

Dalma VÉRY

Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Arts
Modern English and American Literature and Culture Doctoral Program
Budapest, Hungary
dalmavery@gmail.com

LYRICAL OPACITY:

The roots of lyrical narration in *Ulysses*

James Joyce's *Ulysses* is not merely a "story of a day." It is a poetic texture calling attention to itself by way of the versatile verbal constructions it manifests, defying traditional novelistic categories such as plot or character. That is, *Ulysses* – due to its self-reflexively eminent structures of speech – foregrounds thought and sense-relations instead of plot, fashions textual voices instead of building character. Accordingly, the narratorial voices surfacing within the texture also contribute to the weaving of the poetically eminent fabric. Presenting modes of a diffuse textural presence in their constant shifting and through their merging with individual voices, narratorial modes of speech yield a kind of indeterminacy that not only conceives defamiliarizing sense-relations, but also allows sense and perception, speech and thought, image and emotion to become conspicuous. In this way, the prose of *Ulysses* is saturated with a sense of lyricality.

Keywords: texture, opacity, lyricality, narrator, polyphony.

Although in *Ulysses*, "Joyce's narrative hangs loosely on its borrowed Homeric framework" (Kellogg – Phelan – Scholes 2006, 237), in the episodes of Joyce's work it is the particular orders of the diverse modes of speech that gain prominence. It is only through the creative screen of these that the reader may learn of the events and actions taking place within the context of the narrative. This also accounts for the "story of a day" –which expression is often used to describe *Ulysses* – being a rather fragmented story: not only are there several narrative gaps and hiatuses in the posited "sequence" of time and action,¹ but the intricately

1 For example, how did Bloom's day commence between "Cyclops" and "Nausicaa," or Stephen's between "Proteus" and "Aeolus"?

interwoven threads of the variegated modes of articulation prevent any suggestion and conception of narrative and narrational translucency. The texture does not allow the reader to reach beyond for a story apart from discourse. Indeed, critics were frustrated with “what they thought of as Joyce’s infidelity to the minimal requirements of a story [...]” (Lawrence 1981, 39). The episodes of *Ulysses* are framed scenes bearing their own contexts, rather than developments of action. Into such framed scenes are the fragmented stories of Stephen Dedalus, Leopold and Molly Bloom, besides all the minor figures of 1904 Dublin, are embedded. Like in explicitly lyrical novels, diction in *Ulysses* is not oriented towards revealing “new events but the significance of existing events. Actions are turned into scenes which embody recognitions” (Freedman 1963, 8).

As scenes replace plot and bar the reconstruction of a completely coherent and cohesive story, so do the various modes of speech moulding the texture of *Ulysses* and creating an opaque surface of discourses replace the notion of unified characters. Paralleling lyrical novels from this aspect as well, there is “an underemphasis on character” and “[t]he excitement created by the plot is largely absent” (Freedman 1963, 283). Underemphasis on character in *Ulysses* is all the more noticeable as the reader attempts to follow the diverse modes of diction that weave the texture: it is rather the fluctuating voices of the texture the reading ear encounters than the utterances of clearly delineated “characters.” *Ulysses* does not entail a sense of characterization. In fact, Laurent Milesi points out that Joyce’s “evolution of language” is “inseparable from [the] problematization of neat entities like character and voice, as well as the boundaries between them [...]” (Milesi 2007, 2–3). The non-problematized notion of character requires *characterization*, incorporating textually elaborated discursive practices to illuminate a fictional figure from more than one point of vantage. Among such discursive practices of characterization one may find description, “psychological” elucidation and symbolic action. Therefore, “[i]n our attempt to understand a character, we look for direct clues, like explicit pronouncements of the narrator, but we also rely heavily on the character’s actions” (Chatman 1993, 59). Due to the lack of discursive transparency in *Ulysses*, “direct clues” are rarely recoverable from the text with regard to character, while the role of inference is of crucial significance. Joyce’s figures often narrate for themselves without adopting a narratorial voice, i.e. it is through the order and turn of their silent thoughts that we learn to recognize them instead of gaining explicit narratorial insight into their motives. “Pain, that was not yet the pain of love, fretted his heart” (Joyce 1986, 5) is a sentence in the third person singular from “Telemachus.” It refers to Stephen Dedalus and suggests a narratorial stance of speech without asserting omniscience over “character.” The sentence does not say what kind

