Chapter 3

Discourse Types in Ulysses

Bakhtin classifies discourses into three main categories which we have discussed in the introductory chapter. *Ulysses* contains almost all the varieties of discourse types identified by Bakhtin. In this chapter we shall take a close look at the text of *Ulysses* in order to see how it embodies the characteristics of polyphony as theorized by Bakhtin.

In the single-voiced discourse of the first type the narrator is the author himself. The representation of the hero in this model begins in the words either of the implied author or perhaps of the real author himself. Look at the following description of Bloom that is given in as objective a manner as is possible:

Mr Leopold Bloom ate with relish the inner organs of beasts and fowls. He liked thick giblet soup, nutty gizzards, a stuffed roast heart, liver slices fried with crustcrumbs, fried hencods' roes. Most of all he liked grilled mutton kidneys which gave to his palate a fine tang of finely scented urine. (53)
Another example of authorial narration can be seen in the introduction of Mulligan at the beginning of the novel: “Stately, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead, bearing a bowl of lather on which a mirror and a razor lay crossed” (1).

In both these examples the characters are introduced neither through their own words nor as how others see them. Instead they are represented through the direct speech of the author/narrator.

The second type of discourse, viz., the represented speech of the characters starts with an introductory dash in Ulysses, whereas in other writers this type of discourse starts with inverted commas. This is the quoted direct speech of the characters. In the example given below we can notice the directly spoken words of Mulligan and Stephen in a conversation:

- The aunt thinks you killed your mother, he said. That’s why she won’t let me have anything to do with you.

- Someone killed her, Stephen said gloomily.

- You could have knelt down, damn it, Kinch, when your dying mother asked you, Buck Mulligan said. I’m hyperborean as much as you. But to think of your mother
begging you with her last breath to kneel down and pray for her. And you refused. There is something sinister in you... (5)

This does not mean that the represented speech of the character flows uninterrupted in Ulysses. At times the author intrudes in the middle of the conversation to resume authorial narration and sometimes the characters themselves interact to produce other types of discourse such as the stylized discourse, skaz and parody, all of which fortify the polyphonic nature of the text.

“Stylization” is best exemplified in this novel in the chapter “Nausikaa.” In stylization, the authorial purpose co-exists with the other’s discourse and the two move in the same direction. We can notice stylization in our daily speech. When we quote other people’s speech forgetting that it is someone else’s speech, we may sometimes use other’s words as if they are our own words. The two intentions then become unidirectional giving rise to stylization. When objectification is reduced, there might occur a fusion of voices, leading to the creation of the discourse of the first type. David Lodge’s summing up of stylization, taken from Bakhtin’s own description, runs like this: “Stylization occurs when the writer borrows another’s discourse and uses it for his own purposes—with the same general intention as the original but in the process casting ‘a slight shadow of objectification over it’” (After Bakhtin 59). A passage describing the
dressing style of Gerty in the “Nausikaa” episode is evidently not in the author’s language, but in the borrowed language of a cheap women’s fashion magazine or a novelette. Here, the intention of the author in using the language of women’s magazine is quite different from that of the magazine itself, as is quite clear from the passage here:

Gerty was dressed simply but with the instinctive taste of a votary of Dame Fashion for she felt that there was just a might that he might he out. A neat blouse of electric blue, self tinted by dolly dyes (because it was expected in the Lady’s pictorial that electric blue would be worn), with a smart vee opening down to the division and kerchief pocket (in which she always kept a piece of cotton wool scented with her favourite perfume because the hand kerchief spoiled the sit) and a navy three quarter skirt cut to the stride showed off her slim graceful figure to perfection. She wore a coquettish little love of a hat of wide leaved nigger straw contrast trimmed with an underbrim of eggblue chenille and at the side a butterfly bow to tone. (335)

Further, the description of Gerty’s “slight and graceful” figure, Greekly perfect “rosebud mouth,” “bluest Irish blue” eyes, “faintest rosebloom” flush, “perfect proportion” of legs, and “shapely limbs” creates an imagery
that fits so well with the idea of womanhood transmitted by such magazines.

Gerty’s fantasies about her future husband, likewise, evoke the language of romantic fiction.

[...] and he who would woo and win Gerty Mac Dowell must be a man among men. [...] No prince charming is her beau ideal to lay a rare and wondrous love at her feet but rather a manly man with a strong quiet face who had not found his ideal, perhaps his hair slightly flecked with grey, and who would understand, take her in his sheltering arms, strain her to him in all the strength of his deep passionate nature and comfort her with a long kiss. It would be like heaven. For such a one she yearns this balmy summer eve. With all the heart of her she longs to be his only, his affianced bride for riches for poor, in sickness in health, till death us two part, from this to this day forward. (336)

The language of cheap romantic fiction used in this passage employs simultaneously two voices and two worldviews. Gerty’s specifications about her beau continues:
He would be tall with broad shoulders (she had always admired tall men for a husband) with glistening white teeth under his carefully trimmed sweeping moustache and they would go on the continent for their honeymoon (three wonderful weeks!) and then, when they settled down in a nice snug and cosy little homely house, every morning they would both have brekky, simple but perfectly served, for their own two selves and before he went out to business he would give his dear little wifey a good hearty hug and gaze for a moment deep down into her eyes. (337)

It is not simply the language of women’s magazine and romance fiction that are stylized in this chapter. We can also listen to the language of advertisements, superstitions, folk wisdom, Mariolatry, religious oaths, euphemisms, proverbs, fairy tales and so on. Joyce himself says that “Nausikaa” is written in “a namby pamby jammy marmalady drawersy” style (Budgen 210).

The following passage uses the language of women’s magazines in order to glorify Gerty’s beauty. The phrases like “newest thing in footwear,” “patent toe caps,” and “smart buckle” appearing here are also emblematic of the language of advertisements.
Her shoes were the newest thing in footwear (Polly Boardman prided herself that she was very petite but she never had a foot like Gerty MacDowell, a five, and never would ash, oak or elm) with patent toecaps and just one smart buckle at her higharched instep. (335)

Here is the language of women’s magazine combining with the discourse of superstition and folk wisdom:

She was wearing the blue for luck hoping against hope, her own colour and the lucky colour too for a bride to have a bit of blue some where on her because the green she wore that day week brought grief because his father brought him in to study for the intermediate exhibition and because she thought perhaps he might be out because when she was dressing that morning she nearly slipped up the old pair on her inside out and that was for luck and lovers’ meetings if you put those things on inside out so long as it wasn’t of a Friday. (335-36)

Colloquialisms like “as black as thunder,” and “as cross as two sticks,” the language of Mariolatry like “Virgin most powerful,” “Virgin most merciful,” “Refuge of sinners,” and “Comfortress of the afflicted,” proverbs like “love laughs at locksmiths,” clichés like “if you fail try
again,” euphemisms like “vile decoction which has ruined many hearths and homes” for liquour, silly superstitions like “because the green she wore that day week brought grief because his father brought him in to study for the intermediate exhibition,” expressions of folk wisdom like “wearing the blue for luck,” and “she knew how to cry nicely before the mirror. You are lovely, Gerty, it said,” instances of baby talk like “You’re not my sister, naughty Tommy said. It’s my ball” are all integrated into the main discourse of popular fiction in which this chapter of Ulysses is written.

