
“Exile, Cunning, Silence”: Stephen’s New Irish Art in *Ulysses*

Li-ling Tseng

ABSTRACT

A Portrait witnesses the evolution of Stephen’s new Irish art: proclamations of “silence, exile, cunning” are made to predict and dictate his future paths of artistic creation. And in *Ulysses*, Stephen’s famous dicta undergo decisive evolution. First and foremost, the middle dictum, exile, gets revoked blatantly: instead of departing from Ireland, Stephen stays put inside the country. His involuntary, mentally-distancing act of exile now replaces the voluntary, socially-distancing stance of the earlier Stephen. However, the third mandate, cunning, sees a meaningful twist in its execution in *Ulysses*. Stephen’s verbal art and witticism can be seen in his two works: the vampire-lover poem and the Parable of the Plums. Both exhibit the emphatic derivation of existent art, one from an English-translated Gaelic poem and the other from the biblical parabolic genre. And finally, the first dictum, silence, materializes as a dramatic enactment in Stephen’s reimagination of the literary heritage of Shakespeare, bringing the bard’s otherwise silenced life/history back to light. Taken together, Stephen’s new Irish art can be seen propitiously forged in *Ulysses*.

KEYWORDS exile, cunning, silence, Stephen Dedalus, *Ulysses*

Ex-position, Issue No. 48, December 2022 | National Taiwan University
DOI: 10.6153/EXP.202212_(48).0003

Li-ling TSENG, Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

The end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (hereinafter abbreviated as *P*) anticipated the birth of a formula regarding Stephen's new Irish art: the dicta of "silence, exile, cunning" were proclaimed to transgress the involuntary dictates of Irish home, nation, and religion and also to illuminate his future paths of artistic creation by forging "in the smithy of [his] soul the uncreated conscience of [his] race" (*P* 253). While according to Laura Pelaschiar "it is impossible to know whether the fictional artist Stephen Dedalus kept faith with his commitment to silence," she calls attention to the power of silence, "the 'only arms of defence,' for the creator James Joyce, who can be seen to masterfully execute the "rhetoricity of silence" in *A Portrait* (Pelaschiar 45). Even though carefully maintaining a distinction between Stephen Dedalus and James Joyce, in her concluding paragraph, Pelaschiar affirms Joyce's prospect for materializing Stephen's aesthetic of silence in the "Penelope" chapter of *Ulysses* (hereinafter *U*) (Pelaschiar, "Joyce's Art" 47).

When asked if Stephen has written something for the local Irish literary movement, Mulligan tells Haines, "Ten years. . . . He is going to write something in ten years" (*U* 10.1089-90). This blatantly self-reflexive and even metafictional prophecy, albeit coming from Stephen's arch-rival, entertains the conflation between the composition of *A Portrait* and that of *Ulysses*. After all, ten years from Bloomsday, Joyce was to start writing *Ulysses*. Thus, how Stephen, armed with his famous weapons of "silence, exile, cunning," actually fleshes out the subsequent artistic creation "beyond the pages of *Portrait*" (Tan 184) in *Ulysses* remains to be seen. My article seeks to scrutinize and evaluate the outcome of Stephen's implementation of the formula he discovered toward the end of *A Portrait* in forging his burgeoning art in *Ulysses*.¹

¹ Little critical attention has been paid in the studies of *A Portrait* and *Ulysses* to the particular adage form of Stephen's formula, or to the order of the dicta and the meaning of the adage to his art. First of all, "silence" is the hinge for S. Sim to situate Joyce in the latter's ushering in postmodern literature (Sim). Second, in a recent collection themed on Joyce's silences, no essay tries to connect silence with Stephen's art in *Ulysses* (Wawrzycka and Zanotti). What is more, "exile" alone, a prominent theme surfacing rather strikingly in *A Portrait* due to the autobiographical aura of Joyce's first novel, has understandably received abundant critical attention. For more on this, see Cixous, McCourt, and Gillespie, respectively, for their book-length studies. Worth mentioning is Jolanta Wawrzycka's essay "'The Fringe of His Line,'" which is a singular take on treating exile as a poetic metaphor, but her essay discusses only *Dubliners* and *A Portrait*. But in an earlier essay, Wawrzycka does investigate Stephen's "incomplete" ("Tell us" 245) artistic expression as a result of his recourse to exile at the end of *A Portrait*, a conclusion to which my argument concerning Stephen's performance in *Ulysses* is closest. Last but not least, "cunning" in itself is hardly a Joycean keyword, and it is so probably because of its use "according to the tradition of the marketplace" (*P* 188). My article seeks to examine Stephen's own formula with its three components intact, but I will apply an adjusted sequence in discussing his art in *Ulysses*.

