



ONE DAY, JAMES JOYCE

Edited by Burçin Erol



HACETTEPE

Ambasaid na hÉireann

One Day, James Joyce

Edited by Burçin Erol

Department of English Language
and Literature
Hacettepe University

and

The Embassy of Ireland

© Hacettepe University, Department of English Language
and Literature, 2012

Ankara, Turkey

Printed by Bizim Büro

Cover illustration: Portrait of James Joyce by Barrie
Maguire with the courtesy of the painter.

Cover design by Sinan Akılı



Table of Contents

Foreword

1. From the National to the Transnational: Joyce's Ever-expanding Fictions	1
John McCourt	
2. James Joyce's <i>Ulysses</i> : A Homeric Parody Revisited.....	20
Himmet Umunç	
3. Translating James Joyce into Turkish	35
N. Berrin Aksoy	
4. The Irish Pub: A Restorative Milieu for Farrington in James Joyce's "Counterparts"	49
A. Deniz Bozer	
5. "Performative Acts" in "The Dead"	68
Aytül Özüm	
6. James Joyce: The Man in His Letters	83
Alev Karaduman	
7. From <i>Stephen Hero</i> to <i>A Portrait</i> : A Debate on Aesthetics.....	97
Zeynep Z. Atayurt	
Note on Contributors	113



Foreword

This volume is comprised of the articles focusing on different aspects of the works of James Joyce. Originally the shorter versions of the articles were presented at the “One Day, James Joyce Conference” held by the Department of English Language and Literature of Hacettepe University in collaboration with the Embassy of Ireland in Ankara, December 5, 2011. Among the articles which present in depth study of some of Joyce’s works is also one that is specific to studies related to the Turkish translations.

The other point that makes the Conference and the collection of articles special is the support of the Embassy of Ireland. Ireland has been the country of numerous writers who have significant place in European and world literature. The choice of James Joyce as the first of the Irish Writers Conference series was a conscious one as Joyce is among the three most read of the artists who write in English, the other two being Shakespeare and Dickens. It is worth mentioning once again the importance of the official support of the Irish government in sharing this literary and cultural richness with the world.

I would like to once again express my thanks to the former Ambassador of Ireland His Excellency Thomas Russel and His Excellency Kenneth Thomson the Ambassador of Ireland to Turkey. Thanks are also due to Prof. Dr. Uğur Erdener, the former Rector of Hacettepe University and Prof. Dr. Musa Yaşar Sağlam, the former Dean of the Faculty of Letters.

Burçin Erol



1

From the National to the Transnational: Joyce's Ever-expanding Fictions

John McCourt

I might easily have written this story in the traditional manner. [...] Every novelist knows the recipe. [...] It is not very difficult to follow a simple, chronological scheme which the critics understand.' (Joyce qtd. in Jolas 11-12)

Joyce wanted to be simultaneously a writer who was both Irish and European. Thus he became a central figure of the international modernist movement but did so while remaining peculiarly 'national' in his interests, setting all of his works in his native city, with the exception of the brief but evocative Triestine poem-in-prose, *Giacomo Joyce*. Joyce believed that his writing took on an international dimension precisely because of its rootedness in Ireland. As he told Arthur Power, the world's great writers

From the National to the Transnational

were national first [...] and it was the intensity of their own nationalism which made them international in the end [...]. For myself, I always write about Dublin, because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities in the world. In the particular is contained the universal.' (qtd. in Ellmann 505)

Part of Joyce's originality lay in his ability to combine a fidelity to his local Irish world with an expansive sense of the global, to engage in a constant act of cultural translation, to distil into his fiction elements from both his abandoned but ever-present Ireland and from his chosen exile in various European cities.

We need look no further than the Blooms for evidence of this: Leopold, the most unlikely of 'hero' for an Irish national epic, is at once Irish and Roman Catholic as well as being the son of a Hungarian Jewish emigrant; while Molly, born in 1870 in Gibraltar, a 'Spanish type' who becomes 'Mrs Bloom, my wife the prima donna, Madam Marion Tweedy' (*U* 652.37) and is 'the accomplished daughter of Major Brian Tweedy' (*U* 652.41). Her father served with the Royal Dublin Fusiliers and fought at Rorke's Drift and Plevna and is representative of the British Empire while at the same time resembling 'moustached ... Turko the Terrible'. Her mother was a Spanish Jewish called Lunita Laredo. Like Bloom, in a sense she is

John McCourt

both Jewish and Catholic. The mixture of identities embodied in the Blooms are constitutive of Joyce's sense of transnational realities, of his belief that racial purity can never be anything other than a fiction, of his desire to write an Irish novel that is also, in fundamental ways, European. Although both Leopold and Molly Bloom are clearly connoted as Dubliners, it is their 'foreign' qualities that spark their initial mutual attraction. Bloom appreciates Molly's being 'Spanish, half that is' (*U* 16. 876), her having the 'passionate abandon of the south' (*U* 16.1409) while Molly has told him that she chose him 'Because you were so foreign from the others' (*U* 13.1209-10). In 'Nausicaa' Gerty MacDowell similarly notices him as 'that foreign gentleman' (*U* 13. 1302). Strictly speaking, of course Bloom is not a foreigner, having been born in Dublin, just as he is not really or halachically a Jew since his mother was not Jewish and he was never circumcised.

Hybrid, mixed-middling Bloom is a Dubliner with a most unusual Mitteleuropean family background in Szombathely in Hungary. As Cormac O'Grada has shown in his history of the Jewish community in Ireland, Joyce would have found no prototype for this figure in Dublin.¹ The Dublin Jewish community was small and mostly came from further east than Hungary. Bloom, 'a citizen of the British Empire' and 'an Irishman', is marked out by his being so mixed, so different, half belonging to a variety of worlds. He is 'a Jew, a European but an Oriental both because he is a

¹ Cormac O'Grada, *Jewish Ireland in the Age of Joyce. A Socioeconomic History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

From the National to the Transnational

Jew and because he is Irish' (Kershner 291). He is also a Mediterranean man, who appreciates beauty and likes looking at women. His breakfast of inner organs was more a speciality of Trieste than it was of Dublin, while his chosen repast of 'a few olives too if they had them. Italian I prefer. Good glass of burgundy take away that. Lubricate. A nice salad, cool as a cucumber' (*U* 8. 758-762) and his actual snack of burgundy, olives and Gorgonzola cheese certainly owes more to the Triestine than to the Dublin diet. These 'foreign' features owe much to Trieste and to Joyce's friend there, Ettore Schmitz (better known under his pseudonym, Italo Svevo). Bloom is also connoted as an Oriental, 'at his best an exotic tree which, when rooted in its native orient, throve and flourished and was abundant in balm, but, transplanted to a clime more temperate, its roots have lost their quondam vigour' (*U* 14.937-40), one who 'hitches his belt sailor-fashion and with a shrug of oriental obeisance salutes the court, pointing one thumb heavenward' (*U* 15. 959-961). His Jewishness derives from his being of Hungarian-Jewish extraction, and is signaled by the classical (Rabbinical) oriental looks attributed to him by Joyce: 'height 5 ft 9 1/2 inches, full build, olive complexion, may have since grown a beard, when last seen was wearing a black suit' (*U* 17. 2002-2004). Furthermore, 'Bloom's 'relish for the inner organs of beasts' is a cultural marker of Jewish identity - one which becomes completely secularised with the pork kidney' (Davison 201). He is a child of Israel wandering in the wilderness, longing for the sustenance of fruit, thinking of his family roots in the East, in Palestine, and of the passage from there to the Mediterranean, a passage which mirrors that of Molly through Spain,

John McCourt

Gibraltar, the Mediterranean - across Europe to Dublin. Bloom also thinks Molly's bed made a similar trip 'from Gibraltar by long sea long ago' (*U* 15. 3289).

It is useful to bear in mind two contemporary source spaces feeding not only into the makeup of Bloom's character but into the entire rich tapestry that is the *Ulysses* text. The combination of both a Dublin and a foreign lens opens up Joyce's text and reveals just how much the writer imported from abroad. Thus the experience of reading Joyce cannot but be enhanced if we use what Joyce calls 'doubling bicirculars' (*FW* 295.31) and attempt to see Joyce's 'double densed' work (*FW* 365.18) 'from a double focus' (*FW* 349.13). This is not to call for a return to seeing Joyce as a rootless international modernist cut off from his Irish world, but rather to point to the rootedness of his works in his various European homes and most particularly in Trieste, the principal source of the non-Irish materials in *Ulysses*. What Stephen Dedalus calls 'so familiar and so foreign' referring to the Dean of Studies' English has far broader ramifications than simply Ireland's semi-colonial relationship with its bigger island neighbour. Feelings of familiarity and foreignness accompanied Joyce throughout his life: in Trieste, for instance he would have listened to the Austrians and Slavs trying to speak the native Italian language, or better the dialect of *Triestino*, which was both a familiar language and officially a foreign tongue; in Zurich he would have heard familiar Austrian German turned foreign in the Swiss-German version that was used there. Processes of familiarisation and foreignization are in constant

From the National to the Transnational

play and provide his particular literary language with much of its energy.

Joyce used his forty-year continental exile to find his way to come to terms with his home and with what oppressed it. For him, the act of leaving permitted the act of imaginative recreation of what has been left behind. On being asked by Mrs Sheehy Skeffinton why he did not return to Ireland, Joyce replied: 'Have I ever left it?' (Ellmann 704). This position would become a paradigmatic one for many post-colonial writers and intellectuals writing in Joyce's wake, and often living in an exile that was compulsory rather than chosen.

The foreign elements in Joyce's work challenge the native ones and vice-versa. Joyce effectively seems to pre-empt Edward Said's idea of 'contrapuntal reading' which he introduced in his *Culture and Imperialism* which stressed the need for a 'simultaneous awareness' both of 'metropolitan history' and 'other histories' (Said 51). Said had in mind European and non-European worlds, Joyce, on the other hand, is thinking of European culture and Irish culture, with Ireland being representative of 'other', this point being made even more pointedly in the careful juxtaposition of the 'outsider' Irish and Jewish cultures in *Ulysses* which Joyce referred to as his 'epic of two races (Israel and Ireland)' (SL 70). If doubleness is evident in the characters and political reach of many of the topical issues in *Ulysses*, in *Finnegans Wake* it assumes a textual dimension in the individual words where there is a constant double (and sometimes multiple) play: Hiberno or Irish-English and foreign linguistic elements are intricately juxtaposed and

John McCourt

compete with each other even within individual words, each of which offers allusional evidence to be interpreted one way or another or better one way *and* another. Meaning, never definitive, exists as a seemingly transitory assembly of combined possibilities and the reader has to constantly wonder exactly what language is being spoken: 'Are we speachin d'anglas landadge or are you sprakin sea Djoytsch?'(FW 485.12-13).

Joyce's Irishness is what roots his works but he also wanted to show that Irishness was, like every other identity, a mere construction and one which he would relentlessly interrogate in his fiction. He knew he would not be thanked at home for doing so. In *Stephen Hero*, Stephen Daedalus is taken to task by the Gaelic Revivalist Hughes who tells him:

'They wanted no foreign filth. [...] the Irish people had their own glorious literature where they could always find fresh ideals to spur them on to new patriotic endeavours. Mr Daedalus was himself a renegade from the Nationalist ranks; he professed cosmopolitanism. But a man that was of all countries was of no country - you must first have a nation before you can have art.' (SH 95)

Part of the originality of Joyce's writing is to constantly juxtapose an art which is undeniably

From the National to the Transnational

national (although never nationalist), undeniably Irish (although never provincial) with one that is equally 'of all countries'. Writing at a time in which various European nationalisms were increasingly openly disparaging 'foreign filth' in favour of ideas of purity of race, language, origin, Joyce constructs a vision of the nation in his fiction before the nation is formally established – and *de facto* contradicts Hughes - while at the same time deconstructing the very premises on which the Irish nation would actually be founded. For many decades, the essential Irishness of Joyce's works remained obscured by the Irish who rejected his attacks on the twin Irish building blocks of Catholicism and nationalism and by international scholars who preferred to see him as an apolitical European, an internationalist, a high-modernist, cosmopolitan, canonical figure. Joyce himself was partially responsible for his being cast within this latter frame. After all, he instructed his biographer, Herbert Gorman, to proclaim that he 'did not meddle in politics in any way. ... his entire devotion and travail were concentrated on the development and perfection of his art' (Gorman 257).

Subsequent readings of Joyce in this key, that is of a Joyce above and beyond politics (meaning nationalist –mostly Irish – politics) were entirely in keeping with their post-war times. Various of Joyce's friends argued in favour of seeing the writer in this cosmopolitan light and of reading his texts in an ahistorical, anti-nationalist manner: among them, Ezra Pound disputed the need for local knowledge of Dublin in order to read *Ulysses* and hailed Joyce 'as a European, not as a provincial' (Read 32-33). The need

John McCourt

to see Joyce in this light intensified, especially for creative writers both during and in the aftermath of the Second World War. The Italian novelist, Alberto Moravia was representative of many when he wrote of Joyce as 'the incarnation of Europe', of 'a free Europe, where art and literature travelled far and wide like gentle breezes announcing the arrival of spring. A Europe with neither borders nor divisions, where it was legitimate to change places according to the whims of literary inspiration' (Moravia 12).

What these readings made increasingly clear was that in order to become the defining figure within the Irish narrative tradition and to help dislodge 'Christ and Caesar', the Roman Catholic and British Empires that had colonised the Irish mind, Joyce had felt it utterly necessary to connect his writings and subsequently reconnect his unsure country with European modernity. Light had to be brought in from beyond the island. Joyce's inspiration came from many sources that included his fellow exile Dante: 'I love Dante almost as much as the Bible. He is my spiritual food, the rest is ballast' (Ellmann 218) and Flaubert, whom he admired for his precision, detachment, and minute attention to detail. Joyce also looked to Ibsen whom he believed had been the most formative influence on his generation and whom he praised for his 'inward heroism' and his 'absolute indifference to public canons of art, friends and shibboleths' (SL 7). And all these before we even mention Homer or Vico, presiding spirits haunting *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* respectively. In *Dubliners*, Joyce drew on Gabriele D'Annunzio's conception of the epiphany as found in his *L'Epifania del Fuoco* (The Epiphany of

From the National to the Transnational

Fire) which was the first part of his *Il Fuoco* (The Fire), a work held in the highest possible esteem by the young Joyce. He found in it a way of avoiding the progressive, chronological direction of so much of the fiction he was reading. Although he never defined exactly what he meant by epiphany, we have a workable definition from Stephen Daedalus in *Stephen Hero*. He says that epiphanies are a sudden and momentary showing forth or disclosure of one's authentic inner self. This disclosure might manifest itself in vulgarities of speech, or gestures, or memorable phases of the mind. So there is a renewed understanding of the self from a seemingly small actual event. More often than not, the epiphany happens for the reader more than it does for Joyce's protagonist. In any case, Joyce conceived his collection of short stories as a sequence of fifteen epiphanies which were written to let Irish people take 'one good look at themselves in his nicely polished looking-glass' (SL 90). The crucial relationship in Joyce's short stories is no longer between an omniscient narrator who, from the first page of a narrative, possesses a sense of an ending but between an unsure protagonist with whom an uncertain reader enters into communion as part of his attempt at personal interpretation. Expectation of the epiphany is more often than not raised only to be frustrated in the reader who reads in vain for signs of change or satisfaction.

Joyce's forces his readers – and he was writing primarily for an Irish audience – to dwell on the absence of hope that permeates his Dublin world and to seek explanations for it. The frustrating fictions of

John McCourt

Dubliners reveal Joyce's early modernist moves: the elimination of the all-knowing narrator, the insistence on an epiphanic structure exposing otherwise ordinary moments in ordinary lives, a brooding darkness or an odour of corruption that hangs over the city of Dublin which begins to function as an emblematic urban centre of alienation. Joyce's experimentation in the circular stories of *Dubliners* is deepened and developed in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, his radical rewriting of the abandoned *Stephen Hero*. The novel closes with the words 'Dublin 1904 Trieste 1914' as though to underline the alchemical mixing of native and European elements in this, his first published novel. Both novels trade in the style of the *Künstlerroman* but if *Stephen Hero* belatedly bears many of the hallmarks of the nineteenth century novel, *A Portrait* substantially complicates and sometimes abandons realism as it embraces new modernist gestures. Much of the factual and autobiographical material of Joyce's own growing up present in *Stephen Hero* is erased into the phantasmagorical background in *A Portrait*. In *A Portrait* the supporting cast is reduced to a very secondary role so that the focus can be placed even more firmly on Stephen as an isolated hero. Stephen's mother becomes a minor voice while Maurice (a version of the much-put-upon Stanislaus) is refined out of existence (he is remembered just once in *A Portrait* and that only so that we can note that he has been forgotten: '- O, Holy Paul, I forgot about Maurice, said Mr Dedalus' (*P* 75). Much of the overt politics of the earlier work is also erased. Clearly Joyce has bigger fish to fry in addition to his fictionalization of his own process of maturing in Dublin: he wishes to question the very bases upon which a work of art will

From the National to the Transnational

be constructed. Joyce's *Portrait* immediately draws attention to its own artistry and, with its Latin epigraph from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, declares its intention to transform through layers of myth, symbol and artifice. If much of modernist literature is the literature of retelling, Joyce's *Portrait* sets out its store in crucially evoking different layers of meaning and in questioning the traditional role of narrative and of creating the illusion of truth (one of the commonest poses assumed in the realistic novel involved the text presenting itself as a transcription of a real document, an authentic account). Although drawing liberally on autobiographical elements from his own life, Joyce never lets his reader forget that he is reading a constructed narrative which announces its fictive nature in its 'once upon a time' *incipit*, the most widely accepted convention for opening an oral narrative in the English language: '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 3). Soon we are told that it was Stephen's father who told him that story. This signals not only the centrality of the father figure in the novel but it also underlines the inherited and unoriginal nature of all stories. Joyce's aim therefore was to tell old tales in a new way; to question the way in which novels are written, to place his focus on language and its power. Thus, a formulaic opening, which recalls oral culture, is revitalised into 'and a very good time it was' by a Joyce already on the path to exploding the formulas of fiction, making the old new. Young Stephen contributes to the retelling process and places himself within it, drawing our attention immediately to the

John McCourt

difficult boundaries between art and reality, to his own grasp on and ability to transmit reality .

