

Yes The Enigmatic Molly Bloom: Reading and Translating Joycean Autonomous Monologue

Carlos G. Tee

This paper focuses on the autonomous monologue technique in the last episode of *Ulysses*, “Penelope,” and how it affects reading and translation. After getting acquainted with psycho-narration, narrated monologue and quoted monologue, as well as their various combinations in many of the preceding chapters of *Ulysses*, a reader faces a totally different perspective and format in this very last episode. “Penelope” is the only instance in the novel where the authorial voice is totally obliterated by the figural voice all throughout the episode. There is absolutely no sign of an omniscient storyteller’s presence nor are there echoes of an overt narrative voice. Autonomous monologue is the most extreme form of stream of consciousness and the purest. In this episode, Molly tells her story by drawing from her memories of the past and her present circumstances, and her flights of fancy often touch on unexplained allusions to circumstances and details from the other *Ulysses* episodes. This makes reading “Penelope” all the more challenging, and when thought-representational aspects related to autonomous monologue, as well as the absence of punctuation, exacerbate the difficulty of interpreting Molly’s mental excursions, the obstacles to a clear, unequivocal reading are multiplied. Reading virtually overlaps with decoding in the translation process, including the process of translation of this episode by the two teams of Chinese translators who adopted different translation strategies. The first part of this paper discusses the various expressive, textual and stylistic aspects of “Penelope”—which contribute to the difficulty of reading the text—as a prelude to the study of how the two Chinese translators interpreted “Penelope”—including the hurdles they had to overcome and the limitations of the translation strategies they adopted.

Keywords: *Ulysses*, Penelope, James Joyce, Xiao Qian & Wen Jieruo, Jin Di,

Received: October 7, 2016; Revised: January 14, 2017; Accepted: June 16, 2017

閱讀與翻譯摩莉的自主獨白

鄭永康

本文研究重點為《尤利西斯》的最後一篇，即〈潘娜洛普〉。喬伊斯在這一篇選擇了最極端且最純正的意識流表現模式，讓主要人物摩莉生動敘述她的回憶和當下聯想到的豐富思緒。不同於《尤利西斯》前 17 篇，摩莉的自主獨白模式 (autonomous monologue) 獨當一面擔任故事的敘述工具。正因為未經過心理敘述 (psycho-narration) 穿針引線，摩莉的自言自語和天馬行空般回憶帶給了讀者諸多閱讀上的挑戰，再加上整篇故事省略了標點符號，使閱讀極為不流暢。此篇文本語言層次雖然大致上比其他篇章較為淺易，卻因獨白句子支離破碎且摩莉漂浮不定的敘述內容並無一致的主體脈絡可循，讀者往往很難跟得上敘述者的思路轉變，且得以斷斷續續、前瞻後顧地摸索出無標點符號散碎句子的頭尾。文中以〈潘娜洛普〉文本片段為例，詳細分析喬伊斯如何靈活應用自主獨白模式來展現摩莉的內心世界。透過比較兩中譯本，本文更進一步探討蕭乾與文潔若，以及金隄這兩組譯者如何詮釋喬伊斯的原文，進而分析摩莉的自主獨白如何影響閱讀難度。

關鍵詞：《尤利西斯》、〈潘娜洛普〉、喬伊斯、蕭乾與文潔若、金隄

收件：2016年10月7日；修改：2017年1月14日；接受：2017年6月16日

Introduction: Molly on Her Own

“Penelope” is completely different from the preceding episodes of *Ulysses*. In this chapter, we once again enter the mind of a single character, but this time, Molly’s psychological musings are presented in a unique way as an autonomous monologue or silent soliloquy. For the first time, therefore, we hear Molly directly instead of seeing her through the lens of someone’s desire or fear and the “reader is prodded to realize that he has never known her this way before” (Mahaffey, 1999, p. 266). As Steinberg’s study of Molly’s monologue suggests, the episode shows overwhelming eccentricity in a variety of ways (1973, p. 164). For one, Molly refers to herself twice as often per page as does Stephen in “Proteus” and more than six times as often as does Bloom in “Lestrygonians” (Steinberg, 1973, p. 165). In reading this most pervasively sexual episode, the reader thus could never miss the stark contrast between its extreme subjectivity and the extreme objectivity of the preceding chapter, “Ithaca.”

