

TEXTUAL CONVERSATIONS AND DIALOGIC IMAGINATION IN
JAMES JOYCE'S *ULYSSES*Hande TEKDEMİR¹

ABSTRACT

Borrowing from Bakhtinian theory of the novel, this article discusses the novel's generic possibilities with a particular focus on the "Scylla and Charybdis" chapter in James Joyce's Ulysses. Named after the twelfth book of The Odyssey, this chapter takes place in the Dublin National Library where five characters are discussing Shakespeare's controversial play Hamlet. Throughout the chapter, Stephen Dedalus builds up a speculative theory on Shakespeare, which is fundamentally based on an autobiographical reading; yet, he unexpectedly renounces his own theory at the end of the chapter. While the first half of the article explicates Stephen's theory on Shakespeare, which is primarily interpreted through its criticism of paternity, the second half discusses Joyce's various attempts at experimentation with the possibilities of the novel genre. The main purpose is, on the one hand, to examine basic Bakhtinian terminology such as dialogy, carnivalesque, polyglottism, heteroglossia, among others, on the other hand, to practice the ways in which Bakhtin's theory of the novel can be applicable to a literary text. For both purposes, Joyce's Ulysses is taken as an illustrative case.

Keywords: James Joyce, Ulysses, Mikhail Bakhtin, dialogy, the genre of the novel.

JAMES JOYCE'UN *ULYSSES* ADLI ROMANINDA METİNSEL DİYALOGLAR

ÖZ

Edebiyat eleştirmeni Mihail Bahtin'in roman teorisinden yola çıkan bu makale, James Joyce'un Ulysses adlı romanındaki 'Scylla and Charybdis' başlıklı bölüme odaklanarak roman türünün imkanlarını tartışmaktadır. Odysseus'un onikinci kitabının başlığından esinlenen bu bölüm, beş karakterin Shakespeare'in Hamlet adlı oyununu tartıştığı Dublin Milli Kütüphanesi'nde geçer. Stephen Dedalus, Shakespeare hakkında otobiyografik bir yaklaşımı olan spekülatif bir teori geliştirir, fakat bölümün sonunda beklenmedik bir şekilde bölüm boyunca özenle kurguladığı kendi teorisinden vazgeçer. Makalenin ilk yarısı Stephen'in Shakespeare üzerine olan teorisini incelerken, ikinci yarısı Joyce'un roman türünün imkanlarını test ettiği çeşitli örnekleri tartışır. Makalenin amacı, bir yandan içinde dialoji, karnaval, çokseslilik, heteroglossia gibi kavramların olduğu Bahtin terminolojisini incelemek, bir yandan da Bahtin'in roman teorisinin hangi şekillerde bir edebi metne uygulanabilir olduğunu incelemektir. Her iki amaç için de Joyce'un Ulysses adlı romanı bir uygulama metni olarak kullanılır.

¹ Yard. Doç. Dr. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü, hande.tekdemir@boun.edu.tr

Anahtar sözcükler: James Joyce, *Ulysses*, Mihail Bakhtin, dialoji, roman türü

In his groundbreaking work, *The Dialogic Imagination*, particularly the chapter titled, “Epic and the Novel,” philosopher and literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin defines the epic as a complete generic form which presents the past to the reader as a unified and uncontested unit. The adamant choice of the subject matter as the account of an unchanging past deprives the form of a contemporary quality. Moreover, the very form of the epic precludes any sense of continuity, change and transformation, with little concern to look into the future. While the epic hero does not undergo personal development, the totality of his experiences turns him into a metonymic figure for his community. In terms of both form and content, the epic genre heavily relies on tradition, which requires submission to a formulaic diction and a certain set of formal rules. As opposed to the epic, Bakhtin characterizes the novel with its emphasis on the “fleeting and transient” present of the common people – a life without beginning or end. Unlike the epic, the novel has no literary canon of its own, which opens up the form to experimentation, subsequently rendering its literary elements flexible as well. Among such elements, Bakhtin’s theory on the novel foregrounds the use of language, primarily because the novel, debatably, is the only form that can fully accommodate the boundless potentialities of language.