Gradually in the novel Stephen's own sense of language develops as it must do because this is the portrait of a future literary artist. Soon Stephen has to try to grasp what exactly being a 'gentleman' means when questioned about his own father and then he finds himself contemplating the meaning of 'suck ... a queer word' (*P* 11). The reader can sense him trying out and enjoying words: 'And the air in the corridor chilled him too. It was queer and wettish' (*P* 11) and is invited to participate as Stephen tries to understand his own place in the world. Later in the novel, by the time he gets to University, Stephen's broodings on language have matured as the focus narrows unto individual words, which are no longer dead vehicles employed simply for describing other objects, but lively, changing objects of interest in themselves.

He found himself glancing from one casual word to another on his right or left in stolid wonder that they had been so silently emptied of instantaneous sense until every mean shop legend bound his mind like the words of a spell and his soul shrivelled up sighing with age as he walked on in a lane among heaps of dead language. His own consciousness of language was ebbing from his brain and trickling into the very words themselves

From the National to the Transnational

which set to band and disband
themselves in wayward rhythms.

(P 193)

This echoes with a corresponding early paragraph in *Stephen Hero* which opens to the core of Joyce's fascination with language and shows that Stephen like his creator, is horrified with people who are 'strangely ignorant of the value of the words they used so glibly' (SH 29).

It was not only in Skeat that he found words for his treasure-house, he found them also a haphazard in the shoops, on the advertisements, in the mouths of the plodding public. He kept repeating them to himself till they lost all instantaneous meaning and became wonderful vocables. (SH 33)

This is an anticipation of Joyce's future relationship to language right up to *Finnegans Wake*. Words, the words literally picked up in the street, we are told, in order to be rescued from the hell of hells, which is the hell of the Obvious, must lose 'all instantaneous meaning', and then they become 'wonderful vocables'. This can be linked to Joyce's use of the epiphany, indeed the language of the *Wake* as 'a constant epiphanisation of current, familiar, obvious everyday language, by a process of translation that intensifies to the utmost its semantic values, so that the banal

John McCourt

becomes memorable, the common word becomes a wonderful vocable (Melchiori, 1995: 101). But already this process is in train as words and languages jostle for prominence in *A Portrait*: 'The word now shone in his brain, clearer and brighter than any ivory sawn from the mottled tusks of elephants. IVORY, IVOIRE, AVORIO, EBUR' (P 193).

By now words seem to Stephen to exist almost in isolation and are studied as physical formations emptied of 'instantaneous sense', of their everyday meanings and thus reborn. In this process Joyce the Irish author is thus interrogating the standard forms of English, is claiming personal control over the language which he has inherited by imposition. If language begins to be an issue in *A Portrait* which alternates between the first and third person, this dialogic quality mushrooms out into a multitude of competing voices in *Ulysses*, a novel which places language use centre stage. Each of the eighteen episodes is cast in a startlingly unique style and the reader is challenged to make significant adjustments so as to cope with a sense of disorientation. Very often it seems that the dominant building blocks of the traditional novel – fixed character and straightforward plot – or, as Joyce called them in a 1926 letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, 'wideawake language, cutanddry grammar and goahead plot', have become optional and that the dominant presence to emerge from the novel is the city of Dublin itself which is not only brought to life visually in a way that, among other things, owes a debt to early cinema, but is also made to 'speak' in a multitude of voices. Bloom's observation that 'Everything speaks in its own way' (*U* 7.177) reflects a

From the National to the Transnational

significant part of Joyce's symphonic method of employing language in the novel. A few examples give a sense of the novel's achievement in conveying everyday noise in a manner somewhat analogous with that of the Italian futurists (whom Joyce came to know in Trieste): The printing press says 'Sllt' (*U* 7.177) while a gong sounds as 'Bang Bang Bla Bak Blud Bugg Bloo' (*U* 15.189) and a train is heard passing 'frseeeeeeeefronnnng' (*U* 18.596). Even Bloom's bursting trouser button snaps 'Bip!' (*U* 15. 3441) as his trousers fall as the Ulyssean cacophony of sounds lays the way for the diversified babble of 'the chaosmos of Alle anyway connected' (*FW* 118.23) which is coming in *Finnegans Wake*. While here sound is emphasized, what is again relentlessly to the fore is language itself which becomes the unrivalled protagonist of Joyce's last work.

The individual word in the *Wake*, with its simultaneous qualities of appearing to be both foreign and familiar to the reader, takes on a life of its own, resists classification and incarnates the idea of hybridisation, contamination, migration, stratification, assimilation. We should never forget that Joyce was writing between two world wars, under the threat of exasperated nationalisms, and the rampant fascism and nazism that were about to tear Europe apart. By now one of Joyce's aims was to explode the notion that English or any other language for that matter could be used as means to classify a race. Joyce came to refuse the very word race, the idea of purity interrogated in the blend of Irish-German nationalism in the play on the Irish word for Ireland, Éire, in *Finnegans Wake* as the 'eirest race, the ourest nation, the airest place that

John McCourt

erestationed' (FW 514.36-515.1) and instead gave voice to the 'confusioning of human races' (FW 35.5). In doing so he gave voice to a union of languages and to the Europe he had seen from afar, had longed for in Dublin and had discovered at first hand in Trieste, Zurich, and Paris. This effect of 'confusioning' is to unite all Joyce readers as foreigners before the provisionally English text of *Finnegans Wake* and also to empower each and everyone to bring his own familiar language to bear on the limitless linguistic union that is his last book. And in this lies much of the pleasure of the text, the pleasure of *dépaysement*, unfamiliarity. The Russian critic Viktor Shklovsky claimed that this effect is one of the goals of art and used the term *ostranenie*, usually translated as 'defamiliarization,' to describe it:

The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar,' to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. *Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important.* (Shklovsky 12)

Joyce's experiences living in unfamiliar European cities played a role in his development of what might be called a technique of defamiliarization in his fiction, the technique which allowed him to use the cracked

From the National to the Transnational

looking-glass of his fiction as the place to make his native place and native people new and unfamiliar both to themselves and to others, to allow the Irish to 'See ourselves as others see us', to quote Leopold Bloom (*U* 8.661-2).

WORKS CITED

- Davison, Neil. *James Joyce, Ulysses, and the Construction of Jewish Identity: Culture, Biography, and 'the Jew' in Modernist Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Gorman, Herbert. *James Joyce: A Definitive Biography*. London: The Bodley Head, 1941.
- Jolas, Eugene. "My Friend James Joyce" in *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism*. Ed. Seon Givens. New York: Vanguard Press, 1948.
- Joyce, James. *Stephen Hero*. London: Triad Grafton 1989 [1944].
- _____. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. London: Penguin, 2000.
- _____. *Ulysses*. Ed. Hans Walter Gabler. New York: Vintage, 1984.
- _____. *Finnegans Wake*. Ed. John Bishop. London: Penguin, 1999.
- _____. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking, 1975.

John McCourt

- Kershner, R. Brandon. "Ulysses and the Orient." *James Joyce Quarterly* 35 (1998): 273–96.
- Melchiori, Giorgio. *Joyce's Feast of Languages: Seven Essays and Ten Notes*, in Ed. Franca Ruggieri *Joyce Studies in Italy* 4 Bulzoni, Roma 1995.
- Moravia, Alberto. 'Omaggio a Joyce', *Prospettive* (Rome), 4.11-12, 1940.
- Read, Herbert, ed. *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce*. London: Faber & Faber, 1967.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.
- Shklovsky, Victor. "Art as Technique" in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Ed. Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965: 3-24.



2

Joyce's *Ulysses*: The Homeric Parody Revisited

Himmat Umunç

It should be pointed out at the outset that this paper is basically a discussion of Joyce's parodic use of Homer's *Odyssey* in *Ulysses*. Although Joyce's Homeric parody in *Ulysses* has been one of the major concerns of Joyce scholarship, it has not been exhausted yet and still needs to be revisited for further commentary and interpretation. This is a need arising not from the thematic and generic nature of Homer's text but from the allusive complexity and parodic variability of Joyce's own text. Indeed, *Ulysses* is not an easy text in every sense, and Joyce never intended it for ordinary readers or as a novel for light reading and diversion. As he states in one of his letters, *Ulysses* is a novel written "for a very intelligent public" (*Letters* 117). Moreover, he complains that it has been "an extremely tiresome book" for himself (*Letters* 128) since, as he points out, "writing *Ulysses* is a tough job enough" (*Letters* 135) and he has been working on it "like a galley-slave, an ass, a brute" (*Letters* 146); he curses "the enormous bulk and the more than enormous complexity of my three times blasted novel"

(*Letters* 146), and he adds: “For seven years I have been working at this book—blast it!” (*Letters* 146). He further stresses that the novel “presents for me great technical difficulties and for the reader something worse” (*Letters* 143), and when he completes it he promises himself to “sleep for six months” (*Letters* 143). Indeed, his exhaustion resulting from writing the novel led him to curse the whole project when he cried out “damn Homer, Ulysses, Bloom and all the rest” (*Letters* 149). Throughout his letters written during the years he was working on his novel, Joyce again and again complains with protests and curses about the novel and looks forward to his *emancipation* from its exacting and torturous progress.

In fact, not only on the basis of evidence from Joyce’s letters but also in terms of its contents, *Ulysses* is an extremely complicated and arcane text, which has always been a standing challenge to many a learned critic and scholar as well as to intelligent and perceptive readers. It is a text which defies, with over 750 pages and eighteen episodes, any attempt to read it fluently and understand it fully. Academically, as Patrick F. Sheeran has observed, “Joyce scholarship today is a notoriously strenuous even esoteric field of study” (ix). This is mainly due to the complexity and enormous variety of the intertexts which are embedded in it and contain extensive allusions and references to an almost infinite range of sources and topics, comprising Christian Catholic liturgy and culture, classical mythology, literature and philosophy, the classical art of rhetoric, dialectics, aesthetics, patristic writings from the early Church Fathers to Aquinas in the Middle Ages, alchemy, numerology, mathematics,

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

astronomy and astrology, human physiology, theosophy, demonology, occultism, musicology, Irish folklore, history, literature and politics, the Celtic heritage, British culture, literature, linguistics, history and politics, and so on and so forth.¹ Thus, the intelligibility of the text is deliberately deferred and made largely unattainable. Into the text are encoded not only “camouflaged” allusions (Schork 184) but also a great deal of arcane material related to the sources and topics listed above. As a modernist or rather I would say a postmodernist writer (actually he always calls himself an “artist”) Joyce creates a text which is stylistically and semantically extremely sophisticated, and in which he experiments how the art of literary writing can be stretched to its limits, mimicking and appropriating a wide range of discourses and styles from the lyrical to the heroic, from the liturgical to the unquotably pornographical, from the classical to the modernist. So, *Ulysses* is actually an intricate mosaic of intertexts, a textual labyrinth, which, if one can use a simile, like the coils of a telephone network, leads to innumerable other texts that still lead further to more other texts. As the Irish scholar Brian Arkins has put it, “using mediaeval techniques in this endeavour, so that each episode has not only its own title, Scene, and Hour, but also its Organ, Art, Colour, Symbol and Technic, Joyce encompasses all forms of learning and all types of rhetoric” (63). Actually, to recall Joyce’s own description of the novel,

¹ For instance, just for the enormous variety and number of Latin sources used by Joyce not only in *Ulysses* but also in his other works of fiction, see Schork, 289-307.

Himmet Umunç

It [*Ulysses*] is an epic of two races (Israelite-Irish) and at the same time the cycle of the human body as well as a little story of a day (life). [...] It is also a sort of encyclopaedia. My intention is to transpose the [Homeric] myth *sub specie temporis nostri*. Each adventure (that is, every hour, every organ, every art being interconnected and interrelated in the structural scheme of the whole) should not condition but even create its own technique. Each adventure is so to say one person although it is composed of persons. (*Letters* 146-147)

On top of all these intertextual and contextual layers of multiple allusions and meanings in the novel, there is, of course, the obvious Homeric context, but Joyce's text makes it difficult to establish a clear and easily recognizable link with Homer's *Odyssey*, which mainly functions as a framework of reference (Arkins 8). As Joyce points out to his English painter friend Frank Budgen, "the *Odyssey* serves me as a ground plan" (qtd. in Arkins 60). Yet Joyce's use of Homer is not a case of slavish emulation or a clumsy exploitation of a ready-made model. On the contrary, by setting *The Odyssey* as the backdrop of what one may call his own postmodern mock-epic, Joyce revitalizes Homer and makes him the source of his own epiphanic narrative. In fact, it is an act of appropriation; in other words, he translates the

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

Homeric model into his own writing and reshapes it as a parody for his postmodernist construction of the Stephen-Bloom-Molly plot. As Brian Arkins has stated, "writing his story of Edwardian Dublin, Joyce achieved a massive metamorphosis of Homer's *Odyssey*" (3). Indeed, it is a parodic metamorphosis. In this regard, one may recall that, as a mode of writing, parody has been as "the imitative use of the words, styles, attitude, tone and ideas of an author in such a way as to make the ridiculous" (Cuddon 640). In other words, it is, to quote Robert Burden, "a mode of imitation in a subversive form" (135). Therefore, to achieve a comic or satirical effect, parody uses as its means exaggeration, subversion, ridicule, mimicry, distortion, appropriation and burlesquing. So parody is intrinsically a form of comedy and, as Northrop Frye has stressed, "as comedy, [it] exaggerates or distorts the prominent features of style or content in a work" (343). Indeed, the parodic text reverses and breaks up the original text, and this process of reversal becomes a kind of stylistic, topical, structural, typological and generic subversion by way of mocking and ridicule. In this regard, parody is generally classified as what Alastair Fowler has termed a "quasi-generic" type of writing that aims at the ridicule and rejection of the antecedent text on which it depends (126-127). Similarly, Jonathan Culler states that "parody is an imitation, and [...] by making its model explicit it implicitly denies that it is to be read as a serious statement of feelings about real problems or situations" (153). So Joyce's *Ulysses* is a mocking imitation of Homer's *Odyssey* in the sense that Joyce manipulates, distorts, expands, contracts, imitates, re-writes and glosses over Homer in terms of episodic

progression, polysemic allusions and parodic characterization. Indeed, he breaks up the Homeric text and re-arranges it topically, structurally, typologically and stylistically for his own parodic purpose. By doing so, he subverts the conventions of the Homeric epic. Hence, although in its episodic progression and parodic typology *Ulysses* is basically an exploitation of *The Odyssey*, the characters in the novel have nothing in common with Homer's characters in moral and heroic terms. They are not decent, good-mannered, psychologically sound types. They suffer from some sort of moral, psychological and social displacement and sexual aberration. Of course, this is the Menippean form of satire, which Joyce deliberately appropriates into his novel through Petronius' *Satyricon* (Schork 203). However, parodically, the situations and circumstances that Homer's Odysseus encounters on his wanderings have been transformed into the miniature world of Dublin in the early 1900s and represented mockingly through the scenes, people and incidents depicted in *Ulysses*. In other words, unlike the enormous predicaments that Homer's epic hero Odysseus faces and overcomes in alien climes and territories, the predicaments that Joyce's Ulysses-Bloom faces on his wanderings through Dublin are minimal and of mock-epic nature. Hence, as a mock-epic or a mock-heroic, *Ulysses* belongs in the tradition of Pope's *Rape of the Lock* and Byron's *Don Juan*.

As regards Joyce's exploitation and parodic appropriation of Homer, one may ask the question "Why Homer?" and "why *The Odyssey*?" In fact, before Joyce, there had been in the Irish cultural tradition a

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

somewhat historically recurrent interest in Homer. In this regard, the earliest Homeric interest in Ireland was represented by a medieval Irish version of *Ulysses*, called "*Merugud Uilix Mais Leirtis*", in the thirteenth century; translated as "*The Wanderings of Ulysses, Son of Laertes*," this medieval Gaelic text was an extensively abridged version in which the moral virtues of Penelope and Odysseus were highlighted, and it has been suggested that Joyce seems to have been familiar with this Irish version (Arkins 48-49). Moreover, towards the end of the nineteenth century, Trinity College in Dublin became a major centre of classical scholarship, and Joyce's close friend Oliver St. John Gogarty (1878-1957), represented as the bullying and pro-Hellenic character "Buck Mulligan" in *Ulysses*, studied medicine and the classics at this college and encouraged Joyce to come into close contact with the College's leading Hellenists (Arkins 17, 19-20). Joyce seems to have been influenced by Gogarty's philhellenic discourse, which is reiterated in *Ulysses* through Mulligan's constant arguments for the hellenization of Ireland. This is clearly indicated by Mulligan's remark to Stephen, whom he calls "Kinch": "God, Kinch, if you and I could only work together we might do something for the island. Hellenise it" (*Ul* 13).² In fact, from Mulligan's witty references in the novel to the ancient Greeks and their culture one infers that the Hellenization of Ireland ought to be achieved both culturally and institutionally so that neopaganism could replace corrupt Irish Catholicism and that Sandycove with its Martello

² The Penguin edition of Joyce's *Ulysses*, entered in the list of the works cited below, has been used for quotation and textual reference throughout the paper.