Exile

While Stephen prescribed a particular sequence for the three dicta, or his arms of defense, toward the end of *A Portrait*, what figures centrally in the opening pages of *Ulysses* is a direct revoking of his middle dictum, the dictum of “exile”: instead of departure from nationalism-driven Ireland, Stephen stays put inside it. One key to unlocking the deadlocked paralysis of Ireland, as Stephen sensed in *A Portrait*, was to take on a willing exile from Ireland that cast specific nets from Irish Nationalism and Irish Catholicism to enmesh his libertarian inclination, as echoed by Gregory Castle’s remark that “[t]he trope of exile in *A Portrait* offers an elegant aesthetic solution to an ethical dilemma” (22). The opening of *Ulysses*, however, portrays exactly the failed telos of Stephen’s missionary external exile as he is the doomed recipient (albeit not without resistance²) of the blue French telegram summoning him back to Ireland. In effect, as Jolanta Wawrzycka argues, Stephen has eventually failed as a full-blown artist in that “[t]he actual *exile* of the artist is left out of the novel and the artist himself is left incomplete: he is the *artist manqué* . . .” (“Tell Us” 245). Then, tellingly, the enforced exile of “the wild goose, Kevin Egan of Paris” (*U* 3.164) strikes a deep chord with Stephen. Dwelling on the image of Kevin Egan, who is a doppelgänger of the rebellious Fenian John Carey and who “hides” “[i]n gay Paree” (*U* 3.249), Stephen in a nostalgic sentiment (“Remembering thee, O Sion”) laments that his compatriots “have forgotten Kevin Egan” and “not he them” (*U* 3.263-4), and his reenactment of Kevin Egan’s nodding “movement” of tilting his hat down on his eyes (*U* 3.439) evokes and even repeats the fatalistic disappointment surrounding both the recent collective Irish history and Stephen’s personal history. In effect, to have the Fenian exile’s disappointment loom large in the background of the morning of June 16, 1904, Stephen’s consciousness is helplessly entangled with or “still haunted by” (Villar-Argaiz 137), among other things, the net of Irish Nationalism. The critics mentioned below have all made pessimistic comments on Stephen’s repatriation. As Hans Walter Gabler points out, “The memories of Paris . . . circumscribe a new net, that of exile” in that “the Egans, father and son . . . define the condition of exile” for Stephen who, “[t]hrough fathoming the forlorn state of Kevin Egan . . . conveys his recognition of the threat of exile as that of yet another web of netting to be shunned” (62). Michael Spiegel notes that despite a great degree of the French bohemian influence, Stephen’s “thinking remains more fettered than free,” still tied to “the Irish roots he cannot

Stephen’s
New Irish Art
in *Ulysses*

² The well-known misspelled (or mis-recognized by Stephen) message of “Nother dying come home father” (*U* 3.199) in the telegram suggests that Stephen keeps an intuitive distance (“Nother” being doubly read as “another” or “other”) from the intended signified of “Mother.”

detach himself from” (96). While affirming Stephen’s journey through a cosmopolitan lens, Nels Pearson suggests that in moderniz-/internationaliz-ing his project of literary creation independently of geopolitical and national concerns, attempting to forge “a socially and morally liberated conscience,” Stephen cannot help but, once more, “absorb and channel [Dublin’s] suppressed speech” as his “short, ill-fated, and ironic exile” at the beginning of *Ulysses* shows (47). Andrew Gibson’s summary of Stephen’s newly developed condition emphasizes the sobering side of Stephen’s resolution made in his *A Portrait* phase: “Stephen’s condition is actually one of painful belonging rather than alienation” (39).

Hence, being summoned from Paris, Stephen relocates back to Ireland, with his prior announcement to flee still ringing true to readers of *A Portrait*. *Ulysses* opens with Stephen’s guilty feelings about not honoring his mother’s dying wish to repent and pray for her. His mother’s death is clearly responsible for his transition from being the non-compromising, rebellious artist-to-be at the end of *A Portrait* to being the “dreadful bard” (*U* 1.134) suffering from poverty and homelessness in the opening episode of *Ulysses*. At the end of “Telemachus,” Stephen decides not to return to his makeshift “home” at the Martello Tower, for it has been usurped by the Englishman Haines and his Irish compatriot Buck Mulligan: “I will not sleep here tonight. Home also I cannot go” (*U* 1.739-40). “Telemachus” ends with the suggestive word and image of “Usurper” (*U* 1.744), forcibly correlating Stephen with Prince Hamlet, Shakespeare’s tragic hero. As John King points out, just as Hamlet “has become . . . an exile . . . Stephen has exiled himself, too” (303). Michael Patrick Gillespie incisively identifies an existential crisis in Stephen’s exilic condition at the beginning of *Ulysses*: “Just as his dress affects a Hamlet-like representation, his attitude has encompassed a Hamlet-like disposition. He is no longer a part of the world that surrounds him” (109). The Hamlet association indicates that Stephen empathizes with the Danish prince’s existential crisis occasioned by having his throne usurped and then being doomed to exile to England. The opening three episodes of the “Telemachiad” section reveal Stephen’s grave sense of dispossession and internal exile (not only from his home property, home church, and M/motherland but also from his own existence), effectively displacing the external exile and constituting the core experience of his now being a failed exile and repatriate. The portrayal of the mental, exilic state of being shows how *Ulysses* deconstructs one of the younger Stephen’s means of approaching existential/creative independence. That is to say, his involuntary, mentally-distancing act of exile now replaces the voluntary, socio-politically-distancing stance of the earlier Stephen.

Cunning

To illustrate one complicated scenario involving the experience of exile (highly relevant to Stephen's), we can turn to Edward W. Said's depiction of the "median state" in which such a person exists: "neither completely at one with the new setting, nor fully disencumbered of the old, beset with half-involvements and half-detachments, nostalgic and sentimental on one level, an adept mimic or secret outcast at another" (49). Having seen Stephen's "nostalgic and sentimental" level³ in reminiscing over Kevin Egan's exiling existence in Paris, we may be rewarded by examining Stephen's role of being an "adept mimic" now in Ireland's "old setting" according to Said's prescription for the intellectual/exile type Stephen fits. This reading strategy amounts to implementing the third dictum of Stephen's old formula—cunning. The instruction was given in the quotation from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on the title page of *A Portrait*, and it is there that Stephen was (type)set to learn from the legendary artificer who is also his name's sake in his resolution to become an artist. Cunning, indeed, constitutes the essence of Stephen's future artistry. To put this dictum to task, on the opening pages of *Ulysses*, Stephen poses as a literary critic—arguably being a preparatory step toward becoming an artist: cunningly harking to Oscar Wilde's decadent image, he interprets the mirror that Mulligan is holding to shave with as "a symbol of Irish art. The cracked looking glass of a servant" (*U* 1.146). On the one hand, Stephen's crafty symbol-making bespeaks a sophisticated introspection into his present, or "modern" condition of "domestic service" (Gladstone 143) back in Ireland. Andrew Gladstone insightfully points out the critical revision that *Ulysses* makes on the portrayal of the artist—the cracked mirror as Stephen's symbol of Irish art should serve as "*Ulysses*'s gloss on Stephen's credo of exile in *A Portrait*, 'I will not serve,'" thus opening up the "continuing entwinement, in modernism, of aestheticism and domestic service" (143). Therefore, seen in Stephen's impressive symbol-making is not only a rehearsal (repetition) but also an almost wry revision (difference) of this entangling dialectic of involuntary servility vs. voluntarily exilic art that has surfaced thematically in *A Portrait*. On the other hand, to Stephen's credit, the cleverness in the analogy (albeit a borrowing) impresses Mulligan to the extent that Stephen is not only reminded of his rivalry with Mulligan but also reassured of his own "art" momentarily: "Parried again. He fears the lancet of *my art* as I fear that of his. The cold steel pen" (*U* 1.152-53). The naming of "[his] art" (*U* 1.152) exhibits

