

CDU 820.09

Original scientific paper

Accepted for publication on 15th September 1995

## Faulkner and Joyce: A Joint Narrative/Stylistic Protocol

Sorja Bašić  
Faculty of Philosophy  
University of Zagreb

The central thesis of this paper rests on the assumption that the works of James Joyce and William Faulkner reveal striking and up to now insufficiently explored affinities if we see them as clustering around and veering between two contrasted yet often paradoxically merging narrative/stylistic poles. The first one which is psychological and expressive and usually related by critics to the rise of the »stream-of-consciousness novel« has received considerable though still insufficient attention. The other affinity – which is revealed in the feats of hypertextuality enacted in the »lexical playfields« of the later *Ulysses* chapters and Faulkner's mature fictions ranging from *Absalom, Absalom!* to e.g. »Old Man« and most notably *The Hamlet* – has passed unnoticed. The paper is an effort to redress this imbalance.

One way of approaching the works of modernist novelists and their narrative strategies in particular, is to see them as textual battlefields – and marriage-beds – in which representability and unrepresentability are pitted against one another or joined in paradoxical coexistence. One aspect of this duality, singled out in this study as paradigmatic of modernist narrative, is the specific juxtaposition and fusion of two radically different strategies: one of them still striving for closure, completion and the construction of meaning; the other pervaded by undecidability and critical awareness of (literary) difference, resulting in subversion and transgression.

The argument of this paper rests on the assumption that the work of James Joyce remains the supreme example of this modernist phenomenon, but that among English and American novelists William Faulkner is closest to Joyce in his often bottomless combinations of widely (and wildly) differing narrative, stylistic and thematic strands. The works of William Faulkner – like those of James Joyce – cluster

in analogous fashion around two radically opposed narrative/stylistic complexes, following an analogous trajectory along a »continuum« of richly nuanced and graded variants/combinations of the two, spanning the experiential and figural with the narratorial hypertextual (parodic) and subversive poles. The first narrative/stylistic strategy, which often generates intense (poetic) expressiveness, tends to involve the reader; it relies on focalization, free indirect style and interior monologue, as well as a »sensationalist« use of images and metaphors. The second complex is marked by distancing strategies, with tendencies that are overtly auctorial, hypertextual (parodic) and ludic, and which in Faulkner especially also strongly rely on the insistent, often blatant foregrounding of the act of telling.

The first narrative/stylistic complex dominates in Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, and prevails in the earlier episodes of *Ulysses* (up to »Wandering Rocks«). Its modes concentrate on representing consciousness and mind, focalizing the narrative through the characters and keeping narratorial mediation in check. In addition, this pole is marked by strong psychological motivation and a tendency to use language as »experiential« activity: it remains basically illusionist and creates reader-involvement.

Reading the other half of *Ulysses* or some – not all – of Faulkner's later works – for example *The Hamlet*, *Go down Moses*, »Old Man«, even *Intruder in the Dust*, our involvement in the psychologically motivated personal worlds of the characters is obstructed. In spite of the fact that *The Hamlet* or the »Eumaeus« episode in *Ulysses* are literally crammed with stories of human figures, they are explicitly or implicitly also crammed with represented acts of storytelling – with figures of narration overtly engaging our attention in their own right. This type of narrative is always auctorial, clearly diegetic and distancing. However, the many critical attempts to define the nature of the narrative in for example »Oxen of the Sun«, »Sirens« or Eumaeus«, have often brought more confusion than elucidation. Readers, namely, have difficulties in identifying narratives which do not proceed from a narrator who directly interferes with the story, or from one who interferes directly in the discourse (like Sterne, Diderot or the contemporary metafictionalists), but rather from a disembodied Genettan »narrative instance« – generating a rich jumble of voices, modes, styles, often consisting of frank imitations of (their own and other writers') previous voices and styles. In these narratives the personal author/narrator is hidden behind stylistic and structural textual variants juxtaposed in unprecedented variety, which seem to screen the contingencies of the human stories, and even the writers' own authorial persons. These narratives rely on deliberate breach of decorum as well as on excess, extravagant selection, agglomeration, alternation and juxtaposition of styles and literary kinds/genres, as well as of their strategies and structural elements. Often looking like mere »tricks of the trade« (Faulkner), these must also be seen as strategies of survival for modern and postmodern fiction, disguises used by authors in an age of profound epistemological and ontological crisis, attempts to cope with what Wolfgang Iser has called »das