Molly is anything but self-effacing in “Penelope” as she was thrilled, in fact, oftentimes titillated, by her own escapades coming back to her in a torrent of memories as also reported by Kelly (1988, p. 98). There is an almost effortless flow of details as she gives vent to her coquettish reminiscences and fantasies, lying cozily in bed and muttering to herself *sotto voce* (Wales, 1992, p. 91). Penelope’s style, or the lack of it, is in fact relevant to Molly’s monologue. Emancipated from the enclosure of third-person narration, it allows “sporadic poetry” to happen naturally as it might in the spheres of letters and diaries (Kelly, 1988, p. 93). Indeed, this last episode is the “ultimate alternative to the initial style, the human babble that carries on when all edifices of rhetoric and vocabulary have collapsed and been swept away” (Kelly, 1988, p. 98). In fact,

as Cohn argues, “Penelope” is a paradigm (1978, p. 217), and that it is a *locus classicus* within the small corpus on autonomous monologue.

“Penelope” is a relatively difficult read, not so much for its lack of style and punctuation as for the heavy baggage of details and allusions that it carries, as well as its myriad cross-references to specific details from the rest of the novel. In fact, it was precisely for these reasons that Joyce places it at the very end of *Ulysses* rather than at its beginning (Cohn, 1978, p. 217). Logical enough, for such an arrangement greatly eased the task of making the plot of an autonomous monologue text more comprehensible to readers. Nonetheless the episode remains challenging to read, though at a lesser degree compared to the “initial style” of earlier episodes. Oftentimes it requires painstaking effort from readers as we shall see below.

Cohn writes that Joyce considers “Ithaca” to be the last episode of the novel, and “Penelope” to have no beginning, middle or end (1978, p. 218). In fact, readers easily discover that “Penelope” is a ball of thought rolling in time. In a letter to Harriet Weaver, James Joyce writes that it begins and ends with the word “yes,” turning like a huge earth ball “slowly surely and evenly round and round spinning” (as cited in Cohn, 1978, p. 218). It achieves this circularity by its manipulation of the dimension of time but the reader nonetheless comprehends the succession of reminiscences and impressions as Molly weaves a dream image of herself because that circularity is effectively counteracted by elements that underline its temporal consequence (Cohn, 1978, p. 219). That is to say that ball of thought does not just roll; it also unravels in time. And as that ball of thought rolls, sometimes the story’s many details are hard to follow as we shall see later that Molly weaves her countless flashbacks at random, shuttling back and forth across the loom of time in a manner described as “a-chronological” (Cohn, 1978, p. 229).

In the following sections, we shall look into how Molly’s meandering

river of thought makes this episode quite challenging for readers from the vantage point of perspective, syntax, style, word choice and other such factors. As the reading and the decoding steps in the translation of any text practically overlap, we shall also look into how Joyce's English original has been translated into Chinese as a way to put in proper perspective just how reading and understanding are made relatively more compromised by Molly's idiosyncratic monologue expressions.

Autonomous Monologue: Molly's Oleaginous Soliloquy

After getting acquainted with psycho-narration, narrated monologue and quoted monologue in previous chapters of *Ulysses*, indeed a reader faces a totally different perspective and format in the very last episode. "Penelope" is the only instance in the novel where the authorial voice is totally obliterated by the sole figural voice all throughout the episode. There is absolutely neither signs of an omniscient storyteller's presence nor are there echoes of an overt narrative voice. Autonomous monologue is the most extreme form of stream of consciousness (French, 1982, p. 54) and the purest, equaling the thought-representation structure of Edouard Dujardin's *Les Lauriers sont coupés* (Cohn, 1978, p. 16), Joyce's style inspiration in writing *Ulysses*. "Penelope" contrasts very strongly with the divided narration of the previous episodes (French, 1982, p. 244) where not only the monologues are inextricably woven into psycho-narration passages; the narrator also habitually mimics figural language and tone. We shall look into how Molly's monologue differs from the other episodes by examining a number of excerpts in the following sections.