of pain bothered Stephen and why, it only indicates that pain “that was not yet the pain of love” was affecting him. Apparently, it is rather the wording of a vague emotion, the voicing of an impression that is typical of narratorial insight in *Ulysses*, which regularly adopts the thoughts of a particular figure himself/herself and even their turn of phrase. Joyce himself asserted that a portrait – which invariably seeks to demonstrate character – should be the “curve of an emotion” (Kellogg – Phelan – Scholes 2006, 237). However, impressions of character, as suggested by the textually moulded curves of emotion, do not have to assemble themselves into the shape of a complete whole and hence do not have to suit the aim of integrity sought by finite characterization. Understanding “character” in the light of what Joyce terms the “curve of an emotion” implies that “characterization” is not to go beyond the revelatory potential of language as artistically devised speech in exhibiting relations that unfold the terrains of thought and the emotion anchored therein. More precisely, the “curve of an emotion” makes the notions of character and characterization superfluous in themselves, for it is the surface of eminent speech as texture that allows for impressions and sentiments to unfold, without necessitating or providing explanatory remarks or justification.

Accordingly, language in *Ulysses* is shaped to reveal or to hint at – even if at times ironically – the perceptual potential and the emotional setting of particular situations and the way in which figures are involved in their relations. Thus, the scenes exhibited in the episodes of *Ulysses* often present to the reader what may be called “supplementary events,” which “are events that do not drive the story forward and without which the story would still remain intact” (Chatman 1993, 21), while offering a variety of discursive arrangements without which the textural order would be greatly mutilated. “What is important here is [...] the transition from fiction interested in plot to fiction in which plot becomes synonymous with digression” (Lawrence 1981, 40). The digressive nature of the narrative does not only suggest the diffusion of plot but also the increased significance acquired by the manner and mode of narration. “Part of the difficulty at the start for the reader of *Ulysses* is Joyce’s use of the whole range of techniques early in the narration” (Riquelme 1983, 154). These varieties of narration, as potentially digressive modes of discourse, do not only weave the narrative but may also halt its procession, like in Lawrence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*. Digression, in this sense, does not point to the “accumulation” of “superfluous” discourse, but to the texturally digressive nature of the narratorial patterns. “[T]he teller in *Ulysses* does not appear in conventional ways, for instance, as a commentator in the manner of many nineteenth-century novels” (Riquelme 1983, 132), but, as we shall see shortly, it does make itself heard in several other modes of the narratorial role.

Direct narration in *Ulysses* rarely displays any consciousness of its own, hardly comparable to the omniscience for which narrative sources are often credited in fictional texts. Essentially, Joycean narrative directions depend upon the limited consciousness of the ‘centred’ character [...]” (Benstock 1991, 31–32).

The interpenetration between the individual and narratorial modes of awareness allows for the development of varied narrational fabrics of discourse, which tend to divert attention from the mere reporting of events and actions to the digressive speech of perceptions and emotions. Narratorial speech is subject to unexpected turns throughout *Ulysses*, while also endowed with its own stylistic import. The term “poetry” contributes to a more differentiated understanding of such non-standard narrative discourse, in which thought, impression and emotion gain prominence instead of plot and story, while textual voices gain precedence over the consistency of an integrated, finite characterization. “People also use the term ‘poetry’ to describe a predominating impact different from that of narrative. [...] Attention in these texts is focussed not so much on figuring out the story [...] as enjoying the way the lexia play off against each other” (Abbott 2002, 31).

The versatile *lexis* of *Ulysses* – its diction – exhibits its diversity and displays the jointures the various verbal patterns build in the framework created by the expansive narrational muster of a prose epic. This also means that the divergent modes of narratorial speech bear a fundamental role in the delineation of the terrain of sense relations the texture may unfold. Thus, “we cannot really separate the way the book ‘talks about things’ from ‘the things it is talking about.’ Instead, the structural relations between narration and narrative in *Ulysses* are among its most arresting features [...]” (Riquelme 1983, 190). Narratorial speech is vital to the texture insofar as it constitutes the principal discursive setting which may inform all other modes of speech surfacing in *Ulysses* and hence provides a definitive discursive structure for the text and the narrative. As a framing discourse, narration serves to differentiate modes of diction both from itself and often from one another.

