

Elisabetta Cecconi

"Whatdoyoucallhim" (U 73): The naming system as a reflector of social DIS-UNION between Bloom and the Dubliners

1. Objects and aims of the analysis

In this essay I shall take into account conversational instances of social DIS-UNION between Bloom, the perverted Jew of Hungarian origin, and the community of Dubliners which he comes across on 16th June 1904. In particular, I shall concentrate on the characters' use of address and reference terms in two of the most socially connoted episodes of *Ulysses*: "Hades" and "Cyclops". Attention will be given both to the Dubliners' way of addressing/ referring to Bloom and to Bloom's naming of them. Given that forms of address and reference can mirror the complex social relations of individuals in a speech community (Keshavarz 2001: 6), their usage will help our understanding of the characters' attitudes towards each other.

Though crucial, the naming system is not the only marker of Bloom's marginalization in the novel. Other strategies have in fact been used by the author in order to highlight Bloom's ostracism from the Dublin circle. In "Hades", for example, Joyce relies on the lexical repetition of the adverb "behind" and the verb "followed" in order to stress Bloom's spatial *last-ness* as a sign of his alienation from the rest of the group. In the same episode, an analysis of turn-management and turn-distribution among characters confirms the Dubliners' disregard for Bloom. Only on a few occasions, in fact, turns are allocated to him and when he self-selects, his moves are often interrupted or simply not attended to.

Bearing in mind that the principal factors predisposing to intimacy – and thus SOCIAL UNION – are shared values derived from ideology, identity of occupation and interests, sex, religion and nationality, the analysis will show to what extent Bloom's ostracism from the Dublin Catholic community is primarily determined by the Dubliners' perception of him as Jewish.

Prior to analysing the naming system employed by Bloom and the other Dubliners, I shall distinguish address from referent terms and I shall account for the analytical framework within which such items can be examined.

2. Address terms and analytical framework

Oyetade states that terms of address are "words or expressions used to designate the person being talked to while talk is in progress" (1995: 515). Address terms include pronouns, nominals and verb forms (in English the latter corresponds to the imperative form).

Pronominal address is generally characterised by the opposition of the intimate, familiar pronoun designated as "T" (from Latin *tu*) and the distant, formal pronoun designated as "V" (from Latin *vos*). After English lost its ancient pronominal differentiation *thou/you*, the intimacy – distance dichotomy has been mainly preserved in its nominal address system and it is precisely this class that will be most closely examined in the course of this analysis.

Nominal address forms comprise names – i.e. last name [LN], first name [FN] and title last name [TLN] – kinship terms, titles, occupational terms, terms of endearment and insults. Since in the two episodes Bloom and the other characters usually address each other by means of names, particular attention will be given to the socially-marked usage of LN and FN.

As to functions, forms of address are generally used to initiate and maintain social contact between speaker and addressee in the course of the interaction. In this sense they play a crucial role in the definition of the speaker-addressee relationship. They can, in fact, trigger off "the general attitude of the speaker towards the addressee", "the speaker's opinion about the degree of intimacy with or closeness to the interlocutor" and finally "the speaker's judgements about properties of the addressee" (Zwicky 1974: 795).

Having indicated the nature of address terms, I now wish to account for one of the principal models of analysis known as classical address theory. The model is based on the seminal studies of Gilman and Brown (1958), Brown and Gilman (1960), Brown and Ford (1961). In analysing address terms, the authors refer to a dual axis comprising vertical and horizontal dimensions and describe address term usage along this axis as being respectively the "power semantic" and the "solidarity semantic". While the "non-reciprocal power semantic" concerns address between speakers of different status or age, "reciprocal solidarity semantics" is a means for differentiating address among power-equals on the basis of their degree of intimacy/solidarity. Given that Bloom and the Dubliners are acquainted adults with no considerable difference in status or age, their relationship will be primarily assessed on the basis of the horizontal dimension.

The solidarity semantic envisages that interlocutors who have something in common exchange the "T" of intimacy, whereas those who feel distant reciprocate the "V" of formality. In the realm of nominal address usage, Brown and Ford found FN reciprocation in case of intimacy and solidarity between speaker and addressee, TLN reciprocation in case of new acquaintance and – more interesting still for the purpose of my analysis – the enduring reciprocal LN in cases where a mutual "tension" between interlocutors block the natural progression to intimacy (1961: 237).