Zerfallen von Repräsentation«, and Jean-François Lyotard the »withdrawal of the real«. These subversive tendencies dominate in the later work of Joyce and Faulkner, but they are also part of an everpresent subversive, distancing current built into every page ever written by either of them, remaining a distinct feature of their brand of modernism. Even through an early chapter such as »Proteus« there runs an insidious distancing countercurrent, and the two strategies can never be completely separated within any of the episodes or chapters, nor can we neatly divide *Ulysses* into two parts, or completely divorce *The Sound and the Fury* from *The Hamlet*. However, in spite of being intertwined all along, these two tendencies can be separated and used to mark certain vital distinctions within our writers' oeuvres, as well as to establish fascinating analogies between their work, both in the earlier and later stages.

Critics have mostly acknowledged the early similarities in the field of figural, stream of consciousness writing, while the connection between Joyce's and Faulkner's later distancing hypertextual (even metatextual) strategies has been generally ignored. This paper sets out to redress this critical imbalance by tracing the pattern of correspondences right through the entire narrative/stylistic continuum of Joyce's and Faulkner's work, with special emphasis on the later distancing strategies.

## II

*The Sound and the Fury* can be discussed as the most representative example in Faulkner of the expressive narrative/stylistic strategy, with its involving figural writing tending towards an »excess of consciousness« (Lyotard's *au trop de temps*). In its simplicity the Benjy section might be taken as Faulkner's elaboration of what he found in the early paragraphs of »Calypso« (»Duke Street. Here we are. Must eat. The Burton. Feel better then... 138): a kind of infant internal monologue to be compared to the infant forms of free indirect style in the childhood episodes of *A Portrait*. The first three internal monologue sections are minimally narrated, minimally told, and so is the fourth section in spite of its third-person mode and rhetoric (in it we do not get one single glimpse of the thoughts and emotions of any of the characters, and such glimpses, as we well know, are the basic prerequisites of omniscience). With a nod in Hemingway's direction, and a bow in the direction of *Ulysses*, Faulkner created original versions of interior monologue in *The Sound and the Fury* and *As I Lay Dying*, then for all intents and purposes dropped the mode, just as Joyce did in the latter part of *Ulysses*.

Brian McHale has reminded us very aptly that free indirect style was marked by mimetic traits but was also an »index of literariness« This is even more true of interior monologue which depends to an extremely high degree on standards of psychological verisimilitude and mimesis of speech/thought, yet is also extremely artificial mainly because, simulating direct access to »mind stuff« in its pristine state, it must as a rule abandon the backbone of narrative: the temporal sequence of events. The mimetic affiliation of e.g. »*Calypto*« or Quentin's section in *The Sound and the Fury* is also both enhanced and obscured by eminently »poetic« techniques such as compression, allusiveness and metaphorical density, and often subverted by great mannerist and rhetorical foregrounding, and hypertextual elaboration which in Faulkner include the author's playing with *diegesis*. In figural presentation character is all-important, but also often distanced by literariness, as if set in amber. Thus Stephen's interior monologue in »*Scylla and Charybdis*« flouts verisimilitude and in Quentin's section there is extreme difficulty (always distancing) created by the superposition of various, not readily decipherable chronological levels, as well as syntactic violations comparable to those in *Ulysses*. Thus »To. Martha. I. Must. Write.« – where punctuation is imposed above syntax – has a direct counterpart in Faulkner's rendition of Quentin's dialogue with his father (»and he do you consider that courage and i yes sir dont you ...«, 218), where punctuation is suppressed.