³ See also Gillespie for a fundamentally affect-oriented reading of all of Joyce's main novels in terms of how the "general feelings that beset exiles," chiefly "rancor and nostalgia," "shape[] the emotional forces evident in specific narratives [of Joyce's novels]" (28).

Stephen's self-congratulatory affirmation of his cunning appropriation of Wilde's image in his art of dialoguing on the early morning of June 16, 1904.

Cunning carries a double meaning of skill and deception, or, as Dana Badulescu proposes, it is "skill in deception" (30). The deceptive intention features Stephen's first fabrication, or mini-story telling in *Ulysses*, that is, his riddle of the fox burying his grandmother under a holly bush. Inspired by Christ's technique of preaching by the famous puzzle of "To Caesar what is Caesar's, to God what is God's" recorded in all the gospels except for John's, Stephen muses upon the impact of "a riddling sentence to be woven and woven on the Church's looms" (*U* 2.87) that Christ's riddle has engendered. The telling of the fox riddle meets with a confounding "silence" (*U* 2.110) from Stephen's pupils, for they cannot fathom the "darkness" that, in Stephen's typically heretic twist, shines "in brightness which brightness could not comprehend" (*U* 2.160). Disruption of the one-to-one or self-same correspondence underscores the crux defying the comprehension of his pupils/listeners. "A poor soul gone to heaven" (*U* 2.147) is the private clue to solving Stephen's riddle. While his mother's death still haunts his inner thoughts, this clue in the puzzle suggests a bridging between the death of his mother and the fox's burial of its grandmother.

In effect, Stephen's cunning in telling the fox riddle hinges on the fox's action of burying: It "scraped in the earth, listened, scraped up the earth, listened, scraped and scraped" (*U* 2.149-50). Even in the next episode, while seeing a wild dog scraping Sandymount beach, Stephen mentally transposes his earlier imagined behavior of the fox to the present, realist one for the dog: "Something [it] buried there, [its] grandmother. [It] rooted in the sand, dabbling, delving and stopped to listen to the air, scraped up the sand again with a fury of [its] claws" (*U* 3.360-63). We may detect many layers of complexity in this series of imagination and description. On the first level, the repeated action and image of "scraping" suggest burying and digging simultaneously. The suggestion of the fox digging its grandmother up defeats the intention of concealing and hiding her underground. The scenario that the fox-transposed-dog "scraped up the sand again with a fury of [its] claws" similarly indicates a compulsive need and urgency to reconcile these incompatible acts. Thus, designed in Stephen's first fictional creation of the riddle is such self-differential referentiality, a "darkness" that the "brightness" of one-to-one correspondence "could not comprehend."

Then, of significance is the second level of the complicated reading of the fox/dog's repetitive movements. It is noticeable that the fox "scraped . . . , scraped . . . , listened, scraped and scraped" and the dog "stopped to listen . . . , scraped." The two animals' actions of scraping and stopping to listen alternate. Suppose the scraping

is understood to carry the two contradictory meanings of showing and hiding (the body), stopping scraping puts one more negative check on the two irreconcilable meanings, further complicating and even unsettling the logic of self-same correspondence in logocentric signification. Thus, in the same vein as the mental distance from the M/mother-land in misreading the telegram bearing news of his mother's physical decline, in offering the so-called correct answer to the riddle, Stephen has performed a thrice-removed (hence, deceptive) riddle-solving skill by transposing his own mother's death to the fox's and then to the dog's burying of its grandmother.

Stephen, thus, demonstrates his "skill in deception" (Badulescu 30) by hiding his real message and defeating his naïve, non-comprehending pupils (as well as the reader). In fact, his fox riddle sends out the ultimate hidden message lying in the very nature of the action of scraping, as befitting Stephen's new artistry, which emphatically simulates pen strokes both inscribing and crossing out whatever writing or message emerges under those strokes. Such a "writerly" tendency will characterize Stephen's famous vampire poem, officially his first poetic creation described in *Ulysses* since completing his villanelle to E. C. in *A Portrait*. In that preceding novel, Stephen compared the Irish seductress type he saw in E. C. to the image of a lone bat: "a batlike soul waking to the consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness, tarrying awhile, loveless and sinless, with her mild lover and leaving him to whisper of innocent transgression in the latticed ear of a priest" (P 221). While this batlike image of the seductress was quite insidious in her dark and secret association, her lover became a victim not only of her spell but of puritan Irish Catholicism. Thus, the dark image of the batlike girl was necessarily entangled with Stephen's repugnance for his country as "she was the figure of the womanhood of her country" (P 221). Experiencing intense poetic inspiration as it "enfolded him like water with a liquid life" (P 223), Stephen did demonstrate his feat in mastering the intricate form of the villanelle for expressing his desire and distaste toward his eternal temptresscum-muse. The cyclical format of the villanelle genre, among other things, served to express such ambivalence toward the addressee.

