they are the real collection of people and titles. Lawrence rightly observes the “infinite expansibility of the sentence” to cover everything in this episode:

The sentences parody the arbitrary structure of prose writing. The narrative’s attempt to catalogue all the action of the chapter is comically outpaced by the possibilities that present themselves as potential members in the catalogue. (88)

A new urban experience is represented: a passive compendium of citizens in a passive place. It yields the impression of a Big Brother society in which everyone is watched and recorded, from a camera-like narrator. In *Inventing Ireland*, Declan Kiberd proposes how the author takes up “a god’s eye view of Dublin [in this episode], from which distance both men appear (like everyone else) as mere specks on the landscape” (350). In my opinion, the reader not only experiences Dublin as a god-like creature, but also meets a city meticulously created from the street level. From a god-like view of the city, it is impossible to catch a glimpse of Almidano Artifoni’s “heavy hand [taking] Stephen’s firmly,” (219) or Ned Lambert “h[olding] his handkerchief ready for the coming” (222). In “Wandering Rocks,” Joyce chooses a wider area of Dublin than in other episodes and splits the area into smaller parts in which he focuses on different people. If the reader gets the slight impression that there is a street-level narrator in Bloom’s episodes, or more exactly, that the street itself is the narrator which changes with every new street and characters’ movements are narrated from the
view of which, in “Wandering Rocks,” the city itself becomes the narrator. It is not merely a God-like position, but a hybrid position provided by a mixture of god-like and street-like narrator where the narrator zooms in and out as quick and as much as possible. Imagine a city surveillance camera system, with numerous cameras in different parts observing activities of the citizens. The narrator is omnipresent and with these cameras he transforms Dublin into a constantly-watched society. By putting camera in every corner of the city informing the 19 mini-sections, the narrative is a collection of feeds from these cameras. The “Wandering Rocks” narrative metamorphoses into a typical CCTV control-room with 19 monitors. Life becomes a spectacle in which each Dubliner is now transformed into the hero of a show: all of them performing passively for an audience.

The reality effect caused by the proper names does not gesture to a real Dublin but is undermined by the very accumulation of them and interrupted by the interpolations. The parody in grasping reality by a competent medium that I analysed in the previous chapter is heightened to a stronger degree in this episode with the dense repetitions of the simple grammatical structure. The reader is overwhelmed by the style of the broken narrative and the exposed lives of the citizens. When trying to seek for a dominant metaphor for the city in this episode, critics often call it a labyrinth. I suggest the metaphor of a CCTV control-room in which each slice of Dublin is enlarged on a monitor, with multiple monitors arranged side by side to capture the movements of the characters in various places: they are unrelated to each other; they are passively wandering people and places in an urban metropolis, yet they

---

create an illusion of community. They deny any signification that the reader wants to impose onto them and do not belong to a system. The Dublin CCTV room does not provide a panoramic view of the city but only a collection of fragments. The world of Dublin is not intelligible but is an inventory of arbitrary, random, and unconnected data.

“Nausicaa”: Tumescent-Detumescent Twilight on Sandymount Shore

After the heated quarrel with the Citizen in a closed space in “Cyclops,” Bloom comes to the open space of Sandymount Strand, the very location that Stephen walks on 12 hours earlier. The hour is 8 P.M. and the scene is The Rocks. The text of “Nausicaa” is divided into two halves on the surface: Gerty’s and Bloom’s narratives. The reader easily notices that there are also two different types of seascapes described in them. A Dublin rich in purple prose imitating the style of popular novels is reflected in Gerty MacDowell’s eyes, while an opposite rendering of the physical world, a deflated outer reality in which darkness and an empty beach are in complicity with Bloom to release his pent-up bodily frustrations.

The seascape in the first half of “Nausicaa” is depicted as if by a narrator brushing a picture and presenting it to the audience. Everything is painted from a perspective in which the furthest object is presented first and the nearest object last. Whilst the outlook in “Proteus” is ever-changing with a dedication to details, the seascape in “Nausicaa” is mostly panoramic and still. Additionally, differently from the seascape in “Proteus,” reality in this episode is mainly an object to the spectator: It is depicted from a distance by glances and gazes. The adjective “far” is used many times in this episode, for example: “far away in the west,” (331) “gazing far away into the distance,” (333) “she could see far away,” (347) “far out over the sands,” (361)
“far on Kish bank” (361). Gerty’s narrative emphasizes visual effects as Fritz Senn confirms in his examination of colours in the seascape of the first half that it is “[a] rich palette of colours, especially blue but with liberal daubs of scarlet, crimson, rose, coralpink...” (“Nausicaa” 303), in constrast with the second half in which grey is dominant. Joyce wrote that “Nausikaa is written in a namby-pamby jammy marmalady drawersy style” (Letters I 135), and undeniably, the purple prose of romance novels renders Dublin’s seascape picturesque, livid, and kitschy. An example illustrates this style in the first half of the episode:

The summer evening had begun to fold the world in its mysterious embrace. Far away in the west the sun was setting and the last glow of all too fleeting day lingered lovingly on sea and strand, on the proud promontory of dear old Howth guarding as ever the waters of the bay, on the weedgrown rocks along Sandymount shore and, last but not least, on the quiet church whence there streamed forth at times upon the stillness the voice of prayer to her who is in her pure radiance a beacon ever to the stormtossed heart of man, Mary, star of the sea. (331)

In the schema for Ulysses in 1921, Joyce reveals that the technique he designed for “Nausicaa” is Tumescence/Detumescence. I would like to use these words to name the two notable representations of Dublin in this chapter\(^4\). Harry Blamires offers an

\(^4\) I am well aware that splitting the episode into two separate styles run an extraordinary risk of simplifying them, as Fritz Seen sharply notices that, Gerty’s style is not monotonous but divulges “numerous discordant ruptures” (Senn, “Nausicaa” 305)) and a more complex reading of both styles to point out how tumescence and detumesence are inherent in both Gerty’s as well as Bloom’s prose style is greatly needed. However, in the limit of this section, I mostly deal with the swelling nature of Gerty’s borrowed style. See Senn, “Nausicaa” 277-312 for a meticulous examination of various styles in Gerty’s prose.
explanation of the technique as follows: “[s]wollen and then a release from
swollenness, usually relating to sexual arousal and its recovery” (134). The swollen
language consists of exaggeration, “wordy and pompous prose,” “over-descriptive
phrasing and sentences jam-packed with superfluous words and pithy phrases” (134)
which are clearly inherent in Gerty’s style. The reader almost instantly recognizes the
swelling nature of the prose: the narrator keeps adding numerous adjectives and noun
phrases, and the sentences keep agglomerating details. The second sentence of the
opening passage has 91 words that could be divided into at least 3 to 4 smaller
sentences. The reader sees how the narrator tunes herself to the setting sun: “on sea
and strand,” “on the proud promontory of dear old Howth guarding as ever the waters
of the bay,” “on the weedgrown rocks along Sandymount shore,” and “[…] on the
quiet church.” The prose does not stop there, but goes on to depict the prayer and then
the church. The prose behaves like a river that smaller streams keep joining,
accumulating various noun phrases by inserting “on… and on… and on…,” making it
larger and bulkier as Gerty keeps adding dependent clauses to the main clause as if she
is unable to omit any detail of the twilight scene. The reader must catch his breath
finishing the second sentence of the introduction paragraph. Last but not least, the
prose is abundant with figurative language that the narrator uses to limn the scene: it
ranges from simile, metaphor, to anthropomorphism. The evening is personified to
have a “mysterious embrace,” behaves emotionally as it “lingered lovingly,” while
Howth is dubbed as “dear old” and “proud.” The reeking clichés in the prose, which is
“exaggerated into its purplest shade” (Lawrence 120) along with the deluge of
descriptions, expose an unfamiliar narrative to the reader who is used to the objective
and simplistic prose of “Lestrygonians” or “Wandering Rocks.” I will return to this at
the conclusion of this chapter.
Who is Gerty? The text offers an answer: “Gerty MacDowell who was seated near her companions, lost in thought, gazing far away into the distance” (333). Firstly, she is the spectator of the seascape. Many times in the text, the narrator describes Gerty’s eyes as glancing out: “She gazed out towards the distant sea,” (341) “while she gazed her heart went pitapat,” (342) “gazing far away into the distance,” (333) “she oftentimes [gazed] out of the window dreamily” (339). The gaze, thus, becomes the most important characteristic that shapes two realities in this episode: the first moulded by the character who frequently pays attention to her appearance (she looks at herself from her eyes and other’s eyes) and the second constructed through Bloom’s eyes after Gerty is cast as an object of sexual voyeurism. Dublin is projected from Gerty’s motionless gaze: she is fixed and sedentary in her position. In stark contrast with other episodes’ representations of Dublin in which Dublin is always moving with the character, it is static in this episode. Gerty’s gaze is firstly on Sandymount, secondly on herself, and thirdly and lastly on the mysterious man. Secondly, Gerty appropriates popular discourse from various sources into her vocabulary. Her lexicon is full of cliché and kitschy phrases such as “distant sea,” (341) “gathering twilight,” (347) and “sparkling waves” (331). Another example of the twilight scene illustrates Gerty’s style:

How moving the scene there in the gathering twilight, the last glimpse of Erin, the touching chime of those evening bells and at the same time a bat flew forth from the ivied belfry through the dusk, hither, thither, with a tiny lost cry. And she could see far away the lights of the
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44 Joyce replied to Arthur Power’s question about what happened between Gerty and Bloom that, “nothing happened between them. It all took place in Bloom’s imagination” (Power 32).
lighthouses so picturesque she would have loved to do with a box of paints […] (347)

The passage begins with an exclamation and the sentences are long and trite: “the gathering twilight,” “the last glimpse of Erin,” “so picturesque,” and “the touching chime.” Gerty moulds Dublin like a painter. Similar to the introduction passage that I quoted above, the narrator has to strain his prose to sustain the high tone: with 6 small clauses, the sentence becomes taut to cover from the expression of being emotionally touched by the sunset, to the chime of bells, to the manner of flying of the bat, to its cry. Gerty does not stop her observations there but goes further to mention the lamplighter and her love for reading and writing. The paragraph is lengthened as if her engorged prose does not allow a reduction. The prose in this passage and the above-quoted one exemplifies the way the text ostentatiously borrows from the style of sentimental fictions to construct a mawkish setting.

Many scholars have pointed out how Joyce parodies the style of sentimental novels, specifically, Maria Cummins’s *The Lamplighter* in “Nausicaa.” These studies compare and contrast how Joyce’s Gerty is akin to Cummins’s Gerty. The negotiations between Joyce and Cummins leave apparent traces, not only in the overt similarity of the characters’ names, but also in the ways the authors handle their construction of reality. I want to also mention that the heroines’ moods blur their visions of the physical world in both novels. Accidentally, both fictions begin with a sunset scene with a sedentary heroine gazing afar. The time of the day in both are nearly identical, with the dusk and night slowly embracing the world and the little girl in Cummins’ story is “earnestly gazing up the street with much earnestness” (5) while
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45 See Kimberly 383-96, Suzette 123-49.
Gerty in “Nausicaa” is “[l]ost in thought, gazing far away into the distance” (*U* 333). Gertrude is saddened by her own orphaned situation and thus the physical world around her is “cheerless than ever” (Cummins 5). The free indirect discourse is employed from early on, with this phrase likely uttered by Gertrude herself and will play out more obviously in later chapters. The kitschy sunset that is a traditional ingredient of Victorian literature is projected through the character’s emotions in both novels:

The western sky was still streaked with brilliant lines of red, the lingering effects of a gorgeous sunset, while the moon, now nearly at the full, and triumphing in the close of day and the commencement of her nightly reign, cast her full beams upon Emily's white dress, and gave to the beautiful hand and arm, which, escaping from the draperied sleeve, rested on the side of her rustic arm-chair, the semblance of polished marble. (Cummins 163)

The reader undoubtedly notices that no distinct departures from the prototype can be found in Joyce’s text and familiarities between two novels are ostentatious: bright colours (red), maudlin phrases (“lingering effects,” “gorgeous sunset,”) lexical redundancy and figurative language such as anthropomorphism (“triumphing in the close of day,” “the commencement of her nightly reign,”) and simile (“the semblance of polished marble”). All of these factors are displayed again and parodied in the beginning passage of “Nausicaa” I have analyzed above. This borrowed style runs throughout the first half of “Nausicaa,” behaving like a growing stream of other popular discourses like fashion magazines, advertising, mariolatry, proverb, folk wisdom, fairy tale, colloquialism, and euphemism that “[v]ie with one another for air time” (Johnson, “Explanatory Notes” 900).
Dublin in this episode is often a painting in progress by Gerty who expressively confesses, “It was like the paintings that man used to do on the pavement with all the coloured chalks […]” (341). If in other episodes the reader experiences a report of immediate Dublin, it is now watched from a distance, by an unmoving object. In the painting of coloured chalks, Gerty gazes at the sea while being gazed at by a man: “Yes, it was her he was looking at, and there was meaning in his look. […] She could see at once by his dark eyes and his pale intellectual face that he was a foreigner […]” (342). Gerty is well aware that she is the object of a man’s gaze which makes “her heart [go] pitapat” (342). Almost immediately, the narrative appropriates the language of popular discourse to construct Gerty’s fantasy: the man’s eyes that are wonderful and “superbly expressive” “burned into her” to “search her through and through,” and “read her very soul” (342). The man has an “intellectual face” (342), now is transformed into a matinee idol, a foreigner called Martin Harvey. Gerty constructs herself as an object in a picture and rearranges herself to romantically suit the setting. Dublin is metamorphosed into the setting of a romantic novel. She is willing to objectify herself to become the erotic girl to suit the voyeuristic eyes of her ideal man who is sitting in the dusk on the beach. There is a sense of doubleness in Gerty: she is the watcher and the watched. The free indirect technique on the character’s part is the most important device that constructs the double writing of the first half. Gerty, like many characters of Joyce, has the tendency to write her own biography. She composes a romance novel for herself: a beach twilight love story of “a specimen of winsome Irish girlhood” (333). Gerty of “Nausicaa” joins the league of Dublinares’ self-portrayed characters, such as Mr James Duffy of “A Painful Case” and Maria of “Clay.”
The reader recognizes the parallel in the way the Gerty of *Ulysses* and Maria of *Dubliners* depict themselves. This resemblance marks how Joyce develops *Ulysses* from the well-constructed style of his earlier work: “Maria had cut them herself. Maria was a very, very small person indeed but she had a very long nose and a very long chin” (*D* 76). In this passage, the self-image of the character dominates the narrative. Third-person narration blends with Maria’s free indirect speech to create a style aptly associated with Maria: the simple syntax of sentences reveals her self-portrayal and thinking patterns. The sentences are narrated as if spoken from Maria’s mouth, who is a simple and uneducated person: “Maria had cut them herself,” “Maria was a very, very small person indeed.” The reader is, thus, limited to this style and receives the world according to Maria. An identical technique is spotted when the narrator presents Gerty: “Her figure was slight and graceful, inclining even to fragility. […] Her hands were of finely veined alabaster with tapering fingers and as white as lemonjuice […]” (333). Only different in sentence length, the prose style depicts the physical self-awareness as well as the self-presenting tendency of Gerty analogous to Maria’s. The reader imagines Gerty describing herself as “Her figure was slight and graceful,” and that “her hands were of finely veined alabaster with tapering fingers.” Even though versed in two different lexicons, the two women comfortably fall into the same group. However, the narrator of “Clay” withholds many crucial details about Maria’s life. For instance, the relationship between her and the family she visits at the Halloween party produces “the growing sense of a gap between the version of Maria’s experience being presented by the narrative and an alternative, but obscured, reality” (Attridge, “Touching ‘Clay’” 43). Despite the fact that the third-person narrator in “Nausicaa” becomes Gerty-narrator with free indirect discourse spreading through the
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46 See Derek 35-51 for a brilliant analysis of the character Maria and reference and reality in “Clay”.
whole narrative and the detectable gap between the two is kept at a minimum, the prose still exposes the reader to a number of unpleasant aspects of Gerty’s life that the sugar-coating fails to cover. These include her suddenly nasty attitude towards the twins and close friends and her difficult family background with a violent, oppressive father. These loopholes are created by the ironic stance inherent in Gerty’s prose. Nevertheless, the indirect discourse style is still so infectious that it contaminates the parts dedicated to Gerty and even a small part of Bloom as well. Before returning to the interior monologue technique in Bloom’s half, the indirect style of Gerty is powerful enough to be able to colour a gliding passage:

> What a brute he had been! At it again? A fair unsullied soul had called to him and, wretch that he was, how had he answered? An utter cad he had been. He of all men! But there was an infinite store of mercy in those eyes, for him too a word of pardon even though he had erred and sinned and wandered. (350)

The passage temporarily merges the kitschy style of Gerty into the terse interior monologue of Bloom, making him momentarily speak with clichés. Maria-Daniella Dick rightly acknowledges that through this technique, Gerty’s “consciousness becomes coterminous with its representation; purporting to deliver a mimesis of self-presence” (171). Specifically, Gerty acquires her vocabulary from popular discourses, implementing them into every single sentence of her speech and thoughts. In addition, the text includes numerous sentimental exclamations that are likely uttered by Gerty herself, highlighting Gerty’s free indirect discourse. For example, these phrases come straight from Gerty: “such a pity too leaving them there to be all blotted out,” (341) “such purpose that the wouldbe assailant came to grief and (alas to relate!)” (332), “why have women such eyes of witchery?” (334) and “for such a one she yearns this
“balmy summer eve” (336). The profusion of these exclamations makes Gerty’s prose exaggerated. The technique of writing her own biography betrays Gerty because of its very own tendency towards hyperbole. The intensification of the popular discourses apparent in the embellished prose raises a question about Gerty’s identity. The mixed voices of two consciousnesses in Gerty’s part becomes the pivotal point in producing problematic meanings in this half. The reader still detects an unreliable narrator’s voice in the prose and recognizes the gap between the world that Gerty puts up and the world that she is really in. Gerty has to employ a strained prose to keep up with her romantic fantasy and to occlude the reality of domestic violence as well as physical disability.