“Skaz” is another narratorial method by which a novel can become polyphonic. “Skaz” originates from the Russian word “skazat” meaning “to tell.” According to Bakhtin, it refers “to a technique or mode of narration that imitates the oral speech of an individualized narrator” (PDP 8). The eyewitness account of an episode in the peasant or provincial life constitutes skaz. This type of narration allows the author enough freedom to incorporate speech forms like dialects, slang, neologisms and mispronunciations that might give naturalness and vigour to the narrative unattainable in other types of narration. The “Cyclops” episode in Ulysses is a good example of the skaz style being adapted for novelistic narration. Here we see narration by a fictitious narrator where “the third-person narration ‘mimics’ the speech patterns of the characters being described” (Lynne Pearce 86).
-Devil a much, says I. There is a bloody big foxy thief beyond by the garrison church at the corner of Chicken Lane—old Troy was just giving me a wrinkle about him—lifted any God’s quantity of tea and sugar to pay three bob a week said he had a farm in the county Down off a hop of my thumb by the name of Moses Herzog over there near Heytesbury street.

(280)

The above speech is very powerful even with an anonymous speaker. His typical neologisms like “foxy thief” who lifts “God’s quantity” of tea and sugar and the old Troy who gave him a “wrinkle” add special vigour to his speech.

The sailor’s speech is full of skaz vigour. He speaks of the man eaters of Peru who eat corpses and horse livers. He has met these people during the course of his ship journey. The colloquial words he uses render force to his speech:

-Chews coca all day long, the communicative tarpaulin added. Stomachs like breadgraters. Cuts off their diddies when they can’t bear no more children. See them there stark ballocknaked eating a dead horse’s liver raw. (581)
In “parody,” as in stylization, the author borrows the discourse of another person but with a different intention. Here, the author’s discourse acts in a hostile way upon the other’s discourse and the authorial intention and the other’s intention oppose each other and move in opposite directions. The author introduces an opposite semantic intention into a discourse that is already in possession of an intention of its own. Parody occurs in daily speech when we quote another’s words imposing a certain amount of authority on it. However, in both stylization and parody the “original discourse is lexically or grammatically invoked in the text” (Lodge, After Bakhtin 60).

Religious parody is seen everywhere in the text of Ulysses. The text begins with a parody of the Mass. Malachi Mulligan performs a pseudo Black Mass at the starting of the novel. He parodies the gestures of a priest at the altar and shows Stephen the bowl of lather, which he says is the “body and soul and blood and ouns” (3). This is a clear parody of the words of Jesus during the Last Supper when he lifted up the bread and wine and said to his disciples: “Take, eat; this is My body. [...] Drink from it, all of you. For this is My blood.” (Matt 26: 26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19) These are also the words spoken during the consecration of the host during the Mass. So Mulligan’s words parodies both the words of Christ as well the words of the priest, the representative of Christ on earth.
The solemn words of Christ are invoked by Mulligan with a quite different intention. Mulligan’s words and gestures mock the words and gestures of Christ. Another parody on the same words of Christ can be seen in Bloom’s words “This is my body” when lying naked in water. As André Topia notices: “these words, borrowed out of context, take on a completely different orientation” when placed in the context of Bloom lying in water and masturbating (Attridge and Ferrer 115). As is the case with parody, the host (the Biblical discourse) remains a passive recipient of the parasite discourse. *Ulysses* contains many such parodies of the *Bible* in particular and Christianity in general. André Topia sees “intertextual polyphony” in such multiple discourses (ibid 114).

Another very debasing and blasphemous religious parody of the Catholic Litany of the Sacred Heart of Jesus is seen in the prayer of the Daughters of Erin to Bloom: “Kidney of Bloom, pray for us. […] Potato Preservative against Plague and Pestilence, pray for us” (470). Similarly, the mock genealogy of the generation of Leopold announced by Brini, the papal nuncio, is a parody of the genealogy of Christ given in the Bible (Luke 3:23-38). The *Leopoldi autem generatio* reads like this: “Moses begat Noah and Noah begat Eunuch and […] Emmanuel” (467). The ancestry of Bloom is a deliberately distorted version of the original in the *Bible* with prominent names like Enoch changed into Eunuch and Bloom
taking the place of Christ. *Ulysses* contains many such parodies of Biblical themes and of Christian literature and prayers.

In another extract, the author projects Bloom as a well-known doctor who is competent to talk on such weighty medical matters as the cause for erection in males at the time of hanging. In inflating uneducated Bloom in this manner, the author is obviously ridiculing the discourse of medical professionals.

The distinguished scientist Herr Professor Luitpold Blumenduft tendered medical evidence to the effect that the instantaneous fracture of the cervical vertebrae and consequent scission of the spinal cord would, according to the best approved traditions of medical science, be calculated to inevitably produce in the human subject a violent ganglionic stimulus of the nerve centres, causing the pores of the *corpora cavernosa* to rapidly dialate in such a way as to instantaneously facilitate the flow of blood to that part of the human anatomy known as the penis or male organ resulting in the phenomenon which has been denominated by the faculty a morbid upwards and outwards philoprogenetive erection in *articulo mortis per diminutionem capitis.* (292)
Bloom’s narrow escape from the hitting of the biscuit tin thrown by the citizen parodies the biblical story of Elijah ascending into heaven in a chariot of fire. This incident is “magnified to earthquake dimension” in this episode (Budgen 157). The ascent of Elijah into heaven is an incident mentioned in the book of Kings. The relevant verse from the Bible reads like this:

Then it happened, as they [Elijah and Elisha] continued on and talked, that suddenly a chariot of fire appeared with horses of fire, and separated the two of them; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. Now Elisha saw it, and he cried out, ‘My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and its horsemen!’

(2 Kings 2:11-12)

Bloom’s escape is pictured as Elijah’s ascent into heaven. The passage in Ulysses parodying the above biblical quotation runs like this:

When, lo, there came about them all a great brightness and they beheld the chariot wherein He stood ascend to heaven, And they beheld Him in the chariot, clothed upon in the glory of the brightness, having raiment as of the sun, fair as the moon and terrible that for awe they durst not look upon Him. And there came a voice out of heaven, calling: Elijah! Elijah!
And he answered with a main cry: *Abba! Adonai!* And they beheld Him even Him, ben Bloom Elijah, amid clouds of angels ascend to the glory of the brightness at an angle of forty-five degrees over Donohoe’s in Little Green Street like a shot off a shovel. (330)

In the parody, the reader may miss the point of humour if he/she is not sufficiently sensitive to the author’s new intention and the real object/discourse that is parodied.

