

Natalia N. BELOZEROVA¹

UTOPIAN MODELS IN JAMES JOYCE'S "ULYSSES" AS A DISCURSIVE TRANSFORMATION

¹ Dr. Sci (Phil.), Professor,
Tyumen State University
natnicbel@gmail.com

Abstract

The two passages from the 15th episode of "Ulysses" (Circe) are viewed as a parody of utopian models that started to be implemented in the beginning of the 20th century. Such utopian archetypes, as of *space*, *catastrophe*, *chaos* and *a Saviour* are attracted as a major focus of analysis. The context of Bloom's utopian model is presented in the form of a play that runs in the mind of major characters that undergo endless metamorphoses. In these passages Leopold Bloom plays a ritual role of a sovereign, implementing an archetype of a Saviour, who, after being crowned, immediately starts transforming his kingdom, thus bringing into life the archetypes of catastrophe and turning the Chaos into the Order via force. For the prototypal basis of Bloom's utopian model Joyce chose Biblical New Jerusalem that was rolled into one with real Dublin nominally travestied in the text into the new Bloomusalem. The means of discursive transformations include a dense intertextual cluster and the number of discourse oppositions, described by M. Foucault. All these discursive transformations are caused by converting of "the uttered" into "the visible", the process that Yu. Lotman thought to be reversed to the procedure of discourse production, and to be possible only when the sphere of the subconscious is transposed into the sphere the conscious.

Keywords

James Joyce, Ulysses, Leopold Bloom, utopian models, archetypes, metamorphoses.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2017-3-3-58-67

Citation: Belozerova N. N. 2017. "Utopian Models in James Joyce's 'Ulysses' as a Discursive Transformation". Tyumen State University Herald. Humanities Research. Humanitates, vol. 3, no 3, pp. 58-67.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2017-3-3-58-67

Introduction

In this paper, we aim at disclosing the essence of discursive transformations that take place when utopian models are the targets of parodying. Before analyzing "Bloom's utopian model", we should clarify several points.

(1) Firstly, our understanding of parodying.

To describe the process of parodying metaphorically we may attract Shakespearean paradox of "*a king's progress through the guts of a beggar*" [15, act IV, sc. II, pp. 1135-1136].

The similarity between the situation, when a beggar, after the death of a king "may *fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm*", and the situation when a great idea or a text (often taken as great) is travestied in a parody, rests upon a universal semiotic principle of "*differènce*" [5, 7, 11], that often results in emerging of new meanings or concepts.

According to M. Bakhtin and A. Gurevitch, parody is a phenomenon of a carnival culture [3, 9]. The analysis of definitions revealed that the integral seme of the word "parody" is that of "mimesis". Not of a smaller importance is the seme of "travestyng", i.e. burlesque, farce, setting inside out, in other words, everything that rests beyond the laudation.

Thus, parody turns to be a "demythologised" text or a "demythologised" idea.

(2) The second point that we should clarify is the concept of "UTOPIA". This term is treated as "an imagery state described in Sir Thomas Moore's Latin political romance or satire *Utopia* (1516): any imagery state of ideal perfection" [8, p. 1219]. Anyway, every dictionary definition, as well as every scholarly research of utopian models fit to construct an ideal state revealed an axiological approach (see, for example, [4]) where *a political ideal perfection* was a core notion.

As we are going to consider a "demythologised" idea in Joyce's "Ulysses" it is necessary to state mythological components characteristic for any utopia. E. Batalov in his dialogues distinguished three major archetypes characteristic for utopian models. The most significant is the *spatial archetype* representing a *primitive* or *mythological model of the universe*. Another archetype, very important to understand the political message of the utopia is the *archetype of catastrophes*, *archetype of chaos* that could be put into order only through the use of force. Of no less importance is the *archetype of a Savior*, a hero who is opposed to the collective "we" of a utopia [4, pp. 72-97].