Karen Lawrence, when discussing the borrowed style of Gerty, argues that even though Joyce employs numerous styles in order to demonstrate that all styles are arbitrary and equal, the intensification of parody in “Nausicaa” seems to suggest a condescending attitude toward the quality of popular discourses whereby “some styles are more equal than others” (122). I would like to beg for a different reading of Gerty’s kitschy style. By the technique of free indirect discourse, Joyce presents Gerty’s mind with the utmost directness but still maintains a distance so the reader experiences her situation while still understanding its drawbacks. The aim is not to ridicule the Madame Bovary of Sandymount but to empathize with her condition. Gerty has a hard time keeping up with her own high strenuous prose to carry her expectations and fantasies. She is struggling to be both subject and object in her biography. By this distorted, “misleading, garbled or quite untrue” style, the reader gets a chance to “experience the quality of her experience” (Peake 245). This

47 Weldon Thorton shares a similar opinion that Joyce disdains several styles and that the style of “Nausicaa” it “[a] dangerously simplistic and incomplete view of reality” (Voices and Values 102).
heightened experience of a subject as well as an object clearly illustrates how “Nausicaa” is a double writing that subverts the polar relation between them. The value of the style is pushed into uncertainty, because as Patrick McGee proposes:

Whether this writing is good or bad, whether bad writing becomes good when Joyce uses it as an example of bad, whether bad writing ceases to be bad when Joyce paints it and then frames it with his signature, these questions remain unanswerable insofar as Joyce’s signature has been subverted by the parodistic force of his writing. (319)

The undecidability of meanings is essential in Gerty’s style. The text stretches the value judgments to their broken points since there is fluidity on the border between good writing and bad writing, between the imitation and the model, from simply borrowing the style to making a claim on it to produce its own text.

To conclude, just like how Gerty appropriates popular discourses to construct herself, she assimilates what she sees and then re-enacts Dublin based on her own ideology. Dublin serves as a canvas to project her feelings and thoughts; it is blended into her psyche and coloured by her language. This Dublin provokes the reader to experience the mingling of cityscape and psyche-scape by the technique of free indirect discourse that Joyce deploys so effectively. Just as Gerty MacDowell knows “how to cry nicely before the mirror” (336), Dublin is a mirror that she performs in front of in her consciousness.

Gerty and company leave the beach after the fireworks and the narrative now turns to another slowly emerging reality. It is worth noting that the identity of the mysterious man in Gerty’s fantasy is discreet until the last minute: “He was leaning back against the rock behind. Leopold Bloom (for it is he) stands silent, with bowed
head before those young guileless eyes” (350). In her nightfall fantasy, there are two watchers: Gerty herself and Bloom. From the moment the first watcher leaves the scene, the third-person narrator is liberated from Gerty’s lexicon and regains his own voice: he discards the inflated prose style with a sentimental tone to limn the seascape to don the old matter-of-fact prose. This narrator also cooperates with Bloom to produce the familiar style that the reader experiences in Bloom’s episodes: the distancing third-person narration, free indirect discourse and interior monologue. The convention built in the first half is abruptly abandoned in the second half. Because of it, for the first time in the episode, a realistic image of Dublin is evoked by a simple style informing the reader that “It was darker now and there were stones and bits of wood on the strand and slippy seaweed” (351). A passage depicting the lamp-lighting process could be cited to illustrate the difference between Gerty’s and Bloom’s narrator. In Gerty’s daydream, she imagines a real activity and attaches it closely to a third-rate romance novel:

and soon the lamplighter would be going his rounds past the presbyterian church grounds and along by shady Tritonville avenue where the couples walked and lighting the lamp near her window where Reggy Wylie used to turn his freewheel like she read in that book The Lamplighter by Miss Cummins, author of Mabel Vaughan and other tales. (347)

The lamp lighting is imagined in a romantic place where “the couples walked” and at her window with her fantasized boyfriend. Meanwhile, in Bloom’s narrator’s view, and in reality, there is no “shady” avenue or private window. All is listed in an objective manner. He even counts the exact number of trees at Leahy’s terrace. Joyce once asked his aunt Josephine that “‘are there trees in Leahy’s terrace at the side or
near?” (Letters I 136), and used the answer specifically in this episode: “And among
the five young trees a hoisted lintstock lit the lamp at Leahy’s terrace” (361).
However, the reader also detects that free indirect discourse is already at work in
Bloom’s narrative. I will return to this passage later.

Nevertheless, the reader soon realizes that the narrative is quickly absorbed,
against this practical and realistic background, by Bloom’s interior monologue. In total
contrast to the first seascape presented in Gerty’s part, Howth is now depicted in short
phrases or sentences, containing fewer colours and details. The narrative presents a
tired and sporadic seascape. Bloom’s frustration has accumulated during the course of
the day, to be released physically and spiritually during the Gerty encounter. After a
rise and a climax, a descent occurs. After the burst, “O so soft, sweet, soft” (350) is the
reality that now covers Sandymount Strand:

Howth. Bailey light. Two, four, six, eight, nine. See. Has to change or
they might think it a house. Wreckers. Grace Darling. People afraid of
the dark. Also glowworms, cyclists: lightingup time. […] All quiet on
Howth now. The distant hills seem. Where we. The rhododendrons.

(359)

The reader experiences the familiarity of Bloom’s stream of consciousness. Exhausted,
he only spots one or two objects at a time. The whole view is now buried in darkness.
Bloom has to strain his eyes to distinguish between trees and night clouds. The outlook
comes in sporadic images popping up around him: Howth, a star, two stars, night
clouds, trees, and the setting sun. The Howth scene which once reminded Bloom of the
golden days is brought back in full force in “Lestrygonians”: “Where we. The
rhododendrons.” Memory again clouds over Bloom in a different way. Accordingly,
the rise and fall of Bloom’s emotions colour the style, and as a result, Joyce recreates a completely new view corresponding to Bloom’s reining condition: a drowsy seascape represented through free indirect discourse:

A lost long candle wandered up the sky from Mirus bazaar in search of funds for Mercer’s hospital and broke, drooping, and shed a cluster of violet but one white stars. They floated, fell: they faded. The shepherd’s hour: the hour of folding: hour of tryst. […] Howth settled for slumber, tired of long days, of yumyum rhododendrons (he was old) and felt gladly the night breeze lift, ruffle his fell of ferns. He lay but opened a red eye unsleeping, deep and slowly breathing, slumberous but awake. And far on Kish bank the anchored lightship twinkled, winked at Mr Bloom. (361-2)

Bloom’s state of mind furnishes the style with the correlative language: deserted as he is on the beach, he watches “a lost long candle [wander] up the sky.” The phrases “floated, fell: they faded” are similar to his swollen and then depleted energy. He sees the hour of night as “the hour of folding, of tryst,” of couples, which is opposite to his lonesome situation. The fatigued Bloom only recognizes moving objects: a flying bat and creeping surf. Dublin’s landscape from his position seems to absorb his drowsiness totally and is metamorphosed by his own language: Howth experiences Bloom’s own sleepiness, “settled for slumber,” “tired,” “felt gladly.” The style is coloured by Bloom’s language due to free indirect discourse and as a result, a tired, drowsy seascape of a deflated nature is sporadically described by curt words in his monologue. The “rhododendrons” of the past comes back again, only to become ironically “yumyum.”
Dublin in “Nausicaa” acts as a background for the characters’ activities when being represented at a distance; it also participates in them since it is the projected images of the characters’ minds. It could be said that the reader experiences the mingling of seascape and psyche-scape via free indirect discourse and interior monologue. The transformation of the outward into inward reality is in progress as Bloom projects Howth as a mental image while resting after the encounter with the kitschy Dublin in the sunset of Gerty’s fantasy. There is a close interlink between these seascapes and consciousnesses, not on the level of Gerty’s reality leading to Bloom’s, but in how they mutually affect each other and become a shared perception. As Maria-Daniella Dick proposes, Joyce’s insistence in presenting Dublin through two consciousnesses in “Nausicaa” thus transforms the city’s sandy strand into “the site of a silent dialectical exchange, unarticulated between them but articulated in the text” (171). Dublin’s seascape becomes the site for two experimental styles presenting two interdependent realities, where the reader himself encounters two levels of reading: one energy-stricken and exhausting, with the kitschy reality presented by a strenuous prose dense in not only Gerty’s borrowed popular discourse but also her desire to display; and one leisurely with overwhelming darkness, and a random seascape presented by a terse interior monologue.

“Circe”: Nighttown of Beyond the Bounds of Possibility

The daytime wanderings of Stephen and Bloom, ending with the mysterious embrace of the world, transits into the night journey in “Circe,” an episode the whole of which Joyce dedicates to the activities of the red light district of Dublin. The hour, 11pm – 12 midnight is listed in both Linati and Gilbert schemas. The nocturnal world is explored and expanded from a specific location to multiple scenes. The reader of *Ulysses* steps into the Nighttown of Dublin and is greeted with fantastic descriptions:
(The Mabbot street entrance of nighttown, before which stretches an uncobbled tramsiding set with skeleton tracks, red and green will-o’-the-wisps and danger signals. Rows of flimsy houses with gaping doors. Rare lamps with faint rainbow fans. Round Rabaiotti’s halted ice gondola stunted men and women squabble. They grab wafers between which are wedged lumps of coal and copper snow. Sucking, they scatter slowly. (408)

A real place name, Mabbot street, is evoked; numerous noun phrases are employed; the sheer number of bewildering adjectives like “uncobbled,” “flimsy,” “gaping,” “rare,” “faint,” act as verbless stage directions, alerting the reader to what seems to be the contrary of the style of “scrupulous meanness” depicting Dublin streets in other episodes, especially in “Lestrygonians” as I discussed in Chapter Two. In both “Nausicaa” and “Circe,” new contracts of writing place are created. From the sentimental language borrowed from popular novels in the thirteenth episode to the excess of phantasmagorical images in a mocked style of drama in the fifteenth, the text flaunts its elasticity in adopting styles. From the beginning of “Circe,” a nightmarish atmosphere is conjured by the lack of light, the creepy distant sounds, and the ghostly people. The scene could not be more absurd: the tracks are compared to skeletons, danger signals are transformed into “red and green will-o’-the-wisps,” and ice cream becomes “lumps of coal and copper snow.” The reader gets an impression that he is lost in a district of dangers and unexpected encounters. There are two layers of unexpectedness in “Circe” with the first being the content of the story itself that includes all the bizarre activities going on in the episode, and the second being the form that embraces that content. The unexpectedness lies not only in the descriptions
but also in the very problematic genre of the episode. The introduction is in italics and put into two round brackets, the typographical convention of a play:

THE CALLS

Wait, my love, and I'll be with you.

THE ANSWERS

Round behind the stable. (408)

The reader of “Aeolus” encounters a fiction under a cloak of a pretentious newspaper form, and comes to “Circe” to meet Stephen and Bloom and other characters that now belong to the dramatis personae of a play: The whole fictional world is organized in a special form that enables the reader to immediately recognize that it is a play, complete with stage directions and dialogue. The production of meaning is initially challenged due to the formal change from novel to drama. The reader quickly notices the oddity of this play, in which the genre of fiction and drama is subverted and the reader is pushed into the world lying on the blurred boundaries between them. I will return to this later to discuss how stage directions morph into mini-fictions in this episode. The trouble in reading in this episode starts very early, as Derek Attridge observes: “There was the odd sense that this was and wasn’t a theatre – as if a whole street had become a stage. And there was the garish hyperreality of the descriptive method, as though a perfectly normal scene” (“Pararealism in ‘Circe’” 119). Dublin in “Circe” becomes a stage for dramatic performances. It is now the sequence of happenings directly presented and depicted by the dramatic third-person narrator. Right from the beginning, an ominous sinister consciousness presents the Nighttown entrance with random people from ill-lighted streets:
A drunken navvy grips with both hands the railings of an area, lurching heavily. [...] A plate crashes: a woman screams; a child wails. Oaths of a man roar, mutter, cease. Figures wander, lurk, peer from warrens. In a room lit by a candle stuck in a bottleneck a slut combs out the tatts from the hair of a scrofulous child. Cissy Caffrey’s voice, still young, sings shrill from a lane. (409)

True to the chain of events, Dublin is a compendium of creepy figures and sounds. The sudden and disturbing noises listed serve to create a theatrical setting with a portentous theme: a crash, a scream, a wail, a roar, a mutter, or a shrill voice. The streets are depicted with doors and windows always opening and shutting suddenly, people and whores popping in and out from doorways, corners, and windows. Humans, objects, and noises are on the watch, lurking in darkness. The evocative beginning of “Circe” could be considered a symbolic setting for Dublin’s metamorphoses happening later in the episode, as the space for fantastical imaginations. The text prepares a dismal setting full of uncertainties. The theatre of Nighttown as a bizarre district continues with the arrival of Bloom at where the streets become a dangerous field that continuously threatens the life of the character with accidents: he is missed narrowly by the cyclists in the shouts of the urchins when crossing the road; he is almost run down on the tram track and gets cursed by the motorman. Bloom is enticed into a journey through the streets full of ill-lighted houses in Nighttown. The more the reader and Bloom step forward, the more Gothic and ghostly the stage becomes.

Furthermore, Joyce takes advantage of the play form to exteriorize every detail in the narrative. On the stage of a drama, which in the original Greek means “to act”, everything is performed and becomes present: the inside is transformed into the outside; the past leads to the present, and as Johnson points out: “interiority (whether
nightmare, fantasy, memory, or anything repressed) is exteriorized, [and] given an objective reality” (“Explanatory Notes” 922). Hence, Dublin is a collection of happenings. The deepest fears and desires of Bloom and Stephen are turned into reality and these feelings articulate themselves in the dramatic narrative. For instance, Stephen’s dead mother becomes a character in the play and talks to him in the very room of the brothel Cohen:

(Stephen’s mother, emaciated, rises stark through the floor in leper grey with a wreath of faded orange blossoms and a torn bridal veil, her face worn and noseless, green with gravemould. Her hair is scant and lank. (539)

The mother is externalized onto the stage, in this case the brothel room, due to Stephen’s fear and obsession; and suddenly a tower similar to the Martello Tower in “Telemachus” appears out of nowhere to re-perform the scene from the first episode with Buck Mulligan on top of it (539). While Stephen’s mother came visiting him in his mind in “Telemachus,” her apparition becomes flesh in “Circe.” Dublin, in this case, becomes the brothel lying above hell and Stephen’s mother’s ghost emaciates from hell through its floors to talk to him.