Just as in *Ulysses*, in *The Sound and the Fury* we have three interior monologues, differing widely in style and scope, both complementary and antithetical, consonant and dissonant. Each of these monologues is a veritable tour de force. Apart from the fact that their content is dictated by the vagaries of nearly automatic memory and by very personal, even idiosyncratic emotions in various stages of inchoateness (traditionally seen as structural criteria of the mode), they are also monologues by more formal Genettan criteria: readers placed in the person's mind from the very beginning and denied any grammatical references to the source of speech/thought.

In *Ulysses* it is within one novel, one chapter, one passage, even within one and the same sentence, that the reader is often boldly bounced and buffeted or slyly persuaded to move back and fro between stylistic, narrational and other extremes. One of the greatest modulations and intertwinements is that of shifting focalizations, as well as of the merging of the authorial and figural idiom, which takes us from psycho-narration, free indirect speech and their various contaminations, to a host of types and degrees of interior monologue. All these modes constitute the repertoire of the first narrative/stylistic strategy, which in *Ulysses* is most easily discernible in the early Stephen and Bloom episodes (including Bloom's segment in »*Nausicaa*«).

In spite of the everpresent subversive countercurrent, in the early Stephen and Bloom episodes and in *The Sound and the Fury* illusion and involvement are supported by the strictly figural mode of the narrative, from which the narrator has nominally disappeared in spite of the fact that the artifice looms large. In the narrative convention interior monologue was a new mode, but once installed both in *Ulysses* and *The Sound and the Fury* it remained rigorously true to the figural perspective. Stylistically Faulkner is more »mimetic« than Joyce in his monologues: his characters are stylistically consistent throughout, while as we so well know, the monologic techniques of Stephen and Bloom vary from episode to episode.

*Absalom, Absalom!*, comes closer to *Ulysses* in the subversive inconsistency of its figural idioms (even when refracted through Quentin's monologue) and their intricate mannerist encrustations (the mannerisms differ but they are mannerisms nevertheless!). The sentence of *Absalom* meanders and shimmers before us both like a mimetic simulation (analogue) of speech/thought and as a monster in literary space, travelling mysteriously to and from the reader, involving and distancing him in turn. The narrative of *Absalom* differs from the late *Ulysses* chapters, where the story must be inferred from the hypertextual even metatextual jumble of styles, devices and genres (although it is also in turn constructed by them). Here the »excess of the book« (Lyotard's *au trop de livre*) proceeds from a specific and inextricable jumble of figural voices, which are often neither imitative nor consistent, but rather mannered, outsized, meandering, chameleonic, subject to unaccountable and unpredictable constructions.

The narrative transmission of *Absalom* is a puzzle which transcends the complexity of *The Sound and the Fury*.

In addition, in this novel telling is both the strategy and subject of the narration which makes it less mimetic than its predecessor. The telling is often extremely rhetorically artificial and self-conscious, and this has already been sufficiently stressed by critics. What has been insufficiently stressed, however, is the deliberately formalist foregrounding of the mechanics of telling: an abundance of dashes and brackets, interpolations and afterthoughts intruding in both story and discourse and, quite specifically, of formal narrative indexes – »inquit« formulas (an incredible amount of literal notations of saying and telling and thinking and guessing) which break the illusion of involvement with the figures. Thus *Absalom* features a very special narrative blend in which the techniques of overt telling seem to be fused with monologues, so much so that almost all the narrations by other characters (not just those marked by the author as such by italics) can be seen as processed through Quentin's monologue. In this »monologue«, however, there is no stylistic consistency, reminding us of the blatant breach of such consistency in the late *Ulysses* episodes. Moreover, the voices of the »narrations« (Rosa, Sutpen, father, Shreve) as well as the (ostensible) monologue both tell and (more ramblingly) talk aloud (soliloquize?),

speak in the manner of thinking, think as if they were formally soliloquizing (Judith: »If happy I can be I will, if suffer I must I can« 121). Thus all three: telling, talking and thinking are often transposed into formalized, rhetorical, *written* idiom, more removed from psychological and idiolectic verisimilitude than *The Sound and the Fury*.