Borrowing from Bakhtin, this article discusses the novel’s generic possibilities with a particular focus on the “Scylla and Charybdis” chapter in James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. Named after the twelfth book of *The Odyssey*, this chapter takes place in the Dublin National Library where five characters, (Stephen, Mr. Best, John Eglinton, Mr. George Russell, the librarian, later joined by Buck Mulligan) are discussing Shakespeare’s controversial play *Hamlet*. Throughout the chapter, Stephen builds up a speculative theory on Shakespeare, which is fundamentally based on an autobiographical reading; yet, he unexpectedly renounces his own theory at the end of the chapter. As the main theme and characters of *The Odyssey* parallel those of *Ulysses*, the Greek epic is an indispensable part of the narrative and characterization. Deeply engaged with the question of paternity in the first three chapters, Stephen represents the Telemachus figure, while Bloom is Odysseus in search of his son, and Molly is Penelope’s

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

mirror-image turned upside down. The interactive relationship instigated by this intertextuality signifies more than merely an encounter between two particular works: it is also an ideological collusion between two genres, the epic and the novel. As Fritz Senn argues, it is not only classics influencing Joyce, but Joyce in return influences them (qtd. in Booker, 1995: 22). Far from rejecting *The Odyssey* or the other epics, Joyce distorts the epic authority by questioning their taken-for-granted reality. With frequent references to the Greek epic in a novel which is concerned with ordinary events in their most pedestrian form, and identification of the petty, pathetic Bloom as a major character who is at times associated with the majesty of Odysseus, Joyce trivializes, changes and subverts the epic form. Moreover, by containing the epic within itself in addition to many other genres such as poetry, drama, ballad, among others, *Ulysses*, like any of its kind, is celebrated as a supergenre whose power is unlimited because of its ability to "include, ingest, devour other genres and still retain its status as a novel" (Bakhtin, 1981: xxxii).

Through the use of parody and trivialization, Joyce not only subverts the authority of the epic but also endorses the ideology embedded within the novel genre. Since this subversion surpasses one particular text to include all the texts of the western literature that are taken for granted as unchallengeable authorities, Joyce, in a way, challenges the whole western literary canon as an authority. Likewise, his character, Stephen, is hostile to the concept of paternity which connotes power and authority that is institutionalized through politics, religion as well as biological fatherhood. As a reflection of the author's mindset, Stephen approaches all these institutions with skepticism. This article will first explicate Stephen's theory on Shakespeare, which will primarily be interpreted through its criticism of paternity, and then discuss Joyce's various attempts at experimentation with the possibilities of the novel genre. So far, there has undoubtedly been numerous contributions to the scholarship on Joyce studies which has been an established critical field since the publication of the first issue of *The James Joyce Quarterly* in 1963 (Brannon, 2003: 11). Joyce studies has covered a wide range of perspectives: While well-known Joyce scholars such as Stuart Gilbert and Richard Ellman have mostly written about Joyce's oeuvre by making use of biographical criticism, some others focused on specific works as a means to hold certain theoretical discussions:

Ulysses has been reviewed in relation to its employment of modernist aesthetics; *Finnegans Wake* has been conveniently used to introduce basic tropes of postmodernism; *Dubliners* has been studied to contextualize Joyce's political life and his identification of Dublin as the center of paralysis. This article aims to shift these theoretical discussions that primarily focus on context and form to a focus on genre theory, and examine *Ulysses* as an illustrative case for Bakhtin's theory on the novel. My ultimate contribution will be to explicate Bakhtin's theory with a text that can be seen as a pioneering example of the form, and to discuss Joyce as a major experimenter of this form.