It could be said that the representation of Dublin in “Circe” is a feast of transformations, of “acting out (sic) (that is, expression of the unconscious) and acting (sic) out (that is, theatricality)” (Lawrence 159). Similar to the constantly changing costumes of characters in a drama, the city slips continuously into different performances. At first glance, it is a sinister place with nightmarish people and objects. In a sudden moment, a series of absurd events break out in the narrative and similar to Stephen Dedalus’s text, “God becomes man becomes fish becomes barnacle goose
becomes featherbed mountain,” (49) where the city becomes a court becomes a cheering crowd becomes a Bloomsamulem becomes the paradise of the east becomes an apocalyptic scene with a big fire. The brothel which Stephen and Bloom visit becomes Bloom’s house with Bloom as a footman becomes an abused husband with Bello and womanly Bloom becomes the hellish room with Stephen’s mother and her prayers. Having undergone a series of metamorphoses, the Nighttown scene of the drama is multiplied into an assortment of scenes; from a single stage, the city now becomes an assemblage of stages. Rightly, as Katie Wales suggests, “Space itself is mobile, as the scenes rapidly shift from one to another, often imperceptibly and implicitly” (275), while offering readers a series of performances changing vastly in space and place.

I would like to mention three notable scenes in “Circe” in which the city is presented as a collective space in three performances. The first one is when Bloom is feeding a dog and is questioned by two police officers. Out of nowhere, without any warning, the reader encounters a scene at court: Dublin becomes a court with gallery, witness box, press table, and jury box, with Bloom as defendant because of his confusing identities (433-4). However, the reader could not identify the place in which the court is situated. With all the people and their proper names listed specifically in the court, it is strange that there is not a single clue for the exact locality of the court. The performance happens in a fantastical and phantasmagorical Dublin. The second example is when Dublin becomes a huge crowd toting Venetian masts cheering Bloom, whose status now improves. Suddenly released from the space of the court, Bloom is admired and becomes a well-loved figure, a political leader.

(Prolonged applause. Venetian masts, maypoles and festal arches spring up. A streamer bearing the legends Cead Mile Failte and Mah
Ttob Melek Israel spans the street […] Along the route the regiments of the royal Dublin fusiliers, the King’s own Scottish borderers, the Cameron Highlanders and the Welsh Fusiliers, standing to attention, keep back the crowd. (453)

High school students, women, men, and policemen assemble in the streets to listen to his speech. There is no cue in the text for the reader to locate the specific place for this event, even though many proper names of the people as well as details are employed to depict the crowd. Dublin is now a collection of people and objects, rather than a physical place. The text spills to pages to cover a significant number of persons who gather on the unknown streets. The third example is about a fire in Dublin near the end of “Circe”:


Dublin is transformed into a city at the end of the world with an apocalyptic impression, and the prose lists various events to depict the situation. A fire breaks out, horses and men and animals stampede, a chasm in the ground opens, dragons’ teeth fall down from the sky, the midnight sun is darkened, and the dead appear to people. The city becomes a mythical and religious place due to this theatrical effect of prose. No longer a single stage for a single performance, Dublin transforms into numerous theatrical, fantastical, hallucinated, erotic, and unconscious worlds.
In addition, Dublin is constructed as places in the past revisited in the present. The worlds of hallucinations are assembled based on one important factor: that is, the memory of the characters. Reminiscence blends itself with fantasy, creating vast intersecting planes of the past and present. The places in hallucinations are not totally fantastical, but as Jeri Johnson points out, *Ulysses*’s textual past is remembered by the dramatic narrative:

The text recirculates its prior self, re-presenting elements in new configurations. [...] Within *Ulysses*, itself such a ‘living substance or organism’ “Circe” employs textual mnemotechnics to draw our readerly attention to *Ulysses’s*, Stephen’s, Bloom’s and our own ‘mneme’. (“Explanatory Notes” 922)

In Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes, I discuss how the technique of interior monologue transports the reader to different planes of memory. In “Circe,” instead of the shifting process, every memory is performed and every place is revisited in the present. Places re-present themselves and Dublin revisits itself as the episode functions as the memory bank of *Ulysses*. For example, the court momentarily becomes the house of Bloom when Mary Driscoll appears to accuse Bloom and he transforms to wear “housejacket of ripplecloth, flannel trousers, heelless slippers, unshaven” (436). The space of the court is appropriated by the space of household. Moreover, the court is again transmuted into Beaver Street where Bloom had bowel trouble, an incident in his past (438). In addition, the very same ground of the court is now covered with pebbles with the arrival of Paddy Dignam: “worms down through a coalhole, his brown habit trailing its tether over rattling pebbles” (448) and the whole cemetery scene in “Hades” is played out again in “Circe” with many distortions. Dublin, like memory, remembers its own places in an associative manner, breaking the linear sequence in the narrative.
It brings back the places in the past of Bloom and Stephen, distorts them, and recreates them into strange yet familiar places. The wholeness and totalization of places are shattered. One after another, the reader directly experiences Bloom’s numerous places in the past and Dublin becomes the sites of these memories performing on the present stage.

The notion of setting in classical drama, in which one setting is maintained throughout the play according to Aristotle’s rule of three classical unities (which are the unity of action, time, and place), is significantly shattered in “Circe.” This unity is only applicable for performable dramas, whilst the text produces a play mostly for reading in which the setting, the one crucial feature of which is the ability to metamorphose, is split into various fragments. In “Circe,” it is impossible to apply the reality principle as in other episodes, and the reader only recognizes that there are constant shifts in space but is not able to determine whether the characters are shifted to other spaces as well. The multiple scenes and mobile spaces suggest how the reader experiences both Dublin’s realness and unrealness. I would like to return to the introduction passage and discuss how several notable critics discuss the problem of realness and hallucination. It could be said that there are two schools of interpretation of reality and fantasy in “Circe”: one advocates a clear boundary between these two and maintains that the reader could distinguish when and where a hallucination springs up – more often than not, due to an identifiable stimulus; the other believes in a blur between the two and argues for a mixture of realness and unrealness in the narrative.

The representative of the first school, the stimulus-response principle in which a remark, a situation, or a feeling can induce a series of hallucinations, is Charles
Peake\textsuperscript{48}. Taking the realistic theoretical stance in which hallucinations are considered products of the unconscious, Peake argues for a distinct boundary between reality and fantasy. In his opinion, the introduction offers accurate and realistic scenes before the author adds distorted elements to them. Additionally, he proposes that there is a shift between “reality, heightened reality, and unreality” (264); and this very feature creates the hallucinatory quality of the prose. Finally, Peake concludes that these three aspects can be easily distinguishable even though they blend with each other (264).

The representative for the second school is Daniel Ferrer\textsuperscript{49}. He underlines the mixture of real and unreal in the episode and observes how the descriptions are objective and prescriptive at the same time. Ferrer goes further to argue that in the drama of “Circe,” when the narrator introduces “Enter a ghost and hobgoblins” (474) and “Enter the milkman,” there is no difference between them. The reason behind this feature is because the characters as well as scenes in “Circe,”

\begin{quote}
[a]re all set on the same level of reality – or unreality. There is nothing which could make distinctions between them legitimate. On “Circe”’s stage, the memory-narrative becomes a concrete presence. (132)
\end{quote}

Daniel Ferrer’s reading of “Circe” clearly states how the reader has to unlearn the narrative rule that he has learned throughout earlier episodes. In my opinion, there are two levels of realness in \textit{Ulysses}: the first level is the question of whether the backgrounds of Stephen’s, Bloom’s, and Molly’s stories are the real Dublin or the

\textsuperscript{48} Hugh Kenner also supports this strategy of reading: “We know that Bloom is \textit{Ulysses}, and we know, too, what effect the opening description of ‘Circe’ conveys; which means that what we know and what is ‘really’ there (there for a dead observer: a camera, a recorder) are somewhat different.” (“Circe” 346).

\textsuperscript{49} Hélène Cixous belongs to this school. In \textit{The Exile of James Joyce}, she notes that in “Circe” there is “confusion between exterior and interior, thought and action” (700-1).
fictional Dublin; the second level is whether all the events narrated in the story happen or not. “Circe” challenges both levels of realness. In earlier episodes, the reader is struggling with the real Dublin and the fictional Dublin, but he is certain that Bloom does wander on the streets of the fictional Dublin, and the fictional Stephen does discuss Shakespeare with his friends; in other words, the events that are told in the course of the story are actual events in the fiction. I would like to call this convention “the reality principle.” In “Circe,” this principle is totally cancelled out and the reader has to struggle with both the fictional Dublin and the fictional events to distinguish what is happening in the fictional world and what is not. For instance, the reader is uncertain whether Bloom is talking with Mrs. Breen in the same way he met with Gerty. If the text of Ulysses is able to teach the reader anything helpful about “Circe,” it might be that everything in the narrative is unreliable and arbitrary, and that the real is challenged the moment it is presented.

Following the nightmarish introduction scene is the appearance of the children and the idiot, a seemingly normal and realistic scene. Suddenly, the stage direction offers: “Cissy Caffrey’s voice, still young, sings shrill from a lane” (409). It is strangely coincidental that Cissy Caffrey, a girl with the same name with one of Gerty’s friends in “Nausicaa,” has travelled from Sandymount to Nighttown. After Cissy, Edy Boardman makes an appearance. Finally, the twin boys emerge on a gas lamp: “Tommy Caffrey scrambles to a gaslamp and, clasping, climbs in spasms. […] Jacky Caffrey clasps to climb” (412). What kind of reality is this with the twin boys that we know well enough in the previous episode now climbing a gas lamp in the night district of Dublin? Cissy, Edy, Tommy and Caffrey who belong to the normal world in “Nausicaa,” unexpectedly become characters in a play in “Circe.” Is this not a hallucination? There is no clue at all if this can be read as a fantasy. All of these scenes
happen before the arrival of Bloom; therefore, it is impossible to consider all of these
details Bloom’s fantasy. The appearance of Cissy’s shrill voice reveals that the reality
the reader perceives as reality is already a hallucinated reality, or more exactly, the
level of unreality is the same with the level of reality. This is unreality as much as it is
reality, and the text challenges its hallucinated and realistic reality at the same time. It
is not that the text shifts between reality and unreality as Peake suggests, but that the
text is awash in the discourse of both.

It is worth noting that, although the reader still can track down Bloom by the
place names that Joyce drops in the narrative at the beginning of “Circe,” Dublin
gradually blurs itself and place names are no longer employed. At first, the reader still
knows Bloom’s whereabouts in Nighttown: he appears “on the farther side under the
railway bridge” (412); he passes by “Gillen’s hairdresser’s window” (412) and he halts
“at Antonio Rabaiotti’s door” (413); “he disappears into Olhausen’s, the
porkbutcher’s” (413), then “he emerges from under the shutter” (413), and “he stands
at Cormack’s corner” (423). O’Beirne’s wall is the last real place name that the text
gives out as location of Bloom (apart from Cohen’s brothel where both Stephen and
Bloom stay for a long time). Thereafter, the character’s Global Positioning System is
turned off.

The real-place names on the one hand have a similar function in other
episodes: they signal to the reader that the world of Dublin is as realistic as possible.
On the other hand, they play a very tricky role: they problematize the reading by
referring to the real while the context alerts the reader that this is not real. Despite
what Riquelme proposes, the reader quickly realizes that “‘Circe’ is not organized like
a conventional realistic narrative with seemingly real characters in a recognizable
setting acting and thinking in believable ways” (137). I rather agree with Attridge that
the stage directions play a game with the reader in which they gesture him into the world of the “parareal” without a hint of it in its text. This is the play with realism in the episode, in which “the literary foundation on which the episode rests is one of the most traditional and secure in all of Ulysses” (“Pararealism in ‘Circe’” 122).

Specifically, it clearly offers the name of a character in the play, stage directions, character’s speech and monologue. The conventions of the play and how reality is presented are kept intact, “completely unaffected by the bizarre goings-on it is being deployed to articulate” (Attridge, “Pararealism in ‘Circe’” 122). The proper names work like this: it stubbornly signifies that this Dublin is not hallucinated up while all other factors signify that the real world is left to the fantasized device long ago. It is impossible for the reader to realize the point in the text at which hallucinations begin. There is no way the reader can distinguish a real place with a hallucinated one.

When reading the text of “Circe” from the principle of “stimulus-response” as Peake suggests, the main argument would be that the real world continuously triggers the deepest fantasies and desires in the unconscious world of the characters. This stance claims that all the bizarre factors are preparations for the transformation of Dublin because they trigger numerous states of the unconscious. Although the sinister setting triggers the inner fear of danger and the seductive atmosphere brings about unconscious desires, it is not easy to point out what triggers what in most cases because it is difficult to identify a hallucination in the narrative, and reality will be limited if the reader tries to distinguish between the unrealness and realness. Nevertheless, the introduction of Nighttown, in my reading, is one of the important factors that contribute to the fluidity between the reality and hallucination of Dublin because the out-of-this-world beginning is the contaminated area, paving ways to
Dublin’s later transformations. The world of Dublin in “Circe” is based as much on reality as on unreality.

This undecidable world is termed “parareal” by Derek Attridge – a reality that is “faulty, irregular, disordered, and improper” (“Pararealism in ‘Circe’” 122). Instead of a puzzle-solving approach to reading of “Circe” as a journey in which the reader tries his best to distinguish a real scene from a fantastical one and traces back a hallucination to its original source in the real world, Attridge proposes “simply to accept what the typography and tone tell us” (“Pararealism in ‘Circe’” 123). It means to accept that the realness and unrealness are inherent in the way Joyce depicts reality. It means to accept that Stephen’s dead mother flying through the floor of the brothel is equal to the appearance of Bloom holding a parcel of pig’s crubeen. There is a double standard for every realistic or unrealistic event in the episode. When reality becomes hallucinations, there are no gaps between them and reality is bizarre in itself, just like hallucinations. My reading of this double characteristic of Dublin could support the multiplicity of the episode.

The factors that contribute to the multiplicity of “Circe” are not only the realistic, naturalistic as well as phantasmagorical devices which make up the bulk of uncanny and comic descriptions, but also the arbitrariness of objects and the employment of various discourses and styles. These are the foundations for Joyce to transform stage directions into mini-narratives\(^{50}\) that I will briefly outline as follows. Specifically, the stage directions in this special drama include the third-person narrator who behaves like a narrator in a fiction. This narrator shares his space with the

---

\(^{50}\) See Wales 241-76 for a meticulous examination of stage directions in “Circe” in which she investigates a series of work-play in the episode.
characters when merging both Stephen’s and Bloom’s interior monologues into the stage directions. For example:

(Calling encouraging words he shambles back with a furtive poacher’s tread, dogged by the setter into a dark stalestunk corner. He unrolls one parcel and goes to dump the crubeen softly but holds back and feels the trotter.) Sizeable for threepence. But then I have it in my left hand. Calls for more effort. Why? Smaller from want of use. O, let it slide.

Two and six. (430)

The italic lines above belong to the stage directions while the regular lines are Bloom’s interior monologue. In this passage, they blend together in a manner similar to “Lestrygonians,” in which the narrator provides his descriptions of the outer world then jots down Bloom’s stream of consciousness right after. The stage directions in “Circe” have the form of a drama but the content and techniques of a fiction. The narrator employs various rhetorical devices ranging from word-play to metaphors to hyperbole. For instance, the introductory passage contains only noun phrases such as “the Mabbot street entrance of nighttown,” “rows of flimsy houses with gaping doors,” “rare lamps with faint rainbow fans” (408). Joyce later extends it to full sentences to portray the setting of Mabbot street. Gradually, the stage directions expand significantly into a short story with its autonomous ontology: it includes almost only sentences that construct a whole story. In addition, the number of words increases greatly from a few lines in the beginning to more detailed descriptions and stage directions that totally overwhelm the dialogue. Joyce adds a chunk of text, ranging from 250 words to the maximum of 480 words, in numerous places to describe a scene and then lets the character utter several words. This is best illustrated when Bloom is
cheered by a huge Dublin crowd in a passage including 51 lines of text spanning two pages:

*(Prolonged applause. Venetian masts, maypoles and festal arches spring up. A streamer bearing the legends Cead Mile Failte and Mah Ttob Melek Israel spans the street. [...] The air is perfumed with essences. The men cheer. Bloom’s boys run amid the bystanders with branches of hawthorn and wrenbushes.)* (453-4)

The appearance of this passage reflects its content: the gathering of words mimics the gathering of people and things. The narrative is simply transformed into a dense and heavy chunk of text. The passage reminds the reader of the giant passage at the end of “Wandering Rocks” with all the proper names as oversized empty signifiers. The text collects as many signifiers as possible in the passage above, transforming it into fiction. It behaves as a complex fiction rather than just a normal stage direction with a simple and straightforward style. Additionally, Joyce employs hyperbole to create the uncanny effect, which Fritz Senn points out is how the episode supremely disregards naturalistic limits and changes its essence, by “both augmentation and distortion, of hypertrophy and inceptions” (“‘Circe’ as Harking back in Proventive Arrangement” 65). The greatly exuberant prose flaunts its ability of inclusiveness: “coopers, bird fanciers, millwrights, newspaper canvassers, law scriveners, masseurs, vintners, trussmakers, chimneysweps, lard refiners, tabinet and poplin weavers, farriers, Italian warehousemen, church decorators” (454). The list keeps lengthening to cover all classes and people from all over the region of Ireland. In another tedious passage presenting a dystopic Dublin, Joyce employs overstatement to create arbitrary lists in prose:

The list is very illogical when including objects and things that are irrelevant to each other to reflect the situation of chaos at the end of the world. They are troops, the sound of bells, the screech of whores, the vultures, and barnacle geese. The style of prose is no longer realistic, but mythical. The stage directions in “Circe” burst out of the confines of normal stage directions and evolve into mini-narratives. They blend diverse styles from naturalistic to gothic, mythical, and poetic into one. They collect numerous voices and stories into a play. The genre of “Circe” is all the more problematic: it has the form of a play but also carries many features of other discourses.