Studying Joyce, one is aware of several modernist narrative fusions: the mergers of third person narration and monologue (Stephen and Bloom), the inside/outside recreation of sensations and emotions (Bloom in »Lestrygonians« for example), the contaminations of narrated perception and narrated monologue, and generally the mergers of authorial discourse and figural speech in free indirect style (achieving matchless vituosity in *A Portrait*). In analogy with these Joycean mergers, *Absalom* stands out as a new exemplary case of complexity in the field of narrative transmission. It can be placed alongside *Ulysses* at the hub of the modernist wheel, the centre in which many narrative paths converge. As a specific merger of narration and interior monologue resulting in an extremely intriguing unsettling of the narrating instance, it is analogous to an important aspect of *Ulysses*, on a somewhat narrower but on the whole more complex scale. In this perspective, and apart from any sweeping evaluations, *Absalom, Absalom!* appears in every respect more original (Joyce-free) than *The Sound and the Fury*, a veritable narrative maze. Telling its stream and streaming its tale, this masterpiece both entices and defies narrative/stylistic categorization.

Like Joyce, William Faulkner is thus a master-creator of modernist narrative labyrinths. Of the two Joyce is the supreme experimenter in that each of his four fictional works is utterly different from all the others in the narrative/stylistic sphere: having read one you do not necessarily recognize the other. Unlike Joyce's, Faulkner's voice never loses its one unmistakable rhetorical ring, but the narrative structures of his novels are extremely varied. In fact the complexity and variety of the narrative modes used in his oeuvre has hardly been surpassed by any of his peers. Both in Joyce and Faulkner varied and paradoxical combinations occur within individual works, chapters, episodes, down to individual sentences. In spite of this, the chronological unfolding of their work shows analogous trajectories from figural mimesis to auctorial (hypertextual) diegesis, moving from involving to distancing strategies.

Chronologically placed between *The Sound and the Fury* and *Absalom, Light in August* is another extraordinary yet different narrative hybrid. *Absalom, Absalom!* stands as a kind of climax, in which mimesis and diegesis, internal and external speech/thought representation seem to mutually envelop and reflect one another, but remain intensely figural throughout. *Light in August*, on the other hand, is governed by a more strongly externalized perspective, and is in that respect a bridge between

the earliest work (e.g. *Sartoris*), and the tendencies which prevailed after *Absalom*. It is as complex as *Absalom*, but its complexity is of a decidedly different order. Its narration is rather firmly authorial on the whole; along with the tragically intoned presentations of the three main protagonists, this novel is also an interesting early affirmation of a new comic and communal type of telling, often involving rather overt description of events and mind processes. Regardless of whether one gives this comic narrative ascendancy over the presentation of the tragic triptych of Christmas, Joanna Burden and Hightower, the amount and variety of diegesis found in this novel must be considered as a significant formal property foreshadowing Faulkner's development after *Absalom*, with his narrative shifting firmly towards the pole of distancing hypertextuality.

Considering all this, one wonders why, in spite of common (though still insufficiently elaborated) critical agreement about analogies between their »stream-of-consciousness« writing, the later Faulkner is rarely related to Joyce. Representative in this sense is the opinion voiced by Michael Millgate, an excellent Faulkner critic, that »in the years following the spectacular technical experimentation of *The Sound and the Fury* and *As I Lay Dying* Faulkner seems, on the whole, to have engaged in a deliberate suppression of identifiably Joycean elements in his language and technique ...« (»Faulkner's Masters« 149). It is a major claim of this paper that some of Faulkner's later works function in ways comparable to the great later episodes in *Ulysses*, by generating a sense of critical difference, a specific awareness of literariness. These texts deconstruct the unifying, totalizing, heightening and involving aspects of the experiential and stream-of-consciousness writing of both our authors, embracing instead devices which are ironic, discrepant, disrupting, often seemingly capricious and arbitrary. This results in the subversion of realist transparency as well as modernist subjectivity and expressiveness achieved by highlighting the psychologically unrelated plurality of their fictional discourses and narrative conventions: piling them up, using them »in excess«, juxtaposing them, throwing them together pell-mell, often caricaturing their features to the breaking point of illusion. This mix of modes and styles is hypertextual and implicitly metatextual, indicating that narratives are produced by telling, that the ideal of unity can be upheld no more, that no closure or description – literal or allegorical – is final or complete.