The narrator’s presence is of a structural sort, and that is an odd kind of presence indeed. It reveals itself through difference: through the difference between the character’s interior voice and the surrounding narration and through the differences between styles as the narration proceeds from episode to episode. Through these differences, [...] in the interstices between the different styles, the narrator’s structural presence emerges as the rationale for the book’s arrangement (Riquelme 1983, 133).

Fielding in the comic epics in prose entitled *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* made it explicit that he modelled the narratorial role both on that of the *histor*

and the epic bard (Kellogg – Phelan – Scholes 2006, 266). The *histor* is neither a character in the narrative nor an authorial presence, but “the narrator as inquirer, constructing a narrative on the basis of such evidence as he has been able to accumulate” (Kellogg – Phelan – Scholes 2006, 265). The *histor*, then, takes the teller’s neutral, mediating position of unaffected observation, while the epic bard “can reveal unspoken thoughts when he wants to” (Kellogg – Phelan – Scholes 2006, 268), the latter hence contributing to the sense of a non-narrative stance and yielding to the potential lyricality of speech and thought. These two facets of narratorial speech – of the *histor* and the epic bard – also surface in *Ulysses*, another prose epic, which indicates the necessity of relating more than one voice to the work’s structural and textural presence that has been specified as the narrator. Indeed, as Hugh Kenner puts it, Homer himself, “who knew more than common sense knows about storytelling, found that he could not get a story told without at a minimum two voices, his own and the Muse’s [...]” (Kenner 2007, 64). Prose epic, be it comic, lyrical or both, cannot do without the potential multiplicity of voices, that is to say, without the polyphony of discourse. With regard to the facet of lyricality, this seems to be a contradiction – for the lyric is the genre of the single voice –, but the discursive textures of *Ulysses* prove otherwise. Preliminarily, it may suffice to intimate that particular textural constructions involving the polyphony of discourse allow for the singularity of thought, impression and emotion to be foregrounded, not by virtue of a single voice, but by virtue of the equally conspicuous indeterminacy of voice. In *Ulysses*, language happens, and the patterns of language events conceived by the interplay between textural voices amount to an eminent text of lyrical prose epic woven by lexia bound in conspicuous jointures of sense and difference.

Mikhail Bakhtin, in one of his epoch-making works entitled “*Discourse in the Novel*,” develops the concept of the “polyphonic novel” and that of the corresponding literary “heteroglossia.” In Bakhtin’s view, works of literary prose are characterized by the dialogic versatility of languages manifesting themselves as “socio-ideologically” determined textual voices. “Diversity of voices and heteroglossia enter the novel and organize themselves within it into a structured artistic system” (Bakhtin 1981, 300). Such discursive diversity of heteroglossia constitutes the style of the respective works of literary prose.

“[I]n *artistic* prose [...] dialogization penetrates from within the very way in which the word conceives its object and its means for expressing itself, reformulating the semantics and syntactical structure of discourse. Here, dialogic inter-orientation becomes, as it were, an event of discourse itself [...]” (Bakhtin 1981, 284).²