The social implications governing the solidarity semantic will prove of paramount importance for the account of the different

degree of intimacy characterising respectively the Bloom – Dubliners and the Dubliners – Dubliners relationship.

3. Reference terms

Terms of reference need to be distinguished from address terms as the former refer to persons spoken about rather than to persons spoken to. Like address terms, they include pronouns, nominal forms and rather complex noun phrases.

Referential nouns convey information about properties of the person referred to and some of them contribute to the speaker's self-presentation, functioning as signals of his/her social status, education or group membership. Like address terms, the use of nominal referents indicates "attitude, politeness, formality or a particular role-relationship between the speaker and the referent" (Zwicky 1974: 796). This means that a nominal form can express the speaker's evaluation of a person in a nutshell (e.g. Bloom is referred to as "the prudent member" more than once) and, in some cases, highlight his/her mood or momentary feelings towards the person spoken about. In this sense, referent terms not only function to reflect a given relationship between speaker and referent but also contribute to its definition and further development. As Allerton claims: "in talking about persons, speakers tend to operate in a subjective rather than in an objective way with the result that the speaker's social and psychological standpoint ends up playing a vital role in the selection of an appropriate referring expression" (1996: 622).

In addition to the relationship existing between speaker and referent person, nominal descriptors involve two other important relationships which interestingly affect the speaker's way of referring to someone: a) the power/solidarity relationship existing between speaker and addressee and b) the power/solidarity relationship existing between addressee and referent person.

In cases where the characters refer to Bloom, evidence will show to what extent the power-equal solidary relationship existing between the speaking Dubliner and the addressed Dubliners – along with the power-equal *non* solidary relationship existing between the latter and the referent Bloom, are co-responsible for the speaker's selection of distancing, even derogatory referential nouns, which are generally approved of by the community.

4. Bloom's Jewishness

If Bloom is Jewish, he is a very particular kind of Jew indeed.^[2] Born in Ireland of a Christian mother and a Jewish father who converted, he was baptized a Protestant at birth and baptized again as a Roman Catholic in order to marry Molly. Despite his alienation from the Jewish tradition and his involvement in the Irish cause, he is designated and stigmatised as other through much of the day. The Dubliners' world-view – with its polarized system of absolute differences: black-white, English-Irish, Catholic-Jew cannot accommodate a hybrid like Bloom: a Jew is a Jew, no matter where he is born or with whom he sympathizes.

In his letter to Mercanton Joyce writes: "Bloom Jewish? Yes because only a foreigner would do. The Jews were foreigners at that time in Dublin" (Mercanton 1979: 208). Joyce needs to rely on Bloom's foreignness in general and on his Jewishness in particular in order to challenge the limited nationalist visions of his fellow countrymen and to denounce the re-iteration of the binary hierarchies inherited from their English oppressors. In the same letter Joyce describes the Dubliners' attitude towards the Jews: "There was no hostility towards them but contempt, yes the contempt people always show for the unknown". From Hades to Cyclops linguistic evidence will present Bloom as a victim of the Dubliners' low blows and verbal aggression.

5. Naming system in "Hades"

The "Hades" chapter assesses Bloom's place in society. Here for the first time we see Bloom as others see him. At the very beginning of the episode the character meets his companions – Martin Cunningham, Simon Dedalus and Jack Power – and together they enter the same cab to be transported to the cemetery for Dignam's funeral. Martin Cunningham and Mr Power are the first to take their seats. Once inside the coach, they address their friend Dedalus and select him as the next participant entitled to get in: "Come on *Simon*". Bloom lets him go first. When Dedalus too is inside, all the group appears to be there but the answer to Martin's question: "Are we all here now?" is clearly negative: Bloom is in fact still outside, waiting to get in. Hence Cunningham's exhortation: "Come along *Bloom*" (U 108-109).^[3]

From the beginning, the episode highlights the Dubliners' general disregard for Bloom. What is more, the chapter establishes a socially connoted disjuncture between the Dubliners' use of the FN to address Simon and their use of the LN to address Bloom. While in the first case, their selection of the FN indicates a sense of membership and comradeship with the interlocutor, in the second their use of the LN reveals a social distance and alienation from Bloom which can be traced back to his being perceived as a not completely integrated member of the community. Evidence in the text reveals that the practice of addressing/referring to Bloom with the LN is so rooted in this part of the Dublin society, that when Joe Hynes needs to write his full name for the funeral list, he has to ask: "What is your *Christian* name? I'm not sure" (U 141, my emphasis). In the context of use, the term "Christian" assumes quite controversial implications. Bloom is in fact a character who, despite his conversion to Catholicism, continues to be perceived as Jewish by the Community.