A complex mixture of stylization and parody can be seen in the “Oxen of the Sun” episode. The narrative in this chapter begins and runs through a succession of prose styles in the course of which Bloom takes the roles of different persons to suit each style. This chapter is written in nine parts. The development of various English styles parallels the growth of the foetus in the womb. Joyce is parodying different English styles to evoke the baby's gestation period of nine months. An example of stylization can be seen in the passage written in the style of Cardinal John Henry Newman, the essayist and a Catholic convert. This is evidently not the language of Joyce.

There are sins or (let us call as the world calls them) evil memories which are hidden away by man in the darkest places
of the heart but they abide there and wait. He may suffer their memory to grow dim, let them be as though they had not been and all but persuade himself that they were not or at least were otherwise. Yet a chance word will call them forth suddenly and they will rise up to confront him in the most various circumstances, a vision or a dream, or while timbrel and harp soothe his senses or amid the cool silver tranquility of the evening or at the feast at midnight when he is now filled with wine. Not to insult over him will the vision come as over one that lies under her wrath, not for vengeance to cut him off from the living but shrouded in the piteous vesture of the past, silent, remote, reproachful. (400-01)

In fact, the whole of *Ulysses* is modelled on the Homeric epic, *Odyssey*. Joyce was not simply using this ancient epic as a narrative model for his modern novel, but was parodically reinterpreting the Homeric epic in the modern context. As Linda Hutcheon observes, the *Odyssey* becomes for Joyce an “ideal” or “a norm from which the modern departs” (Morson and Emerson, *Rethinking Bakhtin* 87). Even though Joyce assigns the roles of Ulysses to Bloom, Penelope to Molly and Telemachus to Stephen in his scheme, in the modern epic they are seen in a different light. The modern Ulysses is an ineffectual advertisement canvasser who has no son to inherit
his name, the modern Penelope is an adulterous woman and the modern Telemachus does not like to accept a parental authority.

A simple conversation, perhaps the first of its kind in the text, that takes place between the husband and the wife, is charged with dialogues of all types. Bloom enters the hall after buying pork kidney. He sees two letters and a card lying on the hall floor. The ensuing dialogue between Bloom and Molly tries to conceal their fears for each other on the same topic—for Bloom the fear of confronting a rival and for Molly the fear of being caught red handed on the issue of Boylan. The dialogue between them here is a good example of “hidden polemic.” Bakhtin says that in hidden polemic, “the author’s discourse is directed toward its own referential object, as in any other discourse, but at the same time every statement about the object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the other’s discourse on the same theme, at the others’ statement about the same object” (PDP 195). Here, the others’ speech is not at all reproduced but the implication of it is seen in the author’s antagonistic attitude towards the other’s speech. This attitude changes the intonation and syntax of the author’s speech. The author’s speech would have been totally different if the author had not antagonistically reflected the other’s speech. In the hidden polemic, the author’s discourse only strikes an indirect blow on the other’s discourse.
He does not directly take into account the other’s style or discourse as in stylization or parody and the clash of opinions between the two discourses takes place within the object itself which influences the author’s discourse from within. Here is the passage that carries the conversation between Bloom and Molly:

Two letters and a card lay on the hallfloor. He stooped and gathered them. Mrs Marion Bloom. His quick heart slowed at once. Bold hand. Mrs. Marion.

-Poldy!

Entering the bedroom he halfclosed his eyes and walked through warm yellow twilight towards her tousled head.

-Who are the letters for?

He looked at them. Mullingar. Milly.

-A letter for me from Milly, he said carefully, and a card to you. And a letter for you.

He laid her card and letter on the twill bedspread near the curve of her knees.

-Do you want the blind up?
Letting the blind up by gentle tugs halfway his backward eye saw her glance at the letter and tuck it under her pillow.

-That do? He asked, turning.

She was reading the card, propped on her elbow.

-She got the things, she said.

He waited till she had laid the card aside and curled herself back slowly with a snug sigh.

-Hurry up with that tea, she said, I’m parched.

-The kettle is boiling, he said.

But he delayed to clear the chair: her striped petticoat, tossed soiled linen: and lifted all in an armful on to the foot of the bed.

As he went down the kitchen stairs she called:

-Poldy!

-What?

-Scald the teapot. (59-60)
Even though Bloom makes no direct encounter with Boylan, and Boylan’s words are not recorded in the text, it is clear that the sight of his letter is enough to influence Bloom’s actions. Something that Bloom detests and dreads the most for reasons known only to him has appeared before him in the form of the boldly addressed letter to his wife. It is certain from Bloom’s reactions that Bloom holds a hostile relationship with the author of the letter. The influence of the unspoken words of the other person is seen in all the dialogic interactions of Bloom in the text.

Bloom is very agitated to see a letter to “Mrs Marion” written in “bold hand” lying on the hall floor and stoops to get hold of it. It is right at this moment that Molly calls him. Molly’s intonation in calling her husband shows that she is the one who wields authority in the house. She alone calls Bloom by his name Poldy. Yet she has a wavering and anxious tone in asking “who are the letters for?” Her tone is agitated perhaps because she is anticipating a letter or must have even seen the letter in Bloom’s hands and recognised it as Boylan’s. Molly, on her part, evinces a hostile feeling towards the reactions that might come from Bloom about this particular letter. However, Bloom carefully replies that there are letters from his daughter and only then mentions about the letter to Molly. Bloom is definitely angry and suspicious but he does not demonstrate those sentiments. Bloom expresses these feelings through his gestures and his
carefully chosen words and speech. He only bides time to tell Molly about
the letter and tries hard to suppress his agitated tone. He is unable to hand
over the letter directly to his wife and therefore lays the card and letter on
the bedspread. Even his gestures betray his emotions. Already the impact of
Boylan’s letter is seen in the structuring of Bloom’s words and deeds.

Unable to face her reactions on seeing the letter, Bloom goes to the
window to draw up the blinds. But at the same time his inquisitive
“backward eye” sees Molly tucking the letter under her pillow. When
Bloom sees this gesture of Molly, he is almost sure that the letter is from
the person about whom he is thinking. In a bid to appear “normal” in front
of her and to make her feel that he has not even noticed the letter, he tries to
engage her in conversation. Molly’s gesture of discreetly tucking the letter
under the pillow and reading out the details from the card from her daughter
are all very deliberate actions from her side only to draw Bloom’s attention
away from the letter. She pretends to be quite normal in front of Bloom by
curling herself snugly into the bed after reading her daughter’s letter. She
somehow wants Bloom to quit the place for only then can she read the letter
from her lover. In her eagerness to read it, she asks Bloom to get her the tea
soon. She says she’s “parched” for it, parched obviously for tea as well as
for the letter. Such words with double meanings produce “microdialogues”
(PDP 40)—the dialogue heard in each word or gesture of the character in
the "great dialogue" of the text. But Bloom is in no mood to leave the place for he is more interested in knowing about the contents of the letter. For this, he delays himself as far as possible by collecting and removing the soiled clothes of his wife from the bed.