We recall that in other episodes such as "Lestrygonians" Joyce uses opening psycho-narration sentences at the beginning of paragraphs or sections

to provide the scenario where succeeding passages in monologue occur, thus virtually bestowing context to extended monologue passages and whole blocks of paragraphs. This arrangement makes reading easier and understanding of interspersed monologues even possible. Otherwise, the “un-introduced” monologue bursts would sound like some intermittent gibberish difficult to piece together, if at all. In contrast, in autonomous monologue, the narrator’s voice is effectively muffled, virtually allowing the figural voice to sustain the textual flow all by itself. In the case of “Penelope,” Molly’s autonomous monologue, despite the disconcerting absence of an introductory narrative as in “Lestrygonians,” remains comprehensible because “there is so little action” going on in the episode (French, 1982, p. 57). As we know, Molly reclines languidly in the Bloom matrimonial bedstead at 7 Eccles Street all the time she indulges in her gushing reveries.

Indeed, the omniscient third-person narrator we see in earlier chapters is conspicuously absent in this episode, yet Molly is, in her own right, a powerful storyteller. Although she adopts the simplest of syntax and the most elementary of lexis, reflecting perhaps her lack of formal education and her rather-low social standing, her lackadaisical reveries resemble “an oleaginous, slow moving stream, turning in every direction to find the lowest level” as Steinberg observes (1973, p. 113). For Steinberg, however, Molly’s thought flow is more of flood than stream, when compared to Stephen’s and Bloom’s (1973, p. 113). Indeed, Molly’s dialogue with her very own memory differs from the other episodes not just in matter of characters and the adaptation of language to character. The unpunctuated monologue, with its avoidance of the authorial voice, shows that in this ending episode Joyce has dropped his habits of parody and irony that would have made it impossible to express Molly’s thoughts had he employed his earlier, more “conventional” modes such as the initial style.

Precisely, this absence of a third-person narrator in “Penelope” defines

why Molly's autonomous monologue is different from narrated monologue, as the latter mode is a combination of the voices of the narrator and characters, or as Rimmon-Kenan asserts, is an "embedding between utterances and focalizations" (1983, p. 111). On broader terms, autonomous monologue is virtually an extended form of quoted monologue, all its utterances being direct citations of a character's inner thoughts. In effect, therefore, autonomous monologue actually consists of a never-ending cascade of quoted monologue snippets uninterrupted by an omniscient narrator. As we will discuss later, Molly's soliloquy is also different as it employs discrete and more easily recognizable monologue fragments distinguishable from the often pre-verbal quoted monologue bursts of the earlier episodes.

If one were to subject the Penelopean text's surface structure to a scrutiny, it is rather easy to discern that Molly's discourse often appears to employ a rather linear sentence morphology. Kelly writes that it is because the rough-and-tumble speed of her monologue just could not accommodate the carefully assembled detail that can be said of the other parts of the novel (1988, p. 47). We also recall that in other episodes such as "Eumaeus" and "Ithaca," there is a blurring of the division between reality and parody. In "Penelope," with its narrator-less narrative framework, there is no such division. Nonetheless, that is not to say that Molly makes no parody; she does it in her simple yet strong way through her narrative tempo in which her direct commentaries, candid and many times acerbic, shadow almost every account of memory of a person or occurrence that randomly comes to her mind, as we shall look into in another section. A necessary consequence of this is that her sentence structure consists of a rough, unsophisticated, and carefree combination of clauses typically conjoined by coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, as well as other such rhetorical devices.