Being another father figure of western literature along with Homer, Shakespeare becomes the main target of Stephen's criticism in "The Scylla and Charybdis" chapter. The commonsensical man, Mr. Best commences the discussion by reciting a poem written on Hamlet by Mallarmé: "He says: il se promene, lisant au livre de lui-meme, don't you know, reading the book of himself" (1992: 239). The idea that the author reads his own book, his own life and discloses his own experiences in his works is the foundation upon which Stephen will launch his theory. Stephen starts out by drawing attention to an explicit affinity between the peripheral Dublin and Shakespeare's provincial background: "Elizabethan London lay as far from Stratford as corrupt Paris lies from virgin Dublin" (1992: 240). They both share the same fate by fleeing the stable, oppressive and paralyzing atmosphere of Stratford -in Shakespeare's case- and Dublin -in Stephen's and also Joyce's case- for a charming and independent life in London and Paris respectively. Highly evocative of Odysseus' homecoming, Shakespeare returns to Stratford after his London days -only to confront his "loss" of the faithful wife:

He goes back, weary of the creation he has piled up to hide him from himself, an old dog licking an old sore. But, because loss is his gain, he passes on towards eternity in undiminished personality, untaught by the wisdom he has written or by the laws he has revealed. His beaver is up. He is a ghost, a shadow now, the wind by Elsinore rocks or what you will, the sea's voice, a voice heard only in the heart of him who is the substance of his shadow, the sun consubstantial with the father. (1992: 252)

An autobiographical criticism would normally point out one character in *Hamlet* as being representative of Shakespeare.

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

However, Stephen does not seem to opt for a justification of one of the possibilities –whether Shakespeare is Hamlet or the ghost father. Jointly stirring up the image of the father and son, Joyce foregrounds the spiritual aspect of fatherhood, enhanced by the metaphor of apostolic succession that takes place in an uninterrupted regularity.

A father, Stephen said, battling against hopelessness, is a necessary evil. He wrote the play in the months that followed his father's death. If you hold that he, a greying man with two marriageable daughters, with thirty-five years of life, nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita, with fifty of experience, is the beardless undergraduate from Wittenberg then you must hold that his seventy year old mother is the lustful queen. No. The corpse of John Shakespeare does not walk the night. From hour to hour it rots and rots. He rests, disarmed of fatherhood, having devised that mystical estate upon his son. [...] Fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting, is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate, an apostolic succession, from only begetter to only begotten. (1992: 265-266)

By giving prominence to the potential spirituality in fatherhood, Stephen draws attention to the close affinity between Shakespeare and God. The idea has already been suggested by Stephen's account of Shakespeare's return to Stratford with connotations evoking God. Yet, the God he references is not the singular patriarchal Christian God, as is implicitly expressed through an allusion to Sabellius who in the third century proposed that “the names ‘Father,’ ‘Son,’ ‘Holy Spirit’ were merely three names for the same thing (or three different aspects or modes of one Being)” (Gifford, 1988: 26). Far from celebrating God according to the dogmas of the patriarchal church, the coexistence of father and son is repeated through a spiritual association. Stephen's –and Joyce's– conception of the church is certainly not in affirmative tones:

On that mystery and not on the madonna which the cunning Italian intellect flung to the mob of Europe the church is founded and founded irremovably because founded, like the world, macro- and micro-cosm, upon the void. Upon incertitude, upon unlikelihood. (1992: 266)

Being yet another institution of paternity, the firmly-established church, as it is told in the Bible, is literally built upon a rock. While rock implies strength and certitude, Stephen draws attention to the

void underneath it, which he relates to incertitude. This is another way of advocating that the church is nothing more than fiction –albeit a legalized one. To support his theory, Stephen skillfully makes use of a canonical reference to an institution in which he has no belief. By the end of the argument, what Stephen is trying to convey finally becomes manifest to his audience. Eglinton sums up the conclusion: “[t]he truth is midway. He is the ghost and the prince. He is all in all” (1992: 272).²

With the same tools with which he formulates his theory on Shakespeare, Stephen also constructs his own artistic theory that prioritizes the potentiality of creation. As a result, Stephen's theory on Shakespeare also serves as a theory on his own art. In doing so, Stephen clearly associates himself with Shakespeare and Shakespeare with God in terms of their creative power. He also employs this connection for his general criticism of paternity. All of the three threads originate from Stephen's autobiographical criticism of Shakespeare. As an artist, Stephen wants to be his own father, which turns out to be a statement on artistic creation in general in which the significance of the artist bears a prophetic proportion:

When Rutlandbaconsouthamptonshakespeare or another poet of the same name in the comedy of errors wrote *Hamlet* he was not the father of his own son merely but, being no more a son, he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson [...]. (1992: 267)