Significantly, in "Proteus," Stephen resumes using the bat-related, vampire image when starting to compose a "new" poem. However, after going through several revisionary procedures, the result of his creation is suspended in "Proteus" and not disclosed until one hour and four episodes later in "Aeolus." The revelation of Stephen's first literary work since *A Portrait* takes place significantly in "Aeolus," an episode highlighting the newspaper typesetting process. After delivering Deasy's letter to the editor, who mocks Deasy's toilet routine on seeing the torn letter,

Stephen fleshes out, as it were, in his stream of consciousness a reproduction of the quatrain he composed on Sandymount that morning. These four lines are typeset in a print-perfect way, equipped with the correct typographical arrangement (the first word capitalized in the line and line breaks), a version which, though fitting the newspaper mode of this episode, begs the question of whether this corresponds to “the scribbled note” which Stephen has written with a pencil, together with which Stephen crammed “into a pocket” after completing it in “Proteus” (*U* 3.438). Even though it is in “Aeolus” that Stephen’s rewriting of Hyde’s translation of “My Grief on the Sea” and the recycling of the vampire image are identified, in comparing these two episodes and examining Stephen’s claimed revision of “Must be two of em . . . Mouth to her mouth’s kiss” in “Proteus” (*U* 3.400), the “narrative omission” is indeed a “major” one on hindsight, as Fritz Senn notes (86). Thus, by delaying the disclosure of the “full text,” Joyce enables Stephen to implant textual gaps and hints of textual volatility in executing his literary genesis.

The bit torn off Deasy’s letter is significant in that it provides Stephen with a literal margin to pin down his writing. Given the power structure framing Deasy the headmaster vs. Stephen the paid teacher in “Nestor” and given Deasy’s letter on the outbreak of the disease to the editor symbolizing the “over-rehearsed, national-historical obsession from which Stephen is ‘trying to awake’” (Pearson 34)—hence written symptomatically in a cliché-ridden manner⁴—to overwrite it, albeit in its small corner, does suggest and highlight Stephen’s different and unpatriotic approach to dealing with this Irish matter. However, Stephen himself is, after all, skeptical of the efficacy of his art thus created, admitting that his “scribbled note” is at best “[s]igns on a white field,” rendering problematic the intended reading of “these written words” “anywhere” (not least in Ireland) (*U* 3.414-15), let alone by fellow Irishmen. Ultimately, appearing “frightened and anxious” (Rathjen 146), Stephen acknowledges that his ashplant, which is a self-imposed symbol for his developing artistry, “will float away” and “pass on, passing chafing against the low rocks, swirling, passing” (*U* 3.454-56).⁵ Granted, both of Stephen’s writing materials, given the “disposable and ephemeral” surface (McArthur 646) of the torn end of a letter and the light marks made by the pencil, are a pragmatically insufficient and fickle means to record and secure the fruits of his

⁴ Nels Pearson points out that Stephen spots in Deasy’s arguments “tired clichés” or “truths elaborated by untruths” such as “the Galway harbor scheme,” which Deasy considers as being delayed forever by “England’s conspirational subversions of Irish industry” (33).

⁵ Friedhelm Rathjen considers Stephen wielding his ashplant as a potential writing “weapon” in chapter 3 and even later in chapter 9 where Stephen “appears to be more offensive” and tends to be passive and limp, and “not phallic at all” (146).

creation. What is more, the posture “[t]urning his back to the sun he bent over far to a table of rock and scribbled words” (*U* 3.406-07) to “[p]ut a pin in that chap” (*U* 3.309) ultimately brings forth all the issues involved in his first literary genesis in *Ulysses*. The rock serving as his writing table will naturally create difficulty for him when he is trying to write down his message in pencil on a scrap of paper. Besides, the actual posture of turning his back to the sun ironically suggests that the writing scene must take place in the dark, not properly shedding light on the message. Jed Deppman cleverly proposes that Stephen’s bent posture—“Hunched, self-occluding, and scribbling in *darkness*”—conjures up the figure of “a distracted Bartleby,” the scribe in Edgar Allan Poe’s story (160; emphasis added). Significantly, Stephen, once more, stakes out an identification with the un-logocentric, un-theological darkness found in Christ’s eyes when Christ tells his parable, which is theologically associated with the Jews’ sinning against the bright light of Christianity, with whom Stephen sides when he retorts, “Who has not [sinned against the light]?” (*U* 2.373), challenging Deasy’s antisemitism in “Nestor.”

Furthermore, the pale vampire image Stephen draws from the Irish folk tradition for his poetic subject matter engages a complex dialectic. Reminiscing over but reversing his earlier bat-girl-Ireland association in *A Portrait*, in his quatrain, Stephen seems to identify with the incestuous vampire lover who sails across the (Irish) sea (from France) to kiss and suck blood from his dying Irish victim (his mother).⁶ However, Gian Balsamo interprets the blood fluid sucked from Stephen’s mother as her “infertile matter of the menses flowing from her vaginal lips” (423), emphasizing that the “waste with which Stephen identifies the maternal body, and of which he attempts to feed the vampire of his quatrain” shows Stephen dwelling on the “putrefying” matter which is “the opposite of transubstantiation” (423). The waste image, indeed, recurs in Stephen’s performing the bodily function of urination and nose picking in the wake of his writing action—a sequence which Deppman interprets to show that Stephen’s performance in “Proteus” “realigns poetry-writing with human waste, the delivery of words to the world taking place as an evacuation or ejaculation” (162), erupting the “stability” of the vampire poem “on or off the paper” (160). In brief, Stephen’s creation and performance in “Proteus” come across as a “poetics of execration” (Deppman 161). Thus, the “oo-eeehah” issued from his “unspeached” breath (*U* 3.403) suggests “the gaseous origins of Stephen’s poem” (Deppman 162). What cohere in these creations of Stephen’s—that is, “urine, snot, and Stephen’s note”—are the “biodegradable” “waste

⁶ Jefferey A. Weinstock pinpoints that in the “artistic creation” of the vampire, Stephen expresses his subconscious, “forbidding wish, the desire for the carnal, the desire for the mother” (359).

products” that “lose their integrity the moment they might mingle with the external world” (Deppman 161-62). According to Deppman, Stephen’s art is in effect scatological: the scrap Stephen creates is comparable to the “toilet paper to wipe his mind” (162).