(3) Finally, as Joyce had lived through the period when utopian models were transformed into anti-utopian both in fiction (Ye. Zamyatin, A. Huxley, G. Orwell) and in real life, the models, the essence of which Joyce defined in his "Finnegans Wake" as "*teargarten*" and "*singlemindedsupercrowd*", we should single out semantic and structural elements of an anti-utopia.

Leaving aside a sinister development of anti-utopian models in real life, we should note that in fiction the authors intended to portray a natural man who lives in the unnatural environment of a totalitarian state. Actually every archetype (spatial models, catastrophes, transformation of chaos into order with the use of force, the Savior) had

not been altered. Exclusively, the archetype of collective “we” had been transformed. Correspondingly the categories of the point of view and of modality had been transformed: if in a utopia the perfection of an ideal civilization was narrated by a marveled quest, in an anti-utopia the “whips and scorns” of a totalitarian civilization are rendered by an individual dweller, thus the subjective modality dominates. Transformation of a single archetype resulted into transformation of the whole utopian system, primarily at the axiological level. Everything that seemed marvelous and perfect to a guest seemed sinister and hopeless to a dweller of an ideal state.

With regard of these three points, i. e. the essence of parodying, the utopian archetypes and anti-utopian transformation the two passages from the 15th episode of “Ulysses” (Circe) are viewed as a parody of utopian models that started to be implemented in the beginning of the 20th century.

Texts for Analyses

Text 1

“BLOOM: My beloved subjects, a new era is about to dawn. I, Bloom, tell you verily it is even now at dawn. Yea, on the word of a Bloom, ye shall ere long enter into the golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hiberia of the future.

(Thirty two workmen wearing rosettas, from all the counties of Ireland, under the guidance of Derwan the builder, construct the new Bloomusalem. It is a colossal edifice with crystal roof, built in the shape of a huge pork kidney, containing forty thousand rooms. In the course of its extension several buildings and monuments are demolished. Government offices are temporally transferred to railway sheds. Numerous houses are razed to the ground. The inhabitants are lodged in barrels and boxes, all marked with the letters: L.B. Several paupers fall from a ladder. A part of the walls of Dublin, crowded with loyal sightseers, collapses)”.

James Joyce “Ulysses” [12, pp. 606-607]

Text 2

“BLOOM:

I stand for the reform of municipal morals and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature. Saloon motor hearses. Compulsory manual labour for all. All parks open to the public day and night. Electric dishscrubbers. Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival, with masked license, bonuses for all, esperanto the universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free love and free lay church in a free lay state.

O’MADDEN BURKE: Free fox in a free henroost.

DAVY BYRNE: (Yawning) Iiiiiiiiiaaaaaach!

BLOOM: Mixed races and mixed marriage.

LENEHAN: What about mixed bathing?

(Bloom explains to those near him his schemes for social regeneration. All agree with him. The Keeper of the Kildare Street Museum appears, dragging a lorry on which are the shaking statues of several naked goddesses, Venus Callipyge, Venus

Pandemos, Venus Metempsychosis, and plaster figures also naked, representing the new nine muses, Commerce, Operatic Music, Amor, Publicity, Manufacture, Liberty of Speech, Plural Voting, Gastronomy, Private Hygiene, Seaside Concert Entertainments, Painless Obsterics and Astronomy for the People.)"

James Joyce "Ulysses" [12, pp. 610-611]

Analysis

Reading these passages for the first time it is possible to conclude that these are extracts from the play where a sovereign addressing his subjects promises a new "golden age" in a new "golden city" and proposes his constitutional programme.

The author's remarks that describe the dynamic process reveal how the promises of Bloom, a sovereign, to erect on the place of Dublin a golden city similar to Biblical New Jerusalem, named in his honor ("*ye shall ere long enter into the golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem*"), start to be immediately implemented.

The author's remarks of the second extract disclose how a new ideology is simultaneously mythologized and travestied at the process of modifying the old symbols (idols) and creating new ones. The keeper of the museum drags a lorry with the three verbally modified marble Venuses that fit the ideology of Bloom, the Sovereign ("*Venus Callipyge, Venus Pandemos, Venus Metempsychosis*"), as well as nine new plaster muses that symbolize every item of Bloom's constitutional programme.

