

“Usurper.”
Racial and Political Biases of Narrative Assemblage in the “Cyclops”
Chapter of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*

Senior Paper

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For a Degree Bachelor of Arts with
A Major in Literature at
The University of North Carolina at Asheville
Fall 2009

By *BRIAN DUNSMORE*

Thesis Director
Dr. Blake Hobby

Thesis Advisor
Dr. Lorena Russell

“Remember that a picture, before being a battle horse, a nude, an anecdote or whatnot, is essentially a flat surface covered with colors assembled in a certain order.”
—Maurice Denis

In 1890, the French painter Maurice Denis offered the above explanation of painting. From this definition we can construe that art cannot be judged simply as objects born, fully formed, from the minds of their creators. Instead any reasoned critique of a piece of art must factor in the nature of its assemblage. Can we not also define the novel as an art object susceptible to the same kinds of critical engagements to which we subject paintings? Given this definition of art, we must consider the novel as a collection of pages covered in words assembled in a certain order, perhaps “signs on a white field” as Stephen Dedalus suggests in “Proteus” (3.415). This essay is concerned precisely with the idea of words “assembled in a certain order.” What happens in this process of arrangement and how does it affect our understanding of a work? Also, who is the assembler and what can we know about him or her from the text? If there is an assembler at work behind the text, he or she must possess an ideological position from which he or she arranges the work, whether this purpose is towards the fulfillment of narrative cohesion or perhaps a subtler, ideological goal. This interweaving of stylistics and ideology will be the focus of this essay. By interrogating a text in this way new elements of a text can be forced into light. This mode of inquiry infuses the entire textual world with political weight. Every word on the page becomes susceptible to interrogation for its ideological capacities because of its positioning within a text. This essay will focus on the latter pages of the “Cyclops” chapter of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* as this chapter offers a particularly overt example of the Assembler as an ideology-producing machine. Because this chapter seems to also be aware of its own ideological

play, it is also a useful example to demonstrate the power these ideological forces within the creation of meaning in a text.

Yet who is this “arranger” or “assembler” of the text? Is it not simply another name for the author? These questions are important and merit consideration. In his seminal essay, “What is an Author?,” French philosopher Michel Foucault claims that the traditional conception of the author has disappeared from modern textual analysis. In its place we are left with a call to action, which begins by describing the void left by the disappearance of the author:

It is not enough, however, to repeat the empty affirmation that the author has disappeared. For the same reason, it is not enough to keep repeating (after Nietzsche) that God and man have died a common death. Instead, we must locate the space left empty by the author’s disappearance, follow the distribution of gaps and breaches, and watch for the openings that this disappearance uncovers. (Foucault 105)

As a means of describing “the space left empty,” (Foucault 105) Foucault posits the concept of the “author function” (Foucault 108), which he summarizes as:

...(1) the author function is linked to the juridical and institutional system that encompasses, determines, and articulates the universe of discourses; (2) it does not affect all discourses in the same way at all time and in all types of civilization; (3) it is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a discourse to its producer, but rather by *a series of specific and complex operations*; (4) *it does not refer purely and simply to a real individual, since it can give rise simultaneously to several selves, to several subjects...* (Foucault 113)

Therefore the “author function” turns the word “author” into a representation (i.e. signifier) of an apparatus of creation. This machine has multiple parts performing different functions within the supposed whole of the “author.” Following this model of authorship, we can isolate certain parts of the “machine” and analyze their roles as part of the production of a material, in this case *Ulysses*. For the sake of this essay we will be isolating the part of the “machine” that is the assembler, the textual arranger, the creator of order: the focalizer.

In her essay, “Narration and Focalization,” the Dutch cultural theorist, Mieke Bal proposes the idea of the “focalizer.” She claims that the focalizer is “based on two concepts: point of view and restriction of field” (Bal 17). This focalizer is a character within the story whether he or she is acknowledged or not (e.g. given a name, committing actions with or against the other characters) precisely because we, as readers, perceive the reality of the narration through the gaze of the focalizer. Bal makes a sharp, yet mutable distinction between the narrator and the focalizer. “In a narrative with an ‘invisible’ narrator, the focalizer, too, is often anonymous. But no more than the narrator is the focalizer expected to retain this power for himself throughout the narrative. As the narrator can yield the floor, the focalizer can yield the focalizing.” Therefore, Bal has constructed a sometimes distinct, yet reciprocal relationship between the narrator and the focalizer. Yet, whereas the narrator moves the narration (i.e. the report of events and actions that occurred) along its trajectory, the focalizer chooses the point of view and constructs the restriction of field; the focalizer creates the *gaze*. By doing so, the focalizer allows certain facts or opinions in, and forces others out. He or she creates a kind of interpretive screen that filters the reality of a given situation.