The “swelling out of proportion” that Senn mentions in “‘Circe’ as Harking back in Provective Arrangement” is the crucial factor that transforms the episode into an undecidable genre: it is constantly flooded with devices and features that I pointed out above. The text subverts a series of notions about unity: the unity of place and space is shattered due to the multiple settings; the unity of form of a drama is challenged from the transformation of stage directions into mini-fictions; and the unity

---

51 The text also incorporates various consciousnesses into the narrative, rendering it hybrid, and the acting out is not only by the internal consciousness of a single character, but by the whole narrative as it remembers its textuality and consciousness. “Circe” challenges the unity of the consciousness as well, since there is no single consciousness solely presented as the previous chapters might teach the reader, as Fludernik points out, by intermingling various motifs and details from other episodes, Stephen’s as well as Bloom’s. See more about this matter in Fludernik, “Narrative and Its Development in Ulysses” 34.
of time when all the events past and present are conflated together and performed on
the plane of the present. Similar to the genre of “Aeolus,” “Circe” defies any neat
category that theory attempts to impose on a text. The various features of “Circe”’s
text challenges the preemptive notion of what a play should be, and more importantly,
what a fiction should be. Dublin in “Circe” is the most multifarious compared to other
episodes: It is a product of a hybrid consciousness, and is multiplied into different
representations; it is deeply rooted in reality but also embraces unreality; it springs up
from realistic and uncanny details. The textual city is neither in reality nor in a
different world.

**Conclusion**

The examination of various features in the multifarious styles of these four
episodes helps to illustrate how the text shows little reluctance in taking drastic
measures to create new images of Dublin. Specifically, in “Aeolus,” I investigate how
the text pompously mocks the style of the press with the insertion of headlines,
splitting the narrative into two with Dublin as the midpoint between them. The city is
produced mechanically, as if cut off from a consciousness to become a mere symbol.
This parodying style also challenges the genre of the text as fiction when it flexibly
adopts a random style. The text continues on a different adventure in “Wandering
Rocks” when broken down into 19 mini-sections. The accumulation of people, place,
proper names, and the distancing prose generate a strange reality of random objects
and humans, as if being presented on CCTV monitors. The parodying style comes
back again in “Nausicaa” with the sentimental prose and *The Lamplighter* intertext. In
the first half of the episode, Dublin is set up as a twilight zone for a fantasized
romance and is then deflated into a terse and realistic style in Bloom’s interior
monologue in the second half. Dublin becomes two interdependent realities which are
in conversation with each other. “Circe” with its theatrical form, in its turn, renders Dublin differently. The city becomes various settings in which the reality principle is drastically undermined and the unrealness and realness exist on the same plane. The text flaunts a series of interruptions and destabilizations, overthrows the unity of voices, place, space, consciousness, and genre, and prods the reader to reflect on the relationship between reality and art.

In the next chapter, the discussion will centre on the extraordinary style of “Penelope” by pointing out its multifarious styles and voices, to produce the most hybrid Dublin in *Ulysses*. I initially propose that its most remarkable features are the typographical form of the text, the flow of words without punctuations, and the effect of homogeneity. However, the text also carries a number of subtle narrative strands that bear heterogeneity. I posit that there is an ongoing struggle between these two forces. Moreover, a careful textual analysis will assert that Molly dons multiple masks and morphs into various identities which accordingly transform Dublin.
Chapter Five

“Penelope”: A Performing Stage of Voices

First we feel. Then we fall.

James Joyce, FW (627)

The reader reaches the last episode of *Ulysses* that revolves around Molly. The initial focus of this chapter will be the intrusion of Dublin into Molly’s mind despite her sedentary position. I will specifically look at how the three train appearances in her thoughts create a timelessly intruding Dublin. An analytical reading of “Eveline” from *Dubliners* helps to prove that the confined space in which the body is trapped has little impact on how the mind carries out its adventures. Another textual analysis will show how the city becomes remembrance in Molly’s mind, a space of various settings and sexual innuendo; and how Molly shapes her own past and transforms herself into various roles from a distance. This tendency will be explored carefully in the section devoted to how Gibraltar, Molly’s youth place, is constructed as a performing stage for her multiple roles. The last section will center on how Molly conflates places in the past and present whilst keeping a multi-direction in them by the polyloquy and uncertainty in the text. I posit that Molly’s voices and styles are the most kaleidoscopic in *Ulysses* thereby rendering multifarious Dublins.

A-chronological Intruding Dublin

The reader ends *Ulysses* (even though it is very tricky to say that anyone can finish reading the novel) with a brilliant episode consisting of 42 pages of text void of punctuation. He is immediately flung into and is confined wholly in Molly’s mind, the frequently thought-of wife of Mr. Leopold Bloom. While Bloom has travelled, Molly
stays sedentary. The whole chapter features her mind with a body lying mostly in bed at home in the city of Dublin on a sleepless summer night. Compared to other episodes, the time and place of Molly’s monologue are especially important in “Penelope” because they reveal the very environment that surrounds the body and mind of Molly. As for the place, the reader of *Ulysses* does not know the exact location of the Blooms’ house until there is a signal in “Wandering Rocks” when “A card Unfurnished Apartments reappeared on the windowsash of number 7 Eccles street” (224). As for the time, “Penelope” is the only episode in *Ulysses* where the time is unclear. In the Gilbert schema, the scene is “the bed” while the hour is left blank. In the Linati schema, the time slot contains an infinity sign: $\infty$.

Many scholars point out how the physical mobility of the characters in *Ulysses* relates to the narrator: in Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes, the narrators are more active and visible due to their wanderings, but in Molly’s episode, the narrator is narrowed down to zero as she becomes the only voice in the text. Dorrit Cohn summarises this phenomenon in *The Transparent Minds* by one rule: “the less the surrounding world changes (and the less the body moves), the more dispensable the narrator becomes” (311). Cohn also argues that the act of placing Molly’s body in a placid surrounding with limited sensations impinging on her consciousness leads to a wholly subjective interior monologue and that Molly’s monologue is interior not only because of the interior monologue technique but also “[i]n the more literal sense: it is directed to and by the world within” (222). Furthermore, in contending how Molly’s thoughts acquire the status of being “self-center[ed] and therefore self-generative to a
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degree that can hardly be surpassed” (222), Cohn proposes that Molly adheres perfectly to unity of place. These opinions, while heightening the motionlessness of the character, run the risk of overlooking the importance of Dublin in Molly’s stream of conscious by simplifying the outer reality into a few weak stimuli. I suggest that far from a unity of place, the reader experiences various localities in Molly’s thoughts despite her being sedentary. I would like to offer another way of reading Molly’s stationary body and its connection to the representation of Dublin: firstly, due to “Penelope”’s special prose style in which Joyce omits punctuation, turning the episode into 8 giant sentences, the appearance of Dublin is changed accordingly. Secondly, there is an always-there Dublin mediated through Molly’s mind, a city of immediacy, an intruding reality waiting for an opportunity to break into Molly’s monologue. Dublin serves as stimulus to Molly’s thoughts in the most surprising manner. This is not much different from the way Dublin triggers the inner world in Bloom’s mind during his wanderings, albeit to a lesser degree in Molly’s case.

Criticism, when dealing with the style of the last episode, often seeks for a dominant metaphor and dubs Molly’s monologue as a stream, a flow, and a sea, as noted by Derek Attridge (“Molly’s Flow” 93-116). For example, Richard Ellmann in his biography of James Joyce asserts that:

The rarity of capital letters and the run-on sentences in Molly’s monologue are of course related to Joyce’s theory of her mind (and of the female mind in general) as a flow, in contrast to the series of short jumps made by Bloom. (James Joyce 376)

Similarly, Roy K. Gottfried in The Art of Joyce’s Syntax claims:
If Bloom and Stephen, in their singularity and in their interchange, seem to represent language’s two principles, Molly might represent the extreme of language at its loosest and most flowing. (35)

On the contrary, Derek Attridge points out that the appearance of the text as flow is only an optical illusion:

[the sense of an unstoppable onward movement ignoring all conventional limits is derived from the language, not as it supposedly takes shape in a human brain, but as it is presented on the page […] In showing how the chapter’s graphic techniques give rise to the idea of undifferentiated continuity which is then transferred to Molly’s mind. (“Molly’s Flow” 105)

The visual aspect of the text on the page makes the reader imagine that the chapter is continuity and consider Molly’s monologue an unstoppable liquid stream overflowing and on its way conflating all places, time, things, and people into one textual artefact. However, in my reading, the episode bears an intrinsic oscillation between two seminal poles: homogeneity and heterogeneity. The homogeneity of “Penelope” comes from the uniformity of the visual form, the stream, and the flow of the text as I discussed above. This very form creates an unchanging impression to the reader that the text consists of no variation of properties and maintains a constant tone from beginning to end. This effect is created by a lack of punctuation, verbless noun phrases, consistency of the verbs in past tense, and the hegemony of the pronouns “I” and “He.” All these factors contribute to and strengthen a uniform text by powerfully gesturing to the concept of a single voice, conflating time, space and place into one, and consuming every alterity. Nevertheless, there is another integral pole: that is, the
heterogeneity and non-uniform factors that compose the narrative: they are the different styles, voices and various rhetorical tropes that the illusionary and consistent pronoun “I” employs. These two factors create differences and uncertainties in the text. My examination of Dublin as well as Gibraltar will be an oscillating study of these two poles. On the one hand, I will dissect the narrative to single out the fragmentary representations of Dublin in which many voices and styles are employed. On the other hand, I will point out in these very representations another gesture of the narrative, which is the conflating effect that mixes the space and time as well as past and present of Dublin and Gibraltar.

Dublin in “Penelope” is a collection of fragmentary places glued together in a stream. The unity of space is strengthened and shattered at the same time: in the stream, it is a unity but in the reading process of the reader, it is split. This is an inherent paradox. Instead of encountering a single united place that appears altogether in time, the reader has to meet it surrounded by other places, things and people in the sticky prose. In order to separate them, the reader will need to fill in the necessary punctuations, combine words into intelligible orders, and divide the chunks of text into small sentences. The act of reading is thus more troublesome compared to other chapters. In order to single out the moments Dublin is incited or interrupts Molly’s stream of consciousness, I will need to first dissect the narrative. In my examination, the physical world of Dublin intrudes into Molly’s monologue 6 times in total: the train whistles 3 times, the nearby church bells chime 2 times, and the old press creaks once. Firstly, I will look at how the whistling train comes in and out of Molly’s mind.

The train’s first arrival is at the beginning of the third sentence. At the end of the second sentence, Molly lies in bed recalling her sexual intercourse with Boylan in vivid details and counting the days to Monday so she can meet him again. Suddenly,
an explosion of strange letters breaks out in the text in a meaningless
“frseeeeeeefronnnng” and after this sound-word, the train comes whistling:

frseeeeeeefronnnng train somewhere whistling the strength those
engines have in them like big giants and the water rolling all over and
out of them all sides like the end of Loves old sweet sonnnng (706)

What Molly does in the pause between these two sentences is hard to identify: she
might have dozen off then wakes when she hears the whistling train, or the train might
have intruded in her thoughts about Boylan and made her turn a different direction.
Either way, the advent of the train is unexpected and powerful enough to stop her
current of thoughts. There are three steps in the transformation of the physical world
by Molly’s language. An examination of it could help to illustrate the mutual effect
between the intruding physical world and Molly’s mind. Firstly, Molly earlier calls
Boylan “the savage brute” (706) and with the train’s arrival, she immediately refers to
it as “the strength those engines have in them like big giants.” Her vivid memory
colours the physical world and the analogy of savageness between her lover and the
train is evident with the excited and aroused tone of her voice. After that, Molly
imagines “the water rolling all over and out of them all sides like the end of Loves old
sweet sonnnng”: she creates a bizarre analogy between the outer world with the ending
of the song. Finally, the ending of the song itself is distorted by the sound of the train,
concluding as “sweet sonnnng.” The interaction of the inner world and the outer world
is apparent and comes to the forefront of the narrative. Dublin becomes an event in her
reverie, connecting past memories with the present as well as making new reflections:
the train triggers Molly to think of the men working on the train. Additionally, she
calls the train “those roasting engines,” (706) linking her present with earlier thoughts
when she confesses, “I feel all fire inside me,” (705) and this, in its turn, associates to
other memories that she lists: the stifling hot afternoon and how she burned the old newspapers (706). The free association principle in Molly’s monologue works the same way as in Stephen’s and Bloom’s. The physical world undeniably serves as the stimulus for Molly’s thoughts: It provides data for the contemplation and imagination.

Whilst in sentence 1 and 2, Dublin as an immediate reality is almost absent from Molly’s world, it is prominent in sentence 3 in the way it transmutes her whole realm into two onomatopoeic words, one created by her and one influenced by a song.

The second time the train arrives in Molly’s thoughts is as abrupt as the first. While Molly is recalling her sexual experiences with her first love and Gardner, another word interrupts the narrative, this time in a much more heightened and impressing form with the letter “e” repeated 20 times. The linguistic imitation of the physical world is stronger but still bizarre, unpronounceable and meaningless. The typographic effect sends a mixed signal to the reader: Does it mean that the train is coming nearer or does Molly want to emphasize that the noisy train disturbs her flow again?

. . . I can see his face clean shaven Frseeeeeeereeeeeeeeeeefrong that train again weeping tone once in the dear deaead days beyondre call close my eyes breath my lips forward kiss sad look eyes open piano ere oer the world the mists began I hate that istsbeg comes loves sweet ssooooooong (713)

The transformation of the physical world happens in the same way as the first time: earlier Molly is thinking of “Gardner going to south Africa where those Boers killed him with their war and fever […] bad luck” (713) and this saddening memory colours the tone of her thought, making it a “weeping” train, signalling that reminiscing is at
work. However, one problem appears here: are this train and the earlier train the same one? In Molly’s mind, they are the one; she calls it “that train again.” It is impossible to know how much time has passed between the first and the second hearing of the sound of the train. Still, the textual gap between them is 4,114 words. It is hard to imagine a train that can travel that long in the span of a passage including that many words and memories. I rather suggest this is another train that intrudes into her mind. This train in turn starts a new direction of thoughts when Molly recalls her singing experiences with other singers. The train blends with the lyrics and her memory ends again with the conclusion of the song but with the letter “o” repeated.

The last time the train whistles, Molly wishes Bloom would sleep somewhere else and this time the association with the song “Love’s Old Sweet Song,” happens again, due not mainly to the train, but to a mixture of train, fart, and song:

I wish hed sleep in some bed by himself with his cold feet on me give us room even to let a fart God or do the least thing better yes hold them like that a bit on my sidep iano quietly sweeeeee theres that train far away pianissismo eeeeee one more song (714)

This time, “there that train far away” is indeed the same train with the second hearing: they are apart by 512 words. The third time the train appears, it changes Molly’s thoughts before she has enough time to inform us: the word “sweeeeee” comes first then the reader gets, “theres that train far away,” and finally “pianissimo eeeeee one more song.” Molly distorts words, adding more letter “e”s into her reverie; the physical world is blending with her physical body, and a song is singing in her mind.