2 Italics in the original – D. V.

Bakhtin's notions concerning the polyphony of discourse make it apparent, to put it in Jonathan Culler's formulation, "that the figure of voice [...] resists reduction to utterance [...]" (Culler 1985, 40). The resistance of the textual voice to such a reduction originates from the phenomenality of the voice itself. The "reading ear" invariably actualizes speaking voices throughout the interpretation of textures, revealing "the actualization or concretization as a phenomenal aspect of the text" (Man 1985, 55). In *Ulysses*, "Joyce creates the impression of both alternating and mixed voices" (Riquelme 1983, 156), hence making the reader actualize the polyphony of prose and its variety of diction. In the urge of such actualization the reader is compelled to follow the patterned threads of diction set up by the diverse voices, despite the intricacies of the task. "The reader becomes actively engaged in trying to distinguish between the voices and in responding to the difficulty, even at times to the impossibility, of making a determination" (Riquelme 1983, 156). Although attempts are constantly being made at constructing "enunciative postures" (Culler 1975, 170) with which the speakers of the text may be associated, such a posture may not always be attained since Joyce mixed voices besides alternating them. Instead, more often than not, "hybrid constructions" emerge. "What we are calling a hybrid construction is an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages' [...]" (Bakhtin 1981, 304). In such instances of prose narrative, the intermingling of voices amounts to lyrical indeterminacy. As applied to the genre of lyric, Robert W. Boynton and Maynard Mack assert in *Introduction to the Poem* that the voice one assumes to be that of the speaker is sometimes clearly unidentifiable. "In some instances this imagined speaker is in no way definite or distinctive; he is simply a voice" (Tucker 1985, 241). In *Ulysses*, the structural presence of the narratorial voice makes this feature of lyricity perceptible throughout the text.

The narratorial voice tends to be mingled with other textual voices in such a way that the "enunciative posture" of the speaker becomes indeterminable. For example, as Riquelme points out, "[t]he ambiguity of voice in 'Nestor' can be quite pronounced [...]" (Riquelme 1983, 165). More explicitly, "the narrator combines observations of scene not obviously mediated by the character's mind with language that resembles a fragmented quoted monologue" (Riquelme 1983, 165). Constructions like this create a particular mode of opacity inasmuch as they blur the distinctiveness of the speaking voice and thus manifest the self-referential nature of language as thought, characteristic of lyric. "Those narratorial indicators in 'Telemachus' and 'Nestor' that advanced action and set the scene invariably contained opaque elements that constantly called attention to themselves [...]"

(Benstock 1991, 22). The following example from “Nestor” duly exhibits the hence understood opacity of diction: “Across the page the symbols moved in grave morrice, in the mummery of their letters, wearing quaint caps of squares and cubes” (Joyce 1986, 23). Stephen Dedalus is helping one of the students at the school in which he teaches to solve a mathematical problem, when the cited sentence weaves itself into the texture. The diction testifies to two determining points of view. The sentence begins with a framing introduction which presents the totality of a view without any sign of emotional involvement (“Across the page the symbols moved”), while “grave morrice,” “the mummery of their letters” and “quaint caps” suggest a focussed, restricted view yielding fragments of impressions presented by idiosyncratic phrases typical of Stephen’s thinking. In addition, “[t]o give us the illusion of direct experience, a writer often turns, as Joyce does, to affective language, and the analogical language of simile and metaphor” (Leech – Short 2007, 148). Both of these verbal phenomena signal Stephen’s discursive slant. The two different views of narrator and individual fashion two different modes of diction, which, nevertheless, mingle within a single sentence, barring the possibility of determining the speaking “persona.” This example aptly demonstrates that “[t]he dialogic [genre] is characterized, essentially, by the absence of a unifying narrative consciousness that would contain the consciousness of all the characters” (Todorov 1981, 65). The narratorial voice signals only one mode of awareness which weaves the verbal fabric of the work. It is by no means superior to other modes manifesting themselves in *Ulysses*, only different in its vision, scope and attitude. A “unifying consciousness” would be all the more problematic in Joyce’s work as individual voices are also “reflectors,” to apply Henry James’s term: they also narrate, tell for themselves, in their own silent modes of thought, over which exclusively narratorial modes of awareness exert no control. “Henry James called the characters who are not only perceived but also perceiving, ‘reflectors’: if the other characters are above all images reflected in a consciousness, the reflector is that consciousness itself” (Todorov 1981, 65). Differently put, the reflector is the manifestation of discursive particularities in the texture of which individual thoughts are presented. Moreover, as Leech and Short point out, there is a crucial difference between “fictional point of view” and “discoursal point of view” (Leech – Short 2007, 139–140), or, as Genette formulated it originally, between “mood” and “voice.” “Mood” and “voice,” respectively, concern “the question *who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective?* and the very different question *who is the narrator?* – or, more simply, the question *who sees?* and the question *who speaks?*” (Genette 1983, 186).³ Correspondingly, in Leech