Aside from the cloacal metaphors, Stephen’s choice of poetic matter further confounds his intended literary showmanship. Murry McArthur incisively traces Stephen’s anti-climactic metamorphosis from *A Portrait* to *Ulysses*: “Borrowed from the speech of the folk, Stephen’s poem is a perfect example of the ‘uncreated conscience of [his] race.’ In ‘Proteus’ we are given a direct representation of the process of literary creation in the ‘smithy of my soul,’ and that process does not produce an original work of art, but a copy of other copies” (633). The crux of the matter is precisely the “derivative status” (McArthur 648) of Stephen’s literary genesis. He borrows his subject from the Irish folk songs, a subject highly revered by the Celtic revivalists whose taste dominates Stephen’s time in college in Part V of *A Portrait* and Dublin’s popular press in “Aeolus.” When accounting for the source of the letter he delivers, “Stephen answered, blushing, The letter is not mine” (*U* 7.530). His blushing suggests many folds of emotions. First is his confession of acting as the “Bullockbefriending bard” (*U* 7.528), imaginarily accused by Mulligan against his serving as a “dogsbody” to deliver Deasy’s letter. Then, after disclosing (to the reader) and confirming the result of his poetic creation carried out on the letter’s broken end both in his internal speech and in his conversation with the editor, Stephen does, in blushing, smack of admitting to not only his guilt about epistolary vandalism but, perhaps more importantly, his lack of ingenuity when it comes to writing. His work turns out to be a tertiary rendition of an “original” Irish folk song: he chooses to work on Douglas Hyde’s secondary copy, that is, his English translation of the Gaelic original. Thus, a similar (at least) thrice-removed scenario governing the fox riddle is, too, at work in Stephen’s vampire poem, as if deliberately subverting the *Portrait*-specific mission of the birthing of artistic ingenuity. If of any significance, Stephen’s current art or cunning, as shown in the writing of his vampire poem, proves to be derivative, unoriginal, and self-differential.⁷

Insofar as Stephen demonstrates his newly developed art, “Aeolus” is a crucial episode revealing two examples which showcase his new cunning way of writing. One is the above-mentioned summation of the derivative vampire poem he

⁷ An extremely negative critique from Julian Murphet is a case in point. He evaluates Stephen’s poetic composition on the model of Rancière’s politics of literature as an “exhausted distribution of the sayable” in the “tropology and style of the decadent 1890s,” hence rendering his poem “worthless both aesthetically and politically” (219).

scribbled down one hour earlier on the beach. The other is Stephen's impromptu story creation, namely, the Parable of the Plums. Rather like the fickle circumstances surrounding the scene which depicts the writing of Stephen's vampire poem, the genesis and delivery of his second creation in *Ulysses* are almost random and structurally inconsequential. It is noticeable that Stephen enacts a "mobile" mode of storytelling when he and Professor MacHugh, his first listener (to be joined by Crawford and O'Molloy), walk toward a pub. Rather true to life, his storytelling is immediately interrupted by two newsboys' sporadic yelling of the day's racing special, but the next series of interruptions are an openly textual affair. After cueing in his conversation with Professor MacHugh that he has a "vision too" (*U* 7.917), Stephen also beckons the reader to the coming about of his parable: this first takes place on the page under the boldface caption of "Dear Dirty Dublin" (*U* 7.921), and then his tale seems to officially begin with the single word "Dubliners" (*U* 7.923). Standing alone without punctuation marks, the term "Dubliners" designates that it comes from Stephen's thoughts. Joyce's readers will reckon that this reference to Joyce's first fictional work is a good indicator of Joyce the arch-creator transmuting his hallmark intertextual and cross-references to Stephen, the new Irish artist. Besides, practically speaking, this single line of "Dubliners" can mislead the reader into assuming that it functions as a would-be title to Stephen's new story since it opens the storytelling. In short, it is a deliberate and cunning "false start" which appeals to metatextual consciousness on the readers' part.

Right after Joyce's textual/Stephen's mental reference to "Dubliners," Stephen's internal streams of consciousness rush to intrude on the opening of his storytelling. Consequently, four discontinuous paragraphs are used to narrate roughly one-half of his parable, occupying less than twenty-five lines of textual space (*U* 7.923-51) before being interrupted textually by the reported action of Bloom under the captioned section of "Return of Bloom," who arouses vulgar words from the editor. This interruption of Stephen's act of talking, as a result, affects the size and makeup of Stephen's audience in reality. During Stephen's mobile delivery on the street, his audience keeps moving, too, in number. The first listener was Professor MacHugh. Crawford and O'Molloy join the audience after Bloom returns to the library to clinch the Keyes advertisement renewal with Crawford. At this point, Stephen's story resumes with four short paragraphs two pages later (*U* 7.1002-28).

Stephen's delivery of his short-story officially ends with his audible bodily reaction: "He gave a sudden loud laugh as a close" (*U* 7.1028). The "ineluctable modality of the audible" (*U* 3.13) may suggest embarrassment over the lack of a proper sense of ending to his story because the story ends abruptly with two Dublin women spitting plum stones between the railings high up on Nelson's Pillar.

Myles Crawford's confused reaction, "Finished?" (*U* 7.1031), openly nods to a sense of (disappointing) non-conclusion embedded in the plot. Stephen's loud laughter on the street reminds the reader of his visible blushing when he recalls the content of his vampire poem in the press office earlier. An eerie sense of *déjà vu* may surface in the repetition of Stephen's extreme bodily reaction to his own created works.