Examining the conversation and the accompanying gestures, we can see that the whole episode of Molly-Bloom dialogue is charged not only with "hidden polemic" but also "open polemic" and "internally polemical discourse" on the issue of the absent Boylan. An overt polemic "is quite simply directed at another's discourse, which it refutes, as if at its own referential object" (PDP 196). Internally polemical discourse is a word with a sideward glance at someone else's hostile word. All types of "barbed" words and words that "make digs at others" belong to this category. This speech has a tendency to cringe in the presence of or in anticipation of someone else's word or reply.

The agitated surface of this discourse reveals Bloom's hidden and open polemics with his wife and her lover and also Molly's internal polemic with Bloom and her lover. Both Molly and Bloom are aware of the hostile reactions of each other. They are anticipating it and hiding from the sideward glances of each other. In the polemic taking place between Molly and Bloom we can see each of them sensing the other's word on the same object. This conversation is only the beginning of a dialogue between the
husband and the wife. The unceasing dialogue between them continues up to the end of the novel.

Along with this discourse between the husband and the wife on the theme of Boylan, there also takes place a dialogue between Molly and the henpecked husband in Bloom. Bloom, quite unlike the male chauvinist husbands of conventional novels, gets up and prepares tea and breakfast for himself and his wife. Molly stays in bed all the time. Bloom has to collect the daily post for her and open the window curtains and even remove the soiled nightdress of his wife. Molly, by remaining in bed and dictating to her husband with authority remains an unconventional feminine figure—of the sort seen in feminist writings. Thus, this conversation between the husband and wife can be viewed as the dialogue, taking place between an assertive wife and her docile husband. Joyce, through his new models of husband and wife is conducting an internal polemic with other male writers by constructing a new model of a heroine. Joyce poses a threat to other male writers and even to female writers in the delineation of Molly, for in a sense it is the exclusive domain of women's writing that he has conquered in presenting a heroine like Molly. In short, this text can be viewed as a dialogue with other male texts and with the male centered society as well. Richard Pearce sees the authorial voice in Ulysses echoing Homer's patriarchal epic (58). Bakhtin talks of the "epic" distance that is created
between the ruling class and the commoners in feudal societies. "In a patriarchal social structure the ruling class does, in a certain sense, belong to the world of ‘fathers’ and is thus separated by a distance that is almost epic" (DI 15). It is this “epic” distance that is overcome in *Ulysses* both in the case of characters as well as in the case of the novel form.

The patriarch Bloom contains in himself all maternal values and instincts. The patriarchal values are overturned in the figure of Bloom. Instead, it is the matriarch, Molly, who wields the power in the Bloom household. Richard Pearce thinks that for someone in the “dominant group” like Bloom, “Caring for others cannot lead to power, or dominance; indeed, it is a sign of submissiveness” (57). Bloom is here only a very obedient husband in front of his wife. He is “weak,” “uncertain” and lacks the “strength” of language and thought in order to assert himself in front of his dominating wife.

There are other ways of analyzing the “hidden dialogue” in *Ulysses*. It is a coincidence that Bloom receives simultaneously his daughter’s letter and also sees a letter from the paramour of his wife. This is the beginning of yet another clash of “voices” in the text. This time the dialogue is between youth and old age. Bloom’s dialogue with his daughter is counterposed to his dialogue with his wife. He is agitated at the knowledge that his daughter also mentions about Boylan whom he fears. But he tries to
console himself by means of a hidden dialogue. Bakhtin explains hidden dialogue by means of the analogy of a telephone conversation. In a dialogue between two people, even if only the speech of the first person is heard, the traces left by the second speaker’s speech on the first speaker can be understood by listening to the words of the first speaker. This is what one hears when listening to only one side of a telephone conversation. In a telephonic conservation, by listening to the words of one speaker, we can surmise what the other person is saying. The context of “hidden dialogue” in this episode is the instance of Bloom receiving a letter from his daughter:

O well: she knows how to mind herself. But if not? No, nothing has happened. Of course it might. Wait in any case till it does. A wild piece of goods. Her slim legs running up to staircase. Destiny. Ripening now. Vain: very. (64)

This hidden dialogue can be split up and viewed as an actual conversation, taking place between Bloom and a listener. Bloom is trying hard to convince the listener that his daughter is capable of looking after herself. Bloom acts like this only because he is afraid of the hostile look of the “other person” towards his daughter’s deeds. We can examine how the broken up dialogue will look like. This conversation can be imagined to be taking place in the form of two rejoinders, i.e., in the form of a discourse and a counter discourse between Bloom and his listener. Here, their two
separate discourses are fused into one discourse. The two independent rejoinders of Bloom and his listener instead of following one after the other now come out from the mouth of Bloom as a single utterance. The discourse of the listener has "wedged" its way into the speech of Bloom, and although the speech of the listener is absent here, its influence is seen on the accent and syntax of Bloom’s speech. The inaudible words of the listener and the audible words of Bloom move in diverse directions and clash with one another. Thus the two single accented rejoinders of Bloom and of his listener collide within the new utterance of Bloom obtained by the "embedding" of the listener’s discourse in Bloom’s discourse. This brings in a dialogic collision inside the new utterance of Bloom. This phenomenon of the fusing of rejoinders is the result of a second and alien discourse functioning inside the consciousness and speech of the hero.

We can hear a dialogue of this sort in the above interior monologue of Bloom:

O well: she knows how to mind herself. But if not? No, nothing has happened. Of course it might. Wait in any case till it does. A wild piece of goods. Her slim legs running up to staircase. Destiny. Ripening now. Vain: very. (64)
This speech of Bloom when analysed can be seen to contain the discourse of listener as well as the counter discourse of Bloom. The two discourses can perhaps be rewritten like this:

Listener: Does your daughter know how to take care of herself?

Bloom: O well, she knows how to mind herself.

Listener: But what if she doesn’t know Boylan’s real nature?

Bloom: But if no?

Listener: Are you sure nothing has happened so far?

Bloom: No, nothing has happened. Of course it might. Wait in any case till it does.

The acute anticipation of the other’s presence or interrogations gives Bloom’s speech a “halting” quality and this perhaps is because of his lending an ear to listen to the comments of the other. The “intensification” of the other’s voice and accent is seen in the vehement denials of Bloom in the form of “But if no? No, Nothing has happened.”

An example of the agitated mind of Bloom at the sight of his wife’s lover can be seen in the reactions of Bloom while meeting Boylan on his way to the Glasnevin cemetery. Bloom is seen to cringe in the presence of
Boylan with whom he executes an internal polemic. While sitting in the funeral cab, Bloom and his companions meet Boylan on the way. It was "just at that moment" when Bloom was also thinking of Boylan that he met him. Bloom tries hard not to think of Boylan. Bloom's typical reaction of reviewing his nails on seeing Boylan reveals his state of mind more than words could convey.