In Faulkner *The Wild Palms* is an excellent example of this Joycean distancing protocol of strategies. Juxtaposed in it are the experiential and internally focalized text of »Wild Palms« and the overt telling of »Old Man«, where the authorial narrator is clearly in charge of the story from its first parodic sentence: »Once (it was in Mississippi, in May, in the flood year 1927) there were two convicts«...

One of the convicts is tall and gaunt, the other is short and plump, just like Pat and Patachon, and we never learn their names. This detail alone indicates that the interest in character has shifted. As if in total contrast to the involvement with the tragic heroes required from us in »Wild Palms«, the story of the tall convict operates both on the level above, which is mythic, and the level below which is populist, primitive. The tall convict is one of the numerous simpletons and innocents peopling Faulkner's later fiction, who are placed in a basically comic, hyperbolized and fable-like framework – like the protagonists of »Cyclops« or »Eumaeus«. In the low-life setting and terseness of folk idiom there is much realism, but on even more numerous occasions such narration clashes with other contrasting devices, for example the sheer fabulous element of such episodes as the convict's alligator hunting. In this story there is also a new insistence on certain improbable, ludicrous and always trivial incidents. There is for example the scene in which the short convict disappears from the rushing boat by clinging to a tree overhead, »vanishing violently upward like in a translation out of Isaiah«, while the tall convict, who had fallen into the water and managed to regain the spinning boat at last »grasped the stern, the drag of his body becoming a rudder to the skiff, the two of them, man and boat and with the paddle perpendicular above them like a jackstaff, vanishing from the view of the short convict (who had vanished from that of the tall one with the same celerity though in a vertical direction) like a tableau snatched offstage intact with violent and incredible speed« (143).

There is a strange new coldness (distance) in such matter-of-fact, swift narrating told as if by the character, but overlaid with narratorial rhetoric (»celerity«, »a translation out of Isaiah«), always at odds with the simple-minded protagonists, and therefore unflinching though benignly ironical and distancing.

*The Hamlet* – Faulkner's most representative example of the hypertextual distancing manner – is preeminently marked by a »Joycean« jumble of narrative and stylistic protocols, in units ranging from micro-structures (cliches, redundancies and repetitions, puns, fixed epithets), to large juxtaposed textual segments, often imitative or parodic of the conventional elements of entire genres or types of literature (the folk tale, family saga, pastoral, Poesque horror, mythic parable etc.), without however resorting to any more sustained imitations of any recognizable authorial style. The importance of analogous »jumbles« in the later *Ulysses* chapters (music, catechism, women's pulp novels, journalese etc) has been sufficiently recognized in recent Joycean criticism, and need not be elaborated at this point. Let us therefore turn to Faulkner where this recognition has been lacking. He was probably referring to this strategy of »mixed« modes and styles speaking in one of his University of Virginia classes:



I think that the moment in the book, the story, demands its own style and seems to me just as natural as the moment in the year produces the leaves. That when Melville becomes Old Testament, Biblical, that seems natural to me. When he becomes Gothic, that seems natural to me, too, and I hadn't, really hadn't stopped to think, Now where does one change and become another? (*Faulkner in the University*, p. 56)

I think it tells a lot that he mentioned Melville at this point, because – with the collection of quotations at its opening, and the insertion of »scientific« descriptions of whales and whaling, etc – *Moby Dick* was indeed an early example of the »excess« found in Joyce and Faulkner. True, one is confused by Faulkner's stressing the *naturalness* of these changes in style, but entitled to dismiss it, I think, either as one of his obfuscations or the expression of his strongly personal feeling that whatever is good for him is also »natural«. Just as by saying repeatedly that he always told one story, retelling it over and over again he made his claim for universality, but perhaps also admitted his parodic intent: the need to tell a story in many different ways which also involves repetition of others' and one's own writing, in other words, parody and self-parody.