Even though audibly showing his embarrassment over his "inconclusive" story, Stephen nonetheless impresses Professor MacHugh insofar as the latter identifies the strain of sophist cunning, on account of this orator's acerbic and bitter temperament, in the former's storytelling technique. This impressionable gesture reminds the reader of the self-lauding formed after Stephen's clever imaging of the cracked mirror at the beginning of "Telemachus." However, the two designated titles of "A Pisgah Sight of Palestine" and "The Parable of the Plums" are seriously delayed in time, of which the false start of the title-like word "Dubliners" has reminded the readers. They are added or supplemented, as it were, long after the delivery of the entire story, as if they appear as Stephen's afterthoughts, if not nudged by Professor MacHugh's "imperial, imperious, imperative" (*U* 7.486), Latinate entitling on his behalf (*U* 7.1056).

From the attention-diffusing, outdoor setting in which Stephen's storytelling takes place to the shifting attention it draws from his varying audience, and to according open-ended titles to the story, Stephen demonstrates that randomness governs his new art of storytelling and fiction-making. It is a non-teleological mode of thinking at work, inviting haphazard disruptions of a linear unraveling of a holistic story. When offering a semblance of teleology, Stephen strategically uses the Old Testament story and the New Testament parable to convey his hidden meaning. Finally naming his tale "A Pisgah Sight of Palestine," Stephen conjures up a Mosaic vision of the promised land as confirmed by Professor MacHugh's quasi-epiphanic moment that he can "see" where Stephen's inspiration comes from: "Moses and the promised land. We gave him that idea" (*U* 7.1061-62). As shown in "Nestor," Stephen has praised Christ's unorthodox telling of the dark/un-logocentric parable of "To Caesar what is Caesar's, To God what is God's" to preach the gospel. In alternatively naming his story "The Parable of the Plums," which features two Dublin spinsters' joyful, masturbatory, but infertile acts of spitting or disseminating plum stones onto the Dublin environs, Stephen expresses a clear intention to crack open the collusion between religion and politics as criticized by Christ's parable and to deconstruct his fellow Irish Nationalists' presumption of the Christian-centric prospect and revelation of the promised land. To wrap up, we may find that the dictum of cunning in the formula of Stephen's new Irish art

undergoes a meaningful twist in its execution in *Ulysses*. His vampire-lover poem and the Parable of the Plums share a heavily metatextual move, that is, the emphatic derivation of existent art—one from an English-translated Gaelic poem and the other from the biblical parabolic genre.

Silence

Unlike exile and cunning, whose practice in literary terms in *Ulysses* is less examined by critics, silence, Stephen's first dictum, has notably received much critical attention. Taking Joyce's technique of stream of consciousness as a point of departure to argue for the weaponry of silence exercised by postmodern literature, S. Sim suggests that Joyce's modernist narrative innovation is to crack open "that part of ourselves that we normally keep *silent*, our inner thoughts; becoming a revelation of the unsaid in consequence" (128; emphasis added). That is to say, Joyce's new narrative technique in *Ulysses* aims to highlight the silence that underlines the protagonists' thoughts. "Proteus," featuring nothing but Stephen's internal thoughts, puts forward Joyce's new aesthetics of silence at its utmost. However, in his subsequent presence in "Scylla and Charybdis," Stephen appears to take the opposite path, speaking volumes and breaking "the unsaid" and silence that have defined his presence in "Proteus." I argue that *A Portrait's* first dictum of silence materializes as a dramatic enactment in Stephen's reimagination of the literary heritage of Shakespeare in "Scylla and Charybdis," bringing the bard's otherwise silenced life/history back to light.

Literary progeny or autogenesis has preoccupied Stephen's mind since "Proteus." Even though claiming unbelief in Christianity as he does to Haines in their intellectual conversation in "Telemachus," he nonetheless shows himself being obsessed with its doctrine of "[c]reation from nothing" in "Proteus" (*U* 3.35) after conjuring up the midwife images for the two women crossing the strand. This aspiration toward acquiring divine creative energy has arguably borne fruit in his impromptu creation of Parable of the Plums, which, in featuring two "vestal virgins," may have been directly inspired by his early morning sighting of their sisterhood, as Gillespie reminds us (118). The second time, on the spur of the environs, too, Stephen will play with his creativity's potential in fictionalizing Shakespeare's life.

It is highly significant and symptomatic that Stephen's vociferous verbalization in "Scylla and Charybdis" takes place against the background of his forced silence and alienation due to his being left out of the Revivalist gathering, which even Mulligan is attending with George Moore's kind invitation "to bring Haines" along (*U* 9.306), "at Moore's tonight" (*U* 9.274). Even though Stephen's non-abiding

attitude toward the Gaelic League-led Irish language and literature movements has been widely publicized among his peers at UCD in *A Portrait*, the fact that he is now excluded from George Moore's Irish-themed meeting which all the literati members seen in the setting of National Library are expected to attend is reason for great disappointment (Norris 4). Significantly, instead of traditional Irish or Gaelic literature (as in his rewriting of the English-translated Gaelic love poem in "Proteus"), Stephen targets the master of English literature, William Shakespeare, to deliver his literary theorization.

As early as in "Telemachus," from Mulligan's sneak announcement to Haines that "Wait till you hear him on Hamlet" (U 1.487), Stephen's long-harbored theory on Shakespeare and Hamlet is made known to the reader: "He proves by algebra, that Hamlet's grandson is Shakespeare's grandfather and that he himself is the ghost of his own father" (U 1.555-57). The reader, though not the intended Haines, will be eventually given the complete forum for Stephen to deliberate on his Hamlet and Shakespeare theory in "Scylla and Charybdis." Unlike the haphazard circumstances surrounding the delivery of his earlier Parable of the Plums, this long-awaited symposium featuring Stephen, the self-initiated guest speaker, is surprisingly in extended progress early in the afternoon at the National Library, where Stephen conducts intellectual discussions and debates with representatives of the Irish intelligentsia in full swing. "Scylla and Charybdis" turns out to be a discourse delivered by Stephen now, literally wearing his "Hamlet hat." Openly going against the theory of the "independently self-creating," "self-involved," "more closed-off and withdrawn artist" (Slote 132, 133, 137) whom the younger Stephen proposed as the ideal model of authorship for the dramatic form in *A Portrait*, Stephen now interprets Shakespeare's dramatic works as fundamentally autobiographical. He suggests a heavy, albeit distorted, biographical bearing in many of his plays, *Hamlet* above all culminating in this biographical drive. The utmost self-referentiality is bestowed on the creating artist, for "the artist [does] weave and unweave his image" (U 9.377-78). In Stephen's theory, Prince Hamlet is the transmigration of the soul onstage of Shakespeare's dead son Hamnet Shakespeare (U 9.883). In creating or fathering Hamlet, Shakespeare "was not the father of his own son merely, but . . . he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson" (U 9.867-70). As an almighty author, Shakespeare not only re-creates, or brings back to life, those who are dead like his own son (i.e., into Hamlet), but also promises to flesh out all possible, new figments of his creations.