Himmet Umunç

Tower, where Stephen lives with Mulligan and the self-interested English Haines, could be the new centre of the world comparable to ancient Delphi with its omphalos (the navel-stone); the Irish people must rediscover their Hellenic origin and culture. This is implied by what crosses Stephen's mind: "To ourselves ... new paganism ... omphalos" (*Ul* 13). Moreover, Mulligan, who always taunts Stephen, jeers at his surname "Daedalus" since it is not Gaelic but Greek: "Your absurd name, an ancient Greek" (*Ul* 10). Ironically, he also adopts a Hellenized name and replaces his name "Buck" with "Malachi": "My name is absurd too: Malachi Mulligan, two dactyls. But it has a Hellenic ring, hasn't it?" (*Ul* 10).

Certainly, Joyce was not alone in his reveries of Hellenization. In fact, among the Irish revivalists and intellectuals at the time, there was a tendency to refer Homer's Achaeans to a Celtic origin. This view was brought to the fore in 1905 by Henry Browne, Joyce's master of classical studies at University College, Dublin, in his book *Handbook of Homeric Study* (295-301). Actually, Browne was commenting on another Irish classical scholar, Sir William Ridgeway, who, in his book *The Early Age of Greece* published in 1901, had advanced a controversial theory about Homer's Achaeans; according to Ridgeway, the Achaeans were originally a Celtic people that had moved to the South from northern Europe and settled in Greece about the middle of the second millennium B.C. (Browne 296-297). Thus, it was implied that the Achaeans and the Irish people, also an offshoot of the Celts, were racially related. Apparently inspired by this mythological connection between Ireland and ancient Greece, Yeats

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

wrote his lyrical epic poem *The Wanderings of Oisín* [Usheen], which, in the depiction of its hero's heroic adventures in distant lands and seas, seems to emulate *The Odyssey*. Similarly, while at the university, Joyce seems to have been strongly influenced by such a Hellenic link and adopted the same view. Furthermore, ever since his early school years, Joyce had been particularly interested in the character and adventures of Homer's Odysseus. He stresses his early interest in one of his letters, dated 21 September 1920, as follows: "The character of Ulysses always fascinated me—even when a boy." (*Letters* 146). Moreover, one of the texts included in Joyce's reading list of the English course at the secondary school was Charles Lamb's *Adventures of Ulysses*, which undoubtedly had an impact on his Homeric vision (Arkins 14, 54-55). At school not only did he write a composition on Ulysses as "my favourite hero" but also, later on, he planned to write a story with the title "Ulysses" and include it in *Dubliners*, which he wished to call *Ulysses in Dublin* (Arkins 5, 64). He refers to this attempt in a letter: "Imagine fifteen years ago [viz. in 1905] I started writing it as a short story for *Dubliners*!" (*Letters* 146). Privately he tried to master the Greek language and was much fascinated by ancient Greek history, culture, literature and civilization. Subscribing to the common view that the European civilization was the outcome of the Graeco-Roman civilization, Joyce sought his cultural belonging in Europe, not in imperial Britain. By adapting Homer's epic as the framework of reference for his Irish Jew Bloom's wanderings in Dublin and Stephen's search for a father figure, Joyce distances himself from the influence of British imperialism and

sees his cultural identity in the Graeco-Roman tradition of the European civilization.

Structurally considered, Homer's *Odyssey*, which consists of 24 books or chapters, is basically constituted by three parts that can be identified as Telemachus' search for his father Odysseus (the son looking for the father in the first four books), Odysseus' wanderings or predicaments (the hero at large) that are presented in Books V to XIV, and Odysseus' reunion with Telemachus and Penelope (the father's return home and reunion with the son and the wife), described in Books XV to XXIV. In other words, these three parts can be called Telemachy, Wanderings, Return. In *Ulysses*, which consists of eighteen episodes, Joyce uses a similar pattern but re-arranges and modifies Homer's number of the episodes and their corresponding books in the *Odyssey*. As Joyce himself charted out the plan of his novel in one of his letters (*Letters* 145), the first part, which he calls "Telemachia," contains three episodes named "Telemachus," "Nestor" and "Proteus" respectively; then, the second part, called "Odyssey," has twelve episodes that selectively and in a different order corresponds to some of Homer's own episodes and are called "Calypso," the "Lotus-Eaters," "Hades," "Eolus," the "Lestrygonians," "Scylla and Charybdis," the "Wandering Rocks," the "Sirens," the "Cyclops," "Nausikaa" [sic], the "Oxen of the Sun," and "Circe;" as for the third part, which Joyce calls "Nostos" that means the tail part of the novel, its episodes are "Eumeus" [sic], "Ithaca," and "Penelope." Along with his re-arrangement of the Homeric episodes as such, Joyce also introduces extensive divergences from

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

Homer's text in terms of the length of episodes as well as the thematic and individual affinities between the Bloom-Molly-Stephen triad on the one hand and the Odysseus-Penelope-Telemachus triad on the other. Of course, Joyce's Homeric divergences are natural because of his parodic use of *The Odyssey*. Hence, Stephen's affinity with Telemachus is mainly to be understood both in terms of the search-for-the-father motif and with reference to his relationship with the arrogant Mulligan and snobbish Haines, who are his fellow residents in the Martello Tower at Sandycove. Just as the suitors at Odysseus' palace constantly harass and bully Telemachus, Mulligan's arrogant behaviour towards Stephen becomes a parodic version of this Homeric scene. Like the arrogant and insolent suitor Antinous in Homer, Joyce's Mulligan has deep-seated jealousy against Stephen for his artistic and highly intellectual capacity; therefore, he harasses Stephen, mocks at him and, in an insidious way, tries to outdo and hegemonize him in learning, intelligence, artistic temperament. Thus, he becomes a kind of usurper by trying to intimidate and hegemonize Stephen just as, by his Englishness and commercial schemes, Haines represents English colonialism and imperialism whereby historically Ireland has been usurped and colonized by the English, and the Irish people have been regarded by them as primitive and uncivilized; so, like a Homeric suitor, Haines, culturally a snob and racially an Anglo-Saxon, stays in the Martello Tower and, despite Stephen's dislike of him, does not seem to be leaving just as the English never wish to leave Ireland and grant independence to its people. Parodically this is indicated in the morning talk between Stephen and Mulligan:

Himmet Umunç

- Tell me, Mulligan, Stephen said quietly.
- Yes, my love?

- How long is Haines going to stay in this tower?

Buck Mulligan showed a shaven cheek over his right shoulder.

-God, isn't he dreadful? he said frankly. A ponderous Saxon. He thinks you're not a gentleman. God, these bloody English. Bursting with money and indigestion. Because he comes from Oxford. (*U* 10)

Stephen, who has already abandoned his natural father Simon Daedalus and has come to live with these two companions, comparable to Homer's suitors who harass Telemachus in his father's absence, sets out in the morning of 16 June 1904 from the Martello Tower to look for a symbolic father who turns out to be Leopold Bloom. Bloom earns his living as an advertisement agent and, due to his impotence, cherishes sexually repressed fantasies and images of sexually inviting female buttocks. He craves for sexual intercourse but not with his wife Molly. Like Homer's Odysseus wandering in faraway lands and facing all sorts of predicaments, Bloom has also set out from his home in Dublin's Eccles Street to wander through the city, encountering different people and visiting various places. It is during his wanderings that he comes into contact with Stephen, who has also been wandering

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

around. Bloom treats him with affection and warmth. Yet, this father-son relationship does not last long since, at the end of their companionship towards the early hours of the following day, Stephen, invited by Bloom to his home where he (Bloom) intends to offer Molly to him, parts with Bloom and wanders away to a new phase of life. With his fantasies and wishful thinking about sexual intercourse, Bloom goes to bed and sleeps. Thus, reversing Homer's account of Odysseus and Telemachus collaborating and fighting the suitors to put things in order, Joyce anticlimactically makes Bloom and Stephen part with each other.

During the day, while Bloom has been wandering through Dublin, his wife Molly is visited by her lover Blazes Boylan who makes love to her. Bloom knows about this illicit relationship and remains indifferent to it. Contrary to Homer's portrayal of Penelope as a chaste and loving wife, patiently awaiting the ultimate return of her husband, Molly is depicted as a sexually frustrated but unsatiably hungry wife, who has no moral scruples and dignity. She sees her femininity only in terms of sensualism. Her confessional account of her sexual experiences since her early womanhood is given in the novel in the form of a continuous and unpunctuated monologue, which turns Joyce's Penelope parody into a most sophisticated and literarily most memorable *tour de force*. She has an unquotably pornographical perception of gender relations. However, since Bloom has not had sexual intercourse with her for over a decade, she has developed some nymphomaniac illusions. As a middle-aged woman, she now has no other choice but to

Himmet Umunç

continue to live with Bloom as her husband. This acceptance of hers constitutes the closing part of her monologue, in which, recalling her first offer to Bloom during their courtship, she dreams of offering herself to Bloom again for a sexual climax:

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. (*Ul* 704)

To conclude, Joyce's *Ulysses*, with its extremely polysemic allusions and meanings, can be referred to as an unparalleled and inimitable form of parody. It has always maintained its enigmatic and cryptic depth of meaning and, therefore, defied any full and learned interpretation. In terms of its parodic affinities with *The Odyssey*, it can be qualified as a deliberate and playful *reductio ad absurdum* of the Homeric text.

WORKS CITED

- Arkins, Brian. *Greek and Roman Themes in Joyce*.
Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1999.
- Browne, Henry, S.J. *Handbook of Homeric Study*.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1905.

James Joyce's *Ulysses*: A Homeric Parody

- Burden, Robert. "The Novel Interrogates Itself: Parody as Self-Consciousness in Contemporary English Fiction." *The Contemporary English Novel*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury and David Palmer. Startford-upon-Avon Studies 18. 1979. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980: 132-155.
- Butler, Samuel. *The Authoress of the Odyssey*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1922.
- Cuddon, J.A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 4th ed. 1976. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. 1975. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Frye, Northrop, et al. *The Harper Handbook to Literature*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. 1922. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1969.
- _____. *Letters of James Joyce*. Ed. Stuart Gilbert. Vol. I. 1957. New York: Viking, 1966.
- Sheeran, Patrick F. Foreword. *Greek and Roman Themes in Joyce*. Brian Arkins. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1999.
- Schork, R.J. *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce*. Gainesville, Fl.: University Press of Florida, 1997.



3

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

N. Berrin Aksoy

Translation of Joyce into French in 1929, was recorded by the eminent members of the French literary establishment as "a historical moment in the development of the French language in the field of literature" when they objected to a new translation of Joyce's *Ulysses* (Aubert 3). The statement implicitly and explicitly sums up many facts of Joyce translations into any language. One facet is that it establishes Joyce's novels' hierarchical position in the literary polysystem on the top of the scale by calling the translation an historical monument and secondly underlining the enormous capacity required in a vernacular language to be able to produce a translated version of a James Joyce novel (Aubert 4).

This situation can be discussed from the point of view of literature and translation theory. Now we know that translation involves the act of reading and the act of interpretation all at once; however the latter is conditioned by many factors that determine the final result of a translation. "I am myself and my circumstances" said Ortega y Gasset, and the

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

circumstances of translating Joyce into Turkish have not been discussed by and large, or received any due attention for that, except for *Ulysses* to a certain extent, which will be discussed in the later part of this study.

Before starting to discuss the situation of James Joyce translations in Turkish, a few things about translation studies in theory and in practice need to be mentioned; since the topic of this study falls into the domain of the concept and act of literary translation as part of Translation Studies.

Work in the field of Translation Studies has come a long way in the past 50 years in the world and in Turkey. In the past, in the 60s and early 70s, the study of translation tended to be dominated by two very disparate groups, one of which was literary scholars who believed in the inherent presence of a "spirit" or "essence" of a text that would almost always elude the translation process; and those linguisticians who believed that with advances in machine translation every problem encountered in a text could be solved. Today we have a field of study, a discipline known as Translation Studies, and the speed and extent of its development throughout the world is testimony to radical change in attitude towards the whole business of interlingual transfer. From a marginal position at the beginning, the study of the processes of translation has come to occupy centre stage and the recognition of the seminal role played by translators in the history of culture and awareness of the complexities of that role which involves the image creating force of the original work to the translators.

Indeed, as argued by cultural theorists such as Gentzler, Venuti, Bassnett etc.. Translation Studies constitutes the very roots and trunk of the tree on which comparative studies of all kinds depend (Bassnett 1).

The polysystem theory in culture and literature propounded by Gideon Toury and Itamar Even - Zohar and developed by Hermans and Hornby, in 1980s, has served to locate Translation Studies very firmly in history study or foreign language pedagogy. Studying translation today means being aware of the processes that shape a culture at a given point in time, considering the economic, political, social and metaphysical needs implicit in the choice of texts for translation and dissemination. In short, the ideological dimension, so long ignored in investigations of translation processes, has been restored and our knowledge of cultural history has consequently been enriched and will no doubt continue to be enriched so (Bassnett 2). The role of cultural exchange and cultural diffusion by translation is undeniable, one cannot challenge the importance of translation in terms of cultural appreciation, human understanding. All literary translation is to some degree cultural appropriation. Hence, to study literary translation for the purpose of mapping cultural history of a nation has become one of the main concerns of many scholars and scholarly associations. Today, a study of a foreign author's reception is likely to be regarded as not state of the art unless it includes a competent discussion of the respective works in translation; concerted research is being carried out in order to assess the contributions which translations from many

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

literatures have made to a given national literature; on a wider scope still, the ways and by-ways, modes and modalities of multi-directional literary transfer are becoming a focus of comparative work. Many of the reorientations towards a historical-descriptive study of literary translations also require that one identify and define the field of study as a domain in its own right. Otherwise, the object of study is in constant danger of slipping away into collateral concerns such as contrastive linguistics, or the prescriptive-productive science of translating (Frank 85).

In the 2000s, two strategies have been employed towards this end. There are, on the one hand, various approaches that identify the field of literary translation studies in systemic terms; and on the other hand an approach in terms of forming a translation culture through tracking translation down in a historical-descriptive frame.

Forming a translation culture includes more than just "translations". It also involves the originals, the original author, as well as readers at both ends, and the translator himself, not to mention both locations. Hence, we have the four branches of culture; the productive, the distributive, the consumptive and the critical (Frank 86).

The advantage of dealing with literary translations in these terms enables one to consider its constitutive elements - literary and linguistic, individual and institutional. Culture in this context, is a value term implaying norms which delimit choices and, by delimiting them, make them meaningful inter-

cultural differences, and to cultivating the awareness, the knowledge of such differences, in literary, linguistic, cultural, even natural respects, is both a prerequisite for, and a result of, component translating as well as informed translation study. For a literary translation, is first and foremost, the record of a transfer between cultures, literary and otherwise (Frank 87).

It is in the frame of reference that I intend to carry out a historical-descriptive study of James Joyce's translations into Turkish mainly focusing on the extent of the cultural communication and the strategies to overcome the notion of the adjective "untranslatable" label attached to some of James Joyce's works. To this end I will engage with external translation history of Joyce in Turkish by providing answers to questions such as "Which books have been translated, when, how frequently, by whom, and under what conditions". I will also dwell on the history of the texts themselves, both the original and the translation, forming the internal translation history aspect of this study. I do not start from the hypothesis that "translations are facts of one system only: the target system" (Gideon Toury) for this particular case and for the special position of the source author James Joyce in world literature. I will however, deal with the target text in its relation to the original and start by accepting the essential difference of any translation from its source text as the basic fact of its existence. I will try to determine what the important differences are and what consequences they have, and if possible, what has brought them about. I will try to take up all the James Joyce translations choronologically, within

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

a target-context of translators and publishers. Since I will be both source and target oriented, let me start by first identifying the unique position of James Joyce in English as well as in world literature which will hopefully explain some of the reasons why he has been chosen to be translated into Turkish from the view point of source and target orientations.

Joyce's literary aesthetic is based on perceptions, on the sequence of perceptions, both physical and mental, on the way they appear to the mind as discontinuous elements arranged according to a character's particular relation to reality and to a syntax in accordance with his experience. Joyce's works are approached by scholars and literary critics as verbal artefacts that succeed in exploiting with an extraordinary fullness the potential for human insight and pleasure latent within the verbal and cultural fabric of the 20th century which includes its interpretations of previous centuries (Attridge ix).

Joyce is the most international of writers in English, writes Derek Attridge in *The Cambridge Companion* to James Joyce. He goes on to make a comprehensive evaluation of Joyce and his place in the literary world starting with comparing his reputation with Shakespeare's. Both own a global reputation, but unlike Shakespeare, Joyce crossed many national boundaries in his career and in his writing extending his reach further and further until he attempted to embrace the languages and cultures of the entire human community. A second feature of Joyce's work, according to Attridge, is the way it has intersected and continues to intersect, with some of the most

important transmutations of Western thought, both during his lifetime which includes modernism, psychoanalysis, socialism, pacifism, secularism, and anticolonialism and after his lifetime most notably in the movements known broadly as structuralism, post-structuralism and post-modernism. His writings are of many nationalities, and show an engagement with current intellectual and social changes (Attridge 1).

My intention in recording the above statements on Joyce is to establish his place in the literary polysystem of translations into Turkish to find out why, in the first place he has been chosen to be translated in Turkish culture and language, despite such a geographical and seemingly cultural difference. In order to explain this question, a look at the cultural milieu in the Turkish literary polystem where we see a large scale translation initiative in order to enrich and strengthen the literary and cultural productions and activities shortly after the foundation of the Turkish Republic will tell us the why's and what for's. During that time between 1940-1950s, translators were encouraged to translate into Turkish great works of Western and Eastern classics as a state project with many fold objectives of which was to establish a national literature and ultimately a culture of our own deriving its strength from our vernacular language. Accordingly, the translations of the best models of world literature would provide inspiration to produce works of the same quality in Turkish. To begin with, Turkish language and its literary heritage were tested by means of their capacity to produce the translations of those models. In the following parts of this study, it is my hypothesis, deriving from the above perspective,

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

that Joyce translations were manipulated within this framework although at a later time. Joyce was attempted to be translated into Turkish for his universal and intellectual, as well as and humanistic values specifically both to make him known and most importantly, to derive inspiration, a model to be studied to enrich Turkish language and Turkish literature. I believe the implications and reflections of this undertaking can be dealt with in another study.