Stephen invests the artist with a God-like quality and proclaims him “the father of all his race,” a statement reminiscent of his “conscience of my race” in *The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. He supports and further elaborates his conception of the artist when he associates Christ with Shakespeare through a star that appeared at the time of the Prophet's birth:

² Similarly, Bakhtin was trying to find a middle way between the two literary theories of his time (Parla 50). He was not totally in accordance with either the Marxist literary theory in which language and aesthetics were disregarded or with the formalist theory in which too much attention was paid to form. Bakhtin stood at a distance from both while agreeing with some parts of their theories. His position is akin to that of Odysseus's ships which were trying to find a safe passage between the Scylla and Charybdis. Thus, what Eglinton announces at the end of Stephen's lecture seems to be a valid statement for Bakhtin as well; “The truth is midway”.

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

A star, a daystar, a firedrake rose at his birth. It shone by day in the heavens alone, brighter than Venus in the night, and by night it shone over delta in Cassiopeia, the recumbent constellation which is the signature of his initial among the stars. (1992: 269)

Hence, Stephen does not refrain from fabricating a fiction to strengthen his theory, a theory that frequently distorts reality and eliminates boundaries. He blurs the clearly defined boundaries, refuses to work with binary oppositions, and takes into consideration all kinds of possibilities in the interpretation of a work of art and, in fact, of any other cultural product or creative activity. The language itself, the novel form itself will assist him in challenging the boundaries.

With a similar approach, Mikhail Bakhtin underlines the multiplicity of language. Bakhtin's study of language as utterance –as two people speaking to each other, listening and responding– provides the language use with a dynamic quality. That is exactly what Bakhtin finds to be missing in the functions of language chart outlined by the well-known linguist and literary theorist Roman Jakobson who excludes the addressee's response from the act of verbal communication. Interested in language primarily as a system, Jakobson constructs his chart as being valid for every kind of communication, disregarding the unique utterances of individuals. For Bakhtin on the other hand, utterances, which cannot be considered isolated from the addressee, are essential. Jakobson's chart concludes the message as soon as it is uttered by the addresser, with little concern about the way it is to be interpreted by the addressee. For Bakhtin, on the other hand, the real journey begins *after* the message leaves the addresser:

[E]very word is directed toward an *answer* and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates.

The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction. Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken, the word is at the same time determined by that which has not been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word. Such is the situation in any living dialogue.

All rhetorical forms, monologic in their compositional structure, are oriented toward the listener and his answer. This orientation toward the listener is usually considered the basic constitutive feature of rhetorical discourse. It is highly significant for rhetoric that this relationship toward the concrete listener, taking him into account, is a relationship that enters into the very internal construction of rhetorical discourse. This orientation toward an answer is open, blatant and concrete. (1981: 280)

Once it reaches the addressee, it undergoes a transformation according to the perception of the addressee. In such an interactive relation, apart from the probability of an unforeseen interpretation of the original message by the addressee, there is also the possibility that the addresser may modify the original message after taking into account the possible responses that he would like to get from the addressee. This causes the message between addresser and addressee to be reinterpreted and reshaped in an endless circle. As Booker says “this dialogic model of selfhood posits a model in which speech is irreducibly social and subjectivity is meaningless apart from intersubjectivity” (Booker, 1996: 111). Indeed, subjectivity, like many other Bakhtinian concepts, is a continual process.

In what form is the dialogical quality of language practicable? Because of the potential of parody, Bakhtin defines the novel as “the only developing genre” and adds that “only that which is itself developing can comprehend development as a process” (1981: 7). While the novel parodies other genres on their conventionality and canonical nature, it also develops itself through self-parody: “This ability of the novel to criticize itself is a remarkable feature of this ever-developing genre” (1981: 6). As Julia Kristeva too puts it, all languages, all texts are inevitably intertextual. However, this is a developing process in which Bakhtin asserts that there is assimilation and recreation. That is to say, in dealing with the texts that were previously written, there is always the process of rewriting. In very simplistic terms, it can be deduced that Joyce rewrites *The Odyssey* for the modern world. And the rewriting does not terminate once that rewriting process is finished. There will always be reinterpretations every time the text is consumed and re-consumed, which is also valid for all other cultural products.