Despite being motionless in the three occasions that the trains come and go, Dublin still plays an important role in Molly’s mind as the outer reality: it not only
interrupts the flow of her thoughts, but also intensifies and transforms her memories at the same time. The absence of a constant and intense physical world, unlike Bloom receiving persistent stimuli from the modern urban metropolis, is a positive force that contributes to the heightened impact on the nerves of the character when suddenly that physical world emerges, takes shape, and breaks into the mind. The strong effect is ostensibly reflected in Molly’s distorted onomatopoeia. The body kept in a calm surrounding, thus, is a favorable environment for the mind to travel out and far away, shifting between various moods and places.

The problem of identifying whether the first train is the same as the second train as I propose above is due to the one important feature of the narrative: the unknown time. The reader, who is in the same shoes as Molly and wholly limited to her mind, when she confesses, “I never know the time even that watch he gave me never seems to go properly” (699), is never able to tell what time it is in the whole text. Time in “Penelope” is never specifically presented and countable by a clock but is instead a stream, with no beginning and end as Joyce tells Harriet Weaver that “Penelope has no beginning, middle or end” (Letters I 172). The reader is flung into a seamless flow of thoughts presented by not only the absence of punctuations but also the irregularity of syntax; and he follows the text’s rhythm rather than the linearity of time with sequences in which he can easily distinguish which event happens in the present or in the past. Molly’s monologue not only shatters the unity of space but also of time in that she blends every socially-constructed conception such as time, space, and place into a mixture.

Nevertheless, there might be one moment when the text reveals to the reader what specific time it is when the physical Dublin infringes into Molly’s mind. That is the first time she hears the chiming bells of the nearby church. Reflecting on their
family’s downfall with numerous house moves, Molly recalls how Bloom lost his jobs in “Thoms and Helys and Mr Cuffes and Drimmies” (722) and is afraid he might lose his current job too and suddenly,

wait theres Georges church bells wait 3 quarters the hour wait 2 oclock well thats a nice hour of the night for him to be coming home at to anybody climbing down into the area if anybody saw him Ill knock him off that little habit tomorrow (722)

The George’s church bells strike and Molly realizes that it is now 2 o’clock and this swerves her thoughts into a disparaging comment on how late her husband came home that night: “thats a nice hour of the night for him to be coming home” (722). These chiming bells remind the reader that Bloom also hears the same bells at the end of “Calypso”: “A creak and a dark whirr in the air high up. The bells of George's church” (67). These two incidents reveal how Joyce uses bells as one of the devices in the text to kill off any floating forms that hint to a fictive world that I discuss in chapter 3. In “Penelope” the time reference is totally destroyed: the reader is overwhelmed by Molly’s stream of thoughts in which time becomes time-less. Even when Molly hears another chiming, she is not able to know what time it is and the reader is not either:

thats the only way a quarter after what an unearthly hour I suppose theyre just getting up in China now combing out their pigtails for the day well soon have the nuns ringing the angelus theyve nobody coming in to spoil their sleep except an odd priest or two for his night office the alarmclock next door at cockshout clattering the brains out of itself let me see if I can doze off 1 2 3 4 5 (730)
While deep in a reverie in which she plans to excite her husband to extort money from him, the bells chiming meaning “a quarter,” Molly breaks from her plan to wonder about how people get up in China, the nuns and the alarm clock next door. The text informs that “a quarter after what an earthly hour” to signal that Molly hears the chiming bell once again, not from a clock as Blamires suggests in the *New Bloomsday Guide* (199). The reader does not get any more information beyond this: “a quarter after” means that it might be 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, or 5:15. Still, it is impossible to know this is 2:15 o’clock or 5:15’ o’clock even though Molly supposes that “the nuns ringing the angelus” (the angelus prayer is recited daily at 6 o’clock in the morning and it is not logical to assert that the time is 5:15’ since Molly is not certain at all about it.) The gap in the text between the first time she hears the bells and the second time is 4,637 words. Additionally, the reader never knows the speed of Molly’s thoughts, making time in “Penelope” an absolutely empty conception. The world of Dublin does strike into her mind several times, interrupting her thoughts so that Molly as well as the reader sinks into a time-less world. Whilst the Dublins of Stephen and Bloom are constructed from their actual encounters with the city during their rambles that single day, Molly’s Dublin emerges with her being immobile in her bed: and yet Dublin still serves as an intruding reality breaking her reminiscences.

To read *Ulysses* along with other works by Joyce is a useful way to shed a mutually illuminating light on them. The theme of the confined space of body in an unspecific time in which a character carries out the act of crossing beyond any boundary of present and past is featured once in an early short story by Joyce in *Dubliners*, “Eveline.” The protagonist keeps her body in a single, motionless position throughout the story. There is even a reasonable reading of the ending of the story that Eveline does not come to the seaport and that it is merely her illusion. The
determination to “betray the soul of that hemiplegia or paralysis” (Letters I 55) is literally and rhetorically reflected in the character Eveline. Beyond any doubts, the majority of the story “Eveline” happens in her mind and her thoughts smoothly and randomly glide from one topic to another. The beginning passage introduces the position of Eveline’s body as well as her activity: “She sat at the window watching the evening invade the avenue” (D 25). Motionless, Eveline watches the outer world revolving, people passing by, footsteps echoing, the sun setting, and recalls past events. Looking at a man crossing by to the new red houses, she reflects on how they were in the old days and how everything has changed in the present. The circle of watching-hearing-recalling is repeated and the text then adds, “Down far in the avenue she could hear a street organ playing” (D 28). The music reminds her of a similar incident when she heard a melancholy tune and prompts her to remember a promise to her mother. The world of Dublin keeps breaking in Eveline’s mind, and memories run without end. In this very short story, Joyce depicts Eveline’s remembrance of her mother and the past despite her momentary imprisonment with the technique of free indirect discourse. Eveline and Molly share a common characteristic that is the agile mobility of the mind regardless of the motionlessness of the body and the constant intrusion of the physical world into the inner world. Even though the outer world plays a minor and inferior role on the surface, its presence can play a fundamental role in the characters’ thoughts and in shaping their minds.

The journey from Eveline to Molly is a long one, in which the development of various experiments in styles including Gerty’s in “Nausicaa” could belong to an intermediate stage. In “Eveline,” the third-person narrator is prominent and the use of

53 Eugene O’Brien sharply notes the circularity in the logic by the motionless position of Eveline at both the beginning and the end of the story. (50)
free indirect discourse is infrequent; the prose starts mimicking the patterns in which the character speaks and thinks; besides, in Eveline’s mind, the past is overwhelming and fantasy is limited. In “Nausicaa,” free indirect discourse is prevailing and infectious, creating a seemingly completely new territory for Gerty’s thoughts and fantasies. The tumescent and detumescent technique is inherent in Gerty’s style, betraying her vacillations of moods, revealing the gap between her constructed identity and reality. Finally, coming to “Penelope,” the narrator is cancelled out, leaving nothing in the narrative but traces of Molly’s voices in a seamless time. Molly becomes a collection of vocalized voices, a plurality in voice, performing alone on the stage. I will return to this later.

The act of shifting perspectives and creating various fantasies is inherent in the different voices that Molly employs in her consciousness. Alexandra Anyfanti, by applying Henri Bergon’s duration theory in the reading of time in this episode, asserts that: “It seems as if the gates of her mind are set decisively open so that it can expand multi-directionally, allowing in that way an unprecedented torrent of matter and memory” (“Time, Space, and Consciousness in James Joyce’s Ulysses”). Multi-direction is undeniably the best way to read Dublin in “Penelope” because the city is remembered, recreated, constructed, and relived in Molly’s contemplations. Dublin not only darts into Molly’s mind but also transforms and blends her thought as well. Despite the physical limitation of Molly in “Penelope,” Molly traverses the city of Dublin multiple times. She crosses over not only the limitations of space to visit numerous places of Dublin and Gibraltar, but also those of time when conflating present and past. David Hayman also notes how Molly’s mind makes no distinction

54 See Attridge (“Reading Joyce” 1-27) for an insightful analysis of the technique free indirect discourse in “Eveline".
between the two (“The Empirical Molly” 124). In the next part, I will investigate how the Dublin of her past emerges in the narrative, and how the oscillation between homogeneity and heterogeneity is carried out via the struggle between the multi-directions in her voices and the conflating effect of the text.

**Remembrance of Dublin in the Past**

In this section I explore how Dublin is constructed from Molly’s memories, ranging from various locations of the Blooms’ houses, to her encounters with other male Dubliners, to her few daily activities around Dublin. In her reminiscence, the reader gets a glimpse of the Blooms’ places around Dublin, as well as the city as the platform for her courting days with Bloom, from Molly’s perspective. It could be said that place names in memory appear in a vastly different manner from the ones in a narrated story. In Bloom’s episodes, the third-person narrator who reports Bloom’s whereabouts frequently mentions place names, thus making them immediate and rendered from a moving eye. They logically belong to the walking routes of the character. In “Penelope,” they materialize from Molly’s recollections, and are randomly and whimsically evoked. The only relation between them is that they are personally significant to Molly. For example, the Dublin Bakery Company is conjured because Molly and Bloom once had tea there and it is the place where Molly met Boylan for the first time (696). Lombard Street West is mentioned because this is where the Blooms lived for a long time, or Whitefriars Street Chapel appears because Molly lit a candle to wish for luck there (693). They are place names in memory, not the reported ones from the streets that the characters are roaming on. Even though wholly evoked in her recollections, Dublin place names tossed about in the monologue still create a realistic sense of the city, similar to their function in other chapters. In my examination, there are 46 place names of Dublin in total in this episode. On one level
of significance, they refer to the city of Dublin. On another level, they refer to how Dublin is reconstructed. Molly in some cases does not even remember the name of the place that she once visited, and refers to them in a vague way, such as “the museum in Kildare street” (721), or “the jews temples garden” (692). As a result, Dublin is not narrated but remembered.

Molly offers other aspects of Dublin: her Dublin helps to shed a new light on the Dublin of Bloom. On the one hand, Bloom’s memories about various places in Dublin vibrantly resonate in Molly’s thoughts: They are the sweet recollections of their romantic relationship before marriage at Dolphin’s Barn, and Howth. On the other hand, the reader experiences what I call the Rashomon effect of Dublin when comparing and contrasting the Dublin in Molly’s eyes and in Bloom’s eyes. The contradictory experiences of the city are exposed in the way Molly thinks of their miserable moments when the family was on the rocks at Holles Street, as well as her reflections on multiple homes that they moved in and out in the old days. By constructing her Dublin, Molly also emerges as an actress on a performing stage with multiple roles: in their courtship and early marriage days, she was a girl who experienced instant and fervent feelings towards Bloom, a blissful girl who was in love and received a wonderful kiss, a partner doing arcane sexual positions for her husband, a wife critical of her husband who continuously lost jobs and habitations. Molly fondly remembers and cherishes the time when Bloom was her suitor. The first time they met each other at Mat Dillon’s becomes a legendary moment for both of them:

he excited me I dont know how the first night ever we met when I was living in Rehoboth terrace we stood staring at one another for about 10 minutes as if we met somewhere (721)
In that moment time stood still, and the scene is romantically performed in Molly’s mind with Leopold and Molly as an actor and an actress playing being struck by love at first sight and looking at each other as if they have known each other before. (I will discuss this sentimentalist tendency and Molly’s role in it as a fabricated role in the latter part.) Strangely, this feeling of fate and these passionate emotions echo strongly in Bloom’s memories, and become one of the rare shared moments between the two that are still kept intact in their hearts after many difficult years: “First night when first I saw her at Mat Dillon’s in Terenure. Yellow, black lace she wore. Musical chairs. We two the last. Fate. After her. Fate” (264). Molly also fondly recalls Bloom’s kiss at Dolphin’s Barn “the night he kissed my heart at Dolphins barn I couldnt describe it simply it makes you feel like nothing on earth” (699) while Bloom confuses the place where it happened with another place\textsuperscript{55}: “Nightstock in Mat Dillon's garden where I kissed her shoulder. Wish I had a full length oilpainting of her then. June that was too I wooed” (359). To Bloom, this memory is a confusion of bitterness and sweetness that highlights the chasm between the golden courtship time and the present of him being a cuckold: his happy days always have a then-and-now dimension. While with Molly, it could be said that her recollections are more or less a force that swings back and forth effortlessly between various places, spaces, times, and people. The stream of her thoughts brings everything onto a same plane of the present. Molly, more often than not, lends her present voice to a past situation.

One of the places that Molly frequently mentions in the reverie is Lombard West Street, and a comparison of Molly’s and Bloom’s memories in this place shows how their past home means differently to them. John Henry Raleigh in \textit{The Chronicle}

\textsuperscript{55} John Henry Raleigh notes that this is 86: a fused memory on Bloom’s part; he puts together the first night at Mat Dillon’s and the night of the charades at the Doyle’s. (86)
of Leopold and Molly Bloom offers a brilliant summary of their house addresses in a chronological order and suggests that “There was a geographical dimension to the years of happiness” (130). In earlier chapters, Bloom thinks of Lombard Street West numerous times during his ramblings (7 times in total), considering it the apex of their happiness, and most of his loving memories are attached to this place. For example, in “Lestrygonians,” he bitterly and nostalgically recalls how happy he was when they were living on this street: “I was happier then. Or was that I? or am I now I? Twentyeight I was. She twentythree when we left Lombard street west something change. Could never like it again after Rudy” (160). Lombard Street stays in Bloom’s mind as their Eden, their happiest days. Raleigh also argues specifically that, “[s]trictly speaking, the last happy days were on Raymond Terrace” (130). However, since the misery of losing his son after only eleven days of life, the place has become a lane of bitter memories. Despite the happiest moments being at Raymond Terrace, some of the unhappiest days were there, too. Some unconscious twist of nostalgia then displaces what happiness there was to earlier days on Lombard Street. My reading of this allegory of a Fall and Expulsion from Eden is much influenced by him. More than one time, he utters the word “happy” and visits this old home with dearest feelings and detailed recollections:

Swish and soft flop her stays made on the bed. Always warm from her.

Always liked to let her self out. Sitting there after till near two taking out her hairpins. Milly tucked up in beddyhouse. Happy. Happy. That was the night... (149)

The perfect image of a happy family haunts Bloom, especially now when his daughter is away and his wife is going to cheat on him, and he constructs it as a stark opposition between past and present. Contrary to Bloom, Molly’s reminiscence about Lombard
Street cannot be more trivial yet neutral from her perspective. She thinks of this home 4 times in total: “when he asked to take off my stockings lying on the hearthrug in Lombard street” (697); “the day old frostyface Goodwin called about the concert in Lombard street and I just after dinner all flushed and tossed with boiling old stew” (699); “how many houses were we in at all Raymond terrace and Ontario terrace and Lombard street and Holles street” (722); “the wallpaper in Lombard street was much nicer” (730). In Molly’s mind, this place is not the apex of their happiness; it is not bad either: it is just like many other places. That is the place where Bloom asked for an unusual sex style and where they had nice wallpaper. More important, as Raleigh points out, it is the starting point of the downfall of the couple, emotionally as well as economically, since they left this address: “the memory of leaving Lombard Street for Raymond Terrace sticks in Molly's mind as the beginning of the Blooms’ Odyssey around Dublin” (125). Molly ruefully reflects on this bitter journey, yet still goes on about their life with a list of place names:

God here we are as bad as ever after 16 years how many houses were we in at all Raymond terrace and Ontario terrace and Lombard street and Holles street […] and then the City Arms hotel worse and worse (722)

These past homes are the same as the present home, “here we are as bad as ever”, a series of ruins. Molly appears here as a wife critical of her husband’s responsibility for various lowly situations. The span of 16 years of living and moving, of losing jobs and losing habitations in Dublin is reduced to a list of place names. This collection of proper names, instead of having the effect of being giant yet empty signifiers as in the ending passage in “Wandering Rocks,” or the crowding effect of passages in
“Aeolus,” presents Dublin as an unstable environment in which each place name is evoked as a sad moment in their life in Molly’s eyes.

Molly mentions their bad financial situations many times, especially about the time when they were living at Holles Street. Another interesting thing I find out when comparing their attitudes towards and memories of their past homes is that while Bloom mentions Holles Street only one time, “Ten bob I got for Molly's combings when we were on the rocks in Holles Street” (353), Molly thinks of Holles Street five times in total: “when he said I could pose for a picture naked to some rich fellow in Holles street” (704); “there was a nice fellow even in the opposite house that medical in Holles street” (708); “I wouldnt let him lick me in Holles street one night” (723); “the night he borrowed the swallowtail to sing out of in Holles street squeezed and squashed into them” (724). During the whole day, Bloom hardly recalls the time his family was “on the rocks”, and when he does, Bloom thinks of Molly as a whore when he hypothesizes that Boylan gave Molly money. To Molly, however, that was the dark time in their life when she had to work to earn money after Bloom lost his job in Hely’s, “I was selling the clothes and strumming in the coffee palace” (704). Bloom casually mentions the financial situation but in Molly’s eyes, reader is informed how serious it was. The reader only hears Bloom’s thoughts about their blissful days but can never be aware of the unstable conditions of the Blooms until the last chapter in Molly’s summary: Dublin with her is also a list of residential moves and wanderings, a downfall leading to dullness and monotony.