Mr Bloom reviewed the nails of his left hand, then those of his right hand. The nails, yes. Is there anything more in him that they she sees? Fascination. Worst man in Dublin. That keeps him alive. They sometimes feel what a person is. Instinct. But a type like that. My nails. I am just looking at them: well pared. And after: thinking alone. Body getting a bit softy. I would notice that from remembering, what causes that I suppose the skin can't contract quickly enough when the flesh falls off. But the shape is there. The shape is there still. Shoulders. Hips. Plump. Night of the dance dressing. Shift stuck between the cheeks behind.

He clasped his hands between his knees and, satisfied, sent his vacant glance over their faces. (89)
Bloom is foolishly trying to distract his thoughts from Boylan by reviewing his fingernails. However hard he tries to keep himself aloof from Boylan or from those who are greeting Boylan, he cannot manage it. He is so nervous and agitated that he deliberately distracts his attention to his fingernails. The only thing that could distract Bloom now is his well-pared fingernails. While reviewing the nails, he is obviously keeping his eyes down on them for he is afraid of even an eye contact with Boylan. But not long can he keep himself engaged with his fingernail. Soon, thoughts about Molly-Boylan relationship come to his mind. According to Suzette A. Henke the double pronoun in “Is there anything more in him that they she sees” indicates the confusion in Bloom’s mind. He at first tries to see what “they” (all women) see in Boylan. Soon his mind drifts to what “she” (Molly) sees in Boylan (Henke 101). Bloom is now filled with a “dual thought”—the thought that determines the content of his speech and the hidden speech that determines the structure of his speech. Thus in Bloom’s mind, we see one discourse competing with another equally important discourse. The two discourses vying with each other here are the discourse of Bloom trying to avoid Boylan and the discourse of Bloom unable to avoid Boylan.

The above passage is based on the motif of “conscious ignorance” (PDP 247). Here we see the hero concealing from himself and eliminating
from his discourse the very thing that is constantly before his eyes. If one part of his monologue tries to force himself to see and admit what he has in fact known and seen from the beginning, the other part desperately tries to get around the invisibly present “truth” that determines his speech and thought. Initially, he tries to “bring his thoughts to a focus” that lies away from the truth. But at the same time he is forced to concentrate his thoughts on the terrible point of “truth.” Bloom’s thoughts vary between trying to ignore Boylan and trying to come to terms with the present situation.

Finally Bloom sends a “vacant glance” over others’ faces, for he is afraid that a direct eye contact might betray his true emotions and tensions. His gesture of clasping his hands between his knees and the reviewing of his fingernails are all external manifestations of his inner protest at the sight of Boylan. It is Boylan’s presence alone that creates such an agitation in the mind of Bloom. But these actions do not save the situation for him. It is when he sits with his clasped hands between his knees fixing his “vacant glance over their faces” that Jack Power asks him about his wife’s musical tour. This is the beginning of another string of dialogues, for a dialogue once started cannot be concluded.

Here, Power’s words act as the “penetrative words” that pierce the thoughts of Bloom (PDP 242). A penetrative word is “a word capable of actively and confidently interfering in the interior dialogue of the other
person, helping that other person to find his own voice” (PDP 242). Such a penetrative discourse is possible only in actual conversation with another person. A penetrative discourse is a monologic discourse. It is a word devoid of any sideward glances or loopholes or internal polemics. The questions of Joe Hynes (306), Nosey Flynn (164-65) and M’ Coy (72) regarding Molly act as similar “penetrative words” to the thoughts of Bloom concerning the Molly-Boylan relationship and Bloom fumbles every time his wife’s name is mentioned by anybody.

Bloom’s words are always words with a sideward glance. Another quality of his words is that they are words with a “loophole.” A loophole “creates a special type of fictive ultimate word about oneself with an unclosed tone to it, obtrusively peering into the other’s eyes and demanding from the other a sincere refutation” (ibid 234). There is always the possibility of the other’s words contradicting the uttered words of Bloom and bringing out an entirely different meaning. Initially, Bloom’s uttered words may appear as a gesture of his acquiescence in his fate, but the sense of the words changes when the words of the other person interrupts his thoughts.

Bloom recollects the time when once he got money for Molly’s hair. He thinks that there is no harm in allowing her to do what ever she likes if
she fetches money from Boylan. He again thinks it is all a prejudice to talk of adultery if Molly is doing it as a profession:

Ten bob I got for Molly’s combings when we were on the rocks in Holles street. Why not? Suppose he gave her money. Why not? All a prejudice. She’s worth ten, fifteen, more a pound. What? I think so. All that for nothing. Bold hand. Mrs Marion. (353)

Certainly we can see a loophole in Bloom’s speech. A loophole, according to Bakhtin retains “for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one’s own words” (PDP 233). This loophole in Bloom’s speech not only distorts his attitude toward himself but also makes his thoughts ambiguous and elusive even for himself. Bloom who talks in a half-reconciliatory tone actually wants his listener to refute him and say that Boylan and Molly are doing the wrong thing. He definitely wants the other to console him for being in such a situation.

We can see Bloom halting after every word to cast a “sideward glance” at others for he thinks others might think he is actually feeling bad about the whole situation. He throws his sideward glance at the possible response of the others for he fears that the others definitely have a different opinion about the whole situation. Bloom’s speech is always structured
under the influence of the reflected discourse of another person and his repeated “why not” reveals his genuine fear for the other’s refutation.

If in a “word with a loophole” the narrative of the hero is confused and wavering in anticipation of the other’s intrusive words, in a “hagiographic word” there is very little confusion in the hero’s words. In fact, this is “a word without a sideward glance, calmly adequate to itself and its referential object” (PDP 248). The tone and style of the hero’s voice change when he approaches the truth about himself. The truth finally ennobles his heart and the narrative changes from its incoherent beginning. He takes possession of his own authentic voice and gets reconciled with the other’s voice. It is such a situation that gives rise to the “hagiographic word.”

Bloom has nostalgic memories of his courting days. Both Molly and Bloom were very happy then and they had once played Rip Van Winkle at Mat Dillon’s house the year before they got married. Now all that is forgotten. They both have grown older: “All changed. Forgotten. The young are old” (360). Years passed by and their happy days ended with the death of Rudy:

I was happier then. Or was that I? Or am I now I?

Twentyeight I was. She twentythree when we left Lombard
Bloom realizes that their estrangement began after the death of their only son: "Could never like it again after Rudy" is the constant refrain that we hear from both Bloom and Molly about their physical alienation. Bloom desperately yearns for a son and does not even mind accepting a son from Boylan. Bloom partly considers it his fault not having a son and he even thinks that the estrangement with his wife has led to the "mishappenings" of this day. Bloom realizes that he is too old to father a son now. He knows he cannot do anything to save the present situation but to accept it as it is.

I too, last of my race. Milly young student. Well, my fault perhaps. No son. Rudy. Too late now. Or if not? If not? If still?

He bore no hate.