What happens – however – when Bloom addresses or refers to the Dubliners? Mostly, he opts for LN reciprocation or FN plus LN (for reference), thus contributing to the maintenance of mutual distance: e.g. "There is a friend of yours gone by *Dedalus*, he said" (U 109); "Yes Bloom said. He's behind with *Ned Lambert* and *Hynes*" (U 111); "I met *M'Coy* this morning [...] He said he'd try to come" (U 112). "Always in front of us *Corny Kelleher*, laying a wreath at each fore corner" (U 130).

Although Bloom is in many respects an Irishman, on several occasions he validates his alienation from his fellow countrymen in order to preserve a sense of self, that at times includes himself as a Jew (see Schwaber 1999). [4] Consider for example his use of *their* for referring to the Catholic hypocritical sense of devoutness in "Lotus Eaters":

She [Martha Clifford] might be here [church] with a ribbon round her neck and do the other thing all the same on the sly. *Their* character. That fellow that turned queen's evidence on the invincibles he used to receive the, Carey was his name, the communion every morning (U 100, my emphasis)

Some time later Bloom uses the same distancing possessive for referring to all Irish Christians, who are no good at playing cricket: "Donnybrook fair more in *their* line. And the skulls we were acracking when Mc Carthy took the floor" (U 107).

Linguistic evidence suggests that at times Bloom appears to be proud of his Jewish origins. Nonetheless there are also moments in which "his own Jewishness does not seem to incline him to communality or easy friendliness with other Jews" (Schwaber 1999: 85). On their way to the cemetery, the characters catch sight of Reuben O'Dodd, the Jewish money lender. After insulting and mocking him, the Dubliners recognise that they have all appealed to him at times: "We have been all there", Martin Cunningham said broadly. His eyes met Bloom's eyes. He caressed his beard, adding: 'Well nearly all of us' (U 117). Martin's clarification excludes Bloom from the Irish Community of debtors ("all of us") and implicitly associates him with Dodd and the Jewish Community of creditors, or at least of "prudent members". In "Cyclops" the character is labelled as an usurer *in primis* by the citizen who refers to him as "That chap? Beggar my neighbour is his motto" (U 433) and then by the I-narrator: "mean bloody scut" (U 443). Quite ironically, even the character's concern for the Dignam widow's fund gives the Dubliners the opportunity to stereotype him as a modern Shylock. His money-collection – far from being praised as a noble act of solidarity – is portrayed as a cunning stratagem for (in Lenehan's words) "Defrauding widows and orphans" (U 438).

Returning to Dodd's appearance in "Hades", we find that Bloom seems to deny any kind of kinship with him. He even attempts to gain his audience's favour by telling a comic and disparaging anecdote about the Jew's son. His behaviour triggers off a desire for social acceptance in the company, which necessarily requires an act of overt alienation from other Jews. Problems however remain as the gentiles reject Bloom's claim for membership with them. This is evident from an analysis of their turn-management. Bloom introduces the anecdote about Dodd's son but when he reaches the *moment of cloU* i.e. the mockery of the Jew, he is interrupted by Martin Cunningham who takes his turn and brings the joke to successful completion:

- Yes, Mr Bloom said. But the funny part is ...
- And Reuben J., Martin Cunningham said, gave the boatman a florin for saving his son's life.(U 118)

The way in which Bloom is deprived of his conversational floor is indicative of his weaker status in the group and confirms his ostracism from the Dublin Community. Since the character is not recognised as an "authentic Dubliner", his attempt to assume solidarity with them miserably fails. In the characters' mind Bloom remains a hybrid – neither a Jew nor a gentile, or in Andrew Gibson's terms, "a non-Jewish Jew and a non-Irish Irishman" (2002: 55).