The idea of the focalizer's gaze is closely related to the American philosopher, Kenneth Burke's idea of "terministic screens." Burke claimed that language, especially the terminology of a specific field of inquiry (e.g. psychology, literature, philosophy,) creates a "screen" with which we interpret the world. Even new materials, or observations, are filtered through these terministic screens: "many of the observations [of a specific field of inquiry] are but implications of the particular terminology in terms of which the observations are made" (Burke 46). He offers a metaphor for his idea of terministic screens in terms of photography:

When I speak of "terministic screens," I have particularly in mind some photographs I once saw. They were *different* photographs of the *same* object, the difference being that they were made with different color filters. Here something so 'factual' as a photograph revealed notable distinctions in texture, and even form depending upon which color filter was used.

(Burke 45)

Burke applies his idea of the terministic screen to the ways in which human beings filter and construct meaning in the world. Yet can we not also apply the idea of terministic screens to Bal's focalizer? If so, we can say that the focalizer of a text creates a terministic screen through which the narrative of the text is interpreted. He or she establishes the boundaries of interpretation that the reader has to accept when reading the text initially. Yet these terministic boundaries will hopefully be questioned upon further consideration of a text. Because "Cyclops" offers us an example of a separate narrator and focalizer, "Cyclops" is ripe for this kind of theoretical critique.

Recent scholarship on the "Cyclops" chapter has largely functioned in two separate realms of inquiry: identity politics and stylistic analysis. In his essay, "Joyce's

Linguistic Imitation of Homer: The ‘Cyclops Episode and the Radical Appearance of the Catalogue Style’ Raymond A. Prier connects the stylistic departures of “Cyclops” to the style of Homer. He claims that the use of the catalogue style is a part of Joyce’s linguistic jokes regarding Homer and *Odyssey*. He also writes about the role of the secondary narrator in “Cyclops” and explains how the use of the catalogue style contributes another element of gigantism to the “Cyclops” chapter (Prier 43). Yet in Fritz Senn’s essay “Ovidian Roots of Gigantism in Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’” he claims that, stylistically, the gigantic elements in “Cyclops” do not mirror Homer’s giants in *Odyssey*. Instead he finds that the giants in the works of Ovid are more similar to the style of gigantism represented in “Cyclops.” The use of the catalogue style is certainly Homeric, but the way in which Joyce uses the catalogue style in gigantic proportions is far more reminiscent of Ovid than Homer (Senn 101). Yet by positioning the catalogues of “Cyclops” as allusions to Greek epic, the importance of their ideological roles within the chapter becomes obscured. In Brian Richardson “The Genealogies of ‘Ulysses’, the Invention of Postmodernism and the Narratives of Literary History” he uses “Cyclops” as an examples of how the later chapters of *Ulysses* demonstrate the proto-postmodern style. The disjointed style of “Cyclops,” with its multiple narrations and stylistic play becomes the evidence to support Richardson’s claim that postmodernism was born with the publication of *Ulysses* (Richardson 27). If *Ulysses* is a postmodern text then the contemporary critic should feel that he or she has all the tools of our postmodern modes of textual analysis at his or her disposal when working with *Ulysses*. The questioning of the ideology of style is but one of these contemporary tools to bring to this postmodern text.