3 Italics in the original – D. V.

and Short's formulation, "*fictional* point of view [...] is the viewpoint held by one or more characters whose consciousness is represented through the fiction, and [...] *discoursal* point of view [...] is the relationship between the teller [...] and the fiction being represented" (Leech – Short 2007, 298–299). Fictional and discoursal points of view determine the verbal polyphony of voices in *Ulysses*, without being invariably determined in themselves. Considering the excerpt from "Nestor" quoted above, the varying "moods" or fictional points of view make it impossible to determine one exclusive "voice," that is to say, a sole discoursal point of view which moulds the sentence, for most of it is indissociably shared by the diction of narratorial speech and Stephen's discourse.

The reader's sense of obscurity regarding "mood" and "voice" is further increased if (s)he considers the diverse perspectives the narratorial voice may in itself adopt. The perspective of simple narration determines the reporting of movement and non-verbal gesture besides giving rise to descriptions of appearance in a distanced, neutral manner, customarily exposing the totality of an unfolding scene. The sentence "He went out by the open porch and down the gravel path under the trees, hearing the cries of voices and crack of sticks from the playfield" (Joyce 1986, 29) may serve as an example of the reporting of movement from "Nestor." Only two adjectival and no adverbial constructions surface in this sentence, while nouns dominate it, suggesting a relatively unaffected "mood" of narration which can be no other than that of report. The same applies to the following description of non-verbal gesture, also from "Nestor": "Mr Deasy looked down and held for awhile the wings of his nose tweaked between his fingers. Looking up again he set them free." (Joyce 1986, 28.) The reportorial manner of narration allows for the unaffected "mood" of the description to illuminate the sense of the scene. Mr Deasy's gesture is the response to Stephen's assertion that god is "a shout in the street" (Joyce, 1986, 28). The narratorial description of the immediate gesture made in response to Stephen's foregoing statement is made poignant without necessitating a more complex, emotively imbued texture of diction or an elaborate verbal response on the part of Mr Deasy. The clarity of the gesture is made to speak for itself by way of the impassively careful arrangement of words.

However, as seen above regarding the previous example, careful verbal arrangement in *Ulysses* does not always create such referential clarity. The opaque indeterminacy of narratorial diction presents a dominant stylistic marker of the texture, especially in the first eleven chapters of *Ulysses*. As the "mood" or "fictional point of view" of narratorial speech is blurred to make its "speaker" obscure, so does its diction bear definite signs of opacity. "[T]he normally neutral narrative vocabulary [is] pervaded by a little cloud of idioms which a character might use if he were managing the narrative" (Kenner 2007, 17). With the

unmistakeable mark of “a little cloud of idioms,” reportorial narrative cannot be considered mere neutral report any more. It becomes narratorial diction infused with the involvement of an individual perspective. In this sense, the narratorial voice is fashioned in a double manner. As Hugh Kenner makes it explicit, *Ulysses* “commences [...] as a sort of duet for two narrators, or perhaps a conspiracy between them” (Kenner 2007, 67). As Kenner further elaborates, one of the narratorial voices “is perhaps better informed about stage-management, the other a more accomplished lyrical technician” (Kenner 2007, 67). Perspectives oscillate in the narratorial frame of the latter, lyrically indeterminate voice. “Their sharp voices cried about him on all sides: their many forms closed round him, the garish sunshine bleaching the honey of his illdyed head” (Joyce 1986, 24). The third person plural possessive pronoun “their” sets the narrative frame, immediately followed by the adjective “sharp,” which signals a decidedly perceptive, affective “mood,” just like the pinpointing of the “many forms” of students surrounding Mr Deasy in the field. The ultimate phrase of the sentence switches over entirely to a perspective different from that of the reporter narrator (or *histor*), running: “the garish sunshine bleaching the honey of his illdyed head.” Neutral distance is replaced by emotional proximity, scene by detail, adjectives and metaphor shape the diction in “clouds” of expressions. The texture sometimes supplies phrases that serve as bridges between speech and thought across an actually un verbalized, rather felt instant (Kenner 1980, 69). As points of view oscillate, voices mingle, shifting focus from the potential identity of the “speaker” to the sense relations devised within the patterns of *lexis*, and to the distinctive poetic image itself evolving therein. In this way, the indeterminacy of the speaking voice gives rise to the sense of lyrical prose in *Ulysses*.