Many critics agree that Shakespeare plays a key role in conducting "an exploration of potential actualities from the room of infinite possibilities" (Cheng 145)—

an Aristotelian philosophy Stephen holds dear about its toying with the “imaginative possibilities” (Cheng 143), which may unlock nightmarishly limited/limiting interpretations from his feared subject of history. In “Nestor,” an episode centered on history lessons for which he plays the ineffectual role of the pedagogue, Stephen struggles with history’s ruthless totalizing force, which he thinks banishes “the infinite possibilities” (*U* 2.50-51) in a creative person’s imagination and which, he claims, emulating Aristotle, “must be a movement then, an actuality of the possible as possible” (*U* 2.67).⁸ That is to say, in “Nestor,” Stephen enacts “counterfactual” (Norris 16) or counter-historical thinking when he philosophizes, “Had Pyrrhus not fallen by a beldam’s hand in Argos or Julius Caesar not been knifed to death” (*U* 2.48-49), and he insists that these so-called “never were” (*U* 2.52) thoughts “are not to be thought away” (*U* 2.49), because they are teeming with “infinite possibilities” (*U* 2.50-51). Now in “Scylla and Charybdis,” his “what if” philosophizing bodies forth all that has gone *silent*, toying with “things that were not: what Caesar would have lived to do had he believed the soothsayer: what might have been: possibilities of the possible as possible: things not known” (*U* 9.349-50), among which the “playful creation of possible worlds” (Norris 16) of Shakespeare’s real life captures his totalizing imagination. He boldly offers an “alternative to factual history” in “letting go of known history and speculating about Shakespeare” (Cheng 143).

Margot Norris observes that Stephen’s theorization of the correlation between Shakespeare’s life and work factors in “the now, the here” (8) or so-called “local color” (*U* 9.158), that is, the “Elizabethan London [which] lay as far from Stratford as corrupt Paris lies from Virgin Dublin” in Stephen’s verbalization (*U* 9.149-50), as Stephen’s comparison hinges on autobiographical affinity with both Paris and Dublin in the recent course of his life. Norris’s observation is echoed by those of critics such as Michael Spiegel, who emphasizes Stephen’s interpretation of Shakespeare’s art as a move of “historicizing” it by “rooting it within the writer’s personal milieu” (94). In a similar attempt to affirm and amplify the relevance of the here and the now, Richard Brown even identifies the “day in mid June” (*U*

⁸ In analyzing Stephen’s history pedagogy as exemplified in “Nestor,” David W. Janzen provides a useful distinction and definition for the two forms of the Aristotelian concept of *dunamis*—i.e., “the more basic form is the *capacity* to produce change” and “the exercise of this capacity is movement or kinesis” (17), and potentiality this is “a *way of being* something,” or “a *way of being* that exists alongside, or as a remainder of, the actual” (18). Even though Stephen uses the term “movement” in his interpretation of Aristotle’s theory, in his reflection on history (in “Nestor”) he seems to be toying more with Aristotle’s second idea of “potentiality,” namely, “things” that “could have been otherwise” (19). Here my (as well as the cited critics’) argument for explaining the significance of Stephen’s Shakespeare theory is also inclined toward the second sense of “potentiality” in the Aristotelian *dunamis*.

9.154) when Stephen sets his imagination free to conceive of the “imaginative possibilities” of Shakespeare’s journey to London to be June 16, 1604 (125).

As already shown in his implementing the arms of exile and cunning, Stephen’s artistic practice in *Ulysses* has always revolved around representing the here and now of the Irish Nationalist Dublin, where he is staying put and toying with the Gaelic elements in literature that galvanize the country’s cultural debates. Even though analyzing *A Portrait* from a post-colonial perspective, Gregory Castle’s reminder and qualification that Stephen resolves to create a conscience that is primarily “new rather than . . . national” (21) is still illuminating for our examination of the quality of Stephen’s art in *Ulysses*. The “newness” demonstrated in the specific case of “Scylla and Charybdis,” to be sure, lies in Stephen’s fictionalizing capacity that allows vast room for reinventing the given or prescribed biographical record even at the cost of believability. Hence, when asked by John Eglington if he believes in his own theory, Stephen’s prompt negative reply can be interpreted to cohere with his habitual awareness of keeping the correspondence between the signifier and the signified open and flexible, in line with the “differential—relational and thus relevant—knowledge” (Renggli 50), evident in both his vampire poem and Parable of the Plums.⁹ Norris’s identification of Stephen’s method of reimagining the possible connection between Shakespeare’s life and art and “keeping the historical past in the view of ‘the now, the here’” as a hallmark of his “new Irish art” (8; emphasis added) serves as an apt conclusion to this section on Stephen’s practice of breaking the silence in *Ulysses*. In other words, by imagining alternative possibilities for being shaped by the here and the now of Bloomsday in Dublin, Stephen giving voice to the silence embedded in the scant record and history of Shakespeare’s life evinces the culmination of Stephen’s new Irish art in *Ulysses*.