Briefly, the conditions in the Turkish literary polysystem which created an intellectual milieu owes so much to the translation efforts in the early years of the Turkish Republic which aimed at building a national culture and a literature of our own in vernacular Turkish. Hence, the conditions for the reception of a James Joyce translation, an interest in his writings and his image as a great author of the 20th century have existed on these grounds in the Turkish literary polysystem.

In this part of this study, I would like to dwell on the translation of *Dubliners* by Murat Belge (İletişim Publications) to make some comments on the process of translation and on the target text as an end product within Turkish literary polysystem. It is interesting to see that there is no discussion, no explanation by the translator about his toil in the 2011 publication; he explains the stories and motifs and symbols, but nowhere does he attempt to make an assessment of his translation. On the other hand, in many countries, including China, I have come across an explanatory note on the process of translation in the prefaces of Joyce translations. One wonders why this is not the

case in Turkey. There are several reasons that come to my mind instantly. He may have his own doubts about his translation, he may have much confidence in his translation or he may not think it worthwhile to talk about the process of translation. Or, he may not be familiar with the terminological reservoir in making an evaluation of his translation.

I have not come across any articles, dissertations, thesis that carry out a translation criticism of a Joyce translation so far. Is it because in the first place, Joyce is a difficult author and so it is very difficult to talk about the translations? Or maybe, we are still not aware of the importance of a translation studies oriented translation criticism in our literary polysystem. All in all, we have a long way to go in this direction. Let me say a few more things about the original text and the 1987 and 2011 translations of *Dubliners*. This approach modeling Van Den Broeck's Translation Criticism method actually may as well be employed for a comprehensive translation criticism of *Dubliners*. However, this requires plenty of time and a group of experts to pitch in for such a major project. Instead, I will adopt a target oriented approach and look at the reception of *Dublinliler* in our culture. It has six reprints so far by Murat Belge, from İletişim Yayınları. One print in 2010 by İmdat Yeğen from Parşömen Yayınları, one in 1983 from Metin Celal from İmge Yayınevi, and in 1965 from Ataç Kitabevi, a collection of stories from *Dubliners* with the title *Kardeşler* (by Gülçün Yüzel). At present I am only focusing on *Dublinliler* by Murat Belge; 2011 and 1987 prints.

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

When I contacted İletişim Yayınları to inquire about the sales figures of the book, their answer was "satisfactory for the limited target reader". I referred to several bookshops in Ankara and mailed their branches in İstanbul to find out who that limited target reader was. In every case, I was answered as: "University; mainly philology students and some few people who are interested in Western literature". Unfortunately, there is no survey that investigates specifically the Joyce reader in Turkish. Only bookstores and booksellers can give you an idea about the readers, depending on their own observations.

About the reception of Joyce in Turkish then; we can say that Murat Belge's translation of *Dubliners* is well received among the target group. Let's not forget that the target group is small, though. I can easily say that among all the five bookstores I went to in Ankara, the response to the question "Have you got James Joyce's *Dubliners* translation?" was "Yes, we have Murat Belge translation. It is the best because it sells the most". From Translation Studies perspective, this answer is so unsatisfactory but so full of implications. Reading Joyce from Murat Belge's translation is actually a complex dialogue between cultures for the Turkish reader. The readers' perceptions are not only physical and mental, but also cultural. Reading *Dublinliler*, we must not forget that the original text no longer exists. The original language, mastery, craft are all gone. We read him in Turkish, a Turkish used and chosen by Murat Belge; depending on his aesthetic and literary preferences and tastes. In terms of textual scholarship, from this aspect only, can we expect ever to have a faultless text? And to what extent can a

N. Berrin Aksoy

translator convey in the Turkish literary polysystem and the potentials of Turkish language, each in his own particular choice, human experience in *Dubliners* as confronted with the realities of this world in an aesthetically satisfactory fashion for the target reader?

Our conventional ways of speaking about translation elide the translator and his voice is subsumed into the original author's in the interests of asserting equivalence. In the case of Murat Belge translations, we see that invisibility. The theoretical starting point for a translation is its dual, hybrid status (the translation as an independent text vs. the translation as a derivative text) is visible in Belge's translation but this is all the way subdued and quiet. *Dublinliler* looks like a derivative text, it is in no way independent.

So, what has Joyce translations brought to our culture? to our literature, and to our language?

Some of the answers to the above questions may be: Joyce and his literary output. And a confidence confirmed once again by way of being able to produce him in our own language: Turkish.

WORKS CITED

- Attridge, Derek, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. Cambridge; Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Aubert, Jacques. "Translating the Unreadable" in *Through Other Eyes*. Ed Trim and Alotorre. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 2007: 3-15.

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

- Bassnett, Susan. "Translation, Tradition, Transmission" in *New Comparison: A Journal of Comparative and General Literary Studies*. University of East Anglia. Number 8. Autumn 1989: 1-3.
- Frank, P. Armin. "Translation as System and Übersetzungskultur" in *New Comparison: A Journal of Comparative and General Literary Studies*. University of East Anglia. Number 8. Autumn 1989: 85-98.
- Joyce, James. *The Dubliners*. Panther: 1977.
- _____. *Dublinliler*. Trans. Murat Belge. 1987. rpt. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011.

Appendix: James Joyce's Works in Turkish

1. *Ulysses* (Proteus and Lestrygonians Parts)
1992, 1993, 1996, 2003, İstanbul: Yaba Yayınları
Yaşar Günenç
Ulysses
Seren Yayıncılık
2. *Ulysses*
1996, 2001, 2008, 2010, 2011 (13. Baskı) İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları
Nevzat Erkmen
Ulysses (Telemachus-Calypso)
Ocak 1994, İstanbul: Söz Yayıncılık
Nevzat Erkmen
3. *Dublinliler (The Dubliners)*
1987, 1988, 1992, 1994, 2000, 2011 İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
Murat Belge
Eylül 2010, İstanbul: Parşömen Yayınları
İmdat Yeğen
Bir Küçük Bulut (Selected Stories from *The Dubliners*)
1983, İstanbul: İmge Yayınevi

N. Berrin Aksoy

Metin Celal
Kardeşler (Selected Stories from *The Dubliners*)
1965, İstanbul,:Ataç Kitabevi
Gülçin Yücel

4. *Sanatçının Bir Genç Adam Olarak Portresi (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man)*

1966, de Yayınevi
Murat Belge
1983, Birikim Yayınları
Murat Belge
1966, 1989, 1994, 2011, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
Murat Belge

5. *Giacomo Joyce*

Mart 2011, İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık
Zeynep Avcı
Giacomo Joyce
1986, İstanbul: Broy Yayınları
Zeynep Avcı
Giacomo Joyce
1997, İstanbul: İzlek Yayınevi
Erhan Kuzhan

6. *Oda Müziği / Bütün Şiirleri (Chamber Music / Collected Works of James Joyce)*

Eylül 2011, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları
Osman Çakmakçı
Bütün Şiirleri (Collected Poems)
Kasım 1994, İstanbul: Altıkkırkbeş Yayınları (1500 adet)
Osman Çakmakçı
Bütün Şiirler: Joyce (Collected Poems by James Joyce)
Ekim 2000, Erzurum: Babil Yayınları
Osman Çakmakçı

7. *Sürgünler (Exiles)*

1990, 1993, İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi
Bora Komçez
1990, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları
1979, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı (Tiyatro Dizisi)
Selçuk Yönel

Translating James Joyce into Turkish

8. *Sanatçının Mektupları (Selected Joyce Letters)*
Kasım 1991, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayıncılık
Kudret Emirođlu
James Joyce'un Mektupları (Letters of James Joyce)
1983, Düşün Yayınevi
Kudret Emirođlu
James Joyce'un Mektupları (Letters of James Joyce)
Haziran 1994, Düşün Yayınevi
Kudret Emirođlu



4

The Irish Pub: A Restorative Milieu or not for Farrington in James Joyce's "Counterparts"

A. Deniz Bozer

Dubliners is a collection of fifteen short stories written during 1904 and 1907 by James Joyce (1882-1941) who was only twenty-two when he wrote "Counterparts" (1904), the sixth story in this collection. At first glance, with its protagonist the copyist Farrington in a Dublin law office, "Counterparts" may seem like another mid nineteenth - early twentieth century short fiction about a scrivener alongside Nikolai Gogol's "The Overcoat" (1842) with the Russian low-ranking government clerk and copyist Akaky Akakyevich in an office in St. Petersburg, and Herman Melville's "Bartelby, the Scrivener" (1853) with Bartelby, an American scribe in a New York law office. As Norris states "[t]here is alas, no evidence that Joyce read either story" (122). Nevertheless, one cannot but remember the famous quote attributed to Fyodor Dostoyevsky: "We all come out from Gogol's 'Overcoat'."

The Irish Pub

“Counterparts” is a short story that “seems to point in many directions (no wonder, for example, that translations of that title vary considerably)” (Senn 251). Hence, in addition to illustrating themes such as the miserable life of the Dublin poor, the long-standing conflict between England and Ireland, the benumbing power of the Catholic Church, the pitiful condition of abused women and children, and the practice of drinking as a way of attempting to construct masculinity, this paper will mainly examine whether the Irish pub can be considered as a re-constructive and therapeutic refuge or not for those who have been defeated in the face of life.

There are three institutions dealt with in varying proportions in “Counterparts”: the public house, the church, and the family, representing the social, religious and domestic realms, respectively. At the core, however, is the pub, a legendary Irish institution. This socio-cultural construct, often named after the person who owns it, or the street it is situated on, provided an informal setting where patrons, mainly men, could drink with their mates and also freely talk about politics and sports, exchange gossip, tell stories and jokes, sing songs and be merry. At the centre of social life with regard to all classes both in rural and urban Ireland, the pub was considered a refuge for men, especially city-dwellers, who, along with the members of their families, suffered from “inadequate housing”, “unsanitary accomodation” and “intolerable overcrowding” (O’Brien 126) in often dark and cold dwellings. Moreover, a local close to one’s house or work place, offered a sense of belonging to a

community as one ordered the usual, treated friends to a drink, and was treated to one reciprocally. Culturally a nation who enjoys drinking – outside at pubs more than inside at home – the Irish refer to whiskey as “*uisce beatha*, water of life” (Mac Con Iomaire 131). Among the Irish, whiskey is considered an elixir, that is “[a] supposed drug or essence with the property of indefinitely prolonging life; imagined by the alchemists to be either identical with, or closely related to, the ‘elixir’ of sense. 1. More fully, elixir of life (tr. medieval Latin *elixir vitæ*); [a] sovereign remedy for disease; [a] strong extract or tincture” (“Elixir”). In line with this supposedly healing nature of alcoholic drinks, Norris states that “the homosocial world of the Dublin pubs will offer a potentially therapeutic space in which Farrington’s spiritual wounds can be healed and his social status can be restored” (132). In support of this statement, in Irish slang, the abbreviation “g.p.,” for glass of porter, actually “a thoroughly tired pun on general practitioner” (Jackson and McGinley 74), further reinforces this alleged restorative feature of beer and other alcoholic drinks, to which Farrington is no stranger as he orders a glass of dark beer at O’Neill’s: “Here, Pat, give us a g.p., like a good fellow” (C 80).

However, a contrary argument can safely be made in relation to the protagonist of “Counterparts”. It is true that following each professional, social and domestic defeat, Farrington “felt his great body again aching for the comfort of the public-house” (C 83). He not only sought the companionship of his drinking mates but also yearned for the consolation alcohol supposedly provides. Farrington’s route on that day in

The Irish Pub

February starts in the offices of the Crosbie and Alleyne law firm in central Dublin, South of the river Liffey. Joyce mentions the names of streets, bridges, buildings and pubs that really do exist, such as Davey Byrne's pub, Eustace Street, Temple Bar, Fleet Street, the Ballast Office and so forth. Farrington is a copy clerk at Crosbie and Alleyne's. Copy clerks were needed to copy "legal documents in handwriting because typewritten copies were not accepted as legally valid copies of legal documents in the early twentieth century" (Gifford 72). However, he is not a hard-worker; he is always behind in his work, and often sneaks out of the office pretending to be going to the toilet – as much as five times a day – and goes out to the pub. Farrington is called upstairs to Mr Alleyne's office where he is reprimanded for taking too long lunch breaks and not finishing his work on time. "You have always some excuse or another for shirking work" (C 79) says Mr Alleyne. While Mr Alleyne orders him to work on the Bodley-Kirwan contract, the chief clerk, Mr Shelley, who speaks to Farrington "severely" (C 81), has already demanded that he work on the Delacour correspondence. Being reprimanded leaves Farrington with no desire to work and he secretly slips out to the pub. Night was approaching and "he longed to spend it in the bars" (C 81). In his absence, the client Miss Delacour has come and Mr Alleyne calls Farrington up to his office. Back from the pub on time, Farrington hopes that Mr Alleyne would not discover that two of the letters are missing. "The man put the correspondence on the desk and bowed respectfully, but neither Mr Alleyne nor Miss Delacour took any notice of his bow" (C 81). Farrington returns to his desk, and reluctantly starts working on the Bodley and

Kirwan contract. However, “his mind wandered away to the glare and rattle of the public-house. It was a night for hot punches” (C 82). Realising that he still has fourteen pages to copy and will not be able to finish on time, he is enraged. He fails to hear his name called and as he looks up, he sees Mr Alleyne and Miss Delacour standing there; “all the clerks had turned round in anticipation of something” (C 82). Farrington receives a “tirade of abuse” from Mr Alleyne who, alas, has discovered that two of the letters were missing. Upon being asked, Farrington lies: “I know nothing about any other two letters” (C 82). Mr Alleyne insults him in the presence of the client, Miss Delacour, and his fellow employees by asking : “[D]o you take me for a fool? Do you think me an utter fool?” and before he realises it, Farrington replies, “ I don’t think, sir [...] that that’s a fair question to put to me” (C 82). “There was a pause in the very breathing of the clerks and “Miss Delacour [...] began to smile broadly” (C 82). After his brief “felicitous moment” (C 82), Farrington was further scolded for his impertinence and had “to offer an abject apology” (C 83). Actually, Mr Alleyne’s dislike for Farrington had begun when he had overheard him mocking his North of Ireland accent to entertain other office workers. Farrington realises “what a hornet’s nest the office [will] be for him” after this incident (C 83). Once more, he “felt his great body again aching for the comfort of the public-house” (C 83). Before going to a pub, for need of money, he does not hesitate to sell his watch at the pawn-office for much less its worth. Empowered by the feel of the coins in his pocket, he stares “masterfully at the office-girls” (C 83), living another brief moment of pseudo triumph. Farrington’s pub-crawling begins at Davey Byrne’s, where he first

The Irish Pub

tells Nosey Flynn the story of how he stood up to Mr Alleyne, then he repeats it to O'Halloran and Paddy Leonard. "So, I just looked at him - coolly, you know, and looked at her. Then I looked back at him again - taking my time, you know" (C 84). However, in his repeating the story he carefully leaves out the "sir" he used in addressing Mr Alleyne. "His retort, which one knows popped out of his mouth to his own surprise, is now presented as a careful and deliberate statement, calmly delivered in a manner calculated to ensure maximum effect" (Leonard 178). Farrington relives that brief victorious moment each time he tells the story. When Higgins, who works in the same office as Farrington, joins them he is asked by the boys to tell the story from his perspective and he does so "with great vivacity" (C 84). (As Farrington almost transforms into a hero, we cannot help but be reminded of Synge's play *The Playboy of the Western World* (1907) where Christy, who boasts of having murdered his "da" elaborates his story each time he tells it, and even of Keşanlı Ali in Haldun Taner's play *Keşanlı Ali Destanı* (1964) (*Ballad of Ali of Keshan*, Trans. Nüvit Özdoğan. Ankara: International Theatre Institute, 1970) where Ali clings to the myth of having murdered a local troublemaker to be respected in his community. All three, Christy, Ali and Farrington are lost in self-delusion, and boast grandeur as the tale of their deeds are repeated by themselves or others. Dignified as 'heroes', they finally get to be noticed. Yet, for Farrington this victorious moment lasts for much shorter a time than it does for the other two.) Farrington and his mates later go to the Scotch House, and afterwards to Mulligan's off Poolbeg Street where he comes across a striking young woman with a London accent; however she seems not to

be interested in him. He is later defeated twice at arm wrestling by a young English acrobat, Weathers. Having lived enough adversity for one day, Farrington reluctantly sets off to go home. On Westmoreland Street, he takes the tram to Sandymount “a suburban village on Dublin Bay three miles east-south-east of the center of Dublin” (Jackson and McGinley 76), and via College Green goes to Shelbourne Road, which is opposite The Beggar’s Bush Barracks where the British soldiers stay (Jackson and McGinley 83), and passes by the “lower-middle-class homes and tenements” here (Jackson and McGinley 76). He comes home only to find the house cold, and dark and his wife gone to chapel having left their son Tom to cook his father’s dinner. Although the boy compliantly attends to his father’s needs, noticing that the fire is too weak to cook the dinner, Farrington vents his fury which had bottled up in him all day and beats the boy who pitifully begs his father to stop.

“Counterparts” is divided into three sections with regard to the three settings observed in the story: the office (the professional sphere), the pub (the social sphere) and the house (the domestic sphere). In the professional sphere Farrington is verbally battered in the office by his boss; in the social sphere at the pub he is ignored as a man by an English woman, and defeated twice at arm wrestling by a young English man; and in the domestic sphere he seems to be disregarded by his wife. In each one of these spheres Farrington’s being defeated and not being recognised as an individual, leads to frustration and rage which triggers his heavy drinking that results in domestic violence as he batters his own son. Farrington, is

The Irish Pub

almost nonexistent to the people who do not notice him. He is, thus, invalidated as a person. As Scholes notes, he is merely “the man” in the office; he is briefly dignified by being referred to as ‘Farrington’ at the pub; and at the end of the story he “has become even further depersonalized as ‘a man’” (qtd. in Kershner 103).