There has also been extremely adept criticism written about “Cyclops” from the realm of identity politics. Because there are so many different discourses of identity functioning within the chapter (e.g. Jewish, Queer, Irish) the criticism tends to focus on one of these elements. Margot Norris’ razor-sharp essay entitled “Fact, Fiction and Anti-Semitism in the ‘Cyclops’ Episode of Joyce’s *Ulysses*” deals with the ideas of anti-Semitism in *Ulysses* and Joyce’s Dublin and Europe. She claims that much of the anti-Semitism present in the text reflects the opinions of a large amount of Europe at the time. This essay situates the rising Jewish alienation within a historical context, all the while envisioning the coming “Final Solution” (Norris). In her sweeping work on the subject of sexuality and gender in *Ulysses*, *Subaltern Ulysses*, Enda Duffy uses the philosophy and terminology of Antonio Gramsci and Gayatri Spivak to interpret the political subtexts of *Ulysses*. In the section from the text entitled “The Spectacle of the Native” she proposes the idea that Irish chauvinism motivates the tension at Kiernan’s pub. Duffy posits Bloom as a subaltern character, able to “talk about” but not communicate his Jewish position to the men. Because he cannot speak in terms of difference it becomes subtextual and psychologically symbolic (Duffy 66) as the reader later encounters Bloom’s vision of his castrating “Grandpapachi” (15.1650) in the “Circe” chapter of *Ulysses*. Joseph Valente’s *James Joyce and the Problem of Justice* works in similar territory to that of Duffy. Valente’s text explores gender and colonial issues within *Ulysses*. Moving between Joyce’s biographical information and the socio-history of the age in which *Ulysses* was created, Valente claims that *Ulysses* ultimately speaks with numerous voices of the “Other.” (Valente 102) These multiple voices testify to the varying forms of alienated groups within the culture of Ireland. At once, Irish, Jewish, Queer, and lower class; *Ulysses* speaks many “languages.” Yet Valente misses a keen

opportunity to unite the multiplicity of styles in *Ulysses* with the multiplicity of voices speaking within the text. Valente does explore the idea of voices of repression within the text. Certainly the men gathered at Kiernan's Pub are overt voices of repression as they constantly mock Bloom's Jewish heritage and allude to his homosexuality. But how do the politics of the Arranger affect the reader's understanding of Bloom? Couldn't the Arranger of the text also be in league with the men at the pub in displacing the identity of Bloom?

In many cases the questions of masculinity and Irish Nationalism are dealt with in concert since they inform each other. Gerald Doherty's essay "Imperialism and the Rhetoric of Sexuality in James Joyce's *Ulysses*" explores the sexual undertones of the conversations the men are having at the pub in "Cyclops." It places these conversations within a context of Irish chauvinism and colonial rule. Both of these elements manifest themselves in hostile ways in "Cyclops." This aggression is directed at Leopold Bloom turning him into the colonial oppressor and the object of sexual confusion. Bloom becomes the unaware scapegoat of the men's psychological unrest. (Doherty)

In her essay in the eighth edition of the *European Joyce Studies*, entitled "Joyce's Grand Nationals" Marilyn Riezbaum explores the sexual dialogue of the men at Keirnan's Pub. Whereas some of these inquiries about the sexual discourse at the pub deal with the men in broader terms of their entire conversation, Reizbaum focuses specifically on the horse/woman tropes throughout the chapter. Like many of the other text on sexuality, she finds that these tropes allow for and reinforce a kind of chauvinistic violence that is committed against Bloom. Her analysis of these horse references help to shift the focus to many of the quieter participants in the conversation at the pub creating a more well rounded sense of the discourse. It also allows for many

of the subtleties of perspective that this essay will claim are controlled by the Arranger. In his book, *James Joyce and Nationalism*, Emer Nolan questions the commonly held opinions about the nationalist motivations of the Citizen. Nolan claims that critics have always seen the Citizen as at best, impotent and at worst, completely mendacious. Nolan proposes that Joyce actually agrees with a great deal of what the Citizen says in the chapter, yet he uses the Citizen's boisterous nature to critique the call for violence that the Citizen is demanding. This further complicates the idea of the Arranger: is he or she truly a repressive force within the text, or is he or she a critique of the very idea of these repressive forces, like Nolan claims the Citizen is.

Both of these modes of previous scholarship on "Cyclops" are indispensable, yet would not both the inquiries of identity politics and stylistic/formal critique benefit from considering each other as reflexive and *reflective* of each other in "Cyclops"? While this essay will concern itself with the politics and ideologies of style, Burke and Bal are not enough for this kind of inquiry. Two other scholars, David Hayman and James Fairhall, have applied similar ideas of "focalization" and "terministic screens" directly to the text in question (*Ulysses*.) In David Hayman's *Ulysses: the Mechanics of Meaning*, he proposes the concept of the "Arranger" which upon analysis becomes a more ephemeral and poetic version of Bal's "focalizer." As Hayman writes of a passage in "Telemachus" (1.512-19) where the reader cannot separate the inner monologue of Stephen Dedalus from the narration of the actions of Buck Mulligan, Hayman establishes the nature of the "Arranger":

We have a sense that the two individuals are momentarily and magically joined by the narrator whose procedures are more comprehensible on the

thematic and analogical levels than on the mimetic...The narrator is obliging us to accept another order of reality...by the book's second half he will have become...a larger version of his characters with a larger field of vision and many more perceptions to control. (Hayman 92-93)