Bakhtin expands his theory on the multiplicity of language to discuss polyglottism in the novel form. In the polyphonic novel

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

exemplified by Dostoevsky, Bakhtin suggests that Dostoevsky's characters autonomously assume voices of their own independent of their author. In the absence of the author's mouthpiece, Dostoyevskian characters express their own beliefs and opinions, which are revealed through their conversations with other characters in the book.

The acute and intense interaction of another's word is present in his novels in two ways. In the first place in his characters' language there is a profound and unresolved conflict with another's word on the level of lived experience (another's word about me"), on the level of ethical life (another's judgment, recognition or nonrecognition by another) and finally on the level of ideology (the world views of characters understood as unresolved and unresolvable dialogue). What Dostoevsky's characters *say* constitutes an arena of never-ending struggle with others' words, in all realms of life and creative ideological activity. (Bakhtin, 1981: 349)

Hence, the conversation between Raskolnikov and Sonia, between Porfiriy and Raskolnikov or between Razumikhin and Looshin are both two people speaking to each other and also two different approaches accosting each other, like the encounter between the epic and the novel in the conversation between *Ulysses* and *The Odyssey*. Just as how Dostoevsky leaves his characters on their own to converse with each other in a multi-voiced novel, Joyce evokes a similar conception of the author –a God-like figure sitting at the top paring his fingernails:

[Stephen speaking] No sir smile neighbour shall covet his ox or his wife or his manservant or his maidservant or his jackass.

-Or his jennyass, Buck Mulligan antiphoned.

-Gentle Will is being roughly handled, gentle Mr. Best said gently.

-Which Will? gagged sweetly Buck Mulligan. We are getting mixed.

-The will to live, John Eglinton philosophised, for poor Ann, Will's widow, is the will to die.

-*Requiescat!* Stephen prayed. (1992: 264)

In the above quotation, Stephen's allusion to Jews and the Ten Commandments is answered playfully by Buck Mulligan who makes a

word play. Being a more down-to-earth figure, Mr. Best misses the point, which increases with Mulligan's mocking response. Eglinton replies with a philosophical tone while Stephen continues his religious allusions. Hence, different voices representing different points of view, different subject positions are brought together with each character speaking in an idiosyncratic diction. Stuart Gilbert argues that "[e]ach of the speakers in the dialogue have his appropriate *tempo*, thus there is a choppy curtness about Stephen's remarks, Mr. Russell's have a sinuous and studied smoothness, John Eglinton is shrewdly matter of fact" (Gilbert, 1952: 210). In this mosaic, the reader can concurrently be presented with a certain thought followed by a contradictory opinion. What is more, this mosaic may not solely consist of the characters' conversations among themselves and within themselves, but also with the author himself – as Bakhtin writes in *The Dialogic Imagination*:

(...) the works (the novels) in their entirety, taken as utterances of their *author*, are the same never-ending, internally unresolved dialogues among characters (seen as embodied points of view) and between the author himself and his characters; the characters' discourse is never entirely subsumed and remains free and open (as does the discourse of the author himself). (1981: 349)

For instance, Irish revivalists' views are expressed in this chapter only to be subsequently criticized:

The movements which work revolutions in the world are born out of dreams and visions in a peasant's heart on the hillside. For them the earth is not an exploitable ground but the living mother. The rarefied air of the academy and the arena produce the sixshilling novel, the musichall song, France produces the finest flower of corruption in Mallarmé but the desirable life is revealed only to the poor of heart, the life of Homer's Phaeacians. (1992: 238-239)

This belief in and appeal to the "poor of heart" is in fact a kind of motto for the Irish Revivalist Movement, especially employed in the works of drama. Figures like Lady Gregory, Yeats, Synge believe that drama should focus on the life of the common people. The mosaic in the narrative is developed side by side with other novelistic devices, and in these six lines there are references to Mallarmé, as well as to the sixshilling novel which is the popular fiction of the 1880s. Though these pertain to different tastes and are unlikely to exist together,

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

they are all welcomed under the accommodating framework of the novel.