It is evident and impressive that Stephen steps beyond *A Portrait* into carving out the future text world of *Ulysses* in artistically implementing the three dicta he has imagined to bolster his burgeoning art. *Ulysses* does encapsulate the direction of Stephen’s new Irish art: it is self-differential in spirit, being exilic, derivative, and toying with potentiality.

⁹ John Gordon proposes that “Stephen’s ‘[n]o’ is really more of a ‘not yet’” and sees Stephen’s theory “a work in progress” still entertaining visions and revisions like a “dramatic performance” (502). In a similar spirit, conducting a deconstructive inquiry, Gabriel Renggli interprets Stephen’s “No” as showing “Stephen (and Joyce) to be aware of the limited significance of the issue he ostensibly addresses” and emphasizes that Stephen is keen on “exploring the productiveness of what is not known, of the lacunae that open up in the homogeneity of the self-evident” (49).

WORKS CITED

- Badulescu, Dana. "Autobiography as Fiction in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." *Linguaculture* 1 (2011): 29-36.
- Balsamo, Gian. "Mourning to Death: Love, Altruism, and Stephen Dedalus's Poetry of Grief." *Literature and Theology* 21.4 (2007): 417-36.
- Brown, Richard. "Joyce's 'Single Act' Shakespeare." *Pelaschiar* 107-27.
- Castle, Gregory. "'Terrible Queer Creatures at the Latter End of the World': Joyce's *A Portrait* and the Global *Bildungsroman*." *James Joyce Journal* (2016): 1-29.
- Cheng, Vincent. "History and Possibility: Shakespeare and the Stage in *Finnegans Wake*." *Pelaschiar* 140-60.
- Cixous, Hélène. *The Exile of James Joyce*. Trans. Sally A. J. Purcell. New York: D. Lewis, 1972.
- Deppman, Jed. "The Problem of Genesis." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies* 8.2 (2007): 150-73.
- Gabler, Hans Walter. "Narrative Rereadings: Some Remarks on 'Proteus,' 'Circe,' and 'Penelope.'" *La Revue des Lettres Modernes* (1988): 57-68.
- Gibson, Andrew. *Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics, and Aesthetics in Ulysses*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Gillespie, Michael Patrick. *James Joyce and the Exilic Imagination*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2015.
- Gladstone, Andrew. *Fictions of Autonomy: Modernism from Wilde to De Man*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Gordon, John. "Getting Past No in 'Scylla and Charybdis.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 44.3 (2007): 501-22.
- Janzen, David W. "Potential Unfettered: Narrative Transformation as Historical Transition." *English Studies in Canada* 43.2-3 (2017): 13-32.
- Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: Viking, 1964.
- . *Ulysses*. New York: Vintage, 1986.
- King, John. "Trapping the Fox You Are(n't) with a Riddle: The Autobiographical Crisis of Stephen Dedalus in *Ulysses*." *Twentieth-Century Literature* 45.3 (1999): 299-316.
- McArthur, Murry. "'Signs on a White Field': Semiotics and Forgery in the 'Proteus' Chapter of *Ulysses*." *ELH* 53.3 (1986): 633-52.
- McCourt, John. *James Joyce: A Passionate Exile*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 1999.
- Murphet, Julian. "Ineluctable Modality of the Sensible." *Rancièrè and Literature*. Ed. Grace Hellyer. Edinburg: Edinburg UP, 2016. 207-25.
- Norris, Margot. "The Stakes of Stephen's Gambit in 'Scylla and Charybdis.'" *Joyce Studies Annual* (2009): 1-33.
- Pearson, Nels. *Irish Cosmopolitanism: Location and Dislocation in James Joyce, Elizabeth*

- Bowen, and Samuel Beckett. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2015.
- Pelaschiar, Laura. "Joyce's Art of Silence in *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." Wawrzycka and Zanotti 33-49.
- , ed. *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2015.
- Rathjen, Friedhelm. "'The Ashplant is Stephen's Bloom-ing Rod': Stephen, Bloom, and Seamus Heaney on Sandymount Strand." *Irish Company: Joyce & Beckett and More. Edition ReJoyce* 31-32 (2010): 143-50.
- Renggli, Gabriel. "Specters of Totality: Reading and Uncertainty in Joyce's *Ulysses* and Borges's Fictions." *Journal of Modern Literature* 41.2 (2018): 42-59.
- Said, Edward W. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Vintage, 1996.
- Senn, Fritz. *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Sim, S. *Manifesto for Silence: Confronting the Politics and Culture of Noise*. Edinburg: Edinburg UP, 2007.
- Slote, Sam. "Loving the Alien, Egoism, Empathy, Alterity and Shakespeare Bloom in Stephen's Aesthetics." Pelaschiar 128-39.
- Spiegel, Michael. "Is Modernism Really Transnational? *Ulysses*, New Cosmopolitanism, and the Celtic Tiger." *Cultural Critique* 90 (2015): 88-114.
- Tan, Ian. "Ways into Joycean Silences: Reviewing James Joyce's *Silences*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 42.4 (2018): 183-88.
- Villar-Argaiz, Pilar. "The 'Unfettered Freedom' of 'Flitting Bats': The Inoperative Community in James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 52.3-4 (2015): 115-40.
- Wawrzycka, Jolanta. "'The Fringe of His Line': Metaphors of Exile in Joyce." *Joyce Studies in Italy* (2018): 167-77.
- . "'Tell us, Aren't you an Artist?' (*SH* 26)—Revisiting Joyce's *Kunstlerroman*." *Joyce Studies in Italy* (2017): 233-47.
- Wawrzycka, Jolanta, and Serenella Zanotti, eds. *James Joyce's Silences*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.
- Weinstock, Jeffrey A. "The Disappointed Bridge: Textual Hauntings in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 8.3 (1997): 347-69.

**Manuscript received 18 Apr. 2022,
accepted for publication 8 Sept. 2022