Hate. Love. Those are names. Rudy. Soon I am old. (273)

Bloom is obsessed with the thoughts of his wife, and on this particular day he constantly thinks of her. Even while Bloom is physically away from his house and his wife, his mind cannot get out of his house and his wife. His wife out of his sight is never out of his mind. Every little sight,
sound or smell brings to his memory the image of Molly. Molly stands like the fixed end of Donne’s compass around which Bloom rotates. This gives the reader an idea about the intensity of emotions Bloom has on this particular day concerning Molly’s adultery.

Inspite of all that Molly does this day, Bloom tries to see the good aspects of Molly’s character. He is aware of his wife’s plus points in comparison to other women. He knows that it is the seductive powers of his wife that keeps him “faithful” to her even on this day. However Bloom finally gets the feeling that he is fooled by his wife and Boylan. He sees the place where previously he and Molly had consummated their love. He remembers this event with nostalgia and sadness:

All quite on Howth now. The distant hills seem. Where we.
The rhododendrons. I am a fool perhaps. He gets the plums and I the plumstones. Where I come in. All that old hill has seen. Names change: that’s all. Lovers: yum yum. (359)

When Bloom listens to a song by Simon Dedalus about a woman unfaithful to her husband, Bloom thinks it is the nature of every woman to be inconstant. He thinks it is better to try to stop the sea than try to stop a determined woman: “She longed to go. That’s why. Woman. As easy stop the sea: Yes: all is lost” (262).
Thus Bloom’s thoughts are seen fluctuating among uncertainties about what is going to happen that culminates in final realization of the fact. The inconsistent, vague, agitated and even the complaining tone at the beginning gradually changes to a tone of calm acceptance. In all the above musings of Bloom we can listen to the hagiographic word.

The hero remains an enigma to the readers for he even dares to conduct a dialogue with his author. In a very humorous pun on “Chamber music” he creates a farfetched parody of Joyce’s collection of lyrics named “Chamber Music.” The music produced by Molly’s urine falling into the chamber pot is here the “Chamber music” according to Bloom.

O, look we are so! Chamber music. Could make a kind of pun on that. It is a kind of music I often thought when she. Acoustics that is. Tinkling. Empty vessels make most noise. Because the acoustics, the resonance changes according as the weight of the water is equal to the law of falling water. Like those rhapsodies of Liszt’s, Hungarian, gipsycyed. Pearls. Drops. Rain. Diddle iddle addle addle oodle oodle. Hiss. Now. Maybe now. Before. (271)

This short passage creates a parody not merely of Joyce’s collection of poems but of many other scientific phenomena as well as musical and
nursery rhymes. Bloom, as usual, has very little knowledge about the scientific principles of acoustics, or of specific gravity and Newton’s laws of motion. Actually, the acoustical principle of the variation of the pitch of a vessel depending on the volume of the liquid it contains, the Archimedes’ law of specific gravity and Newton’s law of falling bodies get mixed up in the narrative and it turns out to be a ridiculous parody of the scientific principles that it alludes to. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, this is perhaps another case of Bloomism in *Ulysses*. Joyce, through Bloom, pokes fun at those who use high-sounding scientific terms, which cannot be grasped by common people. Such talk, whether it be that of the learned academics or of the semi-educated people who pretend to be academic, has the effect of creating confusion in the minds of ordinary people. Joyce is in fact pointing to the dialogue taking place between these two categories of people. Bloom further sparks off another dialogue between the Hungarian pianist and composer Franz Liszt, famous for his “Hungarian Rhapsodies” and the “Chamber music” produced by Molly.

Bloom, in the process, also complicates his unintentional parody and “internally dialogizes” his parodical comment. This type of “internal dialogization” is a peculiar property of parody. In the vari-directional discourse such as parody, when there arises a resistance from the other’s words, the discourse will become complicated by the “hidden polemic.”
When there is a sharp divergence in the aspirations of the other from the intentions of the author, the other's voice will actively oppose and resist the intentions of the author and there will take place an "internal dialogization" of the vari-directional discourse. Here, the author's thought no more oppressively dominates the other's thought. The resulting discourse will become agitated and internally undecided. This discourse is double-voiced as well as double-accented. Trying to speak this double-accented discourse aloud will only lead to its monologisation. This is an inherent tendency of all types of vari-directional discourse. When an internally dialogized double-voiced discourse disintegrates, it will become two fully isolated and independent discourses.

Bloom's forced dialogues on diverse themes, along with the music of the chamber pot, bring in multiple discourses of various types in a single thought. Since polyphony means multiple voices, the various parodic discourses produce polyphony in this context. In Bloom's pun we can see not only dialogue in the broad sense, but also "microdialogue."

Besides the major dialogue between Molly and Bloom, other equally important dialogues also take place in the novel. One such dialogue in the text is the dialogue on religion. The religious dialogue is perhaps introduced into the novel only to dialogise the questions of faith and morality and the theme of adultery.
The dialogue on religion begins right from the first page of the book. Buck Mulligan parodies the gestures of a priest at Mass. His parodic tone and gestures reveal that his idea on religion is not very serious. Yet, he chides Stephen for not having "humoured" his mother's death wish. He thinks it is the "cursed jesuit strain" in Stephen injected in the wrong way that prevents him from doing his duties to his mother. On recalling A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, we would see that Stephen had once decided to take up the priestly vocation, but had later decided not to go for that. Joyce, who was educated under the Jesuits, had a similar experience in his lifetime. Stephen is the early portrait of Joyce, but nowhere does Joyce allow Stephen’s views on religion to stand above others’ views on the same theme. The view of Stephen-Joyce on religion is not the only view presented to the reader. Instead the author brings in others’ views on the same subject, the effect of which is polyphony and genuine dialogue. It is the novel’s polyphony that prompts Stephen to state in response to a question whether he is a believer that he is a practitioner of “free thought” and that at present he is the servant of the Imperial British state, the holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic church and Mr. Deasy, the headmaster of the school where he works. Stephen hates any type of authority and one cannot be a “believer in the narrow sense of the word” with this temperament (19).
In Bloom too, we can perceive another portrait of Joyce. Bloom, after his conversion to Christianity a few years ago, has towards the end of the book reached the conclusion that the practices of one religion are no better than the practices of another religion. But it is this same Bloom, a professed non-believer, who comforts the terrified Stephen when he hears a thunderclap. Bloom who follows no religion has no fear, whereas Stephen who denounces religion has an inborn faith that does not leave him. It is only the practical Bloom who can comfort Stephen, dismissing the thunderclap as a natural phenomenon, whereas the thunderclap reminds Stephen of the curse from God because of the dormant Catholic strain in him.

Jack Power’s religious faith makes him think that it is a disgrace to the family for a person to commit suicide as it is against the precepts of the religion, but he does not mind keeping a consort even while having a lawful wife. Simon Dedalus’ religious faith allows him to use the names of saints and martyrs and even of Christ to swear and curse. Martin Cunningham’s religious faith makes him sympathetic and tolerant even to his drunkard wife. The priest at the funeral service chants the prayers only out of habit.