Moreover, the routine of Farrington’s daily life takes its toll on him emotionally as well. Joyce reinforces the protagonist’s miserable mood with the gloomy Dublin atmosphere outside. It is winter, the month of February, cold, damp and foggy . “Rain was drizzling down on the cold streets” (C 84). Farrington’s dark mood further intensifies as the story moves into the later hours of the night.

One of the institutions that Joyce questions in “Counterparts” is the family. He portrays a dysfunctional family with Farrington as the stereotype for the drunken Irish Paddy who jeopardises his family’s livelihood for a drink. On the other hand, the wife, Ada, tired of poverty, of her drunken husband and five children, seeks comfort in the confines of the Catholic Church. She is another source of oppression in Farrington’s life as she “bullied her husband when he was sober”. However, she herself “was bullied by him when he was drunk” (C 86). And there are the five miserable young children who are left by themselves late at night in a house without fire and light, and who have to look after themselves and even after their father at times. As it had been a day full of mishaps, one expects Farrington would be pleased to seek refuge at home; however he “loathed returning to his home” (C

86). He preferred the welcoming warmth of the pub and desired to be with his friends; “he longed to be back again in the hot, reeking public-house” (C 86).

Another institution that Joyce disapproves of in the story is the Catholic Church. Although Joyce was brought up as a Catholic, as a young man in his early twenties, he renounced his faith in religion and the Catholic Church. In a letter to Nora, who was later to become his wife, Joyce elaborated on his views of the Church and Catholicism and family: “My mind rejects the whole present social order and Christianity — home, the recognised virtues, classes of life, and religious doctrines” (qtd. in Ellmann 169). He believes that the Catholic Church acts as an anesthetic in inactivating Irish people. In “Counterparts”, the “Ma” is at the Chapel late at night, at the time her husband returns from the pub, having left her children by themselves. “[I]n Irish usage” the chapel stands for the “Roman Catholic Church” (Jackson and McGinley 76). Like Farrington, who seeks consolation from the misfortunes of life and drinks at the pub, Ada pursues comfort in prayers at the Catholic Church. Like his mother, the young son asks, for the intercession of Virgin Mary for the forgiveness of his father’s sins of anger and intemperance so his soul will not suffer after death. Thus, neither stands up to antagonistic forces. “The boy uttered a squeal of pain as the stick cut his thigh. He clasped his hands together in the air and his voice shook with fright” (C 87) “’O, pa!’ he cried. ‘Don’t beat me, pa! And I’ll ... I’ll say a *Hail Mary* for you...” (C 87). Thus, the innocent victim prays for the sinners soul. Through Ada and the child, Joyce

The Irish Pub

portrays the Catholic Church as a disabling institution and questions its power.

“Counterparts” also lends itself to a colonial reading. Ireland, as England’s first colony, was colonised in 1171 by Henry II. The story is set at the turn of the century when Ireland was still under British rule; the Irish Free State was established in 1922 and Ireland finally became a republic in 1949. Hence, colonial presence, which threatens the protagonist is observed throughout the story. In the first section, the junior boss at the law office, Mr Alleyne, an Ulster man with a North of Ireland accent, is one of the representatives of colonial power. Although there were more Catholic Irish in Dublin, the Protestant Ascendancy disproportionately enjoyed socio-economic power, especially so in medical and legal professions according to the 1901 census (O’Brien 40). By having Mr Alleyne’s office upstairs as opposed to Farrington’s office downstairs, Joyce also physically draws attention to their status on the hierarchical ladder. Moreover, Farrington’s job constitutes copying Mr Alleyne’s originals; thus he is reduced to a mimic man. “[C]opying, or written mimicry, is dehumanizing because it forces a speaking subject to endlessly produce the words of another” (Norris 127), in this case mostly Mr Alleyne’s. Upon being reprimanded for the two missing letters, Farrington’s insulting Mr Alleyne, even at the risk of losing his job, can be read as Ireland standing up to England. In this brief but happy and triumphant moment, Farrington is finally noticed. Even Miss Delacour, rewards him with a broad smile. Although Benjamin H.D. Buchloh makes the following statement

in relation to art, his words are also valid in relation to this story: "[T]he systematic invalidation of the hierarchies [...] will someday be abolished," hence enabling anybody to be famous once that hierarchy dissipates (2) Indeed, by standing up to his boss, to the Englishman, Farrington has invalidated the hierarchy and validated his own existence. Moreover, in the second section of the story, at Mulligan's, Farrington's masculinity is challenged first sexually by the woman with a London accent, and then physically by the English acrobat Weathers, again both representing the coloniser. Furthermore, The Beggar's Bush Infantry Barracks, which he passes on his way home, stand for the presence of the British Army in South Dublin. At the end of the day, Farrington is defeated on different levels by this heavy English presence in all the spheres of his life. On the other hand, there seems to be no representative of colonial power in section three. However, when Farrington's oppressive and violent treatment of his child is taken into consideration, it can be deduced that he himself has turned into the coloniser.

As it was believed that excessive alcohol consumption led to disorderly behaviour and even rebellion, in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the Protestant Ascendancy supported temperance. "If you control intemperance than you can regulate and diminish social disorder" (Lloyd 205). However, as a place where politics is freely discussed, the pub which provides a sense of community and of belonging, also enhances some of the objectives of

The Irish Pub

nationalism such as “to propagandize and disseminate nationalist ideology” (Lloyd 208). As “paralysis” means “ *slang* (chiefly U.S.). Intoxicated; incapacitated through drink” (*Oxford English Dictionary*), “helplessly drunk” (*Concise English Dictionary*), Joyce seems to draw attention to heavy drinking as a “paralytic” agent “rendering” Irish men “powerless or immobile” (*Oxford English Dictionary*), preventing them from defying the coloniser, hence resulting in stagnation in colonial Ireland.

As one observer states, “men in Ireland do not take drink for the sake of drinking, but for the sake of companionship” (qtd. in Kearns 24), reflecting “the sociability in the Irish character” (*ibid*). At pubs, the custom of standing or buying rounds among mates who took turns treating each other to a drink was undoubtedly one of the causes of excessive drinking in Ireland. Joyce extensively illustrates this custom in the story: “Farrington stood a drink all round” “O’Halloran stood a round and then Farrington stood another round”. When Farrington is paying for the drinks, Weathers snobbishly orders whiskey and “Appolinaris” (C 85) which is mineral water (Gifford 76), while the lower classes mostly drank beer and cheap whiskey (Kearns 13). The next time, however, “[m]uch to Farrington’s relief he drank a glass of bitter” (C 85). Farrington looks down upon Weathers for being a sponge, which is not incompatible with his position as the English coloniser. Eventually Weathers, too, buys a round but he finds the custom “too Irish” (C 85). “Weathers made them all have one little tincture at his expense” (C 85). A “tincture” meaning “*Mod. Pharmacy*. A solution, usually in a menstruum of alcohol, of some

principle used in medicine; An alcoholic drink” (*Oxford English Dictionary*), hence any alcoholic drink, corresponding with “elixir” in its underlining the supposed healing and comforting effect of beverages that contain alcohol. By the end of the night, although Farrington had drunk heavily and there was only two pence left in his pocket, he was still not drunk; this reveals his resistance to high levels of alcohol which is a sign of alcoholism.

Pubs were traditionally frequented by men, and “women [were] accommodated in a small separate space known as the ‘snug’” (Scanlan 99). The snug was also functional in preserving the anonymity of women who tried “to keep their drinking from their husbands” (Keegan 58). Interestingly, Farrington often preferred the snug in the pubs as can be seen in the following example: “He was now safe in the dark snug of O’Neill’s shop” (C 80). If it is not the snug, it is either a quiet “corner of the counter” at the Scotch House (C 84), or “the parlour at the back” of Mulligan’s (C 85). These examples, however, should not be read as the feminisation of Farrington. For him, “the snug offers refuge from the world as it is walled off from the main bar with access to the counter via a small window” (Keegan 58).

As for the title, “Counterparts” means “*Law*. The opposite part of an indenture q.v.; each of the indented parts of a deed of contract, etc., in its relation to the other part; *esp.* that which is not considered the principal part or original; *gen.* A duplicate, or exact copy. *Obs.*; A person or thing not exactly similar to another, but serving as its equivalent in a different

The Irish Pub

context; One of two parts which fit and complete each other; a person or thing forming a natural complement to another" (*Oxford English Dictionary*). In the story, Joyce first portrays his characters as counterparts such as Mr Alleyne and Farrington, Farrington and Ada, and Mr Alleyne and Ada. Secondly, Joyce has Farrington duplicating legal documents. Moreover, Joyce himself also stylistically duplicates many words as he makes the narrator repeat them. Also, for reasons of mockery Farrington mimics Alleyne, Alleyne mimics Farrington, and Farrington mimics his son. Also, Schneider marks that "the two counters in the office and the pub form another set of counterparts in the story" (200). Both of the counters illustrate the theme of imprisonment. Farrington is imprisoned in the office behind a counter which he has to lift when he wants to leave his desk or return to it, and as Mr Alleyne and Miss Delacour stand "outside the counter" (C 82), he is alienated from others. Similarly, the counter at the pubs where he puts his money "on the counter" (C 82) and where he forms "a little party" with his drinking buddies "at the corner of the counter" (C 84) serve the same purpose.

"Many of the stories in *Dubliners* focus on one of the seven deadly sins; the sin in 'Counterparts' is wrath. Beginning with 'furiously' and 'furious' in the very first sentence, specific references to feelings of rage, anger, savagery, violence, passion and abuse recur frequently throughout the story" (Hagopian and Dolch 203). Farrington is an angry man as the following lines show: when called goes up to Mr Alleyne's room "puffing with [...] vexation" (C 79); "[a] spasm of rage gripped his throat for a few moments"

(C 80); “His body ached to do something, to rush out and revel in violence. All the indignities of his life enraged him.” (C 82); “He longed to [...] bring his fist down on something violently” (C 82); “The tirade continued: it was so bitter and violent that the man could hardly restrain his fist from descending upon the head of the manikin before him” (C 82); he “feels savage and thirsty and revengeful” (C 83); “muttering to himself that they could all go to hell” (C 83); his “face flushed darker still with anger” (C 86); “O’Halloran, observing the violent expression of Farrington’s face [...]” (C 86) signals that it is time to leave; he is “full of smouldering anger and revengefulness” (C 86); “His heart swelled with fury” (C 86); “his fury nearly choked him” (C 86); and he “jumped up furiously” (C 87). In Christian symbolism, each of the Seven Deadly Sins which lead to man’s being eternally condemned in Hell, is symbolised by an animal; “three of the Seven Deadly Sins, Gluttony, Lust, and Anger are personified in bear form” (“Bear”). Indeed, like a bear, Farrington is big; “he was tall and of great bulk” (C 79). Again like a bear Farrington has a strong sense of smell. As Lukas states, “[a] bear’s sense of smell is even better than that of a bloodhound” (21). Similarly, Dolson puts forth that “[b]ears live in a rich and complex scent-defined world. They navigate the world with their noses [...]. bears constantly gather, process, and exchange information using their sense of smell” (26). Correspondingly, Farrington is quick to pick up Miss Delacour’s “moist pungent odour of perfumes” (C 81) and “his nose already sniffed the curling fumes of punch” (C 84).

The Irish Pub

To cope with antagonistic forces that destroy his self-esteem and leave him powerless, Farrington took to drinking which “[s]imultaneously enabled and disabled” him (Lin 52). He drank to raise his low spirits, to numb his pain and mostly to feel empowered. “Thus for Farrington, the public house is not merely a site for male recreation; it is for him also a site for the re-creation and emotional renewal of his masculinity” (Lin 45). Yet, he fails to construct his masculinity there in the end as the oppression he experienced in the professional, social and domestic milieu reflected negatively upon his character and reduced him to an angry bully. In a letter written to his brother Stanislaus, dated 13 November 1906, Joyce states: “I am no friend of tyranny, as you know, but if many husbands are brutal the atmosphere in which they live (vide Counterparts) is brutal [...]” (*Letters* 192), thus like a naturalistic writer, blaming Farrington’s maltreatment of his wife and son on the social and domestic environment.

In a letter dated 5 May 1906 written to Richard Grant, Joyce states his reason for writing *The Dubliners*: “My intention was to write a chapter of the moral history of my country and I chose Dublin for the scene because that city seemed to me the centre of paralysis” (*Letters* 134). In “Counterparts”, Joyce criticises the passivity of the Irish through Farrington who makes no attempt to improve his life. The story encompasses not a unique but typical day in Farrington’s life. Imprisoned in a routine which wears him out physically and emotionally, his eyes, the light of his soul, are “heavy” (C 85), reflecting his lack of energy in taking action. His lack of enthusiasm to find

A. Deniz Bozer

a way of changing his pointless life for the better is further marked by his “heavy” steps (C 79), heavy walking (C 80), and finally sitting down “heavily” (C 87). It is this listlessness and lethargy that Joyce disapproves of in “Counterparts”.

WORKS CITED

- “Bear”. *Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art*. Hope B. Werness. New York: Continuum, 2006.
- Buchloh, Benjamin H.D. "Andy Warhol's One-Dimensional Art: 1956-1966". *Andy Warhol*. Ed. Annette Michelson. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2001. 1-48.
- “Counterpart”. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Dolson, Sylvia. *Bear-ology: Fascinating Bear Facts, Tales & Trivia*. Masonville, Co.: Pixyjack Press, 2009. *Google Books*. Web. 18 November 2011.
- Ellman, Richard. *James Joyce*. 1959. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- “Elixir”. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Gifford, Don. *Joyce Annotated: Notes for Dubliners and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 192.
- Hagopian, John V. and Martin Dolch. *Insight*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Hirschgraben Verlag, 1964.

The Irish Pub

- Jackson, John Wyse and Bernard McGinley. *James Joyce's Dubliners: An Annotated Edition*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1993.
- Joyce, James. "Counterparts". *More Modern Short Stories*. Ed. Peter J. W. Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. 78-89.
- _____. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. Vol. II. Ed. Richard Ellman. New York: Viking, 1966.
- Kearns, Kevin. *Dublin Pub Life and Lore: An Oral History*. Niwot, Colorado: Roberts Rhinehart, 1997.
- Keegan, Thomas. *The Usual: Pub Phenomenology in the Works of James Joyce*. The University of Iowa. 2010. 3409513 PROQUEST. Web. 22 November 2011.
- Kershner, R.B. *Joyce, Bakhtin, and Popular Literature: Chronicles and Disorder*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1989.
- Leonard, Garry Martin. *Reading Dubliners Again: A Lacanian Perspective*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse UP, 1993.
- Lin, Paul. "Standing the Empire: Drinking, Masculinity, and Modernity in 'Counterparts'". Christine van Boheemen-Saaf and Colleen Lamos. Eds. *Masculinities in Joyce: Postcolonial Constructions*. *European Joyce Studies* 10. Amsterdam; Atlanta, Ga.: Rodopi, 2001. 33-57.
- Lloyd, David. "Counterparts: *Dubliners*, Masculinity, and Temperance Nationalism". *Future Crossings: Literature Between Philosophy and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Krzysztof Ziarek and Seamus Deane. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2000. 193-220.

A. Deniz Bozer

- Lukas, Catherine. *Bears*. Pleasantville, New York: Gareth Stevens Publishing, 2009. *Google Books*. Web. 21 November 2011.
- Mac Con Iomaire, Liam. *Ireland of the Proverbs*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Masters Press, 1988.
- Norris, Margot. *Suspicious Readings of Joyce's Dubliners*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.
- O'Brien, Joseph. *Dear Dirty Dublin: A City in Distress, 1899-1916*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982.
- "Paralysis". *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- _____. *Concise English Dictionary*. Wordsworth Editions, Limited. 2007. *Google Books*. Web. 16 November 2011.
- "Paralytic". *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Scanlan, Margaret. *Culture and Customs of Ireland*. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood, 2006.
- Schneider, Ulrich. "Titles in *Dubliners*". *Rejoycing: New Readings of Dubliners*. Eds. Rosa M. Bollettieri Bosinelli and Harold F. Mosher, Jr. Lexington: U P of Kentucky, 1998. 195-205.
- Senn, Fritz. "Gnomon Inverted". *Rejoycing: New Readings of Dubliners*. Eds. Rosa M. Bollettieri Bosinelli and Harold F. Mosher, Jr. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1998. 249-257.
- "Tincture". *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.



5

‘Performative Acts’ in “The Dead”

Aytül Özüm

“The Dead” is one of the most read and analysed short stories in English. Due to its multiple contextual allusions, complex harmony, intertextual nature and most importantly dramatisation of the commonly shared feelings such as passion, love, jealousy, entrapment, fear and frustration, it appeals to many readers since its publication in 1914. Joyce composed it in 1907 as the last story for his collection *Dubliners*. Before he added “The Dead” to the collection he wrote to Grant Richards, a London publisher in 1906: “My intention was to write a chapter of the moral history of my country and I chose Dublin for the scene because the city seemed to me the centre of paralysis ...” (Ellmann 132). Florence L. Walzl comments on the form of *Dubliners* prior to the addition of “The Dead”: “[The] chronological structure is matched to a thematic one of hemiplegia. The result is a progression in which children are depicted as disillusioned, youths as frustrated or trapped, men and women as passive and non-productive and social groups as completely static.