Just like in *Ulysses*, Faulkner in *The Hamlet* often uses – and twists – the conventions and devices, the norms and effects hallowed by tradition and built into the expectations of early twentieth-century readers, such as consistency of character presentation and motivation, verisimilitude of figural speech, significant symbolism, allegory and mythic allusion, along with a whole array of stylistic devices. The »twisting« is another hypertextual strategy: the writer builds up the effects required by a convention or device, then destroys them by exposing them as conventions and devices. On the other hand, Faulkner's later phase, although analogous in function and effect to the »other half« of *Ulysses*, seems and perhaps still is, closer to »traditional« storytelling. Being less conspicuously new, its difference has received little critical attention and still remains to be explored.

Thus, the commonly held thesis of Faulkner's »return« to realism and tradition cannot be accepted *en bloc*, but it remains true to some measure and of some books: *The Wild Palms* is more traditional than *Absalom, Absalom!*, and *The Town* and *The Mansion* are certainly more traditional than anything he ever wrote after *Sartoris*. And in certain ways *The Hamlet* can also indeed be seen as following the convention of the realistic family saga, and specifically a story of low peasant life dealing with unsophisticated »country matters«. Its dialogues often follow the rules of verisimilitude and descriptions are held in check by wry country humour. On this level the novel deals with the doings of the local merchants and usurers, the daily life of poor farmers and sharecroppers, the ginning of cotton, the frustrations of men »curdled« by poverty and turning into criminals: the old (naturalist) story of social injustice and local colour rendered with great attention for mimetic detail. *The Hamlet* contains a number of related stories

conforming to these realist/naturalist standards, well-rounded, motivated, moving, creating reader-involvement: this applies in particular to the story of Houston, to many elements in Ab's and Mink's story, as well as the role of witness/focalizer played by Ratliff. Compared to the creative shock achieved by the early masterpieces such as *Sanctuary* and *The Sound and the Fury*, many of these aspects can be seen as a return to »straight« and rather old-fashioned storytelling, even perhaps as signs of regression, of Faulkner's inability to proceed in his arduous experimental path.

In my view of the novel, however, this realist strand is only one, albeit important block in its narrative structure, standing in precarious and often subversive juxtaposition with often parodically rendered aspects and segments of fable, allegory, tall tale, myth, grotesque horror story, trivial pulp literature and rhapsodic parodic patterning. Furthermore, the realistic potential of the novel is also subverted by the numerous embedded stories, e.g. those told by Ratliff at various points: Ratliff tells old Will Varner the story of young Ab Snopes trading his team for his wife's separator and the story of the horse injected by and painted by Pat Stomper's nigger; the story of de Spain's rug and the burning of the barn is told by Ratliff to Jody; while the narrator himself tells the story of the spotted horses along with several anecdotes. All of these can be related to the convention of oral folk storytelling, which subverts the realistic level of the novel owing to its archaic character. This archaic folk element can be tied in with the fairy-tale and mythic level of *The Hamlet* where Eula is represented as a kind of deity, and a sleeping (sweet-potato-eating) princess waiting for her prince; while Flem, the white trash usurer, the frog-like creature that will never be metamorphosed into a prince, is also Vulcan, the inferior mate (whose lameness is transferred to his father Ab in truly postmodernist fashion like a filing or typing error!). These effects are closely analogous to Joyce's use of Irish mythology, Homer and the Bible, for example in *Cyclops!*

On the micro-level of *The Hamlet* such implicitly metafictional patterns are created along several lines. For example, one set of effects is created by recurring stereotypes and clichés (characters, their dress, tics, habits) which cannot all be assigned to the unimaginative repetitiveness of tired writing but should perhaps be seen as a kind of parodic echoing and multiplication of conventional devices: Flem's cloth cap and grey trousers, his chewing and spitting, Varner's white mare, the invariably grey and shapeless dresses of the village wives, the men squatting on the store gallery. Most of them begin like realistic details, but by dint of repetition end up as endlessly replicated Warholian soup cans and Marilyn faces, serialized, mechanical and intermirroring.