Cohn describes a continuous interior monologue as being based on an

absolute correspondence between time and text, narrated time and time of narration (1978, p. 219). This is exactly where “Penelope” differs, for the episode is a self-enclosure, turning like a huge earth ball as we have mentioned earlier. This is what we mean when we say that Molly’s stream of thought is “a-chronological.” While in the usual fictional narrative time can be speeded up or delayed, in autonomous monologue “time advances by the articulation of thought” (Cohn, 1978, p. 219). That means that in “Penelope” the progress of time is associated only with the successive moments of verbalizations itself, not with the storyline. In Molly’s soliloquy, narrated time is not an extension from here to there but instead randomly scattered here, there and everywhere. Therefore, a reader who attempts to follow any chronological-textual coupling in Molly’s reveries is headed for a big disappointment, as her flood of consciousness is particularly notorious for its helter-skelter, non-consequential references to people, moments and experiences culled from different stages in her life. Instead, the memories and comments are linked with yet other memories and comments in a random manner as they inspire Molly to extend her thought streams on and on. This perhaps explains why reading “Penelope” is like going through countless anecdotes unconnected in the river of time or is like observing Cézanne’s still lifes with their multipoint perspectives. Indeed, this lack of narrative linkage among Molly’s flashbacks creates problems among readers looking for some context to grasp on.

Textual Features: Circularity and Artlessness

Molly’s language, her eccentric mindset and her peculiar monologic discursive style all bear repercussions on the episode’s readability and reader interpretation. In this section, we shall attempt to observe Penelopean text in so far as how its idiosyncratic styles and monologue expressions contribute to a

very different experience for readers.

Starting and ending with the word “yes,” “Penelope” completes a full circle as Molly goes on with her random musings on a hot June night in Dublin. This circularity results in part from the episode’s lack of punctuation and its liquid fluidity. The adoption of relatively long sentences and transitional words is said to maintain an impression of continuous flow and in fact, the extraordinarily extended final sentence deepens this impression, leaving the reader with the feeling s/he has just gone through a passage of long, unbroken rhythm (Steinberg, 1973, p. 119). In effect, therefore, the gushing stream of Molly’s thoughts completely carries the reader away, and the missing textual breaks reportedly reinforce that impression of uninhibited flow (Beeretz, 1998, p. 132). Molly’s ordinary speech also contributes to this impression. For when her uneducated middle-class language is presented in oftentimes merged grammatical constructions, it is said that a sense of an unbroken flow reminiscent of pre-verbal thought is conveyed (Korg, 1979, p. 105). Some scholars claim though that these metaphorical comparisons highlight the paucity of logic in Molly’s mind (Goldberg, 1961, p. 296; Tindall, 1950, p. 42), which is said derogatively to be “typical to women” (Wales, 1992, p. 92).

The rich variety of Molly’s thought streams is likewise a constant source of conundrum for even the most attentive of readers. On this, Smurthwaite comments that Molly is a visualizer (2006, p. 78). Indeed, much of the episode takes the form of replays of past events for which Molly has a memory “verging on the eidetic” (Smurthwaite, 2006, p. 78). Street scenes of her childhood days in Gibraltar, details of life with Bloom, giddy accounts of her many, many racy flirtations with different men, Ben Dollard wearing over-tight trousers and other such occurrences are recalled with visual clarity and vivid intimacy as though they are as fresh as yesterday. Molly draws from these flashbacks at random and reacts on them through her buoyant commentaries. Hayman

reports that in order to achieve chronological development, Joyce introduced these ironic echoes in the form of Molly's commentaries and imposed formal tension through style and structure which reflect back on Molly's memories, thus illuminating their significance (1970, p. 71). Similarly, Cohn also observes this constant oscillation between memories and projects, which she considers as one of the most distinctive marks of freely associative monologic language (1978, p. 227). In these oscillations, the recall parts are often so extensive that the past tense predominates over the present, "with the past sentences at times in straight narrative form, un subordinat ed by thinking verbs" (Cohn, 1978, p. 228). Then what immediately follow are Molly's highly-opinionated comments with their first-person, present-tense combination occurring with verbs of internal activity such as "thinks," "wishes," "hopes," etc. (Cohn, 1978, p. 227).