Moreover, in 3 out of 5 times Molly mentions Holles Street, she recalls sexual incidents related to this place: when she was asked to pose naked by Bloom for a picture, when she took interested in a medical student, and when Bloom asked her to let him perform oral sex on her. Based on these memories, I deduce one noteworthy
characteristic: Molly tends to remember places that are attached to her sexual activities. This leads me to examine other places of Dublin mentioned in Molly’s monologue to see whether they are related to sexual activities and her body or not. The result is that out of 46 places names in total, there are 24 places related to Molly’s sexual incidents. Apart from 5 place names that relate to the everyday life and household activities such as buying flowers, cakes, or clothes, Dublin in Molly’s mind is overwhelmed by sexual thoughts, aligning the sexual dimension closely with the geography of the city. This association pattern renders her body parts and the city’s parts two intermingled realities. Dublin becomes a sexual web where each place triggers her various sexual encounters and a space of libidinal remembrances where Molly recalls her past with lovers and romantic relationships. For instance, examining the way Molly conflates the body part with the place part in retelling her confession to Father Corrigan is very important to see how she considers them as one: “he touched me father and what harm if he did where and I said on the canal bank like a fool but whereabouts on your person my child on the leg behind” (693). The answer for the first question “where” is the place, and rather than the body it is “the canal bank” that is provoked before “the leg behind.” As Richard Brown points out, “Moreover it seems given as an aspect of Molly’s psychology for her to make an insistent demonstrative display of the location, the ‘where’ of her body, frequently her erotic body” (“Body Words” 115). The place in which a sexual incident happened is remembered first, before the body part is presented. Thus, the “where” of place goes hand in hand with the “where” on Molly’s body. Furthermore, the precise locations of the erotic associations are often stated clearly in Molly’s thoughts. For instance, she recalls how Professor Goodwin “commenced kissing me on the choir stairs” and imagines bringing Bloom “and show him the very place too” (697). Dublin in her
remembrance is a network of sexual and personal inductions. The Dublin Bakery Company (D. B. C.) is no longer a neutral and objective place, but one where Boylan first notices her feet. The Tolka River is mentioned because it is where Boylan gives her hands a squeeze. The blending and distorting places are always in progress in Molly’s monologue.

Additionally, Dublin in Bloom’s mind as a dating environment only has 2 places: Dolphin’s Barn and Mat Dillon’s, yet Molly vividly recalls their lovemaking at Harold’s Cross Road while Bloom strangely does not: This is the very place Milly was conceived. Dublin, under the force of her remembrances, is transformed into the romantically flirtatious space for the loving couple. The details of her trysts in the courting days with him are vividly invoked: from the meeting places to the sexual intercourse localities: it was at Dolphin’s Barn that Bloom kissed her heart (698-9), it was along Kenilworth Square that Bloom kissed her “in the eye of my glove,” (697) or at the corner of Harold’s Cross Road where they secretly consummated their love:

when he saw me from behind following in the rain […] I could feel him coming along skulking after me his eyes on my neck […] he pestered me to say yes till I took off my glove slowly watching him he said my openwork sleeves were too cold for the rain […] for it if anyone was passing so I lifted them a bit and touched his trousers outside […] (698)

In the passage, Molly relives her memory by casting her and Bloom in a romantic scene: lovers, under the rain, sensually making love. Molly recalls how Bloom insisted that she lift her petticoat in the rain and Molly became a girl who knows to pamper her lover and was curious to see Bloom’s body but hesitant at the same time because they were in an open space. The prose becomes pressing as if to reflect the situation of a couple doing an intimate act in the rain under many public eyes. Molly adds one detail
about how her father was waiting for her at home, making the situation all the more urgent (698). She also reveals how Bloom had a tendency towards exhibitionism while she was a totally naïve partner. A sense of feminism as well as a victimized penchant is thereby revealed: on the one hand, right before this incident, Molly expressed her mild indignation towards men in general, who can go and do whatever they like while demanding to know everything about where women plan to go (698), and offers her subtle criticism towards Bloom; on the other hand, she transformed herself into a coy and shy girl complying with the man’s pестering.

Places of Dublin are not only the real places in Molly’s memory but also fantasized sites which she constructs according to her desires and where she casts herself in different roles. One prominent guise of Dublin in her daydream is the setting of secret love-making with anonymous men on streets:

I was thinking would I go around by the quays there some dark evening where nobodyd know me and pick up a sailor off the sea thatd be hot on for it and not care a pin whose I was only do it off up in a gate somewhere or one of those wildlooking gipsies in Rathfarnham […] that blackguardlooking fellow with the fine eyes peeling a switch attack me in the dark and ride me up against the wall without a word (727)

Molly carefully builds up the background for her fantasy details by meticulous details, from place (“by the quays”) to time (“some dark evening”) to character (“a sailor off the sea”) to the intercourse position (“up in a gate”) or in another fantasy with “wildlooking gypsies,” “in the dark,” “against the wall.” The language creates a mysterious atmosphere with unknown, dangerous, and quiet men who are seminal to the degree of erotica. Additionally, these men’s sexual acts are coercive in nature and the language reveals the tendency of sexual violence: “do it off up in a gate,” “attack
[...] in the dark, “ride [...] up against the wall.” Alyssa O’Brien is right in “The Molly Blooms of ‘Penelope’” when noting that this dark fantasy is written in a Gothic style. Furthermore, Molly projects herself as the subject who takes the initiative in finding a sexual partner to submit to as a docile, passive, and nameless object. In her fantasy, she is transformed into a victim who is under attack, who is helpless as to be ridden “up against the wall.” Even though there are three identical “I”s in the passage above, they are cast in three different voices and roles. The first “I” is the author of the fantasy in which the second “I” carries out the action and the final “I” slowly becomes the object that dons the mask of “me”56. Molly’s memories, moreover, are often predicated from a distance. While her mind is on Dublin, Molly casts herself into numerous roles and often sets a distance between her and the role that she plays. In Gibraltar, she fabricates herself more freely and openly. In the next part, I would like to see how Gibraltar is constructed in Molly’s memory and more importantly how it can shed light on her Dublin now. Gibraltar is not Gibraltar but a reference to Dublin, that is my argument.

**Gibraltar as the Other Dublin**

Richard Brown in “Molly’s Gibraltar” offers an estimate that the text dedicated to Gibraltar in Molly’s monologue accounts for “around a fifth to a quarter” of “Penelope” (158). In my own examination, Gibraltar accounts for a sixth of “Penelope”: 4,286 words of the 24,286-word episode. Gibraltar is indeed another place in *Ulysses*. Many critics have offered their reading of Gibraltar: for instance, Phillip F. Herring studies how Joyce uses the Gibraltar directory and “The Traveller’s Hand-

56 Alyssa J. O’Brien brilliantly points out the difference between the identical “I”’s and my reading of places in “Penelope” is highly influenced by her examination of how Molly constructs her identity in various styles.
Book for Gibraltar by An Old Inhabitant” to quote real place names and people, while Richard Browns examines the accuracy of Molly’s Gibraltar compared to the real Gibraltar, and proposes how the reader finds a symbolic reading as the place of reading, or alterity (164). I would like to add two more notes to the reading of Gibraltar: firstly, Joyce tries to give a realistic image of Gibraltar and secondly, Joyce undermines this very attempt in the narrative. I want to especially look at how Gibraltar connects to Dublin, how while serving as the Other Place it can link back to the present and helps the reader see Dublin under Molly’s eyes more clearly.

In the mere 4,286-word material focusing on Gibraltar, Joyce uses 32 real place names which randomly dart in Molly’s memory. Apart from them, Joyce also drops many names of real historical Gibraltar people, similar to the way he constructs Dublin. While Dublin is recreated from Joyce’s own experience as well as from numerous sources such as newspapers, correspondences, the Thom’s directory, Gibraltar is built wholly outside of that realm, as Brown observes, “they open up a window on a Ulysses the depth and detailed particularity of whose locations are constructed by such researched use of published documents” (164). In my opinion, this is the very reason that the text produces two different senses of place between Dublin and Gibraltar. Because of his confidence in constructing an authentic Dublin, Joyce did not feel the need to supply any detail or description of the city to the reader. However, in order to create verisimilitude of a strange place that he had never visited before, a place existing in his imagination merely through books, Joyce fell into the traditional pattern of flooding the narrative with numerous imagined details. For instance, this is a typical passage dedicated to Gibraltar:

its like those names in Gibraltar Delapaz Delagracia they had the devils queer names there father Vial plana of Santa Maria that gave me the
The reader recognizes the effort of listing to make it real: the details of Gibraltar overflow the narrative all at once, and Molly continuously uses “and” to list her torrent of things in Gibraltar, ranging from people’s names (Delapaz, Delagracia, Father Vial plana of Santa Maria, Rosales, O’Reilly, Pisimbo, Mrs Opisso) to place names (Governor Street, the Calle las Siete Revueltas, Paradise Ramp and Bedlam Ramp and Rodger’s Ramp and Crutchett’s Ramp) to various races (the Greeks and the Jews and the Arabs) to vague descriptions of places (the auctions in the morning, the fowl market all clucking). The reader gets an impression that Molly is trying to flaunt, unnaturally, her memories of Gibraltar.

On the one hand, the reader gets a realistic representation of the place through the names of people, places and events; on the other hand, the surplus of details makes him suspicious about this place. At the beginning of the novel, the reader who is familiar with the conventions of classical novels and expects to encounter numerous imaginative details and clues in fictions writing about a place would find Ulysses strange and disappointing. As I have analysed in the third chapter, Ulysses rejects any expectation of the reader in finding the imaginative clues: Joyce offers little to no description of Dublin and its cityscape. In “Penelope,” Joyce breaks this contract on writing on place (and other contracts as well) again when presenting Gibraltar by a very different method. Whilst writing about Dublin, there is never a single chance where Joyce uses a vague term like “all the queer little streets,” (732) for all streets...
must be named; while writing about Gibraltar, every rule is subverted. One of the reasons that I suggest for this broken convention is that these flows of Gibraltar’s things seem like Molly’s answer to the question, “so what do you remember about that place? Answer me, prove to me that you once lived there and you know that place by heart.” Accordingly, Molly blurts out her answer as a proof. The suddenly intense and vehement stream of details from Molly becomes abnormal, transforming her into an involuntary speaker in this scene. This very passage suggests to me the possibility of a listener, an invisible interlocutor in “Penelope.” I will return to this later.

It could be argued that Gibraltar is seen from the blurry eyes of Molly’s memory, and is weak and vague due to the workings of memory. Vagueness is the prominent clue for the reader to see that Joyce is indeed unfamiliar with the place and gets nervous when writing about it. Gibraltar is not in the same contract of writing about place as *Ulysses* is about Dublin. Nevertheless, this very vagueness proves to be beneficial to Joyce: a territory of capacity is opened when writing about it. I would go further to argue that Gibraltar is constructed not as a single entity, where the reader puts definite labels on the sensuous warm place of youth or the place of the sun and the sea. Rather, Gibraltar is constructed as numerous stages for Molly to perform on and this is the most vital factor contributing to the diversity and plurality of styles and voices in “Penelope.” Molly, flexibly, is a heroine in a cheap Victorian novel, a girl in a sentimentalist romance, or an actress in a farewell scene. For instance, in the following passage, Gibraltar is cast in the role of a kitschy environment in a love story. Molly retells her first meeting with Mulvey in a very sentimental style:

he was watching me whenever he got an opportunity at the band on the Alameda esplanade when I was with father and captain Grove I looked up at the church first and then at the windows then down and our eyes
met I felt something go through me like all needles my eyes were
dancing I remember after when I looked at myself in the glass hardly
recognized myself (707)

The reader immediately detects a vibrant Gerty trace in the above passage: the story
dons a mask of fantasy reeking in popular discourses: the man is lurking and seeking
for a chance to approach the girl; there are always obstacles hindering the meeting of
the youthful couple, and in this case they are the father and Captain Grove; the girl is
depicted as an object being watched; the meeting place is the church; and there is a
fateful magical moment when “our eyes met.” Molly goes into dramatic details about
how this moment transforms her body: “something go through me like all needles,”
“my eyes were dancing,” to the degree that when looking at herself in the mirror, she
“hardly recognized myself.” The exaggeration in this prose that the reader is already
familiar with from Gerty’s language returns in Molly’s thoughts. Molly momentarily
becomes a naïve girl in a mawkish Victorian story. Richard Pearce observes that there
is a double perspective in this scene in that Molly becomes the spectacle of a man as
well as a spectacle in the mirror under her own eyes (40-60). The theme of gazing and
being gazed at in “Nausicaa” is played again and the text echoes the romance
discourse in Gerty’s language. In addition, as O’Brien points out, there is also the
transformation of the hero under the eyes of the heroine, in the same way Gerty
projects Bloom as her ideal man:

The voyeuristic “he,” constructed as “a little bald intelligent looking
disappointed and gay,” is himself a two-dimensional product of the
language which constructs the passage rather than a realistic narrative
agent who produces the fantasy. (56-7)
While Gerty is based on Gerty Flint the heroine of *The Lamplighter*, a maudlin novel by Maria Susanna Cummins, Molly’s bald man is now converted into Thomas of *The Shadow of Ashlydyat*, the hero of a popular novel written by Mrs. Henry Wood. In her memory, Molly reconstructs Gibraltar as a suitable background for her love story. Instead of a single narrator that remains unchanged throughout the narrative, the reader experiences a different voice in this passage branching from the narrative performance of her girlhood love life. In another passage, Molly recalls herself as an actress in a melancholy parting scene the exact location of which is unknown. Compared to the techniques in the representation of Dublin, this could be considered an extremely rare incident.

I remember that day with the waves and the boats with their high heads rocking and the swell of ship those Officers uniforms on shore leave made me seasick he didnt say anything he was very serious I had the high buttoned boots on and my skirt was blowing he kissed me six or seven times didnt I cry yes I believe I did or near it my lips were tittering when I said goodbye (707-8)

The scene is constructed by randomly jotted down phrases: the waves, the boats, and their high heads. As O’Brien observes, Molly in the passage “appear[s] [not] as engaged spectacle, but rather as detached observer” (58): similar to Gerty who knows how to cry beautifully in front of a mirror, Molly creates a distance between the present Molly and her old self: passively, “she feels seasick, feels kisses, perhaps cries, or feels like crying” (O’Brien 59). Molly does not remember her true feelings, “didnt I cry yes I believe I did or near it” in that parting scene but remembers her clothes far too well down to the level of “my skirt was blowing.” What she does is constructing herself in the image of a girl with blowing skirt and high-buttoned boots and tittering
lips standing above the waves. Even though Joyce employs numerous place names to recreate the real Gibraltar, the way Molly uses different voices to reenact the place renders it considerably unreal. Gibraltar is as much Dublin in Molly’s mind in that she considers them a remembered space, a changing stage according to her chameleonic styles and identities where she relives and recreates memories. These multi-voices gesture significantly to the heterogeneity of the text.