Besides the reportorial narrator, concerned with “stage-management,” and the other, “lyrical technician,” another unidentifiable voice makes itself heard in the texture, often performing a narratorial role. This latter unidentifiable voice is an indeterminable textual presence customarily signalled by the term “arranger.”

The arranger should be seen as something between a persona and a function, somewhere between the narrator and the implied author. One is tempted to speak of ‘him’ as an ‘it,’ akin to Samuel Beckett’s *Unnamable* [...]. Perhaps it would be best to see the arranger as a significant, felt absence in the text, an unstated but inescapable source of control (Hayman 1982, 122–123).

The “arranger” bears its own, bold manner of stylization, involving ironic commentary, mocking word play, repetition with a difference, onomatopoeia, telescoped constructions (Herring 1977, 145) and textually intrusive segments. Most importantly, the “arranger” manifests itself in its conspicuous manner of speech when juxtaposed with and impinging on other modes of discourse, or

verbally imitating non-verbal phenomena. That is to say, the peculiarity of speech signalled by this indeterminate, reflexive verbal presence lies in its manner of representing non-verbal manifestations and in its mode of reinterpreting other discourses, thus in its response made to these. In line with such considerations, I would opt for the term “shadow narrator” instead of “arranger,” for the former refers succinctly to a mode of discourse which illuminates something other than itself by way of verbal subversion, just as shadows epitomize whatever they distort and magnify. It is by way of such an inflating-illuminating contrast that the voice of the “shadow narrator” exposes what it relates to. Thus, it is not only the “persona” of the “shadow voice” which remains unidentifiable, but also – and most significantly – its “mood” or potential points of vantage, which remain unmotivated from a fictional point of view and still determine the particular manner of speech this voice adopts. The following example is from the chapter entitled “*Scylla and Charybdis*”: “Portals of discovery opened to let in the quaker librarian, softcreakfooted, bald, eared and assiduous.” (Joyce 1986, 156.) “Portals of discovery” is an echo of Stephen’s phrase from the previous two lines: “A man of genius makes no mistakes. His errors are volitional and are the portals of discovery.” It is by virtue of this echo that the “shadow narrator” sets up a mockingly metonymical relation between the door of the library and the momentous “portals of discovery,” creating an ironic association between a man of genius and the “quaker librarian” (Mr Lyster) entering the scene. Moreover, the latent simile between the features “bald” and the sarcastic quasi-feature “eared” also directs attention to the indeterminable discursal point of view related to the “shadow narrator.” Such a manner of “seeing” is without parallel in the entire work: its extended horizons of perception and insight, the “poetic licenses” of which it avails itself, besides its versatile manner of articulation, all amount to a peculiar strain of diction with an unrestricted scope of connotations. The liberties the “shadow narrator” takes with the possibilities of perception and articulation also contribute to language becoming the actual, poetically self-referential and lyrically obscure protagonist of the prose epic of *Ulysses*. Perception and sense, image and thought are rendered in an opaquely eminent verbal framework, weaving lyrical sensibility imperceptibly into multiple segments of prose.