As Hayman's analysis of *Ulysses* enters the later chapters, Hayman claims: "With the increasingly obvious arranger intervention come broader if not more effective tactics. But with the broader tactics comes a diminishing attention to detail and nuance on the level of action" (Hayman 133). He cites "Cyclops" as an example of this:

The parodic catalogues in "Cyclops" demand relatively little concentration and reflection, though they may impede the action and still time. The uproarious conclusion to 'Oxen in the Sun'...is less an intellectual challenge than a challenge to remove the screen imposed on action by presentation. The reader becomes the object of the text's activity.

(Hayman 133)

Though Hayman rightly acknowledges the increase in the intensity and tension of the Arranger, his assessment of the importance of the "parodic catalogues" in "Cyclops" is incorrect. Instead his claims regarding "Oxen in the Sun" should be applied also to "Cyclops." As the same "challenge to remove the screen imposed...by presentation [i.e. the Arranger]" occurs in "Cyclops" as well. This oversight notwithstanding, Hayman's idea of the "Arranger," as a force present within the text, creating meaning, is a useful analytical tool and profoundly similar to Bal's idea of the focalizer.

James Fairhall's *James Joyce and the Question of History* also utilizes Hayman's idea of the "Arranger" in his analysis of Joyce in his historical position. This text explores Joyce's attitudes towards colonialism, nationalism, gender, and class as

demonstrated in Joyce's works. Stylistic analysis becomes secondary, but when Fairhall does explore formal elements, he often references Hayman's "Arranger." Because of Fairhall's differing motivations, he casts the Arranger in a different light than Hayman. Like Hayman, Fairhall claims it is the Arranger that "generates the hallucinations in 'Circe,' the asides in 'Cyclops,' the fugue structure of 'Sirens'" (Fairhall 205). Yet Fairhall attempts to give a socio-historical rationale for the Arranger: the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure. Fairhall claims that within three years of Saussure's death in 1913 "his [Saussure's] name became a household word in all interested circles which presumably would have included Joyce, living in Saussure's native Switzerland from 1915 to late 1919" (Fairhall 206). Fairhall claims:

Joyce's Arranger functions somewhat like a mad linguist who tries to illustrate Saussure's ideas within the miniature verbal universe of a single book. As such, the Arranger is imbued with the supra-personal consciousness of language as system (*langue*) and at the same time seems to control and record every manifestation (*parole*) of that system. (Fairhall 207)

For Saussure, "langue" was the abstract system of language that a human internalizes and functions within as part of a language community. "Parole" was the manifestation of this in quotidian, realistic communication. (Saussure 14) Langue deals with how a language system can function and has functioned historically; parole deals with how a language system *currently* functions. The thirty-two stylistic asides in "Cyclops" each satirize some form of language usage present at the time of Joyce (e.g. Biblical language, the language of newspaper reportage) these stylistic asides are also the occasions in the text when the Arranger/Focalizer makes him or herself most obviously known.

Therefore this lends an important level of credence to Fairhall's claims of the Arranger as a "mad linguist" (Fairhall 207).

Yet what exactly is this "mad linguist" doing to the reader's impression of the narrative whole of Cyclops? More specifically what does he or she seem to think of Leopold Bloom? "Cyclops" explores political and racial issues through the previously mentioned stylistic asides. By drawing upon a wealth of literary models, the chapter constantly questions and repositions the reader's views and opinions of the characters in the narrative. Yet there is a direct narration (i.e. a linear progress of action) through the chapter, which is interrupted by these stylistic asides. The direct narrator of the chapter is unknown. This is perhaps an allusion to Odysseus' moniker "Noman" when drinking wine with Polyphemus and also, a direct clue that the narrator is not the focal point of the text, since the focalizer will usurp him on many occasions with his or her stylistic asides. According to the Gilbert Schema, the technique at work in this chapter is "gigantism." This idea of gigantism functions on multiple levels and must be factored in to an understanding of the Arranger's work within the chapter. By gigantizing Bloom's ethnic difference as a Hungarian Jew, the focalizer actually accentuates and contributes to Bloom's alienation.