When comparing Dublin with Gibraltar, Paul O’Hanrahan offers an interesting reading of Dublin in contrast with Gibraltar, in which he argues that Dublin is a place of coldness, hardship, and unstableness. In an attempt to set Dublin and Gibraltar into two extremes, he reduces these two places into a dichotomy of hot versus cold, romantic versus squalid, and longing versus bored. He asserts, “In comparing Dublin and Gibraltar, Molly’s preference is unequivocal” (193). I would rather suggest a complex view of Gibraltar and Dublin. Gibraltar connects to Dublin in present by many subtle and sensitive links like thunders, for example. In the following passage, the thunder in the afternoon reminds Molly of Gibraltar thunders and how she still thinks now that the world is coming to an end like in the old days:

> the moment I popped straight into bed till that thunder woke me up God be merciful to us I thought the heavens were coming down about us to punish when I blessed myself and said a Hail Mary like those awful thunderbolts in Gibraltar and then they come and tell you theres no God

(693)

Dorrit Cohn notes that Molly uses the same past tense verbs to refer to all the events (229). The thunder in the afternoon seems to happen in a manner identical to that of the thunder back in the old days in Gibraltar because they are all events of the past,
even though the gap in time between them is enormous. The past is thus an a-chronological container for various incidents gliding effortlessly from one to another in Molly’s mind. In another instance, back in the days in Gibraltar when her friend Mrs. Stanhope left and the monotonous daily routines consumed Molly:

the days like years not a letter from a living soul except the odd few I posted to myself with bits of paper in them so bored […] and no visitors or post ever except his cheques or some advertisement […] I wish somebody would write me a loveletter (709)

Mrs. Stanhope no longer wrote any letter to Molly and she sometimes had to post letters to herself. The boredom and dullness extend from the past to present, with the memory situated side-by-side with the present being “as bad as now” (708). The phrases without verbs in the passage above create an uncertainty, at first about the time Molly is referring to: “the days like years not a letter from a living soul” can be applied to this present time as well as the past; the same goes for “and no visitors or post ever.” The technique of employing all the verbs in past tense, along with the noun phrases, makes the events in Molly’s past and present interchangeable. Alternatively, in this passage, the memories of Gibraltar are suddenly interrupted and the reader is transferred to the present time with the lingering feelings of the old days: “I suppose theyre all dead and rotten long ago besides I dont like being alone in this big barrack of a place at night” (716). Dublin in this case is Gibraltarized: the house on 7 Eccles Street becomes a barrack of her girlhood’s memory, or the barrack of Gibraltar travels from the past to become the house of Molly at present. The conflating effect of space and time is already at work in this passage and paves ways for many intermingled places to come. In another example, Dublin becomes her present base when recollecting events at a market where she went to see a bull fight:
when that matador Gomez was given the bulls ear clothes we have to wear whoever invented them expecting you to walk up Killiney hill

(Dublin is the anchor that attaches Molly firmly in the present, and is definitely her milestone, her present, and her frame of reference. Gibraltar is transferred to Dublin in Molly’s mind, for when thinking about the clothes she wore back then in Gibraltar and applying them to Killiney Hill in Dublin, she imagines how she can wear that kind of clothes to “walk up Killiney hill” in the present. In Molly’s mind, Dublin is still the frame from which she refers to and draws a simile when in need. At moments, Dublin seems to disappear while Gibraltar occupies Molly’s thoughts. Its rocky landscape is vividly reconstructed from Molly’s memories of her lost youth (and from books about the colony, including its phone directory.) However, it could be argued that the Rock plays as an “other” place to her Dublin: Gibraltar is “there and then” while Dublin is “here and now,” and there, here, then, now are all mixed into the timeless, spaceless remembrances.

The connection is made by a smooth continuation in the narrative due to the two devices that I mentioned above; and the effect is a gesture to a homogenous text more strongly than ever: there is a temporary suspense and the production of meaning is momentarily deferred because there are no clue for the reader to understand what place or time Molly is referring to. This deferring stage is worse in “Penelope” compared to the muddy space produced by the free indirect discourse in Stephen’s and Bloom’s episodes, due to the illusion of a single voice in a flow of thoughts. Dublin not only makes her recall Gibraltar, or vice versa, but Dublin and Gibraltar are amalgamated and the urge to drive them to two opposite poles is annulled. Richard Brown’s assertion that “Gibraltar gives Molly somewhere other to go than Dublin, at
least in her imagination, which empowers her in relation to her immediate environment," ("Molly’s Gibraltar” 159) is true and aptly applies to my argument. On the one hand, Gibraltar is the constructed identity of Dublin. On the other hand, Gibraltar is made up from different voices with various textual tropes. The conflated and yet multi-directional places complement, compete with, and struggle with each other to emerge at the forefront of the narrative.

**Conflated and yet Multi-directional Places: Polyloquy and Ambiguity**

As I discuss above, there is a displacing yet blending effect in representing Dublin and Gibraltar in Molly’s flow of thoughts. Joyce conflates Molly’s Gibraltar with Dublin by a lack of punctuations in her text, making all places existent on the same plane: the plane of present time. The result is not only a conflation of places but also of voices, troubling the reader when identifying the authorship of voices. However, the multifarious voices still keep the fight between homogeneity and heterogeneity going on. I will study two notable examples to illustrate how the struggles between them happen in the very same lines. Towards the end of “Penelope,” the conflating device is used more frequently. For instance, in sentence 8, in her fantasy about Stephen being intelligent and a poet, the reader is first swept into an imaginary story about him until the text offers details about it as a memory that Molly incorporates from her past in Gibraltar:

hes very young to be a professor I hope hes not a professor like Goodwin was he was a patent professor of John Jameson they all write about some woman in their poetry well I suppose he wont find many like me where softly sighs of love the light guitar where poetry is in the air the blue sea and the moon shining so beautifully coming back on the
nightboat from Tarifa the lighthouse at Europa point the guitar that fellow played was so expressive will I ever go back there again all new faces two glancing eyes a lattice hid Ill sing that for him theyre my eyes if hes anything of a poet two eyes as darkly bright as loves own star arent those beautiful words as loves young star (725)

The romantic fantasy about Stephen and poets goes on until “I suppose he wont find many like me” when the narrative is interrupted by a line from a song called “In Old Madrid” “where softly sighs of love the light guitar” and Molly composes another line “where poetry is in the air.” Molly continuously creates phrases and appropriates words from other sources to construct her own text. The reader is scouring through many voices and has a hard time identifying the author of these new phrases. The interpretation of the reader is created and broken continuously because Molly keeps adding more information. After quoting the lyrics, Molly composes “the blue sea and the moon shining so beautifully coming back on the nightboat.” The reader enters a temporary suspension, waiting for another clue to break from the early assumption that it is just another creative or imaginative thought of Molly’s until “from Tarifa the lighthouse at Europa point the guitar that fellow played was so expressive.” Due to the place names Tarifa and Europa, the reader recognizes that Molly is recollecting and romanticizing an incident in Gibraltar. The following lines are once again the intermingled words from the song and Molly’s reflections: “Ill sing that for him theyre my eyes if hes anything of a poet two eyes as darkly bright as loves own star arent those beautiful words as loves young star.” Furthermore, those hybrid lines, which consist of song lyrics and Molly’s own phrases, could be written in the form of a
As the reader can see, the multi-directional device is also at work. The quoted lyrics and the creative lines by Molly when combined could totally be read as a poem with rhythms that I underline. Molly’s monologic language is thereby more flexible than critics normally give it credit for. In the passage above, it could be seen that Molly creates a poem by and for herself. At the first reading, the poetic atmosphere is created by the song, with the sea and the moon. At the second time, Molly’s language

---

The passage could be rewritten into a poem:

where softly sighs of love
the light *guitar*
where poetry is in the *air*
the blue *sea*
and the moon *shining*
so beautifully
coming back on the nightboat
from *Tarifa*
the lighthouse at *Europa* point
the *guitar*
that fellow played was so expressive
will I ever go back there again
all new faces
two glancing eyes a *lattice* hid
Ill sing that for him
theyre my *eyes*
if hes anything of a poet
two eyes as darkly *bright*
as loves own star
arent those beautiful words
as loves young star
and style transforms her monologue into a real poem. However, the line “aren’t those beautiful words,” as O’Brien notes, reveals an ambiguity in the narrative when the authorship is challenged: it may belong either to the song, or Molly, Joyce, or the text. This helps us to reread the whole passage to posit that ambiguity is inherent in a passage like this when every word or phrase could be contributed to different authors. The reader is always wondering to which source a line belongs. As O’Brien points out, Molly dons many masks all claiming the title “I”:

“Molly” is difficult to locate in this passage. With the first “I” she speculates being the object of love poetry. The poetry then takes over, changing the mood and imagery of the scene. The next “I” seems to locate Molly in control of thoughts regarding Gibraltar. Her “thoughts,” however, are interrupted again by Bingham’s song, “where softly sighs of love the light guitar.” (54-55)

The continuity of the text is disrupted by the metamorphosis of the “I” as well as the insertion of different phrases from different sources and subjects. The text becomes a destabilized field in which “the representation of this supposedly stable ‘I’ is undermined by the language constructing the textual fantasy” (O’Brien 55). For a moment, the passage with different “I”s referring to different voices, written in a style of a poem while maintaining its form as a monologue, appropriates figural words and musical tropes signalling that this is a heterogeneous text. However, Dublin, Stephen, the song “In Old Madrid,” the blue sea, the moon and Gibraltar are blended into a single unity, which is undoubtedly a gesture to a homogeneous text. One question arises: which channels speak to the reader louder? Is Dublin heterogeneous or homogeneous?
Another instance at the end of “Penelope” raises a similar challenge for the reader. At the end of “Lestrygonians,” a seminal episode featuring Bloom alone, Howth comes back to Bloom’s mind. At the end of “Penelope” featuring Molly, Joyce plays again the motif of Howth:

yes and how he kissed me under the Moorish wall and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes. (732)

The passage will not produce any problem if the reader is not aware of the “mountain flower” motif and Blooms as the author of these words. Right before the passage above, Molly recalls her courtship days with Bloom at Howth (731). Richard Ellmann notes that Molly confuses and conflates the incident of the old days in Gibraltar when she lay beside Mulvey with the incident at Howth with Bloom (171). The way Molly refers to all men in the text as simply “he” or “him” whether he is Bloom or Mulvey, conflates not only places but persons as well. However, Ellmann overlooks one important incident in Molly’s memory in Gibraltar: there are two remembrances of Mulvey: first, Molly kissed Mulvey under the Moorish Wall, and second, they fondled each other on the rock near O’Hara Tower. These two places and incidents are separate from each other even though the exact timing of each incident is blurry in the text. Therefore in the passage there is an overlap of three distinct incidents: Molly

---

58 See Appendix B of “Molly’s Masculine Pronouns” in Benstocks (1980) for a detailed explanation about whom Molly refers to in her thoughts.
confabulates the place on top of the Rocks where she lay with Mulvey with Howth where she and Bloom lay together, and conflates the Moorish Wall kiss with the Howth kiss. Molly uses the same past tense verbs for all of them, making these three incidents blend into each other. As Molly states herself, “it was leapyear like now,” (731) and she transfers the phrase “the flower of the mountain” with which Bloom described her at Howth to the present: from being the flower in the past, she is the flower now, “I was a flower of the mountain yes so we are flowers” (731). Not only is the “he”s as Mulvey and Bloom joined into a single unity but also the “I”s of various times in the past and present. As opposed to other instances where Molly employs various voices to reconstruct her past in the present, she pours all different voices into a mixture and all past and present become one in the final lines of Ulysses. However, this effect is quickly smashed with the advent of numerous “Yes’es.

Another noteworthy thing is that right in the middle of her overlapped reminiscences about Bloom and Mulvey and Howth and Gibraltar, a series of memories of Gibraltar floods the narrative to signal another style at work:

I was thinking of so many things he didnt know of Mulvey and Mr Stanhope and Hester and father and old captain Groves and the sailors playing all birds fly and I say stoop and washing up dishes they called it on the pier and […] I was a Flower of the mountain (731-2)

In the above passage, Molly remembers how Gibraltar is like a secret to Bloom, a place he would never know. Gibraltar seems different as not only are streets unnamed but houses are also listed as “the pink and blue and yellow houses” (732); and the list goes on forever with “the rosegardens and the jessamine and geraniums and cactuses” (732) and “the wineshops half open at night” (732). The flaunting of the knowledge of
Gibraltar seems desperate and alerts the reader to the continuous “and”s and the vague descriptions, which all contribute to a different Molly emerging in the narrative. Molly becomes a subject who recalls how another subject recalls her past. There is a distance between the Molly of the past and the Molly of present. The Molly of the present becomes the invisible interlocutor for the Molly of the past. The “I” is dissected then multiplied. Suddenly, in the middle of these details, a phrase appears to interrupt the list: “glancing eyes a lattice hid for her lover to kiss” (732). This line is from the song “In Old Madrid,” and Molly more than often employs its lyrics from the present perspective when invoking the old days. The ambiguity occurs when the present Molly becomes the subject of the remembering, in the way the memories of Gibraltar are pouring into the narrative: are those details remembered by the past Molly when being proposed to by Bloom, or do they include memories which are remembered now by the present Molly?

The style of the prose in this search for the lost Gibraltar is distinct from the style when remembering Howth and Bloom. In remembering Howth, the prose starts with the normal descriptions at an average speed: “we were lying among the rhododendrons on Howth head in the grey tweed suit and his straw hat” (731). Besides, the first word “Yes” of these lines appears: “yes first I gave him the bit of seedcake out of my mouth” (731). The speed is maintained regularly until “I wouldnt answer first only looked out over the sea and the sky” (731). The trouble begins right after the line “I was thinking of so many things he didnt know of” (731). Suddenly, the prose is hastened, becoming a snow ball, or as Joyce said: “it turns like the huge earth ball slowly surely and evenly round and round spinning” (SL 285). Additionally, in this 278 words passage of Gibraltar, there are 36 “and” (while in “Penelope” there are 646 “and” in total) and 40 phrases without verbs and only 2 phrases with verbs. Molly
accumulates in a hasty manner all the memories popping up in every corner of her mind. The text accelerates, adding numerous phrases; the remembrance keeps lengthening and multiplying until the final Yes, the culminating Yes, the climaxing Yes. I will argue that the word Yes is the destabilizing point in the final lines of “Penelope.”

Throughout this episode there are 92 yeses, and in the lines from the Howth memory there are 19 yeses. As Derrida rightly notes in his brilliant essay, “Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Ulysses”: “Molly says ‘yes, yes,’ she responds to a request, but a request that she requests” (54). Molly is saying yes to a listener as well as to herself; more importantly, she is responding to a request requested by her. Derrida also asserts that “A yes never comes alone, and one is never alone in saying yes” (“Ulysses Gramophone” 66). Therefore Molly’s episode could not be called monologue, (and this act could be called a “somnambulistic carelessness” according to Derrida) because Molly is not the sole person who is speaking. She is a plurality of multi-directional voices. Molly responds passionately to the request to perform her remembrance of the past, to revive it, to her present self and to her old self at the same time. The performances of the Howth and Gibraltar memories intermingle into one inseparable voice but also a symphonic choir of them. Furthermore, the word is not only quietly written on the page but also loudly spoken, thus “yes” is gramophoned in Joyce. That is, “yes can only be a mark in Ulysses, a mark at once written and spoken, vocalized as a grapheme and written as phoneme, yes, in a word, gramophoned” (78). Calling a person who experiences the text of Ulysses a reader is not enough. He needs to be a listener as well because hearing Ulysses goes hand-in-hand with reading it. Yes is vocalized by Molly, to Bloom, to herself, and to the reader. Even though the Howth and Gibraltar scenes are put in sequence, there are several lines where they overlap
and yet the reader senses different competing forces. Although at the very end, the text engulfs all into an indistinguishable yes and all becomes present, the unity and wholeness of the narrative are still challenged because all is gramophoned, written out and vocalized out simultaneously.