The artistic time in the remarks coincides with the actual time of the utterance and develops with the utmost speed. The three sentences, uttered by Bloom temporally correspond to the actions of thirty two workmen who construct a new city (Bloomasalem) in a form of a pork kidney, demolish and raze to the ground the old one and lodge the inhabitants into the barrels and boxes. The transformation chaos and social catastrophe is reinforced by the sentences: "*Several paupers fall from a ladder. A part of the walls of Dublin, crowded with loyal sightseers, collapses*".

It is evident that such temporal coincidence is possible only when the action develops in the consciousness or the subconsciousness of a personage.

The whole episode that includes these two passages, is written in the form of a play that develops in the consciousness and partially in the subconsciousness of Leopold Bloom and Steven Dedalus, the principal personages of "Ulysses", who being intoxicated visit a pub and a brothel in Dublin. The list of dramatic personae of this play include these main characters who undergo endless metamorphoses, the phantoms of their dead parents, other people and ghosts whose words and actions haunt the conscious both of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus. This list is completed by different objects, animated and granted the ability to act, speak and sing, as well by different voices. Every utterance is clarified by a detailed remark whose text type is a dynamic description of a perpetually transforming scene of action. Joyce here seems to split the subconsciousness of his main characters: the remarks display imagery concepts, the utterances present verbal implementations. Both are linked by an unbroken association chain. It is possible to trace the feedback between the signifier and the signified, i. e. every word or phrase highlighted by the consciousness (as if uttered) "obtains" flesh in the form of an image, action, scene or a series of scenes.

The structure-shaping intertextual core of this episode rests upon the tenth book of “Odysseus”. There Homer’s character narrated how he with his team in search of Ithaca landed upon an island of Circe, a sorceress and what metamorphoses his companions had gone through.

Decland Kiberd, the author of the introduction and notes to the academic edition of Ulysses, pointed out several other constant intertextual components of this episode. These are the Bible and oeuvres of Shakespeare, especially “A Midsummers Night’s Dream” [13, p. 1123], where the characters undergo different metamorphoses before they obtain their initial human shape. D. Kiberd adds to this list other works by Joyce and the whole store of Irish mythology that is famous for constant transformations.

It is remarkable that Joyce had included into this episode a scene that could be regarded a reversed metaphor of the two categories rolled into one: the category of “mimesis” and the category of “intertextuality”. When “*The mirror up to nature*” [15, act 3, sc. 2, p. 1147] starts floating in front of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus, instead of their own reflection they see the reflection of Shakespeare [12, pp. 671-672]. The face of the poet is distorted with paresis, the “Lord of the Language” (Joyce) is paradoxically tongue-tied. Here we observe the same mode of parodying and travesty as in the passages under analysis.

In these passages it is possible to trace one more allusion that is completely implicit. It is the reference to the “Internationale”, the anthem of communists and anarchists, the French version of which has offered the image of “TABULARASE” [1, 16]; while a Russian version has offered the image of a former world of violence, demolished and razed to ground, on the site of which a “Brave New and Just World” is supposed to be erected¹. It is this image that has been parodied in the utopian model of Leopold Bloom that shows how upon the site of the old Dublin, demolished and razed to the ground, a new Bloomasalem in the form of a giant pork kidney is being erected.

Let us consider the demythologization of utopian archetypes.

In these scenes Leopold Bloom having passed in his consciousness through a number of metamorphoses, including transformation into a female, acts in the ritual role of a king. In this role he embodies the *archetype of a savior* who starts without any delay and without taking into account sufferings of his subjects to renovate his kingdom thus implementing the archetype of catastrophe and turning chaos into order through the use of force. (“*The inhabitants are lodged in barrels and boxes... Several paupers fall from a ladder. A part of the walls of Dublin, crowded with loyal sightseers, collapses*”). Bloom in his consciousness appears and acts in the ritual role of a sovereign, therefore, his speech is marked by the modality of obligation (“*ye shall ere long enter*”), archaic pathos and rhetorical ellipsis.