The opinions and feelings expressed by the characters in the chapter often seem to be driven to gigantic extremes, therefore becoming comically grandiose. Even the men's sentimentality over the death of Paddy Dignam becomes comical, as the men get drunker. (12.230) The thirty-three stylistic digressions also play with the idea of "gigantism" by their use of hyperbolic word-choice and long lists of people and objects. These massive lists contribute to a sense of gigantic space throughout the chapter. This causes the attentive reader to imagine gigantic areas of land in order to encompass all

the objects listed in the stylistic digressions. Yet these stylistic digressions are told from another point of view: that of the focalizer.

In order to illustrate the claims above, the last three stylistic asides will be addressed, as they are most ripe for inquiry in this mode. The first stylistic digression in this section begins: “A large and appreciative gathering of friends and acquaintances from the metropolis and greater Dublin assembled in their thousands to bid farewell to Nagyasagos uram Lipoti Virag, Late of Messrs Alexander Thom’s, printers to His Majesty.” (12.1850) Nagyasagos uram Lipoti Virag, translates to “Your greatness, my Lord, Leopold Flower” in Hungarian. (Gifford 379) According to John Henry Raleigh’s *The Chronicle of Leopold and Molly Bloom*, Joyce consistently incorrectly transliterated his Hungarian throughout *Ulysses*. Because of this, there seem to be incongruities within the class position of “Lipoti Virag.” “Nagyasagos uram” (Your greatness) would imply an upper-class, if not royal, station. Yet the final words of farewell in this section: “Visszontlatasra, kedves baratom! Visszontlatasra!” (12.1841) translate to: “goodbye (‘see you again’) my dear fellow! Goodbye!” At this time, the Hungarian language represented its class system in its word formations, therefore these farewell blessings are more befitting of a common, or perhaps a middle-class man. (Raleigh 14) Either way, we can safely assume these long, incorrectly transliterated words are another effort at distancing Bloom from an English language reader because of their inaccessibility.

According to Raleigh and Gifford’s annotations, *Ulysses*’ use of “Lipoti Virag” also confuses the exact ancestral location of Bloom’s lineage. If the name has been Anglicized as Lipoti Virag then it translates to a proper name: “Leopold Flower” though “Lipóti” should be lipot. But if Joyce’s Hungarian is correct, then Virag would be a family name. According to Raleigh, “Jews were often designated by the place they came

from plus their family name. Thus “Lipóti Virag” could mean a Jew named Virag who came from Lipot (Raleigh 13). Lipot was the name of the Jewish Quarter of Budapest, Hungary (Gifford 379). In the “Ithaca” chapter of *Ulysses* the reader is told the full ancestral migration that placed Leopold Bloom in Ireland: “Szombathély, Vienna, Budapest, Milan, London and Dublin” (17.535-6). Another, slightly different, family geography occurs later in the chapter as Bloom remembers a conversation with his father: “Dublin, London, Florence, Milan, Vienna, Budapest, Szombathély” (17.1908). Though both lists are reversed, Vienna and Budapest are switched. This incongruity, along with the linguistic question of “Virag from Lipot” leaves the reader wondering why Budapest is circumscribed but never overtly discussed.

The use of “Virag” in this passage, reminds the reader that earlier in the book he or she found out that Bloom’s grandfather changed his last name from Virag to Bloom when he moved to Ireland. By using the extended Hungarian name, the focalizer adds to the reader’s sense of Bloom as isolated from Ireland. This passage also further alienates Bloom from the Ireland and politics of his time (i.e. the Home Rule Movement.)

Alexander Thom & Co. was an actual printing company that specialized in printing copies of the acts of the English Parliament. This also reminds the reader that Bloom is an ad-man for a paper in Ireland. Therefore the focalizer allows for the possibly libelous conclusion on the part of the reader that Bloom and the English government are in league against the people of Ireland. Does the focalizer agree with the Citizen’s claims that “it was Bloom who gave the ideas to Sinn Fein to put in his paper all kinds of jerrymandering, packed juries, and swindling”? (12.1140-41). The text continues: “...on the occasion of his [Lipoti Virag/Bloom] departure for the distant clime of Szazharminczbrojugulyas-Dugulas (Meadow of Murmuring Waters)” (12.1818). The use