If these are the responses of some of the characters in the text towards religion, the author has also given us an opportunity to see how the main female character in the text views religion. Her perceptions stand in
opposition to the views of other people. Molly is also afraid of thunderclap like Stephen but she dismisses her fear with a “Hail Mary” (693). This incident takes place immediately after the adultery committed by her. For her adultery and religion go hand in hand as in the case of Jack Power. So the adultery with Boylan is quite a casual matter for her. The theme of adultery will look different to each person according to his/her religious faith. The simultaneous occurrence of the arguments of different characters on this question has not changed their religious beliefs or even made an impression on the reader, but has only contributed to the development of polyphony in the text.

Bloom is seen entertaining a clandestine relationship with a lady acquaintance of his. This relationship is used to dialogise the theme of adultery. Let us examine a simple instance of such a dialogue in the “Sirens” episode of the text. Bloom is quite certain that he is wrong in entertaining extramarital relationships. This is evident from his behaviour right from the beginning of this day. He is seen trying to hide from Molly a piece of paper with a false address by keeping it inside his hat. He goes to the post office to fetch a letter from his lady acquaintance, Martha, and now he writes a letter to Martha in front of the keen and watchful eyes of Richie Goulding. He knows that Richie may not appreciate him writing to Martha. Bloom would murmur something pretending that he is writing an
advertisement when he feels the watchful glance of Richie on him. Bloom does this trick only to divert the attention of Richie from the secret letter he is writing for he feels that Richie's inquisitive eye may find out his whole secret. Later in the text we see Bloom hiding this matter as well as his similar encounters with other women from his wife but Molly has already noticed Bloom writing a letter to “somebody who thinks she has a softy in him” (691). Bloom writes the letter to Martha thus:

   Bloom mur: best references. But Henry wrote: it will excite me. [...] Murmered: Messrs Callan, Coleman and Co, limited. Henry wrote:

   Miss Martha Clifford

   c/o P.O.

   Dolphin’s barn lane

   Dublin. (268)

   In the above extract we can listen to two simultaneous discourses—that of the advertisement canvasser Bloom and that of the lover Henry. This orchestration “on the plane of a single work discourses of various types, with all their expressive capacities intact, without reducing them to a common denominator” is what creates polyphony in the text (PDP 200).
Sheldon Brivic has this to say on the polyphonic discourse in the "Sirens" episode:

Music breaks down the logical continuity of language and replaces it with a sequence of immediate impressions. As a result, the thoughts of a character tend to mix two tracks of discordant discourse at once and to interrupt each other. (52-53)

The original scene of Bloom trying to face the situation of Boylan meeting Molly is counterposed to the sounds outside and inside the bar, the sound of Bloom eating food, and of writing to Martha. Joyce himself describes this chapter as "a fugue in counterpoint" (Budgen 135). Thus the musical analogy of polyphony turns out to be important here.

References to adultery and related ideas are not simply introduced at random into the text. These themes again act as a dialogising background for the issue of Molly's adultery. However, all these dialogues are subservient to the main dialogue, i.e., the dialogue between Bloom and Molly on the question of marital infidelity. When Bloom enters Molly's bed with the realization that "each one who enters imagines himself to be the first to enter whereas he is always the last term of a preceding series even if the first term of a succeeding one, each imagining himself to be the
first, last, only and alone, whereas he is neither first nor last nor only nor alone in a series originating in and repeated to infinity” (683), Joyce, like Bloom, is with “circumspection” and “solicitude” making a look at Bakhtin’s dialogic theory that states: “The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly oriented towards a future answer-word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer’s direction” (DI 280).

Another dialogical interaction that takes place in the text is between Bloom and Stephen. The dialogue between them cannot be simply reduced to a dialogue between a father in quest of a son and a son in quest of a father. Instead, they represent two temperaments, two races and two age groups. We see Bloom always following Stephen, who in turn is seen trying to avoid Bloom. They are separated by an age difference of sixteen years. Stephen is now twenty-two and Bloom thirty-eight. Stephen is in his early youth whereas Bloom is past middle age. Stephen feels revulsion towards Bloom in shaking hands with the man of a strange kind of flesh who is “sinewless,” and “wobbly.” Stephen is a Gentile and Bloom a Jew. Stephen is an artist, Bloom a lover of science. Stephen is educated but Bloom is only partially educated. Stephen has a father whom he can’t accept and Bloom has no son. The “father-son” dialogue further leads on to the
dialogue on the Trinity, the dialogue with Shakespeare, the dialogue with Homer and so on.

The Bloom-Stephen dialogue takes place as a continuation of the Bloom-Molly dialogue. However, Joyce as author does not seem to take any privilege in bringing about a forced meeting between Bloom and Stephen. Instead he allows these characters the necessary freedom to meet at their convenience. Bloom remembers that they had met earlier on two occasions—one when Stephen was 5 in 1887 in the company of his mother. Stephen then had refused to give his hand in salutation to Bloom. The second time was in 1892 when Stephen was 10 years old. Then Stephen had invited Bloom to dinner but Bloom had declined the offer. On this day, it is Bloom who sees Stephen first, while the former is seated in the funeral cab. Bloom sees Stephen, “a lithe young man, clad in mourning” and wearing a wide hat passing by (85). When Bloom sees him, he informs Dedalus about him. But Stephen does not see Bloom watching him. Again, at the newspaper office, Bloom just misses the chance to meet Stephen. At the National library, Mulligan introduces Bloom to Stephen telling him that Bloom knew both him and his father. Bloom and Stephen, however, do not casually bump into each other even in this central episode. In the episode at the maternity hospital they both come into the view of each other and their eyes meet. Bloom saves Stephen from the poisonous drink at the maternity
hospital and follows him and saves him from being caught by the policemen. He also retrieves Stephen's money from the clutches of the whores. Bloom shouts Stephen's name and only then does Stephen recognise the presence of Bloom and he mutters the name of Bloom as the "Black panther vampire" (564). We see Bloom and Stephen walking side by side only towards the end of the novel. The last section of the novel allows the readers a glimpse of the confrontation that takes place between Bloom and Stephen. The reader and perhaps the author himself are surprised to hear the conflicting views of Bloom and Stephen on various topics even though they often agreed on several issues. Thus we get no consistent point of view either of the author or of the characters. However, because of the genuine dialogic interaction between the two, neither the reader nor the author nor the characters can predict beforehand what will exactly happen in their relationship.

The dialogue that takes place between the two is given in a question-answer form in the "Ithaca" episode. This can also be treated as the replica of the dialogue taking place in the mind of Joyce himself, for Bloom and Stephen in a sense are two contending aspects of his personality. Here are excerpts from this episode of Ulysses:

Of what did the duumvirate deliberate during their itinerary?
Music, literature, Ireland, Dublin, Paris, friendship, woman, prostitution, diet, the influence of gaslight or the light of arc and glowlamps on the growth of adjoining paraheliotropic trees, exposed corporation emergency dustbuckets, the Roman catholic church, ecclesiastical celebacy, the Irish nation, jesuit education, careers, the study of medicine, the past day, the maleficent influence of the presabbath, Stephen’s collapse.