Aytül Özüm

The central image of the book is a creeping paralysis that ends in a dead society” (18). “The Dead” further explores the theme of spiritual and moral paralysis and its impact on Dublin urban culture. Although it is the final story of the collection, it is possible to read it as a separate story as well. The story have been read from various perspectives, almost all focusing on the city of Dublin as the protagonist and “the British presence in Ireland and the Roman Catholic church in which Joyce was educated” as antagonistic forces (Schwarz 63). Different criticisms such as reader-response, psychoanalytic, contextual, the new historical, deconstructive, feminist and new critical work so well when they are applied to the story that the text becomes richer, more meaningful and telling in each interpretation. Here I wanted to read “The Dead” from another perspective, from Judith Butler’s theory of gender performativity, believing that it provides another relevant framework, close to feminist interpretations of the story and enables readers to reconsider how gender in practice displays itself in the given circumstances and relate the characters’ perception of their gender roles to the general emotional and cultural crisis experienced in the city of Dublin. The theory of performativity helps us observe to what extent the characters perform specific gender roles “as a culturally sustained temporal duration” (*Gender Trouble* xv) and proximity of these roles to religious, political and also biographical criticisms of the story.

The story starts with a gathering. Lily, the servant of the family, performs one of her usual duties by letting in the guests. The annual dinner party of

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

Kate and Julia Morkan and their young niece Mary Jane Morkan brings together the family’s relatives and friends. The action takes place before the Feast of Epiphany on January 6. The spinsters Kate and Julia specially wait for their cousin Gabriel, “a provincial writer and teacher with continental aspirations” and his wife Gretta (Munich 173). With their arrival the first clash between the sexes start in the talk between Gabriel and Lily. Gabriel ends this disturbing conversation by giving a gold coin to Lily. The arrival of Freddy Malins, the other cousin interrupts Gabriel’s conversation with Gretta on what to do after the party, to stay at a hotel or make a long trip home. Miss Ivors is Gabriel’s old friend, they become partners for a short while while dancing in the party and she accuses him of writing literary reviews for *The Daily Express*, a conservative newspaper and labels him “West Briton,” a pejorative term used for an anglophilic Irish person. Miss Ivors continues to quarrel with him about his negligence towards his own country and after awhile leaves the party. When the dinner is ready Gabriel is at the head of the table to carve the goose for the guests. While addressing them, he mentions how thankful he is for their hospitality and complains about the new generation’s lack of interest in “those qualities of humanity, of hospitality, of kindly humour which belonged to an older day” (Joyce 232). He remembers the dead and voices his respect for them. The guests start to leave the party, Mr. Bartell Darcy sings a song for the rest, *The Lass of Augrim*. Gabriel notices that Gretta becomes mysteriously upset and thoughtful after listening the song. At the hotel she explains that years ago her lover sang the same song in Galway. Gretta talks about the sad story of her boy friend

Aytül Özüm

Michael Furey who waited for hours outside her house under a tree and died next day. Gretta falls asleep and Gabriel is awake, shocked by the news he had been totally foreign to. The story ends with Gabriel's thinking about his own life, Michael Furey and the other dead lying covered by the snow in Ireland.

When I reread the story I observed all the characters in the story, from Gabriel to Mr. Darcy, from the sisters to Miss Ivors, in action and thought that they are obliged to fulfill their roles, sexual, social, familial and political, in accordance with the set expectations of the heteronormative grounds. They feel disillusioned, in-between and trapped due to the past experiences that historically and individually shaped their identities. While analyzing the story through Butler's phenomenological and performative perspective, I noticed that her theory is applicable to the implications of the issues of sex and gender inscribed rather problematically in the story. For Butler, it is the body regardless of its sex that "becomes its gender through a series of acts which are renewed, revised and consolidated through time" (Butler "Performative" 524). She describes this gendered body in its historicity or rather temporality while pointing out that, "the body is understood to be an active process of embodying certain cultural and historical possibilities, a complicated process of appropriation ... the acts by which gender is constituted bear similarities to performative acts within theatrical contexts" (Butler "Performative" 520). Keeping this in mind, it becomes obvious that the story demonstrates the potential difficulty each character has in the process of appropriation. The roles are laid

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

bare for both male and female characters by societal or institutional expectations but Joyce’s people in “The Dead” are uneasy, problematic and quite unwilling to perform their ready-made roles. Their histories become factors that further complicate these performances.

Butler explains “... in what ways gender is constructed through specific corporeal acts, and what possibilities exist for the cultural transformation of gender through such acts” (Butler “Performative” 520). The story demonstrates a number of frustrated and disillusioned people. The roles enacted either in delivering speeches, in welcoming the guests and entertaining them or in dialogues, all conclude in unresolved paralyses projected in the way they perform their roles. How they perform their socially accepted roles in accordance with their gender offers a significant clue to understand them. In other words, what they talk about or the narrator makes them think about the present and remember their past also demonstrate their own perception of gendered identities. The bodies of the individuals reified by their verbal utterances in the story, especially of Gabriel and Gretta, Kate and Julia, and Miss Ivors show “factic materiality” in “a continual and incessant” change (Butler “Performative” 520). One feels that in the story there is a huge burden of tradition comprised of reiterative acts surrounding the individuals. Butler considers gender “as a corporeal style,” it is both “intentional and performative,” where performative means non-referential, unrealistic (Butler “Performative” 520). They act because they have to therefore the real always lies buried, unexplained but shaped by the intentions of the society. In “The Dead”

Aytül Özüm

we have an exhibition of characters who do not present themselves as “lifeless recipient[s] of wholly pre-given cultural relations” (Butler “Performative,” 526) but the living facts who have to face the inscriptions of the whole cultural change on their body. For Butler “gender is not a radical choice or project ... Actors are always already on the stage, within the terms of the performance. Just as a script may be enacted in various ways, and just as the play requires both text and interpretation, so the gendered body acts its part in a culturally restricted corporeal space and enacts interpretations within the confines of already existing directives” (Butler “Performative,” 526). The story offers several enacted interpretations of the roles mostly through the clashes between the male and female characters. Restrictively conservative political and cultural codes of the age limit the characters in the story to a great extent and determine how they act their roles.

Gabriel first appears as an impatiently longed for male guest. When Lily, the caretaker’s daughter, mentions that Miss Kate and Julia thought he was not coming, the first thing that he says in the story is “... they forget that my wife here takes three mortal hours to dress herself” (Joyce 201). This is not an unusual scene as it depicts a conventional image of a husband waiting for his wife to dress herself, and he performs this expected role as a husband and feels obliged to give voice to a general assumption that it takes women hours to dress themselves. Butler distances herself from those who perceive gender as deliberately performed and discourages thinking about performativity in voluntarist and deliberate terms. In

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

that sense, although Gabriel’s comment on the time Gretta spends while getting dressed is appropriate as his role as a husband it can not be regarded as a deliberate moment of pretention or acting out but it is a more oblivious process. Gender for Butler is constrained it does not mean that it is formed by limitations, but it means that constraint is the prerequisite of performativity (Jagose 87). There are many debates about the conversation between Lily, the servant girl and Gabriel, which takes place as follows:

-Tell me, Lily, he said in a friendly tone, do you still go to school?

-O no, sir, she answered. I am done schooling this year and more.

-O, then, said Gabriel gaily, I suppose we’ll be going to your wedding one

of these fine days with your young man, eh?

The girl glanced back at him over her shoulder and said with great bitterness:-The man that is now is only a palaver and what they can get out of you.”

Gabriel coloured as if he felt he had made a mistake and, without looking at

her, kicked off his goloshes
...(Joyce 202)

This dialogue may also be a moment of performative failure from the maid’s perspective with

her refusal of marriage institution. More importantly, Joyce does not let Gabriel reveal his social masculine attributions accurately. For Margot Norris, Gabriel calculates their privacy at that moment and makes a suggestive advance toward Lily. The critic points out that “Gabriel ventures upon a flirtation with Lily only after assuring himself that goings-on in the pantry would not be heard over the noise of dancing and the piano upstairs ...” (229). One of the possible readings of the scene might be that Gabriel’s ill-reputation puts Lily on her guard and lets her be cautious against him in advance. Another possibility is that Lily seems to be a nervous and rude servant and this gold coin will diminish her agitation. The meaning of the scene is deliberately dubious. This is Joyce’s style. When the narrator’s presence as another character in the story is taken into consideration, it becomes more difficult to comprehend this conversation and where they want to get at in the very beginning of the story. Furthermore the narrator does not offer us any explanation about their dialogue. What we know is that this conversation makes Gabriel irritated and anxious although it automatically puts them in a power struggle, Lily feels degraded and looked down upon. For the narrator, he feels he had failed there because “he had taken up a wrong tone. His whole speech was a mistake from first to last, an utter failure” (Joyce 204). This failure is only one of the repercussions of his lack of confidence and will be accompanied by other performative repetitions. Different from Lily’s, his is not a performative failure, but it is the revelation of the social constraint originating from his past.

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

Gabriel is going to deliver a speech during the dinner, the headings of his speech are “Irish hospitality, sad memories, the Three Graces [the sisters and Mary Jane], Paris and quotation from Browning” (Joyce 219). When the time comes, Gabriel “[takes] his seat boldly at the head of the table and having looked to the edge of the carver, plunged his fork firmly into the goose. He felt quite at ease now for he was an expert carver and liked nothing better than to find himself at the head of a well-laden table” (Joyce 225). As can be seen, he has to feel flattered, relieved, his ego should be satisfied to be able to act his part properly after he fails in his second encounter with another female figure in the story, Miss Ivors. She is an active Irish nationalist, and she keeps accusing Gabriel of neglecting his own country, praising England and admiring the continent. The way the narrator describes her femininity and associating it with her national cause also have to do with foregrounding how she performs her gender: “She was a frank-mannered talkative young lady, with a freckled face and prominent brown eyes. She did not wear a low-cut bodice and the large brooch which was fixed in the front of her collar bore on it an Irish device” (Joyce 213). Why does the narrator emphasize her not wearing a low-cut bodice? Does it mean that she is not feminine enough? She is depicted through her battle against Gabriel. Gabriel is not courageous enough to face her attacks. While “a blush invade[s] his forehead,” he thinks that he says the last word to finalize their rather bitter conversation: “O, to tell you the truth, ... I’m sick of my own country, sick of it” (Joyce 216). But he is wrong since Miss Ivors herself finalizes their talk by whispering into his ear and

calling him “West Briton” just before she leaves. He later asks himself if “she really [had] any life of her own behind all her propagandism” (Joyce 219). Does he wonder if she complies with the heteronormative formation of gender? Is she a traditional woman? Such values are compared in an implicit way. So far neither Gabriel as a patriarchal representation of gender nor the women as objects of Gabriel’s desire succeed to perform their traditional gender acts; both Gabriel’s and the women’s cases illustrate what Butler calls “comedy of heterosexuality” and lack of essentialism in terms of gender which is in constant flux.

If we agree with the idea that Joyce criticizes patriarchy and his own contribution to the othering of women not in what is visible in the story but in what is concealed in the narrative, Julia and the pope make a very sharp binary. On the second page of the story the narrator informs us that “Julia, though she was quite grey, was still the leading soprano in Adam and Eve...” (Joyce 200) but now she is not. The readers recognise that something has happened to Julia’s job in the choir but the narrator is reluctant to give the details to the readers. Julia Morkan’s case cannot offer a chance to understand how and why the female art was silenced by the Church. The event Kate refers to but the story leaves unexplained is about a papal document issued in 1903, before the date of Morkans’ Christmas party, dismissing women from church choirs. Kate expresses herself: “I know all about the honour of God ... but it is not at all honourable for the pope to turn out the women out of the choirs that have slaved there all their lives and put little whipper-snappers of boys over their heads. I suppose it is for

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

the good of the Church if the pope does it. But it is not just ... it is not right” (Joyce 221-22). The pope’s banning female singers from the Church is pure sexual discrimination. Joyce by having Julia Morkan sing before the guests proves that she is very good in her art. Therefore Julia’s performing her art concretizes the most serious conflict in terms of masculine and feminine gender performances that lies hidden in the tension between Julia and the pope. The pope performs his authoritative power over Julia, a female artist. Kate is not afraid of being punished when she challenges the pope’s so-called incontrovertible decision: “O, I don’t question the pope’s being right. I’m only a stupid old woman and I wouldn’t presume to do such a thing. But there is such a thing as common everyday politeness and gratitude. And if I were in Julia’s place I’d tell that Father Healey straight up to his face ...”(Joyce 222). After this ironic comment the discussion does not go further, the sisters have to go to dinner and entertain their guests as expected. Joyce employs the reinforcement of binary of gender and trusts the judgment of the intellectual reader. What counts is not only the fact of the pope’s banning female singers from church but also their reaction to the pope’s authority. The pope’s constraint is the prerequisite of Julia’s performance to show that she is dismissed not because she is a bad singer, but a woman. Despite everything they have to agree with the essentialist classification of gender roles. Joyce does not approve of that but what is confusing for the readers is the detailed depiction of the dinner party and dancing instead of satisfying the readers’ curiosity about the historical context about the pope. Mary Jane performs her role as a female reconciler and puts an

Aytül Özüm

end to the discussion suggesting that they eat as soon as possible: "...we really are all hungry and when we are hungry we are all very quarrelsome" (Joyce 222).

The story is committed to portray liberal Irish women but it is also committed to highlight Gabriel's epiphany of his own vulnerability and mortality. Bartell Darcy's song "The Lass of Augrim" tells the story of a young peasant girl who has a child by a Lord Gregory, who seduced and then left her. She comes to his castle to beg for his help, but is turned away by his mother who, behind the closed front door, imitates her sons voice. She puts out to sea in a small boat to drown herself and the child, but is not saved, even though the lord discovers his mother's plot and races to find her. The ballad ends with the lord mourning for his lost love and bringing down a curse on his mother (Gray). Not only with what it does to Gretta but also with its content, this Irish ballad offers another problematised notion of gender. On the one hand, the young woman becomes the sexual object of a Lord, it is an unsuitable match and therefore she is punished with death. On the other hand the mother challenges her son's authority, his phallic power but performs her role well by protecting him, adopting his role and by sustaining the stability of his social status by preventing their union.

Gretta first becomes the aesthetic object of her husband's artistic vision and then functions as a means for Gabriel to reevaluate himself both as a husband and as a living soul. Gabriel objectifies her as a figure or an image in one of his imaginary portraits: "He asked himself what is a woman standing on the

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

stairs in the shadow, listening to distant music, a symbol of. If he were a painter he would paint her in that attitude. ...*Distant Music* he would call the picture if he were a painter” (Joyce 240). It seems that Gabriel imposes his authoritative supervision over the household and thinks that he has vigilant control over what his wife and children do, dress and eat. This is very ironic as Gabriel’s care for his family is nullified by Gabriel’s own perception of himself as Gretta’s husband and also by the narrator’s comment about Gretta’s relationship with Michael Furey. Gretta had concealed a big secret of her life from Gabriel for so many years until she feels emotionally exhausted after hearing the song and remembering her dead lover: “Perhaps she had not told him all the story ... His own identity was fading out into a grey impalpable world: the sordid world itself which these dead had one time reared and lived in was dissolving and dwindling” (Joyce 254-55). She can hardly be categorized as a representative of idealized submissive femininity. Gabriel realises that Greta had never been under his control, this realisation hurts his patriarchal self-esteem. Neither Gabriel nor Gretta can reappropriate his/her role in their marriage. However what is positive about Gabriel is his realising the condition of his marriage and his own fallibility. The story suggests that their gender is formed everyday gradually with different performative acts thus this formation resists all the binaries of gender.

As a conclusion, Joyce shows to what extent his characters and the narrator feel threatened by the values of heteronormative social and political formations on which the patriarchy depends for its

authority. For Butler, all gender is performative. In line with this affirmation the characters demonstrate their capacity of reiteration through various performative deeds in the story. Each reiteration, for Butler, performed by individuals as parody in the formation of gender roles can resist the dominant social codes. Parody as subversive imitation also involves the idea of challenge and it shows that “the domains of gender and sexuality are not organised in terms of originality and imitation. What they manifest instead is endless – though heavily regulated – possibilities of performativity” (Jagose 85). It is evident that in the story although there is a challenge still grounded on heteronormative values, the codes make people paralised and thus passive. Joyce’s characters feel forced to be both active and inactive and repeat what social and political codes ask them to fulfill regarding their gender roles.

WORKS CITED

- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- _____. “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory.” *Theatre Journal* 40. 4 (1988): 519-531. JSTOR. Web. 31 Mar. 2012.
- Ellmann, Richard. *The Letters of James Joyce*. Vol 2. New York: Viking, 1966.
- Gray, Wallace. “Wallace Gray’s Notes for James Joyce’s ‘The Dead’.” *World wide Dubliners by James Joyce*. Web. 21 Dec. 2011.

“Performative Acts” in “The Dead”

<<http://www.mendele.com/WWD/WWDdead.notes.html>>.

- Jagose, Annamarie. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York UP., 1996.
- Joyce, James. “The Dead,” *Dubliners*. London: Grafton, 1990. 199-256.
- Munich, Adrienne Auslander. “Form and Subtext in Joyce’s ‘The Dead’.” *Modern Philology* 82.2 (1984): 173-184. JSTOR. Web. 28 Mar. 2012.
- Norris, Margot. *Suspicious Readings of Dubliners*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.
- Schwarz, Daniel. *The Dead : Complete, Authoritative Text with Biographical and Historical Contexts, Critical History, and Essays From Five Contemporary Critical Perspectives*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Walzl, Florence. “Gabriel and Michael: The Conclusion of ‘The Dead’,” *James Joyce Quarterly* 4.1 (1966): 17-31. JSTOR. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.



6

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

Alev Karaduman

James Augustine Aloysius Joyce (2 February 1882 – 13 January 1941), who was one of the most prolific, creative, and influential Irish writers of the early 20th century, is generally known to be a novelist with his *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), *Ulysses* (1922) and *Finnegans Wake* (1939), a poet with his *Chamber Music* (poems, 1907), *Pomes Penyeach* (1927), *Collected Poems* (1936), a short story writer with his *Dubliners* (1914), a literary person interested in drama as shown by his work called *Exiles* (1918) (Bulson 30-35), a language teacher, a linguist, a journalist, a lecturer, a translator, an Irish intellectual and a rebel who is seriously concerned about the liberation of Ireland from the British rule and imperialism. But on the other hand, he is “a man” with feelings and doubts, jealousies and anger, like anyone of us, who not only loves but also adores his life-long spouse Nora Barnacle who later became his mentor, his wife, and the mother of their two children. Thus, the major aim of this paper is to present Joyce’s inner

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

life as “a man”, a passionate lover and a husband by focusing on his relationship with Nora Barnacle.