There are a number of verbal manifestations Molly habitually adopts to carry out her idiosyncratic, highly subjective commentaries on her own reminiscences. Let us take a look at some examples in the following excerpt:

(Example A1)

***I hate that confession when I used to go to Father Corrigan he touched me father and what harm if he did where and I said on the canal bank like a fool but whereabouts on your person my child on the leg behind high up was it yes rather high up was it where you sit down yes O Lord couldnt he say bottom right out and have done with it what has that got to do with it and did you whatever way he put it I forget no father and I always think of the real father what did he want to know for when I already confessed it to God he had a nice fat hand the palm moist always I wouldnt mind feeling it neither would he Id say by the bullneck in his horsecollar I wonder did he know me in the box I could see his face he couldnt see mine of course hed never turn or let on still his eyes were red when his father died theyre lost for a woman of course*

must be terrible when a man cries let alone them Id like to be embraced by one in his vestments [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1984, p. 610)

In the first few lines of this passage, Molly recounts her exchange with Father Corrigan inside the confessional box (in italics), followed by her current thoughts and commentary on that memory as fresh as yesterday. Notice that the succeeding lines follow this same pattern where memory and commentary virtually alternate as repeated binary pairs. It would suffice to say that, in effect, Molly practically engages in some internal dialogue with her own recalls and reminiscences.

In Example A1 above, take note of the temporal shifts in grammar. The first verb (“hate”) is in simple present tense expressing Molly’s current feeling of awkward discomfort at the thought of the confession she made long ago. Then the succeeding verbs are in the past tense as she recalled her exchanges with Father Corrigan in the confessional box: used to go, touched, said, etc. These verb tense changes are telltale signs of the oscillations between memories and projects Cohn was referring to (1978). It is readily observable how the past tense predominates over the present in these alternations between recalls and projects.

Translating “Penelope” into Chinese

In the next few pages, we shall look into how “Penelope” is read and translated into the two Chinese versions by the husband-and-wife team of Xiao Qian (蕭乾) and Wen Jieruo (文潔若), and by Jin Di (金隄) to get a better picture of the challenges they faced in reading and in undertaking their separate translation projects.

Decoding an original text represents the crucial initial step in the

translation process. As the hermeneutician Gadamer reminds us, the translator's task "differs only in degree, not in kind, from the general hermeneutical reading of any text" (1992, p. 387). Having said that, we will analyze the two Chinese versions for a better insight into how the original was read and translated, and from there, work backwards to come to understand how Molly's expression idiosyncrasies actually distract, if not altogether impede, translator interpretation. In making these comparisons, it is neither our aim to launch a nitpicking witch hunt for translation mistakes nor to propose better alternatives. Rather the two Chinese translations, when juxtaposed with the original texts, will show in sharper relief how Molly's monologue style actually interferes with reading and translation. Let us now take a look at how the above passage is interpreted by Xiao and Wen.

Interestingly, Xiao and Wen translates the above passage this way:

(Example A2)

** 我討厭做懺悔 那陣子我常到科雷根神父那兒去懺悔 他摸了摸我神父 那麼他對你造成什麼損害了嗎 在哪兒 我像個傻子似的說 在運河堤岸上 但是我的孩子 在你身上哪一帶 是腿後邊高處嗎 對嗎 對啦 挺高的 就是你用來坐的那個部位 對啦我老天爺 難道他就不能乾脆說聲屁股 不就結了嗎 這跟那有什麼關係 那麼你有沒有 我忘記他是怎麼說的了 沒有 神父 而且我總是想到真正的父親 他想知道什麼呢因為當我向天主懺悔完了之後 他有著一雙肥肥胖胖挺好看的手 手心總是發濕 摸摸這只手我倒也不在意 他也未嘗不是這樣 我望著套在他那公牛脖子上的白圈圈就琢磨 我倒想知道他認沒認出呆在懺悔閣子裏的我 我看得見他的臉 當然嘍我的臉他是瞧不見的 他也絕沒有朝這邊望 連點兒苗頭都沒有 儘管這樣可當他父親死的時候他兩眼都紅了 當然嘍 他們對女人已經死了心