This is not the first time Bloom keeps his distance from other Jews. In the early morning he is at Duglacz's to buy some kidney. When he sees "the pile of cut sheets: the model farm at Kimerth", he immediately recognizes that the pork butcher too is a Jew: "I thought he was" (U 71). Nonetheless he decides to remain reticent: "A speck of eager fire from foxeyes thanked him. He withdrew his gaze after an instant. No: better not: another time" (U 72). It is generally acknowledged that Joyce tends to rely upon omission for emphasis and in this case, Bloom's silence provides further evidence of his general reluctance to engage in easy comradeship with Jews. [5]

Another instance of SOCIAL DIS-UNION between Bloom and the Dubliners occurs later on when John Henry Menton qualifies him as a "coon": "What did she [Molly] marry a coon like that for?" (U 127). His selection of the derogatory term for designating Bloom in front of the other Dubliners suggests a sort of tacit agreement between the speaker's and the addressees' conceptualization of the referent. In Schegloff's words, "the selection of a location formulation requires of a speaker an analysis of his own social and psychological location and of the location of his co-conversationalists" (1972: 105). This means that Menton relies on the Dubliners' approbation of the insulting term for qualifying Bloom, thus contributing to the construction of *consensus* around the racial mockery of the Jew. As Cheng points out, "coon" is at once a derogatory slang term for both black and Jew" (1995: 181). The Irishmen are therefore racializing Bloom simultaneously as Jew and as black – a racialization, ironically, to which the Irish themselves had long been subject by their English colonizers. A further instance of association between Bloom's Jewishness and blackness occurs at the end of "Cyclops". While Martin Cunningham and Jack Power try to whisk Bloom away from the confrontation with the citizen, one of the bystanders starts singing: "if the man in the moon was a jew, jew, jew" (U 444) – echoing a popular American song at the time: "if the man in the moon were a coon, coon, coon" (Gifford 1988: 378).

What is striking in the Irishmen's contempt towards "Otherness" is that if on the one hand their history of colonized and persecuted country should make them feel in solidarity with black and Jewish people, on the other hand, their social behaviour re-iterates a system of racist hierarchies and ethnocentrism, where the other from elsewhere can only be seen as an alien intruder.

Manifestations of social alienation and intolerance towards Bloom's Jewishness are brought to the extreme in "Cyclops",

where we encounter a temporary betrayal of the traditional Irish-Jewish analogy, running from Tone to Parnell through O'Connell (see Gibson 2002).

6. Naming system in "Cyclops"

In the community of increasingly drunken men at Barney Kiernan's Bloom is at first referred to as "the prudent member" by Joe Hynes: " 'Sweat of my brow', says Joe. 'twas the prudent member gave me the wheeze. 'I saw him before I met you', says I" (U 384). Interestingly, the speaker's choice of the referent term and its immediate decodification by the addressee suggest that the evaluation of Bloom as the prudent member is part of the people's common knowledge. This of course reinforces the Dubliners' sense of social and ideological UNION, while casting Bloom in the role of outsider. What is more, the reference to Bloom as "prudent member" at the character-character discourse level is *re-registered* at the narrator-narratee discourse level by the parodic voice. This intervenes in the characters' dialogue in order to signal Bloom's approach to the pub. Its qualification of the character as 'O Bloom, the son of Rory [...] he of the prudent soul" (U 384) reveals the semantic interference existing between the two subjects of the enunciation. The parodic voice's echoing of the character's words determines a dialogic orchestration of perspectives which contributes to the caricature of Bloom's "prudence" as a marker of his own social foreignness. [6] As "prudent member", Bloom is excluded from the Gentile circle of drinkers, gamblers and violent sport lovers at Barney Kiernan's [7].

In the course of this episode the references to Bloom are still more racially connoted. In particular, the citizen and the I-narrator designate him as "an Israelite" (U 406); "those bloody Jerusalem cuckoos" (U 436); "a new apostle to the gentiles" (U 430), "the new Messiah for Ireland" (U 438). In many cases the linguistic descriptors are accompanied by the empathetic deictic predeterminers "that/those" which highlight the speaker's social and emotional distance from Bloom (see Comte 1989). Let us consider the citizen's expressions: "that bloody jewman" (U 445), "that chap" (U 433), the pronoun "those are nice things...coming over here...filling the country with bugs" (U 419); or the I-narrator's "those jews have a sort of queer odour" (U 393).