In 1904, when Joyce was 22 years old young man, his life changed when he encountered with “a reddish-brown-haired girl” (Bulson 6) Nora Barnacle, a young woman from Galway who worked as a chambermaid in Dublin. Immediately, Joyce fell in love with this young flirtatious and tempting woman who was very attractive, had many admirers and was in favour of “going out, liked dancing, practical jokes, and boys” (Pierce 52). In a letter he wrote to Nora dated on 15 June 1904, he asked an appointment from her in a sentimental mood.

My Dear Nora,

I may be blind. I looked for a long time at a head of reddish-brown hair and decided it was not yours. I went home quite dejected. I would like to make an appointment but it might not suit you. I hope you will be kind enough to make one with me – if you have not forgotten me!
(Gilbert *Letters* 42)

This tough, firm, proud and rebellious man, who could easily reject to make any corrections asked by the editor, in his story though he was in hard financial problems, was changed into a humble, uncertain, modest, yielding lover. In order to understand the change of mood in his character let's have a look at the

Alev Karaduman

letter written to the editor, Mr Grant Richards, with harsh wording:

Dear Mr Grant Richards,

You tell me that the printer to whom you sent my story *Two Gallants* before you read it yourself refuses to print it and therefore you ask me either to suppress it or to modify it in such a way as to enable it to pass. I cannot see my way to do either of these things. I have written my book with considerable care, in spite of a hundred difficulties and in accordance with what I understand to be the classical tradition of my art. You must therefore allow me to say that your printer's opinion of it does not interest me in the least. (Ellmann *Letters V.I* 45)

He could behave with arrogance to others, but in his private life, emotionally, he was extremely mild. His modest, cautious, and, at the same time, uncertain attitude towards Nora continued till he was sure of her love. In a letter dated 15 August 1904, he, in a way, asked her permission to be accepted as a lover. He wrote:

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

My Dear Nora,

It has just struck one. I came in at half past eleven. Since then I have been sitting in an easy chair like a fool. I could do nothing. I hear nothing but your voice. I am like a fool hearing you call me 'Dear'. I offended two men today by leaving them coolly. I wanted to hear your voice, not theirs.

When I am with you I leave aside my contemptuous suspicious nature. I wish I felt your head over my shoulder now.

I have been a half-hour writing this thing. Will you write something to me? I hope you will. How am I to sign myself? I won't sign anything at all, because I don't know what to sign myself. (Gilbert, *Letters*, 46)

He felt too insecure, anxious and he was constantly in a mood of tapidation till he received a letter from Nora in which it was written that she also shared the same feelings with Joyce. She responded with a letter written on 16 August 1904:

My Dearest,

My loneliness which I have so deeply felt, since we parted last night seemed to fade away as if by magic, but, alas, it was only

Alev Karaduman

for a short time, and I then became worse than ever. When I read your letter from the moment that I close my eyes till I open them again in the morning, it seems to me that I am always in your company under every possible variety of circumstances talking to you, walking with you, meeting you suddenly in different places until I am beginning to wonder if my spirit takes leave of my body in sleep and goes to seek you, and what is more find you or perhaps this is nothing but a fantasy. Occasionally too I fall into a fit of melancholy that lasts for the day and which find almost impossible to dispel it is about time, now ... I should finish this letter as the more I write the lonelier I feel in consequence of you being so far away and the thought of having to write what I would wish to speak were you beside me makes me feel utterly miserable so with best wishes and love. I now close. Believe me to be ever yours

xxxxxxxNORAH BARNACLE
(Gilbert, *Letters*, 47)

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

Joyce's contemptuous suspicious nature did not allow him to act freely and make him happy, though his love was accepted and appreciated by Nora. The major reason behind it was, most probably, Nora's previous love affairs in which she also experienced her sexuality. Nora's love turned him into a jealous lover who even questioned her loyalty to him. And here it should be recalled that the impact of Victorian morals and gender concepts were strongly felt during the Edwardian period; especially any premarital sexual relationship was strictly forbidden and condemned. Joyce could not be regarded as a pure Victorian man, but when the term was love, he was strictly traditional and conformist. To Nora, he wrote an unsigned letter without a greeting which reflected his confused mind, his deep love and his fear of losing her forever.

I dare not address you tonight
by any familiar name.

All day, since I read your letter
this morning, I have felt like a
mongrel dog that has received a
flash across the eyes. I have been
awake now for two whole days
and I wandered about the streets
like some filthy cur whose
mistress had cut him with her
whip and hunted him from her
door.

You write like a queen. As long
as I live I shall always remember
the quiet dignity of that letter, its
sadness and scorn, and the utter
humiliation it caused me.

Alev Karaduman

I have lost your esteem. I have worn down your love. Leave me than. ... Let me sink back again into the mire I came from. Forget me and my empty words. Go back to your own life and let me go alone to my ruin. It is wrong for you to live with a vile beast like me ...

Act bravely as you have always done. If you decide to leave me in disgust I will bear it like a man, Leave me now to the things and companions I was so fond of. I will not complain ... Act bravely and leave me ... If you leave me, I shall live forever with your memory, holier than God to me. I shall pray to your name... Think that your lips have kissed him and your hair has fallen over him and that your arms have held him to you.

I will not sign my name because it is the name you called me when you loved me and honoured me and gave me your young tender soul to wound and betray. [unsigned] (Gilbert, *Letters*, 177)

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

For most of the people, especially for Joyce's father, John Joyce, Nora was not a suitable match for Joyce and it took several years for father Joyce to accept Nora as a suitable bride for his son whom he sent to the best schools in Ireland. When James and Nora were leaving Ireland for Trieste in 1904, it was John Joyce who did not know that his son had a travelling companion. As Pierce puts "it was an unlikely match, a woman from the west of Ireland, who was not especially intellectual or artistic, and rather remote, thin-faced, intense, slightly dandyish Dubliner, ... (Gilbert, *Letters*, 49). At this stage of his life, Joyce found what he was looking for: "a companion who understood him, someone whom he could give himself fully" (Bulson 6). He was at the same time really afraid of being left and of losing Nora's love. He wrote a letter with a poem in it.

You love me, do you not? You
will take me now into your
bosom and shelter me and
perhaps pity me for my sins and
follies and lead me like a child.

I would in that sweet bosom be
(O sweet it is and fair it is!)
Where no rude wind might visit me.
Because of sad austerities
I would in that sweet bosom be.

I would be ever in that heart
(O soft I knock and soft entreat her!)
Where only peace might be my part.
Austerities were all the sweeter

Alev Karaduman

So I were ever in that heart. (Ellmann
Letters V.II 178)

In another letter, he expressed his deep and faithful love to her as such.

In a way I have no right to expect that you should regard me as anything more than the rest of men – in fact in view of my own life I have no right at all to expect it. But yet I seemed to have expected it if only because I myself had never regarded anyone as I regarded you.
(Ellmann *Letters* V.II 169)

Within two months of their romance, he wanted something more than tender caresses, and he believed that Nora could fill the absence created by the loss of his mother. Joyce was also aware of this fact. He simply wrote to her; “Certain people who know that we are much together often insult me about you. I listen to them calmly, disdaining to answer them ...” (Ellmann, *Letters* V.II, 66). In many ways, Nora was not a suitable match for him. She did not share his passion for literature, and he quickly realized that she “cared nothing” (Ellmann *Letters* V.III 73) for his art. But, whatever she lacked in formal education and refinement, she made up for in beauty, daring, wit and courage. At the same time, in 1904, she was a very courageous woman who had the courage to elope with a man to an uncertain destination in Europe without the protection of marriage. Very few women would

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

have done it. The reason behind this, was Joyce's fierce rejection of the institution of marriage. He explained his refusal of all the institutions, and social order, in his country as such:

My mind rejects the whole present social order and Christianity ... Six years ago I left the Catholic Church, hating it most fervently. I found it impossible for me to remain in it on account of the impulses of my nature. I made secret war upon it when I was a student and declined to accept the positions it offered me. By doing this I made myself a beggar but I retained my pride It seemed to me that I was fighting a battle with every religious and social force in Ireland for you and that I had nothing to rely on but myself. There is no life here – no naturalness or honesty.
(Ellmann *Letters* V.II 79)

He was in revolt against the Church and the thought of religious ceremony was distasteful and “his Catholic upbringing led him to regard a purely civil marriage” (Gilbert 36). After 27 years later and having two children, as a request of their daughter Lucie, who had suffered from nervous breakdown for a very long time and died as a result of it, they would get married in 1931.

Alev Karaduman

Nora Joyce was a capable woman. She was not only “independent-and strong-willed” (Senn 87), but also “intelligent as her later fluency in French, German, and Italian suggests. In spite of Joyce’s many promptings, she had no interest in literature” (Deming 89). For her part, she never idealized him, even after he became very popular and famous in the 1920s.

Nora’s influence on Joyce’s was not only romantic. She changed his understanding of the West of Ireland as well. In other words, she had significantly reshaped Joyce’s view of Ireland. After falling in love with Nora and sharing his rest of his life with her, the west could no longer in the remote corner of his mind but “had to be incorporated into his overall judgement of the world”. As Brenda Maddox, Nora’s biographer simply suggests;

Nora helped Joyce remain faithful to his imagination, deepened his understanding of the west, and recalled, especially through her broad Galway accent, an Ireland beyond the Pale ... she taught him to accept Ireland and to find a home for his rebellious spirit. (49)

A pattern suggested itself here between Dublin versus the West, male versus female, husband versus wife. Joyce was a Dubliner who experienced in 1909 in his own country “stemmed from the male Dubliner vis-a-vis the female west of Ireland” (Pierce 68). He called

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

Nora “you dear, strange little girl”, “the little curious Galway girl”, “my little Galway bride” (L II. 254, 249, 242). What he loved in Nora, with his own word, was “the beauty and doom of the race whom he was a child” (Ellmann, *Letters* V.II 267). It was through Nora’s love that “Joyce overcame his estrangement, re-established his purity, and renewed his feelings for his city and country (Pierce 68). He, for several times, wrote to Nora: “How sick, sick I am of Dublin! It is the city of failure, of rancour and of unhappiness. I long to be out of it” and continued “Dublin is a detestable city and the people are most repulsive to me” and “I feel the day all wasted here among the common Dublin people whom I hate and despise (Ellmann *Letters* V.II 237, 287, 172). He saw more clearly the possibilities towards his country which had driven him away from her “were somewhat mitigated by his sense of irrevocable attachment to Ireland exile.” (Senn 90). He even sometimes asked for guidance from Nora in his letters stating that: “Guide me, my saint, my angel. Lead me forward. Everything that is noble and exalted and deep and true and moving in what I write comes, I believe, from you” (Ellmann *Letters* V.II 230). His belief in Nora was so deep that he expressed it as such: “surely to God you are a woman and can understand what I say! I know that you have acted very nobly and very generously to me but try and answer my frankness with like frankness” (Ellmann *Letters* V.II 172). Joyce was really right in this respect. Nora had always been loyal, true and frank to him even after his death. Joyce died of “perforated duodenum” in 1941. With a modest ceremony, and a few friends, he was buried in Zurich’s Fluntern Cemetery two days later. When asked by a Catholic priest if she wanted a

Alev Karaduman

religious service, Nora refused saying that, "I cannot do that to him" (Bulson 42) A wreath with lyre symbolizing Ireland was placed by the graveside. Nora Joyce remained in Zurich until her death in 1951. She was buried in the same cemetery as her husband but not next to him. The two were disinterred and buried side by side in 1966.

To conclude, in his works Joyce always appears to be an extremely learned, and unusually intelligent writer, seriously concerned with his art. Yet, in his private letters, he was a man of powerful human sentiments and conflicts. This contrast between Joyce the writer and intellectual the one hand, Joyce with private sentiments on the other has seldom been taken into consideration in academic criticism. In fact, it would not be out of place to suggest that Joyce, the man in his letters can further be traced in his works. So, in this regard, his letters may be read as a prelude to his portrayal and representations in his fictions.

While I was repeating this to myself I knew that that life was still waiting for me if I chose to enter it. It could not give me perhaps the intoxication it had once given but it was still there and now that I am wiser and more controllable it was safe. It would ask no questions, expect nothing from me but a few moments of my life, leaving the rest free, and would promise me pleasure in return. I thought of

James Joyce: The Man in His Letters

all this and without regret I
rejected it. It was useless for me;
it could not give me what I
wanted. (Gilbert *Letters* 48)

WORKS CITED

- Bulson, Eric. *The Cambridge Introduction James Joyce*. New York: CUP. 2006.
- Deming, Robert, ed. *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*. Vol I 1902-1927. New York; Barnes and Noble.1970.
- Ellmann, Richard, ed. *Letters of James Joyce. V II and III*. New York: Viking .1966.
- Ellmann, Richard and Mason, Ellsworth, eds. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. New York: Viking, 1959.
- Gilbert, Stuart, ed. *Letters of James Joyce. V I*. New York: Viking, 1957, 1966.
- Pierce, David. *James Joyce's Ireland*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1992.
- Senn, Fritz, ed. *New Light on Joyce From the Dublin Symposium*. Bloomington and London. Indiana UP. 1972.



7

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*: A Debate on Aesthetics

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

James Joyce engaged with the notions of art and aesthetics in many of his works, particularly in his essays, and his works might be regarded as a continuous discussion of the artistic practice they propound. Arguably, Joyce's *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* are the novels that bring the concepts of art and the artist to the fore in a highly philosophical narrative that initiates a debate on aesthetics. Written between 1904 and 1906 *Stephen Hero* is an earlier version of Joyce's *A Portrait* (1917), and it is often regarded as "more discursive" and "personal" than *A Portrait*. Stephen as hero is a young man and is more dependent on his family, while Stephen as artist is an adult and is detached from his family. Despite their different stylistic features, both texts exploit similar ideas as friendship, religion, family, country and art. Thus, the aesthetic theory offered by Stephen in both texts becomes highly important regarding the artistic growth of Stephen as

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

well as Joyce's interpretation of the nature of art and the artist. Therefore, the aim of this study is to explore the principal aspects of Stephen's aesthetics in relation to his elucidation of the concepts of truth and beauty, his formulation of "aesthetic apprehension", his engagement with the interrelatedness of art and life, his conceptualization of epiphany, and his elaborate explorations of literary genres. Thus, through an examination of Joyce's theories about art and literature as projected through Stephen, this study argues that the aesthetic theory presented in *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* situates Joyce somewhere between his successor French philosophers and literary theorists such as Jean Paul Sartre and Maurice Blanchot. Therein, this study looks into what kind of a possible dialogue in terms of intersections and digressions could be instigated between Joyce's aesthetics and that of Sartre and Blanchot in their works *What is Literature?* (1950) and *The Space of Literature* (1955) respectively.

In *A Portrait*, Stephen begins to establish his aesthetic theory with the concepts of truth and beauty, and differentiates these terms in the light of the two principles he adapted from St. Thomas Aquinas:

Truth is beheld by the intellect which is appeased by the most satisfying relations of the intelligible; beauty is beheld by the imagination which is appeased by the most satisfying relations of the sensible. The first step in the direction of truth is to understand

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

the frame and scope of the intellect itself, to comprehend the act of intellection. [...] The first step in the direction of beauty is to understand the frame and scope of the imagination, to comprehend the act itself of aesthetic apprehension. (*A Portrait* 236-37)

In line with this, one might think that truth and beauty can be attained only in a self-conscious act which is founded on an apprehension of the procedure for attaining truth and beauty. However, Stephen of *Stephen Hero* has formulated the apprehension of truth and beauty in terms of a less self-conscious act by referring to it as a sort of desire that requires fulfillment. According to Stephen what distinguishes truth from beauty is that truth which is associated with the “intellectual appetite” seeks “the most satisfying relations of the intelligible” while beauty which is associated with the “aesthetic appetite” seeks the most satisfying relations of the sensible” (*Stephen Hero* 172). Stephen defines truth and beauty in similar terms used by Aquinas to define good which is translated by Joyce as “the possession of what an appetite tends” (Hope 184). In Aquinas’s definition both truth and beauty appear as a particular class of “good”, while for Joyce they evoke different implications.

For instance, in his essay “James Clarence Mangan” (1902) Joyce defines beauty as “the splendour of truth” stating that it is “a gracious presence when the imagination contemplates intensely

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

the truth of his own being or the visible world, and the spirit which proceeds out of truth and beauty is the holy spirit of joy" (60). The Stephens of both *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* ascribe great importance to the notion of beauty resting their theory on the achievement of beauty in a work of art. Unlike Sartre who arguably adopted a Platonist view pointing out that art reproduces the beauty already existing in nature, a view which is evinced in his remark "the beauty of nature is in no way comparable to that of art" (34), Joyce takes a different approach saying "[...] Art was neither a copy nor an imitation of nature: the artistic process was a natural process [...] veritably sublime process of one's own nature which had a right to examination and open discussion" (*Stephen Hero* 171). Here, Joyce takes a rather anti-Platonist outlook on nature and art, and thus his statement implies the ways in which the artistic process operates like the natural process whilst avoiding the tendency to reproduce the things of the world within this process.