It is remarkable that in Joycean text where the level of travesty is high, demythologization of a Savior archetype does not take place. Moreover, when at the end

¹ «Весь мир насилья мы разрушим до основанья, а затем, мы наш, мы новый мир построим».

of the episode when Joyce shifts the accent from the level of subconsciousness to the actions of personages he makes Bloom act in the manner of the Good Samaritan: Bloom delivers Stephen Dedalus of soldiers' jeers. Thus, a constant multi — component archetype has been constructed.

Demythologization takes place when an ideal city (state) is presented. Out of all utopian models Joyce sticks to the model of New Jerusalem from the Revelation of St. John the Evangelist [10, ch. 21-22, pp. 1178-1180]. The process of travesty starts with distorted name of the city (the new Bloomusalem). This new name alters two famous urban spaces: Biblical New Jerusalem whose crystalline, emerald, sapphire and golden palaces become identical to "*a colossal edifice with crystal roof, built in the shape of a huge pork kidney, containing forty thousand rooms*", and real Dublin, demolished and razed to the ground.

Such travesty and demythologization is caused by the process of "turning of the uttered into the visible", the process that Yu. Lotman thought to be reversed to the procedure of discourse production, and to be possible only when the sphere of the subconscious is transposed into the sphere the conscious [14, pp. 60-61].

The possibilities to demythologize and travesty the space depend upon the peculiarities of psychological (subjective) "chronotop" (space-time relations in fiction [2, pp. 121-262]), whose components are not absolute and rest upon psychological structure of the personage. If the action takes place in the mind of a personage, *time-space* can expand, split, shrink and undergo other transformations. In the passages under analysis *time-space* form and span entirely depend upon the semantics of words and phrases that float in the personage's mind, as well as upon the form of the predicate (*a new era is about to dawn... it is even now at dawn... ye shall ere long enter into the golden city*).

Considering the discursive transformation, we can note a certain paradox. On the one hand, nearly the whole action of the episode develops in the minds of the personage, which means that discursive procedures are impossible as real utterances are absent. On the other hand, as this verbal and non verbal process that runs in the mind of a character is structured in the form of a play with proper utterances and author's remarks it is possible to define both discursive procedures and discursive transformations.

We have already pointed out that Bloom's verbal behavior is determined by his ritual role of a sovereign (A Savior), the structure of Ulysses upon whose image he was modeled. As Ulysses, he plays the functions (roles) of a father, a son and a husband; as Ulysses, he makes a long way home. All differences are caused by the two factors: (1) by the nonconcurrency of conventional sets [6, pp. 19-25] that depend upon correlation of a person's social behavior with his ethnicity and cultural adherence (Leopold Bloom is a Jew who lives in the Ireland of 1904); and (2) the shift of locus (time-space): objective time-space of the 20-years travelling period in the Aegean Sea corresponds to subjective time-space one-day journey in Dublin and in the consciousness. The shift of locus into the consciousness has caused the absence in the structure of Bloom one of the most important structural traits of Ulysses. Unlike Ulysses, Bloom is not cunning. False pretence is impossible in one's own conscious-

ness. That is why, while analyzing these extracts, it is impossible to single out the discursive opposition of *the true and the false*.

On the other hand, the shift of locus in the mind did not prevent revelation of the opposition of *clever/insane* that genetically goes back to the structure of Ulysses and forms the basis of discursive procedures. It is possible to trace this opposition in the illogical chain of social values, that he calls the plain Ten Commandments. (“*New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature. Saloon motor hearses. Compulsory manual labour for all. All parks open to the public day and night. Electric dishscrubbers. Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival, with masked license, bonuses for all, esperanto the universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free love and free lay church in a free lay state.*”)

These plain commandments present a utopian (typical for modern pre-election promises) programme, where the values are not equal. The illogical character of this programme that links high ideals with mundane objects and actions contribute to the travesty of the utopia ideal.