The citizen also stigmatizes Bloom through black racial expressions: "Is it that whiteyed kaffir...that never backed a horse in anger in his life" (U 435). To which Hynes adds: "He's a bloody dark horse himself" (U 435). Both phrases contribute to the association of Bloom with the dark throwaways of the world and echo Menton's reference to him as a "coon". As Cheng points out, "such slurs on Bloom's Jewishness are often followed by unconscious comparisons of the Irish situation to that of the exiled Israelites under Pharaoh" (1995: 198). Consider for example the citizen's appeal to the racialized metaphors of the Irish as Jews: "But those that come to the land of the free remember the land of bondage" (U 428). If on the one hand the citizen violates the Irish-Jewish analogy through his xenophobic attacks against Bloom, on the other he can't help appealing to the Jewish parallel when talking about Ireland as a persecuted country.

Bloom's otherness is also assessed on the basis of his sexual deficiencies. In a macho society, where masculinity is among the shared values which determine who is in and who is out, Bloom – through Mr Breen – is accused of being "a half and a half" (U 416), "Do you call that a man? The citizen asks" (U 439). Later on the I-narrator will label Bloom as a "mixed middling" with feminine traits: "Lying up in the hotel Pisser was telling me once a month with headache like a totty with her courses" (U 439).

Unlike the other Dubliners, Bloom neither addresses nor refers to them in a derogatory manner. Nonetheless, we can see in "Hades" that his reciprocation of LN confirms his lack of intimacy with them: "Now don't you think, *Bergan*" (U 412); "O I'm sure that will be all right, *Hynes*, says Bloom" (U 420). Interestingly, when we compare Bloom's and the Dubliners' naming of Paddy Dignam we find linguistic evidence for Schwaber's claim (1999:90) that Bloom must have been more an acquaintance than a friend to Paddy and this, despite his deep concern for the Dignam family's subsistence. Whereas Bloom refers to the man as *Paddy Dignam* (U 123), *poor Dignam* (U 139), or *Dignam* (U 146), the Dubliners use the more intimate and emotionally involved terms: *poor Paddy* (U 118), *poor little Paddy* (U 118) and *poor fellow* (U 119). The contrast between Bloom's selection of LN or FN+LN and the Dubliners' choice of the FN for referring to the same person discloses the different relationships existing between the speakers (Bloom, Simon Dedalus, Jack Power) and the referent [8]. There is only one character Bloom at times refers to by means of the FN: Martin Cunningham: "*Martin* asked me to go to the house" (U 405), "Dedalus told me he was in there. Drunk about the place and capering with *Martin's* umbrella" (U 121). Bloom appreciates him for his impartiality and human touch. He defines him as "a sympathetic human man" (U 120). It is worth noting, however, that although at times Martin Cunningham appears more open-minded and tolerant than others, he never reciprocates Bloom's manifestation of solidarity, by either addressing, or referring to him as Leopold. Again, for all the Dubliners Bloom continues to be "Bloom".

The key function of FNs as opposed to LNs is still more evident in the episode when Ned Lambert and Jack O'Molloy join their fellow citizens in the pub. Here FN reciprocation acts as a crucial marker of friendliness and comradeship among the Dubliners:

- Hello *Ned*
- Hello *Alf*
- Hello *Jack*

- Hello *Joe*
- God save yoU says the citizen
- Save you kindly says J.J. What'll it be *Ned?* (U 414)

The Dubliners' welcome to Ned and O'Molloy has little in common with their reaction to Bloom's entrance in the pub some time before. It is interesting to note how the typical Christian blessing extended to all the members of the Dublin circle is replaced by the citizen's almost threatening exhortation to an hesitating Bloom to come in.

- There he is again, says the citizen, staring out
- Who, says I
- *Bloom* says he [...]

And begob, I saw his physog do a peep in and sludder off again (U 390)

After a while, the citizen's dog starts growling again at Bloom:

- Come in come on, he won't eat yoU says the citizen. (U 391)

Bloom slopes in, no one turns to him and he reciprocates the others' disregard, by straightaway asking the waiter about Martin Cunningham.

Although Bloom's temporary trip to the pub provides him with plenty of opportunity to participate in the conversation, his imprudent and pedantic behaviour does nothing but increase his vulnerability. To Bloom's preaching of universal love, brotherhood and tolerance, the citizen replies with his xenophobic obsession: "we want no more strangers in our house" (U 420), where the in-group marker *we* exalts the exclusive Irish Community to the detriment of Bloom who is not considered to be part of it. The citizen's binary opposition *them* vs. *us* rejects a Bloom who claims to be Irish, just because he is born in Ireland, who is supposed to be a mason and who openly defends his Jewish origin in the name of universal Christian values.