of the extreme foreignness of “Szazharminczbrojugulyas-Dugulas” is also comically inaccessible to the average English reader. Because of the punctuation we are left to believe that it translates to “Meadow of the Murmuring Waters” yet it does not. In Hungarian it best translates to “130-calf-shepard [or soup] stopping-up [sticking-into]” (Gifford 379). Once again this is a confusing transliteration, but all possible meanings point towards the focalizer establishing Bloom as a pied-piper (leader of sheep), luring the lambs of Ireland to their demise at the English slaughterhouse (stopping-up, sticking-into soup.) As he departs on a “mastodontic pleasure ship” Lipoti Virag (note: Leopold Bloom has *disappeared* from this section, as his proper name is never mentioned. He is *replaced* with a Hungarian clown of himself, Lipoti Virag) notices the bonfires lit in his honor along many famous hills in Ireland. Once again the theme of gigantism appears. Because of the geographical locations of these hills no man could see them all from one place unless he himself were an Atlas-like giant. Certainly this section is filled, like the others before it, with benign jokes and word play alluding to the idea of the gigantic, yet it is also the moment in the chapter when we see the terministic screen of the focalizer forming. The reader must now find a way to escape the lens of the focalizer in order to empathize with Bloom any longer. For the rest of the chapter the focalizer’s supposedly benevolent stylistic asides will be tinged with an element attempting to force a distance between the reader and Bloom.

The narration abruptly shifted back to the anonymous narrator. The men continue yelling outside the pub. As Bloom gets into his car and departs the citizen hurls the buiscut-tin at Bloom’s car. Immediately following this series of events the text enters into another highly stylized section. Gifford claims that this section is satirizing a newspaper’s report of a natural disaster. (Gifford 380) Here again we see the work of

the focalizer, but in a return to a more benign form; he or she is less concerned with alienating the reader from Bloom and more with the aggrandizement (gigantism) of the biscuit-tin hitting the ground. It begins: “The catastrophe was terrific and instantaneous in its effect...there is no record extant of a similar seismic disturbance in our island since.” (12.1858) This is another example of gigantism within this chapter. The biscuit box that the citizen threw at Bloom’s car probably made a slight clatter as it fell into the street, yet here we encounter it hyperbolized as a “seismic disturbance.” It is not clear in this section exactly what the natural disaster was. Because it had an epicenter, it would seem logical that it was an earthquake, yet other “eyewitnesses” reported a “violent atmospheric perturbation of cyclonic character.” (12.1869) Still others claimed they saw a meteor hurtling through the air (once again, an aggrandizement of the biscuit tin.) The passage claims that debris has been found as far away as The Giant’s Causeway.

This causeway is a collection of volcanic rocks on the coast of North Ireland that resembles an unfinished bridge. (Bulson 92) In Irish mythology, the great Irish warrior, Fionn mac Cumhaill, built the bridge in order to fight his Scottish counterpart, Benandonner. Benandonner was much larger and stronger than Fionn mac Cumhaill so Fionn mac Cumhaill retreated back to Ireland and asked his wife to dress him up like an infant in order to hide from Benandonner. When Benandonner came to find Fionn mac Cumhaill in Ireland he encountered Fionn mac Cumhaill’s wife and the massive “baby.” Upon looking at the large infant, Benandonner assumed Fionn mac Cumhaill must be a giant in order to produce such a large child and retreated to Scotland. (Gifford 381) This allusion functions on two levels: firstly as simply another riff on the theme of gigantism, but also as another attack on the character of Bloom. In the narration immediately preceding this stylistic aside Bloom is fleeing in a car. The tensions of the pub have

become too much and he is fleeing the stronger giant, Benandoner, in the form of the belligerent Citizen. Fionn mac Cumhaill uses cowardice and cunning to save himself in a fight he could not win. Rather than facing defeat and death, he tricks his stronger opponent. Is the focalizer drawing a parallel with Bloom? Is Bloom fleeing from a fight he cannot win, retreating to the metaphorical arms of his wife/mother as an infant? Certainly these psychosexual themes are present in Bloom's mind in "Circe."

Once again this narrative break quickly ends and the reader is returned to the direct, anonymous narration. The men joke back and forth regarding the Citizen's anger as Bloom's car speeds away: "And the last we saw was the bloody car rounding the corner and old sheepface on it gesticulating and the bloody mongrel [the Citizen's dog] after it." (12.1900) The final paragraph of the chapter is another stylistic departure. This one satirizing Biblical language (Gifford 381): "When, lo, there came about them all a great brightness and they beheld the chariot wherein He stood ascend to heaven. [sic]" (12.1910) The passage once again calls into question the ambivalent view of the focalizer of these stylistic asides towards Leopold Bloom. Bloom is described in terms reminiscent of both Jesus of Nazareth and Elijah. Both these men ascended to heaven. Bloom's speedy departure from the pub becomes exaggerated into an ascension to Heaven similar to Biblical heroes, once again circumscribing and accentuating his Jewish heritage and cowardice in retreat. A voice comes from the sky calling "Elijah! Elijah!" to which Bloom responds "Abba! Adonai!" (345) meaning "Father-God! God!" (Gifford 381) This was the same lamentation that Christ gave during his anguish in the garden of Gethsemane: And he [Jesus] said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee: take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt" (Mark 14:36). In her book, *Joyce and the Bible*, Virginia Moseley claims that this is the