To return to the theme of polyglottism and the idea of characters conversing with the author, Joyce satirizes the smugness, and the vanity of the revivalists as the annotated edition notes on this chapter. Accordingly, he positions himself as another speaker who is discussing revivalism with Russell. This is a multi-layered gesture, as he lets Russell speak in the mind of one of his characters.

Young Colum and Starkey. George Roberts is doing the commercial part. Longworth will give it a good puff in the *Express*. O, will he? I liked Colum's *Drover*. Yes, I think he has that queer thing, genius. Do you think he has genius really? Yeats admired his line: *As in wild earth a Grecian vase*. Did he? [...] Our national epic has yet to be written, Dr. Sigerson says. Moore is the man for it. A knight of the rueful countenance here in Dublin. With a saffron-kilt? O'Neill Russell? O, yes, he must speak the grand old tongue. And his Dulcinea? James Stephens is doing some clever sketches. We are becoming important, it seems. (1992: 246)

In the passage above, Stephen internally parodies the way in which Russell's mind works. As he imitates Russell's voice, he also adapts the revivalist terminology and perspective.

Apart from the multiple voices and points of view, another variety is found in the existence of various genres in *Ulysses*, which, in Bakhtinian terminology, is called heteroglossia, or the dialogy between different genres. In addition to the parody of the epic, there are all kinds of poems, popular folk songs, nursery rhymes, extracts from plays, references to epics and other novels. The conversation between different genres is at some points seamlessly integrated into the ongoing narrative. Two of the most obvious examples are on the first page of the chapter: "He came a step a sinkapace forward on neatsleather creaking and a step backward a sinkapace on the solemn floor" (1992: 235). As the annotated edition clarifies, this sentence combines lines from *Twelfth Night* and *Julius Caesar*. Part of a line from *Twelfth Night* is quoted a few lines below: "Twicreakingly analysis he corantoed off". To provide the play with a sense of dramatic action, stage directions are inserted into the narrative; "Two left" (235), "And my turn? When? Come!" (244), "Entr'acte,"(252) "He wailed," "He laughed" (256). At a climactic

point in the chapter, all characters start speaking in Shakespearean diction:

STEPHEN: He had three brothers, Gilbert, Edmund, Richard.
[...]

MAGEEGLINJOHN: Names! What's in a name?

BEST: That is my name, Richard, don't you know. I hope you are going to say a good word for Richard, don't you know, for my sake. [...]

STEPHEN: In his trinity of black Wills, the villain shakebags, Iago, Richard Crookback, Edmund in *King Lear*, two bear the wicked uncles' names. (1992: 268)

This sort of interaction between genres, or Bakhtinian carnivalization, may result in effectively bringing high and low genres together. Carnival is literally defined as the transgression of boundaries. Starting from the Dionysiac rituals, in all kinds of carnivals different people from all walks of life convene in one setting so that social boundaries are violated. In its figurative usage, Bakhtinian carnivalesque is twofold: Firstly, carnivalesque is used as part and parcel of Bakhtin's criticism of paternity as he takes the canon to task for placing the "high" over what is traditionally considered to be "low" genres. In the present chapter, for instance, a bawdy poem about sex is quoted immediately after a reference to *Paradise Lost* –perhaps the loftiest of all genres (1992: 235). As Bakhtin argues,

The ranking of literary genres or authors in a hierarchy analogous to social classes is a particularly clear example of a much broader and complex cultural process whereby the human body, physic forms, geographical space and the social formation are all constructed within interrelating and dependent hierarchies of high and low. (qtd. in Booker, 1996: 107)

Secondly, Bakhtin challenges the status and class hierarchy, as it is reflected in literary forms. In his choice of the protagonist as a Jewish character, for instance, Joyce complicates the hierarchical order of what is stereotypically marked as high and low in the social paradigm.

As the "wandering Jew," Bloom is ridiculed, looked down on and ignored throughout the novel. In the "Hades" chapter, he is constantly interrupted by the other characters in the long carriage

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

ride to the Glasnevin Cemetery. In the "Scylla and Charybdis" chapter too, Mr. Bloom leaves the library being unnoticed by the people:

About to pass through the doorway, feeling one behind, he stood aside.