Ned Lambert ridicules Bloom's hybrid status: "Is he a Jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? ... Or who is he?" (U 438). The discrepant, even contradictory qualities which are attributed to him position Bloom as "Ultimate other". Part of the answer to Ned's question comes in "Circe", where, as Gibson notices, Joyce's Jew is defined as an "anythingarian", or a composite of many things:

Bloom is an effective weapon against the ideological and discursive formations of the two imperial masters in Ireland [British colonialism and Catholicism], for he is both intimate with those formations and yet, by virtue of his Jewishness and foreignness, the source of a doubly alienated and alienating perspective on them. (Gibson 2002: 56)

To the Dubliners' exclusive view of a nation, which emerges as "an imagined community with a national essence, character and identity, resulting in a value-laden hierarchy that writes out or homogenizes non conforming *others*" (Cheng 1995: 211), Bloom opposes his inclusive definition of a nation which allows for personal or ethnic difference, recognizing the status of "citizen" to anyone within the community: "A nation is the same people living in the same place ...or also living in other places" (U 430). To the manifestations of social DIS-UNION characterising the Dubliners' relationship with a "perverted Jew", Bloom opposes the utopia of a new Bloomusalem: a tolerant nation whose characteristics are pluralistic: "Union of all, Jew, moslem and gentile...universal brotherhood....Mixed races and mixed marriage" (U 610-611).

Conclusion

This analysis of the characters' naming in *Ulysses* has attempted to highlight the important socio-ideological implications at the basis of the speaker's choice of address and referent terms in the Irish community, as Joyce presents it at the beginning of the XX century.

The Dubliners' habit of addressing/referring to Bloom through an alternation of LN and derogatory terms confirms their socially distant attitude towards a converted Jew. Their ostracism of Bloom is even further stressed by the solidarity semantics governing their mutual exchange of FNs. The re-iteration of this address (referent) form, in fact, sanctions the Dubliners' sense of comradeship, thus reinforcing, at any time, the reader's perception of Bloom as an alien.

An analysis of Bloom's address behaviour, on the other hand, discloses some of the inner contradictions inherent in the identity of a "perverted Jew" of Hungarian origin; one who is born in Ireland and has converted to Catholicism. In his

conversational attitude, the character oscillates between his desire for social acceptance by the united group of Dubliners and his search for exclusivity, i.e. for a dimension where he can preserve and be proud of his "felt Jewish soul" (Schwaber 1999: 83). His first drift to integration is traceable in his sense of detachment from other Jews (see his attitude towards Duglacz and Reuben J. Dodd). His need for exclusivity, on the other hand, emerges both from his reciprocation of the non-solidary LN or FN+LN, and of the distant pronoun *their* when addressing/referring to his fellow countrymen. Needless to say, such a contradictory positioning doesn't finally prevent Bloom from dreaming of a nationalism in the plural, where humanitarianism and liberalism can bring about a redefinition of Irish nationhood.

References

- Adams, R. (1962) *Surface and Symbol: The Consistency of James Joyce's Ulysses*, New York: Oxford U.P.
- Allerton, D. (1996) "Proper names and definite descriptions with the same reference: a pragmatic choice of language users", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 621-633.
- Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960) "The pronouns of power and solidarity", in T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, New York: Technology Press, 253-276.
- Brown, R. & Ford, M. (1961) "Address in American English", in *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 62, 234-244. (?)
- Budgen, F. [1933] (1964) *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*, Bloomington: Indiana U.P.
- Carter, R. & Nash, W. (1983) "Language and Literariness", *Prose Studies*, 6, 2, 123-141.
- Comte, M. E. [1977] (1989) *La linguistica testuale*, Milano: Feltrinelli
- Cheng, V. J., (1995) *Joyce, Race and Empire*, Cambridge, Cambridge U.P.
- Gibson, A. (2002) *Joyce's Revenge*, Oxford: Oxford U.P.
- Gifford, D. (1988) *Ulysses Annotated Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*, Berkeley: California U.P.
- Gilman, A. & Brown, R. (1958) "Who says 'Tu' to whom?", in *A Review of General Semantics*, 15 (3), 169-174.
- Joyce, J. (1992 [1922]) *Ulysses Annotated Students' Edition*, intr. by D. Kiberd, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2001) "The role of social context, intimacy and distance in the choice of forms of address", in *International Journal of Social Language*, 148, 5-18.
- Mercanton, J. (1979) "The Hours of James Joyce", in Willard Potts (ed.), *Portraits of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of James Joyce by Europeans*, Dublin: Wolfhound, 205-252
- Nadel, I. B. (1989) *Joyce and the Jews*, Houndmills: MacMillan Press
- Oyetade, S.O. (1995) "A sociolinguistic analysis of address forms in Yoruba", *Language in Society*, 24, 515-535
- Pugliatti, P. (1979) "Per un supplemento di studio della 'voce' in *Ulysses*", *Spicilegio Moderno*, 12, 107-120.
- Reizbaum, M. (1999) *James Joyce's Judaic Other*, Stanford: Stanford U.P.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1972) "Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place", in P.P. Giglioli (ed.) *Language and social context*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 95-135.
- Schwaber, P. (1999) *The Cast of Characters: A Reading of Ulysses*, New Heaven & London: Yale U.P.
- Steinberg, E. (1981) "James Joyce and the Critics Notwithstanding, Leopold Bloom is not Jewish", *Journal of Modern Literature*, 3, 1, 27-49.
- Zwicky, A. M. (1974) "Hey, what's your name!", *Proceedings from the Tenth Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*, 787- 801.