moment when “Bloom reveals his identity” (Moseley 74). This is the only occasion in these latter stylistic asides where Bloom (or the vision of Bloom that the focalizer creates) actually speaks. Since the stylistic asides are not seen as part of the narrative, but a parody of it, the reader is left to wonder: did Bloom actually utter these words, and assume the role of “ben Bloom Elijah”? (12.1916) This section also reminds the reader of the Citizen statement earlier in the chapter about Bloom: “A wolf in sheep’s clothing, says the citizen. That’s what he is. Virag from Hungary! Ahasuerus I call him. Cursed by God” (12.1617-8). In his book, *Joyce and the Jews*, Ira Nadel explains the name “Ahasuerus”: “Ahasuerus was the name of the Jew who treated Christ rudely on the day of the Crucifixion but was also a King of the Persians and the husband of Esther in the Book of Esther. Archetypically, he become associated with the Wandering Jew” (Nadel 55). Because he mocked Christ, Ahasuerus was doomed to walk the Earth until the Second Coming. Buck Mulligan alludes to Bloom as Ahasuerus in “Scylla and Charybdis” as well: “The wandering jew, Buck Mulligan whispered with clown’s awe. Did you see his eye? He looked upon you to lust after you...O, Kinch [Stephen Dedalus], thou art in peril.” (9.1210-1)

In this section Bloom is called “ben Bloom Elijah” (12.1916). This name, like “Nagyasagos uram Lipoti Virag,” in the earlier passage highlights Bloom’s ethnic difference from the other men in the bar. The anonymous narrator of the majority of the chapter certainly sees Bloom as an outsider, but even the focalizer of these stylistic asides seems to contribute to the reader’s sense of Leopold Bloom’s alienation. By aggrandizing him as Christ/Elijah or a royal dignitary and heightening the foreignness of his names, the focalizer is further distancing Bloom from Ireland and, vicariously, the reader. The “giants” of “Cyclops” become alienating agents within the text. In this way,

the thirty-three stylistic parodies become far less benign than their surface inspection supposes.

In his work on the subject of parody in “Cyclops,” Mark Nunes suggest that another form of gigantism is at play in his chapter. He sees the multitude of narrative gazes as representative of the one-eyed giant of *The Odyssey*: Polyphemus. Because each narrator’s point of view is limited by either narrative position or parody, no single voice can speak for the actions of the men at Kiernan’s Pub. The “I” narrator is limited by his or her locality. He or she can only function in first person restricted because he or she is a character within the narrative he or she is advancing. The stylistic asides are limited by the same restrictions as the forms that they parody.

The journalistic parodies, such as the account of the “seismic disturbance” (12.1872) can only gaze dispassionately at the events, which it reports. The parodies of epic such as the final account of Bloom’s departure from the scene lack the clarity and matter-of-fact narration that would be helpful to the reader’s comprehension of the situations being described. Therefore Nunes sees these different styles are essentially their own one-eyed giants, constantly interrupting each other and reminding the reader of the inherent failures of the singular narrative gaze. He claims that the final sentence:

And they beheld Him even Him, ben Bloom Elijah, amid clouds of
angels ascend to the glory of the brightness
at an angle of fortyfive degrees over Donohoe's in Little Green
street
like a shot off a shovel. (12.1915-18)

actually functions as an overview of the entire narrative strategy of the chapter. Moving from the epic, Biblical language of the stylistic aside that it bookends (“And they beheld

him..." into the "objective" journalistic gaze, "...at an angle of fortyfive degrees..." and concluding with the "Dub" slang of the I-narrator: "like a shot off a shovel." (Nunes 178) These stylistic changes in such quick succession reminds how untrustworthy the multiplicity of voices in this chapter truly are and, as Nunes puts it, reminds us of the comedy of "Cyclops": "This final sentence presents in miniature the overall narrative strategy of the chapter: a stand-up routine in which multiple impersonators wrestle for center stage, each constantly losing grip of the one microphone in midsentence or midthought, or surrendering it only at the most inopportune moments" (Nunes 178).