The reader can understand how critics advocate for the homogeneity of “Penelope” when they argue for a central or single consciousness in this episode. Hans Walter Gabler, for example, argues that the “[…] Arranger's functions are relinquished to a central consciousness projected into the fictional character of Molly Bloom” (67-68). Similarly, Dermot Kelly argues for Molly as a consistent narrator and how Joyce by the omission of figurative language and the artlessness of the narrator erases the distance between narrator and event, thus freeing the narrative from any parody and irony (97). Another important scholar who focuses her study on stream-of-consciousness, Dorrit Cohn, argues for a single voice in that the narrative voice, the Arranger’s voice, is cancelled throughout the episode by the figural voice. This single-voice text is asserted as a wholly independent text. Even though Cohn contends for the autonomy of Molly’s monologue, she overlooks how powerfully different voices are inherent even though she does detect the sentences’ ability to gaze back and question as well as evaluate the past. (228)

I would argue for a more complex reading of the episode in that Molly is not the only narrator. In Teller and Tale, John Paul Riquelme asks the very reasonable question of whether there is anyone else beside Molly that narrates “Penelope” (132) and points out that “‘Penelope’ allow[s] the teller to seem both immanent and withdrawn” (225). I want to subvert the illusion of one united time and one single pronoun in the narrative. James Maddox and David Hayman both note how Molly “has... a complete, unmediated identification with her own past” (Maddox 213-15)
and “the sense that time is one continuous erotic present” due to the illusion of the flow of thoughts. However, the illusion of the seamless flow held up by the formal device is not the only illusion in “Penelope.” The consistency of “I” creates an impression that there is only one Molly speaking the whole time. Examining these multiple “I”s and “voices” in “Penelope,” the reader distinguishes different voices and roles that Molly comfortably lends herself to when performing in Dublin that now becomes a stage. Discussing the numerous roles of Molly, Cheryl Herr notices:

She stages herself as Venus in Furs, the indignant and protective spouse, the jealous domestic detective, the professional singer, the professional seductress or femme fatale, the teenage flirt, the teenage naif, the unrepentant adulteress, the guilt-ridden adulteress […]

(“‘Penelope’ as Period Piece” 130)

Sharing this very opinion in “Pretending in ‘Penelope’” is Kimberly J. Devlin who considers Molly “as not a character but rather as a role to be en-acted” (72). Similarly, Dermot Kelly spots one important characteristic of Molly’s interior monologue that differs from that of Stephen and Bloom: that is, Molly’s inaction due to the absence of an external narrator could generate openness in which she “can say anything […] can make fantasy reality” (93). The openness that Kelly suggests, in my reading, is the possible space for the narrative agency. Molly’s voice has the agency to split itself into numerous voices, empowering them and liberating them each to autonomy in the text. The concept of a single narrator and voice is significantly challenged in “Penelope.” The struggle is maintained between a monotonous hegemonic voice supported by the appearance of the flowing text without punctuations, sweeping and luring all into its current and making them homogeneous, and other subcurrents and streams as subtle voices fighting to escape from the periphery to get into the centre of the narrative.
These are the voices of difference. There are times when the one narrator becomes strong and powerful enough, making the teller immanent. But at other times, other voices are competent enough to get out of the confines of the teller, forcing the teller to withdraw. The invisible listener will accordingly appear and disappear in the narrative. This very narrative agency gives power to the voices, urging the language to get into various roles and as a result making fantasy reality, constructing and altering reality. I strongly agree with Alyssa J. O'Brien’s argument that Molly’s discourse is anything but univocal because her discourse posits a listener and,

The ongoing parodic caricatures of others’ voices rupture the ostensible flow of her thoughts, further rendering inaccurate the concept of a “monologue” or “soliloquy”: her playful and various mimic vocalities are better described as a “polylogue” or “polyloquy.” (85)

The language of different voices metamorphoses nonstop, dons various masks, and creates numerous styles. It relives courtship days in the style of a naïve girl who was fervently in love; it creates a Molly who pampered her boyfriend while leaking a feminist impression when subtly disparaging the man under the rain in the city of Dublin; it poses Molly as a criticizing wife in various bad financial situations in their marriage days; it crafts a Gothic fantasy with Molly becoming a girl suffering happily, a sexual attack in a Dublin existing in unknown dark backstreets and quays; it transforms Molly into a heroine of a sentimental story in exoticized Gibraltar; and it incorporates beautiful nature and lyrics into a poem and blend fantasy with memories. Unlike what A. Walton Litz remarks of “‘Penelope’… not contrib[ing] to the sequence of styles” (“Ithaca” 404), I assert that instead of a single consistent style and narrator, the narrative carries an assortment of styles and voices, flexibly switching through various modes of writing, from sentimental novel, to poetic writing,
to Gothic story, making Molly Bloom the epitome of incohesiveness, of multiple subjectivities.

**Conclusion**

Molly’s extraordinary interior monologue, almost entirely devoid of punctuation, sweeps up scattered bits of Dublin from every quarter as they dash into her mind in a flow. This flotsam of urban particularities is borne on a flood of remembrance that suggests that Joyce may have been trying to compose his own theory of language. Whilst the Dublins of Stephen and Bloom are constructed from their actual encounters with the city during their rambles on that single day, Molly’s Dublin emerges entirely as reminiscences and yet still vividly and diversely. The reader experiences in “Penelope” several images of Dublins mediated through different styles that I have analysed in this chapter: a representation of Dublin as impressions that the physical world continuously pours into the nerves of the characters, triggering numerous sensations as in the case of Bloom; or Dublin as a projected fantasy by a mind steeped in popular discourses as in the case of Gerty; or Dublin as a stage for Molly to perform on and be an artist as in the case of Stephen. In Peake’s words, “Penelope” is a culmination (317), and in Joyce’s, it is “the clou of the book” (SL 285) because it is indeed an odyssey of style. I assert that despite the limits of her sedentariness, Molly does wander in her mind and in her styles. The style of “Penelope” is a mixture of all styles: it is an example of the double writing in that she produces multiple identities, at times merging places, people, and things, past and present, but always oscillating between various selves. The narrative jostles between homogeneity and heterogeneity and shatters the notion of unity together with the cohesiveness of time and place. Dublin in this episode has the capacity to dwell both in remembrance and immediacy, the past and the present, body and mind.
Conclusion

For some years now I have had a house in Paris, where I spend part of the year, but hitherto this city has never appeared in the things I write. Maybe to write about Paris, I ought to leave, to distance myself from it, if it is true that all writing starts out from a lack or an absence.

Italo Calvino, Hermit in Paris: Autobiographical Writings 167

Joyce left Ireland permanently in 1904 to elope with Nora, beginning what became the determined voyage of a willing exile. In a poem printed at his own expense as a satirical broadside, Gas from a Burner, Joyce takes to heart the idea that Ireland wilfully banishes her artists so he preemptively shoves her away instead. Richard Ellmann points out in his biography, “Whenever his relations with his native land were in danger of improving, he was to find a new incident to solidify his intransigence and to reaffirm the rightness of his voluntary absence” (109). Writers flee from home and thereby attain the distance to re-experience their youth in a new light, to be tortured by aching nostalgia, to wallow in estrangement and alienation, to achieve a compulsion to search for their lost motherland. In his years of exile, Joyce completed Dubliners, revised Stephen Hero into A Portrait, created Exiles, Ulysses and Finnegans Wake. Apart from Giacomo Joyce, all of Joyce’s works circle around Dublin and her people. Joyce rejects boundaries and enthusiastically crosses any border to reconstruct Dublin in his textual landscape. An imaginary Dublin is built from fragmentary memories, impressions, and raw materials which are combined to present this imagined metropolis as real, and yet, at the same time, this very textual Dublin evolves and metamorphoses in his multifarious styles. Writing about Dublin is as much reshaping and recreating it, in Ulysses’ double writing.
Geographical criticism of Joyce treats each of his works from *Dubliners* onward as the ultimate realist urban fiction, a unique one-dimensional object; this is the epitome of the mimetic mode of reading. The revolutionary montage of multiple “Dublins” over a range of historical juxtapositions and varied styles has taken a back seat in Joyce studies. This dissertation addresses that neglected underlying cityscape and proposes readings of the multifarious countenances of Dublin in various episodes of *Ulysses*: “Proteus,” “Lestrygonians,” “Aeolus,” “Wandering Rocks,” “Nausicaa,” “Circe”, and “Penelope.” The city becomes a decentered textuality represented through an exuberance of styles, and the reader encounters a “queer idea of Dublin” (*U* 173) to be forever in the process of making sense of it.

Joyce’s odyssey of style proves true to Erich Auerback’s observation in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* that, “Many writers have invented their own methods […] of making the reality which they adopt as their subject appear in changing lights and in changing strata, or of abandoning the specific angle of observation of either a seemingly objective or purely subjective representation in favour of a more varied perspective” (545). New external and internal changes brought about by modern life in the urban metropolis are important reasons for Joyce’s renunciation of traditional literature and its forms, which he goes on to reinvent.

*Ulysses* offers new ways of rendering new experiences. In the process of grappling with a protean reality, Joyce must have realized that language is an incomplete system of representation and recognized its failure to fully reflect reality. To get a firmer grasp on Proteus, he employs multifarious styles and constantly shifting perspectives. For each style in its turn becomes an autonomic force flaunting its exuberance while parodying itself in the process. It further compels the reader to focus on stylistic games of reading, and writing rather than representations. As a result, the text of *Ulysses*
becomes a shape-shifting artefact that persistently breaks down any imposed schemes and rules that the reader brings to the experience. Thus, not only are various facades of Dublin represented via various styles, but the production of textual Dublin is also a work forever in progress. Reading *Ulysses* as an organic whole or a neatly closed system always runs the risk of neglecting features informing the openness that creates undecidability in the narrative. On the one hand, the book gestures to its own rich, symbolic and rhetorical patterns, but on the other hand, there are always subtle narrative traits the surplus details, styles, and allegories of which thwart any effort at systematic criticism. This includes Joyce’s own schema for each episode, for as Bloom thinks about his attempt at recalling and translating a passage of Don Giovanni he concludes that it “[d]oesn’t go properly” (*U* 171).

There are multiple steps in the reading journey in *Ulysses*, along which conventions established in early episodes are replaced in later ones only to be yet again broken by the next. This is a perpetual process from episode to episode, or even within an episode. A reader accustomed to 19th century realist conventions would find the physical world of “Telemachus” familiarly portrayed. However, this assurance is shaken and tested by the uncertainty in the subtle strands of narrative that ironically call attention to the impossibility of language as a successful system of representation, through the employment of many adverbs, the quick metamorphoses of Dublin Bay despite its objectiveness, and the internalization of the seascape in Stephen Dedalus’s mind. The reader quickly finds out that this departure from the hackneyed literary conventions of an authoritative third-person narrator may have been more easily endured when after two brief episodes it is abandoned entirely and a new set of rules is launched in “Proteus.” Now the pretence of a narrator is jettisoned and free indirect discourse is overrun by a spate of interior monologue. From the very first line of
“Proteus,” Dublin’s seascape is awash in intertextuality and Stephen’s stream-of-consciousness, and is continuously morphing due to his own repeated experiments in language. Then Stephen fades from the scene altogether. A new convention is set up when the narrative changes its spatial point of view with Bloom in “Calypso.” Bloom’s episodes, “Lestrygonians” particularly, set out an unusual way to depict Dublin: by the flood of proper names devoid of description in sentences with bare grammatical structures. Realism is at the forefront of these episodes, rubbing the reader’s nose in the real world more intensely than in any novel, yet it is also challenged by the free indirect style which generates multiple voices and shatters the traditional unity of voice. On the one hand, the modern Dublin inundates Bloom’s mind with stimuli; on the other hand, the objective city is further challenged by his interior monologue, in which Dublin is infused on multiple private planes of Bloom’s mind “by the daughters of memory,” conflating the past and present with various locations. The living, breathing city forbids an Aristotelian unity of time and space by being cobbled together from various sites in Bloom’s remembrance. The city transforms into a signifying field in which proper names and what they conjure become signifiers and signifieds, rendering reality multidimensional. Whilst the reader unceasingly reads for the plot and seeks the linearity of time and space, he is exposed to numerous violations of narrative contracts and interruptions. *Ulysses*, in the first six episodes and the eighth, reminds the reader that the choice to privilege the dominant features and overlook the recessive ones easily leads to a simplistic reading of the novel. By defying a binary opposition, the text devises collections of destabilizing points that produce problems in the production of meaning, making the often-overlooked and remarkable features interdependent. Moreover, it teaches the reader
that each episode is written in a distinguished and distinct mode, rendering the initial style obsolete.

The various styles employed in later episodes dominate the narrative, and yet the overlooked features are still actively working. Sandwiched between Bloom’s episodes and yet defying any well-established rules is “Aeolus.” The polarizations are quickly formed; the old conventions are reinstated and then shattered. On the one hand, the reality effect is still powerful in the narrative with the collection of place names in the description of the city centre. On the other hand, a prominent rhetorical mask, the headlines, is inserted to mimic the style of the press. This turns the narrative into a fake newspaper that challenges the genre of *Ulysses* as a fiction. These headlines attempt to push the reality effect to the periphery and overwhelm the reader with the unreality of the narrative. Dublin stands in the midst of the struggle of these two discourses, and the city becomes a textual artefact whose final meanings are constantly interrupted. In “Wandering Rocks,” the effect of reality is significantly heightened thanks to the accumulation of proper names and the objective, dead-pan style. However, this convention is contested by the interpolations into the narrative, now divided into 19 mini-sections, in which the city is portrayed from the aerial as well as street level. As a result, the text is submerged in fragmentariness, and Dublin is now less a community than an assortment of unrelated people and places on the monitors in a Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) network. The city is transfigured into a spectacle. The first half of “Nausicaa” again violates these conventions by leaping from a deficiency of imaginative details to an excess of them. Starkly distinguished with a purple prose opulent in descriptions and clichés, the text borrows from the vocabulary of popular discourses and produces a sentimental Dublin. And yet within this episode, these kitschy details disappear in the second half when the short and blunt interior
monologue of Bloom returns. As a result, Dublin’s seascape emerges as a deflated reality. In “Circe,” the reality effect is resurrected with the employment of place names, and yet challenged by a prose rich in fantastic descriptions, creating a world constructed both in realness and unrealness. All of these features are parts of a drama that is swiftly dissolved in the transformation of stage directions into mini-narratives that are suitable for reading rather than performing. Everything from the characters’ externalized minds to the physical aspects of the world is presented on the present stage; and Dublin mutates radically into various settings at once destroying the unity of time, space, place, and consciousness. The final episode is the most experimental. “Penelope” initially seems uniform due to flows of words totally lacking punctuations, the consistence of verbs in past tense, and the pronoun “he” applied to numerous persons. In spite of that, they are not neatly bookended with the polyloquy of voices, identities, and styles that were hitherto plied throughout the text. These features transform Dublin in the most surprising of manners: it becomes a reality intruding Molly’s mind, a world of places in the past, and a conflated space of both Dublin proper and Gibraltar.

*Ulysses*, thus, is not a book that changes its mind halfway, but right from the beginning lines by repeated violations of conventions is constantly disrupting the contracts between the reader and text. These incessant changes and the power struggle of various features within and between episodes to occupy the forefront teach the reader that conventions are made to be broken, and that if the reader wants to expect anything from the book, it will be that each episode is written in a different style. Shocks and frustrations will ensue, but the fundamental rule is maintained: the flexibility and plurality of style is an utmost commitment. By the employment of excessiveness in style, the text shows us how style is an interpretation of reality.
Ulysses urges the reader to reflect upon the relationship between reality and art, the real and the fictive Dublin. The referential function of language is considerably defied and the equality of the fictive Dublin with the real geographical one is asserted. Thus Joyce’s Dublin is similar to Derrida’s différance, that is “neither this nor that; but rather this and that [...] without being reducible to a dialectical logical either” (Derrida, *Deconstruction and the Other* 161). Joyce cures the absence of his urban habitat by the presence of the textual city, pushing Dublin into the realm of proliferated and disseminated meanings that goes beyond the mimetic mode of reading. The city resists an orderly or symbolic reading by its evasive styles and challenges a single production of meaning. Dublin does not settle for clear-cut conceptions. By avoiding defining a stable style, the text abandons the representational coherence of the classic novel in favour of a textual urban space rejecting totalization. *Ulysses* yields itself to a genre that is not meant to be classifiable or categorizable, making the reader “wonder what kind is that book [the author] brought [him]” (*U* 715). Dublin is thus not a real city, but rather a city as scripture, an urban textuality writ large.
### APPENDIX A

Number of Dublin Place Names in *Ulysses’*s selected episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Number of Dublin place names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telemachus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calypso</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus Eaters</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hades</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolus</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lestrygonians</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandering Rocks</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausicaa</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circe</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Number of Dublin Place Names in *Dubliners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Number of Dublin Place names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sisters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Encounter</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araby</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveline</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the Race</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Gallants</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boarding House</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Little Cloud</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterparts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Painful Case</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Day in the Committee Room</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mother</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Ratio of Interior Monologue to Third-person Narration in Episodes from “Telemachus” to “Proteus”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stephen</th>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Third-person</th>
<th>Ratio (IM/ON)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telemachus</td>
<td>7375</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>4523</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>2992</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proteus</td>
<td>5699</td>
<td>4952</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>6.7:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Ratio of Interior Monologue to Third-person Narration in Episodes from “Calypso” to “Lestrygonians”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloom</th>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Third-person</th>
<th>Ratio (IM/ON)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calypso</td>
<td>5961</td>
<td>3186</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>1.1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lotus Eaters</td>
<td>6444</td>
<td>3873</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>1.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hades</td>
<td>10967</td>
<td>5458</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lestrygonians</td>
<td>12649</td>
<td>8902</td>
<td>3747</td>
<td>2.4:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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