[1] All the quotations are taken from *Ulysses Students' Annotated Edition* (1992), Harmondsworth: Penguin.

[2] Starting with Robert Adams (1962), several commentators have denied Bloom's Jewishness, stressing the many ways in which he is not, by Jewish tradition, Jewish. Steinberg states that "in not a single rite of passage, past or future, does Leopold Bloom qualify as a Jew" (1981: 29). On the other hand, scholars such as Schwaber (1999) and Reizbaum (1999) recognize "Bloom's felt Jewish soul" (Schwaber 1999: 83) and consider it as a cultural marker of "otherness" in the realm of the Empire "where the king's English and Anglicanism bestow 'natural citizenship'" (Reizbaum 1999: iv).

[3] Bloom is the last one to get into the carriage. Quite interestingly, he is also the last one to get out of it and during the entire funeral service we see him walking and stopping *behind* the rest of the group. In the economy of his relationship with the other characters, his spatial position/attitude becomes another marker of his marginalization from the community. In stretches of narrative Bloom is described as occupying the *vacant place* left by the others in the carriage (U 108); standing *behind* (U 129); *following* his companions (U 126); standing *behind* near the font (U 130); coming *last* (U 132); walking *unheeded* (U 143); drawing *behind* a few paces (U 147).

[4] Budgen claims that Bloom's isolation is not an unhappy one: "he wills it, much as he wills his domestic betrayal in that he makes no effort to prevent it" (1964: 275).

[5] In 1919, at the end of his stay in Zurich and after a period of close friendship with various Jews, Joyce wrote "The Jew hates the Jew in the Jew". The statement has been found among the notesheet for *Cyclops* (see Nadel 1989: 139). The meaning of the sentence helps our understanding of the many contradictions inherent in Jewish identities. Torn between their need for social acceptance and their search for exclusivity, many Jews experienced an inner laceration which intensified their burden of being Jewish, as Bloom's conversational attitude demonstrates in *Ulysses*. This was particularly the case with emancipated Jews, as they realized that they would never be totally accepted in the community because of their origin.

[6] For an interesting study on the dialogic interferences between the narrator's and the character's voice, see Pugliatti (1979).

[7] The expression "prudent member" can assume sexual connotations. The term "member" has in fact the secondary meaning of "penis" (*OED*). In this sense, the nominal reference would allude to the many years of Bloom's sexual inactivity and consequential lack of procreation – an unacceptable shortcoming indeed in the Dublin masculine society. Following Gifford the expression may also be interpreted as referring to Bloom's belonging to the Masonry. The use of the term "prudent" would be justified by the acknowledgement that the Masonic order forbids "imprudent conversation in relation to Masonry in the presence of uninitiated strangers" (1988: 326). In "Lestrygonians" Nosey Flynn contributes to the suspicion of Bloom's secretiveness as a mason by claiming that he would never put anything "in black and white" (U 227).

[8] Given that Paddy Dignam was an integrated member of the Dublin Catholic community, it is very likely that his social attitude towards Bloom was similar to that of the other Gentiles.