We should note the “I” modality of this programme and the complete absence of a dangerous “WE” modality, that in real life often implements itself in the totalitarian models. (See, for example, *marchons* of the *marsaillese*). Unlike widely-known utopian or anti-utopian models that are presented either from the point of view of a guest or from the point of view of a dweller, Bloom’s utopian model is presented from the point of view of the Savior, the sovereign who confronts the “the beloved subjects”.

Furthermore, the utopian ideal is travestied in the commentaries. Three utterances from “the beloved subjects” disclose the implication of Bloom’s programme and contribute to demythologization. An altered by association proverb about the fox in a henroost [*free fox in a free henroost*], a laud yawn and a question about mixed bathing *a la nu* downgrade in a carnival way the pathos of Bloom’s appeal and, correspondingly the ideal of Utopia

Conclusion

We aimed at disclosing the essence of discursive transformations that take place when utopian models are the targets of parodying

The analyses revealed that Bloom’s utopian model is the result of the shift of the locus into the consciousness of the hero and the result of demythologization of several utopian archetypes. Bloom’s utopian model is characterized by the “I” modality. It is presented from the point of view of the Savior, the sovereign who confronts the “the beloved subjects”.

REFERENCES

1. Antiwar Songs (AWS) — L'Internationale. www.antiwarsongs.org/canzone.php?id=2003&lang=en#lyrics_song

2. Bakhtin M. M. 1986. "Formy vremeni i khronotopa v romane" [Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel]. In: Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i, pp. 121-262. Moscow.
3. Bakhtin M. M. 1986. "Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaya kul'tura Srednevekov'ya i Rennsansa: (postanovka problemy)" [The Work of Francois Rabelais and the Folk Culture of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Stating the Problem]. In: Bakhtin M. M. Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i, pp. 291-352. Compiled by S. G. Bocharov, V. V. Kozhinov. Moscow: Khudozh. lit.
4. Batalov E. Ya. 1989. V mire utopii: pyat' dialogov ob utopii, utopich. soznanii i utopich. Eksperimentakh [In the World of Utopia: Five Dialogues about Utopia, Utopian. Consciousness and Utopian Experiments]. Moscow: Politizdat.
5. Derrida J. 1978. Writing and Difference. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Dijk T. A. Van. 1989. Yazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikatsiya [Language, Cognition and Communication]. Translated from English. Compiled by V. V. Petrova. Pp. 19-25. Moscow: Progress.
7. Foucault M. 1994. Slovo i veshchi. Arkheologiya gumanitarnykh nauk [Les mots et les choses. Une archeologie des sciences humaines]. St. Petersburg: A-cad.
8. Geddie W. (ed.). 1969. Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary. Revised edition with supplement. Allied Publishers.
9. Gurevich A. Ya. 1984. Kategoriya srednevekovoy kul'tury [The Category of the Medieval Culture]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
10. Holy Bible. Revelation.
11. Jakobson R. 1999. Teksty, dokumenty, issledovaniya [Texts, Documents, Studies]. Moscow: Ros. gos. gumanit. un-t.
12. Joyce J. 1992. Ulysses. Annotated Students' edition with an introduction and notes by D. Kiberd. London: Penguin Books.
13. Kiberd D. 1992. Introduction and notes to "Ulysses", pp. ix-ixxxviii. London: Penguin Books.
14. Lotman Yu. M. 1992. Kul'tura i vzryv [Culture and Explosion], pp. 60-61. Moscow: Progress.
15. Shakespeare W. 1599-1602. Hamlet.
16. Wikipedia. "Eugène Pottier (1816-1887) « Du passé faisons table rase »." en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eug%C3%A8ne_Edine_Pottier

Наталья Николаевна БЕЛОЗЁРОВА¹

УДК: 81'1

УТОПИЧЕСКИЕ МОДЕЛИ В «УЛИССЕ» ДЖЕЙМСА ДЖОЙСА КАК ДИСКУРСИВНАЯ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ

¹ доктор филологических наук, профессор,
Тюменский государственный университет
natnicbel@gmail.com