In *The Hamlet* there is also an inordinate amount of self-quotation which deserves closer study: the good country people seemingly looking at nothing yet seeing everything; McCarron sleeping on the same pallet with his negro companion in boyhood, growing up handsome, yet disreputable, handling a pistol, like Dalton Ames; Eula as flowing immemorial female; Ratliff the sexless bachelor observer; the digging of gold as in »The Fire and the Hearth«; the succession of buggies and carts and surreys, the Odyssean ships of Yoknapatawpha, sailing upon seas of dust; and the ubiquitous animals, from meanest mule to regal hound and at least one flying horse. All these remind us of Faulkner's other books (fictions pointing to other fictions) as much as they refresh our knowledge of Yoknapatawpha, and tell us of human character and the world.

It is often difficult to decide whether the repetition is suggestive or just tired, an accidental oversight or intentional self-parody. On the whole there is less involvement: the numerous references to the choking summer dust in *The Hamlet* never reach the integrative poetic intensity of the passage describing Quentin's and Miss Rosa's last ride to Sutpen's Hundred; and seeing the hulking figure of Ike trailing his toy on a string cannot compete with the shock of our first belated vision of Benjy and his empty, intensely blue gaze. They are all, of course, versions of Faulkner's »one story« told over and over. But they are later versions, often exposed as devices, signs, Faulkner's trademarks, formal strategies which just like Joyce's, do not allow the critic to ever completely drop a »formalist« approach.

We register the allegorical references and appreciate the elements of realism, caricature, grotesque humour, archaic folk yarns and descriptive elements or poetic renderings; however, beyond all these, our reading generates a distancing meta-effect which prevents the full recovery of either symbolic or literal meanings, signalling the breakdown of representability which Iser has diagnosed in Joyce. Seen in this perspective *The Hamlet* can be compared to some eclectic agglomeration of forms and styles put together by a postmodern architect relying on the deliberate use of mixed quotations, some of them archaic. Because *The Hamlet* would lose some of its specific newness if some of its devices were not so frankly archaic! There is an essential sense in which the ways and means of this novel do not hang together, remaining slightly off-centre and mutually subversive. This novel is thus a self-reflexive assemblage of narrative repertoires apart from being an (un)inhabitable house of fiction.

The styles and functions of the various parts and aspects of *The Hamlet* are mismatched like Ratliff's team: the mismatching is of course the deliberate work of a genius. In this Faulkner is like Joyce. Poised between poetic mythic potential and its empty conventional shell, between realism and mannerism, naive archaic motifs and sophisticated use of language, these writers also force us to be aware of the functioning of their texts. Apart from referring to ideas and moral values, social and historical facts

and truths of the human heart, their language is a massive system of references to other languages, based on literary repetition and requiring awareness of critical difference.

From the point of view of character presentation the »Circe« episode in *Ulysses* may be as important for our understanding of Bloom or Stephen as are the episodes of »Telemachus« or »Calypso«. And Flem's story is as important for our understanding of Faulkner's vision of the South as is Jason's monologue. However, as critics we must be aware that in »Circe« or *The Hamlet* this understanding is elicited by radically different strategies. We must remember that modernism was a narrative/ stylistic garden of at least two forking paths: one following the intricate caduceus of the mind; the other leading to the lexical playfields of contemporary hypertextuality.

Faulkner himself generally played down Joyce's influence. When he admitted it, for example in a talk at Nagano, he limited it to »the tricks of the trade«. We might even be content to take him up on that, considering the immense importance that these »tricks of the trade« had acquired in the work of these two fiercely experimental modernists and in the two analogous narrative/stylistic complexes developed by them. Comparing Joyce and Faulkner, critics have mostly dealt with their introversions into the mind and their preoccupation with consciousness, while the similarities of their distancing parodic and hypertextual strategies have been neglected. This paper has indicated, I hope, the need to redress this critical imbalance, by finding new points of contact between these two modernist literary giants. By placing *Ulysses* alongside a provisional composite mega-artefact entitled *The Dying Sound of the Old Man in the Dust of the Hamlet*, and using the terms of comparison developed in this paper, one should be able to gain a sense of their doubled greatness in similarity and similarity in greatness. After all, it is in these very »monsterpieces« that one finds the best interior monologue ever written in any language, as well as some of the very best »new« parodic writing produced by any modernist or postmodernist.