Did Bloom discover common factors of similarity between their respective like and unlike reactions to experience?

Both were sensitive to artistic impressions musical in preference to plastic or pictorial. Both preferred a continental to an insular manner of life, a cisaltantic to a transatlantic place of residence. Both indurated by early domestic training and an inherited tenacity of heterodox resistance professed their disbelief in many orthodox religions, national, social and ethical doctrines. Both admitted the alternately stimulating and obtunding influence of heterosexual magnetism. (619)
Were their views on some points divergent?

Stephen dissented openly from Bloom's views on the importance of dietary and civic self-help while Bloom dissented tacitly from Stephen's views on the eternal affirmation of the spirit of man in literature. Bloom assently covertly to Stephen's rectification of the anachronism involved in assigning the date of conversion of the Irish nation to Christianity from druidism by Patrick son of Calpurnus, son of Potitus, son of Odyssus, sent by pope Celestine I in the year 432 in the reign of Leary to the year 260 or thereabouts in the reign of Cormac Mac Art (+ 266 A. D.) suffocated by imperfect deglutition of aliment at Sletty and interred at Rossnaree. The collapse which Bloom ascribed to gastric inanition and certain chemical compounds of varying degrees of adulteration and alcoholic strength, accelerated by mental exertion and the velocity of rapid circular motion in a relaxing atmosphere. Stephen attributed to the reapparition of a matutinal cloud (perceived by both from two different points of observation, Sandy cove and Dublin), at first no bigger than a woman's hand.
Was there one point on which their views were equal and negative?

The influence of gaslight or electric light on the growth of adjoining paraheliotropic trees. (620)

However, even if such a conversation took place between the two, Bloom was not without “fear for the young man beside him, whom he furtively scrutinised with an air of some consternation, remembering he had just come back from Paris” (600). Even while giving his protégé useful counsel he was afraid of the “originality of genius” and self confidence of the young man. Only when cornered by the question about the soul by Bloom, does Stephen make a “superhuman effort of memory to try to concentrate and remember before he could say” (588). Thus in a way, the whole dialogue between them is a result of Bloom’s effort to effect a meeting with Stephen. Because of their difference in schooling and ages, their views clashed on many points. However, both Bloom and Stephen agreed on the point of the beauty of Bloom’s wife.

Bloom wants Stephen at his household so that he could distract his wife from her thoughts about Boylan. He has also the secret intention of allowing a relationship to bloom between between Milly and Stephen. If Bloom’s dreams of bringing Stephen to his house realises he can also help
Stephen come up in life by training him in music. He is ambitious to have a son and his wish to be the father of a grown up Rudy will be partially fulfilled in Stephen. He can also make Stephen start a training class for Molly in Italian. These are Bloom's motives in inviting Stephen to his house. All the dialogic interaction among Bloom, Stephen and Molly takes place in this background.

If Bloom had turned down the offer of Stephen for dinner during a previous occasion, on this day Stephen accepts the dinner offered him by Bloom but refuses to stay back. His other proposals were also "Promptly, inexplicably, with amicability, gratefully" declined by Stephen (648). If the reader anticipates an ending for the text with Stephen accepting Bloom's invitation and becoming his "son" and Bloom in turn becoming a "father," he/she is sure to get disappointed. Though the author suggests such a possibility, it does not materialise at the end. Even after all the conversation that takes place between them, they depart standing "perpendicular at the same door and on different sides of its base, the lines of their valedictory arms, meeting at any point and forming any angle less than the sum of two right angles" (656). Thus in retaining their individualities but at the same time entering into a dialogic conversation, there exists a truly polyphonic relation between them.
The thematic construction of this text with three major characters and their relationship is such that it facilitates the generation and sustenance of dialogue, for Bakhtin's view on "dialogue" in fact is a "multilogue." That is, a dialogue ultimately produces multiple voices. This may be the reason why Bakhtin uses the terms "dialogue" and "polyphony" interchangeably. Joyce does not allow a single dominating male voice to gain supremacy in the text. He introduces another equally strong and opposing voice of a woman—Molly—to stand in opposition against the voice of the dominating male voice as well as against the other male voices in the text. There are other female voices also that argue with the oppositional voice of Molly as well as with the male voices. The introduction of Molly into the novel serves to produce a dialogue between men and women, between husband and wife. Molly's discourse is always oriented against the discourses of all other male characters of the novel. It is not only against Bloom or Stephen, but against other "Mollys," and also against her author, "Jamesey," and other authors like Rabelais (703, 719). Molly hates books with "Mollys" in them (707). She loves the world to be ruled by women for she thinks women won't go "killing one another and slaughtering" nor do they gamble and lose money on horses (728). Thus the reader converses with the cultural and ideological environment of the author and his times as well as his own times through the different characters. Their fields of vision collide dialogically with one another and their words illuminate the same object
differently and they all pose resistance to their author’s words. The backgrounding of the text in Homer’s *Odyssey* is another major source of dialogicality in the text. And dialogue once generated in the text cannot die down abruptly; it goes on and on creating further dialogues. Bakhtin has given a very detailed analysis and an elaborate schematic representation of the several types of discourse in Dostoevsky. We are here only discussing those discourse types that we think are most relevant to our study of *Ulysses*. A diagrammatic representation of the above analysis as it applies to *Ulysses* is given below. This table is a slightly modified version of Bakhtin’s own table showing the various discourse types in Dostoevsky (PDP 199).

**Discourse types in *Ulysses***:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Single voiced discourse</th>
<th>E.g. direct speech of James Joyce in <em>Ulysses</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represented by the direct speech of the author.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Objectified discourse (or) the discourse of a represented person</th>
<th>E.g. the speech of characters like Bloom, Mulligan, Stephen, Molly etc. in <em>Ulysses</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represented by the direct speech of the characters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Double-voiced discourse</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### i) Passive double-voiced discourse.

#### a) Unidirectional double-voiced discourse as represented by stylization, skaz etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.g. (for stylization) — the “Nausikaa” episode written in the style of some cheap women’s magazine.</th>
<th>When objectification is minimised there will place a fusion of voices, i.e. it will become the discourse of the first type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### b) Vari-directional double-voiced discourse as represented by parody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.g. numerous religious and other parodies in <em>Ulysses</em>.</th>
<th>When objectification is minimised, the other’s idea gets activated and an internal dialogization takes place disintegrating the discourse into two discourses of the first type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ii) Active double-voiced discourse.

Represented by hidden polemic, overt polemic, internally polemical discourse, internal dialogue etc.
Thus we see that the narrative of *Ulysses* weaves in its texture all types of discourse in various designs and patterns and can thus be considered a compendium of all the discourse types propounded by Bakhtin. We can see the fluctuation from one type of discourse into another throughout the text. No section of the text is stagnant with a particular type of discourse. However, the text in general is replete with double-voiced discourse of various types, and it is the pervasive presence of this discourse that ensures polyphony in *Ulysses*. 