References

- Abbott, H. Porter. 2002. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovic. 1981. Discourse in the Novel. In: *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. 259–422. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Benstock, Bernard. 1991. Opaque and Transparent Narrative. In: *Narrative Con/Texts in Ulysses*. 19–38. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Chatman, Seymour. 1993. *Reading Narrative Fiction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1985. Changes in the Study of the Lyric. In: *Lyric Poetry Beyond New Criticism*. 38–54. Edited by Chaviva Hošek and Patricia Parker. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Freedman, Ralph. 1963. *The Lyrical Novel: Studies in Herman Hesse, André Gide, and Virginia Woolf*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Genette, Gérard. 1983. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Hayman, David. 1982. *Ulysses: The Mechanics of Meaning*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Herring, Phillip F. 1977. Lotuseaters. In: *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical Essays*. 71–89. Edited by Clive Hart and David Hayman. Berkeley, etc: University of California Press.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. 1986. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kellogg, Robert – Phelan, James – Scholes, Robert. 2006. *The Nature of Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenner, Hugh. 1980. *Ulysses*. London, etc.: George Allen and Unwin.
- Kenner, Hugh. *Joyce's Voices*. 2007. Rochester, McLean, London: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Lawrence, Karen. 1981. The Narrative Norm. In: *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses*. 38–54. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey – Short, Mick. 2007. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Man, Paul de. 1985. Lyrical Voice in Contemporary Theory: Riffaterre and Jaus. In: *Lyric Poetry Beyond New Criticism*. 55–72. Edited by Chaviva Hošek and Patricia Parker. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Milesi, Laurent. 2007. Introduction: Language(s) with a Difference. In: *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. 1–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riquelme, John-Paul. 1983. *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1981. *Introduction to Poetics*. Translated by Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tucker, Herbert F. 1985. Dramatic Monologue and the Overhearing of Lyric. In: *Lyric Poetry Beyond New Criticism*. 226–243. Edited by Chaviva Hošek and Patricia Parker. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

VÉRY Dalma

LÍRAI HOMÁLYOSSÁG

A lírai narráció gyökerei az *Ulysses*ben

James Joyce *Ulyssese* nem pusztán „egy nap története,” sokkal inkább egy költői szöveg, mely összetett nyelvi konstrukciói által mutat vissza önmagára, szembefordulva a regényelmélet olyan hagyományos fogalmaival, mint a cselekmény vagy a karakter. Másképp fogalmazva, az *Ulysses* – az önmagukra visszautalásban kitűnő nyelvi szerkezetei nyomán – a cselekmény helyett a gondolatot és az értelem-összefüggéseket, a karakterek megrajzolása helyett a szövegben megnyilatkozó polifóniát helyezi előtérbe. Ennek megfelelően, a mű textúrájában felfedezhető narratív hangok ugyancsak szerepet kapnak a költőien rendkívüli szöveg kialakításában. Folytonos diszkurzív elmozdulásai és az egyéni beszédmódokkal történő összerosódások révén a narrátori artikuláció változatai olyan diffúz és meghatározhatatlan jelenlétet képeznek a szövegben, mely nemcsak költőien elidegenítő összefüggéseket alakít ki, hanem lehetővé teszi azt is, hogy előtérbe kerüljön az értelem és az észlelés, a beszéd és a gondolat, a benyomás és az érintettség jelentősége. Ily módon, az *Ulysses* szöveve líraisággal átítatottá válik.

Kulcsszavak: textúra, homályosság, líraiság, narrátor, polifónia.

Dalma VERI

LIRSKA (NE)JASNOĆA

Koreni lirske naracije u *Uliku*

Uliks Džejmisa Džojsa nije samo „prikaz dešavanja jednog dana.” Prvenstveno je pesničko tkanje koje upućuje nazad na sebe samog putem složenih jezičkih konstrukcija, suprotstavljajući se terminima tradicionalnih teorija romana kao što su radnja i karakter. Drugačije formulisano, *Uliks* – pomoću izuzetnih jezičkih struktura koje upućuju nazad, na sebe same – ističe misao i povezivanje značenja umesto radnje, polifoniju teksta umesto opisivanja karaktera. Zbog toga narativni glasovi koji se javljaju u teksturi dela takođe dobijaju ulogu u ovom tkanju koje je pesnički izuzetno. Njihova konstantna diskurzivna pomeranja se mešaju sa pojedinačnim iskazima, što rezultuje difuznim i neodređenim varijantama narativnih artikulacija u tekstu. Kao posledica toga nastaju ne samo povezanosti koje se međusobno otuđuju, već je omogućeno i da se značaj razuma i opažanja, govora i misli, utiska i uključenosti stave u prvi plan. Na taj način tkanje *Uliksa* postaje lirski protkan.

Ključne reči: tekstura, nejasnoća, liričnost, narator, polifonija.