In his essay "Aesthetics" Joyce points to the spiritual aspect that the notions of truth and beauty encompass, stating that "the true and the beautiful are spiritually possessed, the true by intellection, the beautiful by apprehension; and the appetites which desire to possess them, the intellectual and aesthetic appetites are therefore spiritual appetites" (105). In both *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* Joyce constructs Stephen as a character who tends to enunciate his own aesthetic theories, and in *A Portrait* Joyce further develops the aesthetic theory he outlined in *Stephen Hero*. Stephen in *A Portrait* asserts that "the object of

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

the artist is the creation of the beautiful” (211) laying emphasis on aesthetic sensitivity, and states:

Beauty is expressed by the artist cannot awaken in us an emotion which is kinetic or a sensation which is purely physical. It awakens, or ought to awaken, or induces, an aesthetic stasis, an ideal pity or ideal terror, a stasis called forth, the prolonged and at last dissolved by what I call the rhythm of beauty. (*A Portrait* 234)

Stephen takes the view that proper art is static since it does not arouse a desire or repulsion in the reader while improper art is kinetic as it tends to encourage the reader to do something. The theory of kinetic and static effect that a work of art generates is evinced in the very characterization of Stephen in both works. In *Stephen Hero*, Joyce constructs Stephen as a young man who asserts his ideas in a rigid manner, and as Theodore Spencer pointed out in his “Introduction” to the novel “he is emotionally and intellectually a cruder and more youthful figure than in his creator’s eyes he was later to become” (13). He is “arrogant” and “proud” (Spencer 13), and he is so convinced of the truth of his ideas that he tends to overlook others’ views, whereas in *A Portrait* Stephen presents his theories in a serious but an impersonal fashion, in a conversation with his friend Lynch. Viewed in this context, it might be argued that the former produces a kinetic effect by inspiring the reader to share Stephen’s antagonistic views and feelings about his country, while the latter

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

creates a static effect as it avoids encouraging the reader to move or take an action, and puts a distance between the writer and the readers. In *A Portrait* Stephen attributes the static principle of art to the objectivity of the artist and the work of art, stating “the artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, paring his fingernails” (245). Thus, for Stephen an expression of the artist’s personality in a work of art leads to bad or improper art.

Stephen’s ideas with respect to the objectivity of the artist opens up a stimulating discourse when viewed within the context of Sartre and Blanchot’s theories on the notion of objectivity in art. Unlike Joyce, Sartre argues that the objectivity of an artist may not be achieved. In *What is Literature?* he points out as follows:

[...] All literary work is an appeal. If it should be asked to what the writer is appealing, the answer is simple. As the sufficient reason for the appearance of aesthetic object is never found either in the book or in the author’s mind, his subjectivity, which he cannot get away from, cannot give a reason for the act of leading into objectivity. (Sartre 32)

Sartre emphasizes the subjectivity of the writer linking artistic subjectivity to the notion of freedom. He points out that “whether the writer is an essayist, a

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

pamphleteer, a satirist or a novelist, whether he speaks only of individual passions, or whether he attacks the social order, the writer, a free man addressing free men, has only one subject – freedom” (Sartre 68). In line with this argument, Sartre distinguishes between good and bad novels stating that “the bad novel aims to please by flattering, whereas the good one is an exigence and an act of faith” (67).

Whilst Joyce’s Stephen in *A Portrait* tends to prioritize the static effect of art and its objectivity arguing that the artist/writer should neither concern himself with judging nor think about if the reader would approve or disapprove of his views, Sartre highlights the kinetic effect of art and its subjectivity seeing it as a medium through which an artist/writer conveys his thoughts, beliefs and ideas without constraints. Blanchot, on the other hand, asserts that impersonality in a work of art can be attained, and he offers his formula:

The work of art does not refer immediately back to the person who presumably made it. When we know nothing at all about the circumstances that contributed to its production, about the history of its creation – when we do not even know the name of the person who made it possible – it is then that the work comes closest to itself. (Blanchot 221)

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

Although the Stephens of both in *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* do not seek to impose the invisibility of the writer, it might be argued that Blanchot's formula regarding the objectivity of the work of art echoes the aesthetic theories of Stephen, particularly the Stephen of *A Portrait* where the character's ideas on aesthetics are revealed in a more in-depth and elaborate fashion.

Both Stephens engage with the notions of truth and beauty, static and kinetic effect of art, and the artist's objectivity, and this engagement is further scrutinized in their views regarding the interrelatedness of art and life, an idea which encapsulates another aspect of Joyce's and Stephen's aesthetic theory. In his essay "Drama and Life" (1900) Joyce stated that "Life we must accept as we see it before our eyes, men and women as we meet them in the real world, not as we apprehend them in the world of faery" (28). For Joyce a work of art should portray a realistic account of experience as he says "art is true to itself when it deals with truth" ("Drama and Life" 27). In his *Stephen Hero*, Joyce further develops the relation between art and life through Stephen's views on the subject:

Art is not an escape from life. [...] Art, on the contrary is just the very central expression of life. An artist is not a fellow who dangles a mechanical heaven before the public. The priest does that. The artist affirms out of the fullness of his own life, he creates. (*Stephen Hero* 86)

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

Stephen like Joyce himself regards art as “an imaginative criticism of life [...] based on a realistic fidelity to ordinary experience” (Goldberg 81). Sartre, Joyce before him, also emphasized the significance of the interrelatedness of art and life, stating that “one of the chief motives of artistic creation is certainly the need of feeling that we are essential in relation to the world” (26-27). A related attitude to art is that of Blanchot who rather tends to focus on the humanistic aspect:

[...] Art is what we call humanistic.
[...] Art appears as the artist and the artist as man – as man in the most general sense. Art is expressed to the extent that the artist represents humanity: represents that is, the human being he is regardless of his particular being as an artist. (Blanchot 218)

Blanchot here draws attention to the distinction between artist as artist and artist as man. In *A Portrait*, Stephen preempts Blanchot’s argument in his depiction of art which he defines as “the human disposition of sensible or intelligible matter for an aesthetic end” (*A Portrait* 235). Here, Stephen tends to define art in Aristotelian terms regarding how art arrives at a general truth by means of particular expression. For Stephen art is an activity which consists in the contemplation of the intelligible through the sensible appetite or the contemplation of the intelligible through the particular. In his

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

explanation of this process, Stephen emphasizes the “aesthetic end” that a work of art should strive for, and he explores the ways in which a work of art could accomplish this aesthetic disposition through achieving the three stages of aesthetic apprehension. Stephen establishes his theory of aesthetic apprehension on concepts he borrows from Aquinas’s conceptualization of “wholeness (*integritas*), harmony (*consonantia*) and radiance (*claritas*)” (*A Portrait* 241). According to Stephen’s theory of aesthetic apprehension, before any object can be apprehended as beautiful, it must be first seen as a unified whole. He explains to Lynch how the first stage of his theory operates, and gives the example of “a basket”. In looking at a basket, he tells Lynch, the mind first separates the basket from its surroundings, and sees it as one thing. This epitomizes wholeness and is the result of a psychological focusing, since one tends to see a thing as a whole and then realize its parts. Having recognized the basket as one thing, “You feel now”, as Stephen explains, “it is a thing” and explains harmony saying, “You apprehend it as complex, multiple, divisible, separable, made up of its parts and their sum, harmonious” (*A Portrait* 242-243). The second stage implies the beauty of an object as the aesthetic image apprehended in its coherent complexity within the balance of its parts with respect to the whole which they compose. Blanchot comments on the perception of the aesthetic image in similar terms stating that “first we have the object, afterwards comes the image” (46). Following the achievement of these two stages of aesthetic apprehension, the third stage, the *quidditas* or what Joyce defined as the “whatness of a thing” emerges. Stephen in *A Portrait*

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

defines *quidditas* in relation to *claritas* or radiance, stating:

When you have apprehended the basket as one thing and have then analyzed it according to its form and apprehended it as a thing you make the only synthesis which is logically and aesthetically permissible. You see that it is that thing which it is and no other thing. The radiance of which he speaks is the scholastic *quidditas*, the *whatness* of a thing. This supreme quality is felt by the artist when the aesthetic image is first conceived in his imagination. (*A Portrait* 242)

According to Stephen's theory, the achievement of radiance also brings about the "silent stasis" of aesthetic pleasure, an artistic joy which Stephen defines as "the spiritual state very like [...] the enchantment of the heart" (*A Portrait* 242-43). In this final act, "the appetite is appeased and this is the stasis, the state of intellectual delight which arises from the perfection of the act" (Hope 197). Thus, Stephen's theory of the three stages of aesthetic apprehension overlaps with Aquinas's proposition of the three transcendental characteristics needed for beauty. These characteristics are defined by Stephen as one, true and good, characteristics that correspond to the notions of wholeness, harmony and radiance encapsulated in Stephen's aesthetic theory. Drawing on Joyce's conceptualization of the aesthetic pleasure,

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

Sartre ponders the essence of *claritas* or radiance in a work of art stating:

[...] The writer, like all the other artists, aims at giving his reader a certain feeling that is customarily called aesthetic pleasure and which I would rather call aesthetic joy, and that this feeling, when it appears, is a sign that the work of art is achieved. (Sartre 41)

For Joyce, the attainment of artistic joy or the effect of radiance is closely related to the doctrine of epiphany, an aspect of Stephen's aesthetic theory which only appears in *Stephen Hero* and is left out in *A Portrait*. Stephen in *Stephen Hero* identifies the moment of the apprehension of *claritas* with the epiphany which he describes as "a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether in the vulgarity of speech or gesture or in a memorable phase of the mind itself" (213). Stephen arrives at this moment while passing through Eccles Street and seeing a young lady standing on the steps of a brown brick house, a sight which he regards as "the very incarnation of Irish paralysis" (*Stephen Hero* 211). Here, Joyce examines the ways in which an ordinary image is capable of releasing within the viewer an intense emotional response. Stephen elaborates on this moment as follows:

First we recognize that the moment is *one* integral thing, then we recognize that it is an organized composite structure, *a thing* in fact: finally when

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

the parts are adjusted to the special point, we recognize that it is that thing which it is. Its soul, its *whatness*, leaps to us from the vestment of its appearance. The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant. The object achieves its epiphany. (*Stephen Hero* 213)

Here, epiphany is described as an oscillating image which is sensuously apprehended and which communicates the meaning of the experience of the aesthetic apprehension. For Stephen the task of “the man of letters” is “to record these epiphanies with extreme care”, and “[to realize] that they are the most delicate and evanescent of moments” (*Stephen Hero* 211). According to Stephen it is only after the object has been epiphanized its beauty could be unveiled.

Stephen’s aesthetic theory is further explored in his apprehension of literature, a medium which he sees as the highest of all arts. According to Stephen the most purely personal form of art consists in the lyrical form which represents direct emotional expression. After the lyrical genre comes the less personal, epic genre which, as Stephen argues, could be regarded as the continuation or almost a maturation of the lyrical form. For Stephen the most purified form of literature and the least personal one is the dramatic genre since the dramatic artist stands apart from his work, and therefore the dramatic form exists in a static condition. Stephen states that “the aesthetic image in the dramatic form is life purified in

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

and re-projected from the human imagination” (*A Portrait* 244). It could be inferred from this statement that for Joyce dramatic genre represents the true and proper art complying with his principle of the stasis.

This said, the nature of poetry and the function of the poet occupy a significant space in Stephen and Joyce’s aesthetic theories. In his essay “James Clarence Mangan” (1902) Joyce states that “poetry in any art transcends the mode of its expression” (54). It might be argued that Joyce tends to favor poetry over prose, and share Shelley’s views on poetry emphasizing poetry as the expression of truth and beauty presented in a certain rhythm and order. Expressed in similar terms to Joyce’s views, Blanchot defines poetry as “a powerful universe of words where relations, configurations, forces are affirmed through sound, figure, rhythmic mobility in a unified and sovereignly autonomous space” (225). Like Joyce, Blanchot tends to prioritize poetry emphasizing the personal aspect of the genre whilst highlighting the rhythm and order as its eminent features. In contrast to Joyce and Blanchot, Sartre promotes prose over poetry and conceives prose writing as a task set to freedom. Interestingly, although Joyce attaches a great artistic importance to poetry and dramatic form it is through his fiction that he seems to achieve a sense of freedom as an artist.

To conclude, the aesthetic theories presented in *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* are primarily Stephen’s, not Joyce’s, although Joyce used many of his own ideas in his construction of Stephen as a hero and as a young man. Therefore the theories presented in both

Zeynep Z. Atayurt

works might not be considered a medium to appreciate or to judge Joyce's art. However, the point which brings both Joyce's and Stephen's theories under the same umbrella is their tendency to situate art in the body of life. Viewed in this perspective, both texts exploit the idea that everything that nourishes art is living while all that stifles art is unfavorable. Both in *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait* Joyce explores the possibilities of new art which takes the work of art as a world in itself within the standards of wholeness, harmony and radiance whilst offering a subtle discourse whose complexity invites further aesthetic explorations, interpretations and re-interpretations, and thus sheds light on the works of later philosophers and theorists.

WORKS CITED

- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Space of Literature*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1982 [1955].
- Goldberg, S.L. "Art and Life: The Aesthetic of the *Portrait*." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Ed. William M. Schutte. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 64-84.
- Hope, A.D. "The Esthetic Theory of James Joyce." *Joyce's Portrait: Criticisms and Critiques*. Ed. Thomas Connolly. London: Peter Owen, 1964. 184-203.
- Joyce, James. *Stephen Hero*. New York: New Directions, 1944.

From *Stephen Hero* to *A Portrait*

- _____. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1996.
- _____. "James Clarence Mangan." *Occasional, Critical and Political Writing*. Ed. Kevin Barry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 53-60.
- _____. "Aesthetics." *Occasional, Critical and Political Writing*. Ed. Kevin Barry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 102-07.
- _____. "Drama and Life." *Occasional, Critical and Political Writing*. Ed. Kevin Barry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 23-29.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *What is Literature?* London: Methuen, 1950.
- Spencer, Theodore. "Introduction." *Stephen Hero*. New York: New Directions, 1944. 7-17.



CONTRIBUTORS

Zeynep Z. Atayurt received her B.A and M.A degrees in English Language and Literature from Ankara University in Turkey. In 2002 she was granted a scholarship by the Turkish government for postgraduate study abroad. She earned her second M.A degree in Twentieth Century Literature in 2003 at Leeds University where she went on to do a PhD in English. In 2008 she was awarded her PhD. She has written various reviews and essays on modern and contemporary British literature. She is currently working as an assistant professor at the Department of English Language and Literature at Ankara University.

N. Berrin Aksoy Received her B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. from the Department of English Language and Literature Hacettepe University . She is currently a senior lecturer and Chair at the Department of Translation/Interpretation, Atılım University, Ankara. Her research interests and publications include translation theory, literary translation, comparative literature, Turkish literature and English literature.

A. Deniz Bozer received her B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. (1981) from the Department of English Language and Literature Hacettepe University. Her dissertation

was entitled “The Ethics of Restoration Libertinism as Questioned in the Comedies of Aphra Behn.” She also received another M.A. from the Department of English Literature at Georgia State University in Atlanta. She has taught at METU and Bilkent for many years and since 1984 she is at Hacettepe University where she worked simultaneously for about eleven years at both the Department of English Language and Literature and the Department of Translation and Interpretation (1987-1998, Chairperson). She was awarded full professorship in 1993. In addition to courses on British cultural studies, she mainly teaches British drama across the centuries at the Department of English Language and Literature. She has published extensively on British drama, comparative literature, literary translation and the short story. She is the director of the Centre for British Literary and Cultural Studies at the same institution. She is also a member of the Turkish Association of Theatre Critics which is affiliated with the International Association of Theatre Critics (IATC)”.

John McCourt teaches at Università Roma Tre. He is the founder and former director of the Trieste Joyce School, he is the author of *James Joyce: A Passionate Exile* (London: Orion Books, and New York: St Martin's Press, 2000) and of *The Years of Bloom: Joyce in Trieste 1904-1920*. (Dublin: Lilliput Press and Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000). His Italian *James Joyce Gli Anni di Bloom* (Mondadori, 2004) won the Comisso Price. He has been guest editor of the *James Joyce Quarterly* and was a Trustee of the International James Joyce Foundation from 2002 to 2008. In

February 2009 his edited collection, *James Joyce in Context*, was published by Cambridge University Press and was followed by *Roll Away the Reel World: James Joyce and the Cinema Volta* (Cork University Press) in 2010.

Alev Karaduman She received her B.A.' M.A. and Ph.D. from Department of English Language and Literature, Hacettepe University, in the fields of 18th and 19th century British novel. For her PhD Dissertation, she conducted research and was a guest lecturer in Syracuse University (USA) in 2000 and Friedrich Schiller University of Jena (Germany) in 2001. For Postdoctoral Studies on Post - Colonial British Literature, she has been to Friedrich Schiller University of Jena in 2004 and was a visiting lecturer in Technische Universität Dortmund (Germany) in 2006 within the framework of Erasmus Programme. She has published articles in journals and currently teaches at Hacettepe University as an assistant professor.

Aytül Özüm She received her B.A. in English Language and Literature from Hacettepe University, Ankara in 1992. She received a Master's Degree in English Language and Literature from Hacettepe University in 1994. She received a scholarship from the British Council and completed her second Master's Degree in British and Comparative Cultural Studies from University of Warwick in 1995. She received her Ph.D. in English Language and Literature from Hacettepe University in 1999. She

currently works as Associate Professor at the Department of English Language and Literature at Hacettepe University. She teaches English Novel, Short Story, Translation and Literary Theory and Criticism courses. She has published articles on literary theory and the English novel and is the author of the book entitled *Angela Carter ve Büyülü Gerçekçilik* (*Angela Carter and Magical Realism*) written in Turkish. Her fields of interest are modern and postmodern English literature, cultural studies and literary theory.

Himmet Umunç received his Ph.D. from the University of London (King's College) in 1974. He was promoted associate professor in 1981 and full professor in 1987. He taught British culture and literature for over forty years in the Department of English Language and Literature, Hacettepe University, Ankara. Currently he is affiliated with Başkent University, serving as the Chair of both the Department of American Culture and Literature and the Department of English. His research interests include British studies, American studies, representation of Turkey in British and American writings, literary theory and criticism, cultural studies, and comparative literature. He has published in learned journals and presented papers at national and international conferences.