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются два отрывка из 15-го эпизода «Улисс» (Цирцея) как пародия на утопические модели, которые начали реализовываться в начале XX в. Такие утопические архетипы, как *пространство*, *катастрофа*, *хаос* и *Спаситель*, привлекаются как основной фокус анализа. Контекст утопической модели Блума представлен в виде игры, которая движется в сознании главных персонажей, претерпевая бесконечные метаморфозы. В этих отрывках Леопольд Блум играет ритуальную роль суверена, реализуя архетип Спасителя, который после коронации сразу начинает трансформировать свое царство, тем самым приводя в жизнь архетипы катастрофы и силой превращая Хаос в Порядок. Для прототипной основы утопической модели Блума Джойс выбрал Библейский Новый Иерусалим, объединив его с реальным Дублином, который в тексте номинально травестирован в Новый Блумсалим. Методы дискурсивного преобразования включают плотный интертекстуальный кластер и описанное М. Фуко количество дискурсивных оппозиций. Все эти дискурсивные преобразования вызваны превращением «произнесенного» в «видимое», процесс, обращенный (как считал Лотман) к созданию дискурса, и возможный только тогда, когда подсознательное переходит в сознательное.

Ключевые слова

Джеймс Джойс, Улисс, Леопольд Блум, утопические модели, архетипы, метаморфизм.

Цитирование: Белозёрова Н. Н. Утопические модели в «Улиссе» Джеймса Джойса как дискурсивная трансформация / Н. Н. Белозёрова // Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Гуманитарные исследования. Humanitates. 2017. Том 3. № 3. С. 58-67. DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2017-3-3-58-67

DOI: 10.21684/2411-197X-2017-3-3-58-67

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Antiwar Songs (AWS) — L'Internationale. www.antiwarsongs.org/canzone.php?id=2003&lang=en#lyrics_song
2. Бахтин М. М. Формы времени и хронотопа в романе / М. М. Бахтин // Литературно-критические статьи. М., 1986. С. 121-262.
3. Бахтин М. М. Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура Средневековья и Ренессанса: (постановка проблемы) / М. М. Бахтин // Бахтин М. М. Литературно-критические статьи / Сост. С. Г. Бочаров, В. В. Кожин. М.: Худож. лит., 1986. С. 291-352.
4. Баталов Э. Я. В мире утопии: пять диалогов об утопии, утопич. сознании и утопич. Экспериментах / Э. Я. Баталов. М.: Политиздат, 1989. 319 с.
5. Derrida J. Writing and Difference / J. Derrida; translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
6. Дейк Т. А. Ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. Пер. с англ. / Т. А. Ван Дейк; сост. В. В. Петрова. М.: Прогресс, 1989. 312 с. С. 19-25.
7. Фуко М. Слово и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук / М. Фуко. СПб.: А-сэд, 1994. 407 с.
8. Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary / edited by W. Geddie. Revised edition with supplement. Allied Publishers, 1969.
9. Гуревич А. Я. Категория средневековой культуры / А. Я. Гуревич. М.: Искусство, 1984. 350 с.
10. Holy Bible. Revelation.
11. Якобсон Р. Тексты, документы, исследования / Р. Якобсон. М.: Рос. гос. гуманит. ун-т., 1999. 916 с.
12. Joyce J. Ulysses. Annotated Students' edition with an introduction and notes by D. Kiberd / J. Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 1992. 1195 pp.
13. Kiberd D. Introduction and notes to "Ulysses" / D. Kiberd. London: Penguin Books, 1992. Pp. ix-ixxxviii.
14. Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв / Ю. М. Лотман. М.: Прогресс, 1992. С. 60-61.
15. Shakespeare W. Hamlet / W. Shakespeare. 1599-1602.
16. Eugène Pottier (1816–1887) « Du passé faisons table rase » // Wikipedia. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eug%C3%A8ne_Edine_Pottier