Part. The moment is now. Where then? If Socrates leave his house today, if Judas go forth tonight. Why? That lies in space which I in time must come to, ineluctably. (1992: 279)

While Stephen is still meditating, Bloom passes between him and Buck Mulligan:

A man passed out between them, bowing, greeting.

-Good day again, Buck Mulligan said.

The portico.

Here I watched the birds for augury. [...] (1992: 279).

Still, Stephen is unaware of the importance of the encounter. Having a practical, instinctual nature as opposed to the brooding and philosophizing mind of Stephen, Bloom senses a kind of attraction. His glance that escapes Stephen's attention is noted by Bulligan who instantly stereotypes him as "[t]he wandering jew": "Did you see his eye? He looked upon you to lust after you" (1992: 279). Even in the rare case of being noticed, Bloom is ironically marked through a negative remark. Despite being trivialized and misinterpreted, it is doubly ironic that Bloom is in effect the essence of Stephen's theory, as he will be the father –the "foundation" on which the whole discussion is based.

The most characteristic quality of Bloom is his frequent association in the novel with bodily functions like eating, defecating or smelling. At the beginning of the "Calypso" chapter, Molly imperiously lies in her bed like a Goddess, served by Bloom. In sharp contrast to that, the same chapter ends in the toilet with Bloom practicing his "material bodily lower stratum." Indeed, associated with both the cat and the kidney throughout the "Calypso" chapter, Bloom is the most suitable figure to be characterized by "the material bodily lower stratum" (qtd. in Booker, 1996: 106). This is really a transgression of boundaries, transgression of all the limits of propriety, beauty or narrativity. Yet, carnivalization had long been associated with a novel written hundreds of years ago –*Don Quixote*– and has since then frequently been practiced in the novel genre. What is really genuine about *Ulysses* in terms of carnivalization? What makes the transgression in this particular novel unconventional? Carnivalization is a transgression for a limited time

and space in restrictive terms. As Terry Eagleton puts it, "carnival is a licensed affair" (qtd. in Booker, 1996: 107). Although there is transgression in the carnival, the borders of that transgression are clearly defined by the authorities to prevent any resistance that can violate the predetermined norms. In the case of Joyce's novel, what is idiosyncratic is its little hero's inexhaustible and unrestricted resistance. Bloom resists despite being systematically ridiculed.

Then perhaps it is noteworthy that Stephen renounces his own theory even as he has spent the whole chapter working on it. After all, what grand theory could explain the resistance, uniqueness, dynamics of the utterance of the individual that changes at every encounter, and changes in time too? What theory could be sufficient to account for the motivations behind Bloom's resistance to both particular characters in the novel and the social structure that oppresses him? Indeed, this little man's resilience precludes the credibility of any grand theory. Such a subjective experience can only be narrated in a novel in which individuals exchange their utterances in a dialogic mode within a carnivalesque atmosphere. Yet, it would be inadequate to interpret *Ulysses* as being merely a clash of ideas, languages, narratives and genres. There is a certain design or purpose behind the carnival in *Ulysses* to subvert paternity, which has the potential to be extended to a wider criticism on patriarchy. By waiving an authorial voice which is another version of paternity, Joyce practices his literary theory in his writing –like Stephen and Bakhtin– and leaves his characters alone. Finally, it is crucial to conclude with an emphasis on the social commentary made through the individual in *Ulysses*. As is obvious for Bakhtin, it is also valid for Joyce too, that the individual is a social phenomenon and bears traces of his past although he is capable of reinterpreting those experiences in an endless cycle.

WORKS CITED

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. (ed.) Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, Austin.

BOOKER, Keith. (1995) *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

BRANNON, Julie Sloan. (2003) *Who Reads Ulysses? The Rhetoric of the Joyce Wars and the Common Reader*. Routledge: New York.

Textual Conversations and Dialogic Imagination in James Joyce's *Ulysses*

---. (1996) *A Practical Introduction To Literary Theory and Criticism*, Longman Publishers, New York.

GIFFORD, Don. (1988) *Ulysses Annotated*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

GILBERT, Stuart. (1952) *James Joyce's Ulysses*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

JOYCE, James. (1992) *Ulysses*. Penguin Books Ltd, London.

PARLA, Jale. (2000) *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman*. İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