Above all else, *Ulysses* is a comic novel. This must always be kept in mind when dealing with this work. In attempting to uncover the "work" of the style and language of "Cyclops," this essay has, perhaps, come dangerously close to losing its sense of humor regarding the underlying meanings of this passage of *Ulysses*. A case can be made that the ambivalence this essay has uncovered in this selection is actually part of Joyce's sense of play regarding the gigantic. At times the narrator of the stylistic asides seems profoundly sympathetic to Bloom and other times strongly against Bloom. In each case it is an intensified emotion, therefore forming another of Joyce's riffs on the theme of gigantisms. This possibility should always be kept in mind to check the over-zealous inquirer.

The astute reader of *Ulysses* has noticed this second narrator as early as the first chapter. In "Telemachus" the focalizer/narrator cannot help interjecting: "his even white teeth glistening here and there with gold points. *Chrysostomos*. [italics mine] Two strong shrill whistles answered through the calm." (1.38) As early as the thirty-eighth line someone *else* is speaking other than the narrator. This establishes as distance between the narration and the narrator(s.) Through many of the early chapters this

multivocal narrator does not interfere with the narrative flow of the text. Yet “Cyclops” marks a kind of threshold. The chapters that follow “Cyclops” begin to display the increasing power and control of the focalizing force that seemed so minor and easily overlooked with his or her first cry of “Chrysostomos” in “Telemachus.” “Cyclops” disjointed, “interrupting” (Nunes 178) narrators establish a system of coordinates of possibility for the subsequent chapters after “Cyclops.” It prepares the reader for the questioning other voice in “Ithaca” and the complex multiplicity of narrative dialogues in “Circe.” Because “Cyclops” begins to establish the focalizer as almost a character within the very story that he or she is telling, it is only appropriate to begin in “Cyclops” when interpreting the motivations of this new character/narrator/focalizer. If we accept the focalizer as a character we can ask the same basic questions that we would of a character within the narrative as well. What motivates him or her? How does his or her language “work?” How does his or her presentation and stylistic choices affect the comprehension of the text? What does he or she think of the characters that he or she is narrating? It is important to understand these motives and intentions of this narrative interloper, as he or she begins to take the reins of narration. To do this we must question his or her ideological and political motives as well as his or her stylistic and rhetoric choices as they often overlap each other. Without it, an important voice in the later half of the novel becomes unintelligible.

Works Cited

- Bal, Mieke. *A Mieke Bal Reader*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

- Doherty, Gerald. "Imperialism and the Rhetoric of Sexuality in James Joyce's 'Ulysses.'" *European Joyce Studies* 8 (1998): 207-230.
- Duffy, Enda. *Subaltern "Ulysses."* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Fairhall, James. *James Joyce and the Question of History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Gifford, Don. "*Ulysses*" *Annotated.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Hayman, David. "*Ulysses*": *The Mechanics of Meaning.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* New York: Vintage Books, 1986.
- Moseley, Virginia. *Joyce and the Bible.* DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1967.
- Nadel, Ira B. *Joyce and the Jews: Culture and Texts.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989.
- Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism.* New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Norris, Margot. "Fact, Fiction, and Anti-Semitism in the 'Cyclops' Episode of Joyce's 'Ulysses.'" *Journal of Narrative Theory* 36.2 (2006): 163-189.
- Nunes, Mark. "Beyond the 'Holy See': Parody and Narrative Assemblage in 'Cyclops'." *Twentieth Century Literature* 45.2 (1999): 174-185.
- Prier, Raymond A. "Joyce's Linguistic Imitation of Homer: The 'Cyclops Episode' and the Radical Appearance of the Catalogue Style." *Neohelicon* 14 (Mar. 1987): 39-66.
- Raleigh, John H. *The Chronicle of Leopold and Molly Bloom: Ulysses as Narrative.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Reizbaum, Marilyn. "Joyce's Grand Nationals." *European Joyce Studies* 8 (1998): 187-206.

Richardson, Brian. "The Genealogies of "Ulysses", the Invention of Postmodernism, and the Narratives of Literary History." *ELH* 67.4 (2000): 1035-1054.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Senn, Fritz. "Ovidian Roots of Gigantism in Joyce's "Ulysses"." *Journal of Modern Literature* 15.4 (1989): 561-577.

Valente, Joseph. *James Joyce and the Problem of Justice*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.