#### SELECTED LITERATURE

- BAHTIN, Mihail. *Marksizam i filozofija jezika*. Beograd: Nolit, 1980.
- BARTHES, Roland. »L'analyse structurale du récit«. *Communications* 8. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1966.
- BENSTOCK, Bernard (ed). *The Seventh of Joyce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- BLEIKASTEN, André. *The Ink of Melancholy: Faulkner's Novels from »The Sound and the Fury« to »Light in August«*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
- BRADBURY, Malcolm and McFarlane, James (eds.). *Modernism 1890–1930*. New York: Penguin, 1976.
- BROOKS, Cleanth. *William Faulkner. The Yoknapatawpha Country*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963.

- CULLER, Jonathan. *Flaubert. The Uses of Uncertainty*. Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell UP, 1975.
- FLAKER, Aleksandar. *Stilske formacije*. Zagreb, 1976.
- FOWLER, Doreen and Abadie, Ann J. (eds). *Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha: Faulkner and the Craft of Fiction*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1987.
- GENETTE, Gérard: *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*. Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell UP, 1980.
- GENETTE, Gérard. *Palimpsestes*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1983.
- GUERARD, Albert J. *The Triumph of the Novel: Dickens, Dostoevsky, Faulkner*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- HASSAN Ihab & HASSAN Sally (eds.). *Innovation/Renovation. New Perspectives on the Humanities*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.
- HUTCHEON, Linda. *A Theory of Parody. The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms*. New York/London: Methuen, 1986.
- ISER, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.
- KENNER, Hugh: *Joyce's Voices* London: Faber & Faber, 1978.
- LYOTARD, Jean-Francois. »Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism?« *Innovation/Renovation* etc, pp. 329–341.
- MILLGATE, Michael. »Faulkner's Masters« *Tulane Studies in English*, Vol. 23, 1978.
- MORELAND, Richard. *Faulkner and Modernism: Rereading and Rewriting*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.
- RIMMON-KENAN, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics*. London/New York: Methuen, 1983.
- THOMAS, Brook. *Joyce's Ulysses: A Book of Many Happy Returns*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1982.
- VAN BOHEEMEN, Christine (ed.). *Joyce, Modernity and Its Mediation*. Amsterdam, Atlanta GA: Rodopi, 1989.
- VIDAN, Ivo. *Roman struje svijesti* Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1971.
- WAUGH, Patricia. *Metafiction. The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London/New York: Methuen, 1984.
- WEINSTEIN, Philip. *Faulkner's Subject: A Cosmos No One Owns*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- WERNER, Craig Hansen. »Dubliners« *A Pluralistic World*. Boston: Twayne, 1988.
- ZMEGAČ, Viktor. *Povijesna poetika romana*. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1987.

## JOYCE I FAULKNER: ZAJEDNIČKI NARATIVNO-STILSKI PROTOKOL

Središnja teza ove rasprave počiva na uvjerenju da djela Jamesa Joycea i Williama Faulknera otkrivaju veliku srodnost, posebno ako u njima pratimo stapanje i sukobljavanje dvaju stlisko-narativnih strategija: prva je psihološka i ekspresivna, a kritika joj je posvetila stanovitu mjeru pozornosti, posebno u sferi »romana struje svijesti« (npr. usporedba unutarnjeg monologa u ranim poglavljima *Uliksa* i u Faulknerovoj *Buci i bijesu*). Druga srodnost proizlazi is strategija hipertekstualnosti i jezične igre koje prevladavaju u kasnijim poglavljima *Uliksa* kao i u Faulknerovim zrelim romanima, od *Absalome, sine moj!* do *Uljeza u prašinu* ili *Zaselka*. Rasprava ukazuje na taj kritički propust i uspostavlja neke tentativne parametre uspoređivanja.