當一個男人哭鼻子的時候該是挺可舊的事 他們就更不必說啦
我倒是巴不得讓這些穿法衣的人當中的一個抱一陣…… [emphasis
added] (Joyce, 1995, p. 1563)

Notice how they have equaled Molly's discourse down to its chatty, girlish banter. While verb tense differences between the memory part and the commentaries stand out in the original text, thereby allowing a clear distinction between past and present thoughts, they do not register strongly in the minds of Chinese readers as verb tense changes in the Chinese language are oftentimes merely implied by context. In Xiao and Wen's translation, we also observe how the sentence "what did he want to know for when I already confessed it to God" was distorted into 他想知道什麼呢因為當我向天主懺悔完了之後. Evidently, Xiao and Wen misread the meaning of the word "when," which in this instance, functions like "since." Again, this illustrates just how confusion related to grammar and syntax, when made worse by Joyce's misleading modes of representing thought, could be a setback to translatoric re-expression. Apparently, Xiao and Wen often failed to recognize or deliberately ignored grammatical signposts in their reading of other *Ulysses* episodes, leading to translations that deviate from the original, as reported by Tee (2013b, p. 81). With the coordinate sentence morphology in Molly's reveries, recognizing those signposts is actually even more challenging.

This coordinate structure sometimes shows even shorter strands of unpunctuated snippets telling Molly's memory accounts of persons and events in her life. Here's an example:

(Example B1)

***take that Mrs Maybrick that poisoned her husband for what I wonder in love with some other man yet it was found out on her wasnt she the downright*

villain to go and do a thing like that of course some men can be dreadfully aggravating drive you mad and always the worst word in the world what do they ask us to marry them for if were so bad as all that comes to yes because they cant get on without us *white Arsenic she put in his tea off flypaper wasnt it* I wonder why they call it that if I asked him hed say its from the Greek leave us as wise as we were before *she must have been madly in love with the other fellow to run the chance of being hanged* O she didnt care if that was her nature what could she do besides theyre not brutes enough to go and hang a woman surely are they... [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1984, p. 613)

In Example B1, we take note of how Molly's memory recalls (in italics) alternate with her commentaries in a repeated pattern down the text. In fact, this coordinate structural feature is common all throughout "Penelope," and although verb tenses starkly differ between memory reports and Molly's highly opinionated "editorializing" as we have discussed above, and thus also provide some chronological contrast, reading is made less difficult compared to the other Bloom episodes, partly because of the patent simplicity of the vocabulary and syntax. The following is Xiao and Wen's version:

(Example B2)

** 就拿那個毒死丈夫的梅布裏克太太來說吧 為的是什麼呢 真奇怪 是不是另外有了情夫呢 對啦 後來敗露啦 居然幹出這等事 難道她不是個地地道道的壞蛋嗎 當然嘍 有些男人就是討厭透頂 簡直能把你逼瘋 滿嘴都是天底下最惡毒的字眼兒 要是我們壞到這個地步 當初他們幹嗎還非要我們嫁給他們不可呢 對啦 那是因為他們沒有我們就過不了日子 她把粘蠅紙上的砒霜刮下來放進他的茶裏了 不就是這樣的嗎 我納悶他們

為什麼給起了這麼個名字 我要是問他 他就會說是從希臘文來的 聽他這麼解釋 我一點兒也不開竅 她准是把另外那小子愛得發了瘋 才去冒這被絞死的危險 哦 她還滿不在乎哩 這要是她的天性的話她又能怎麼著呢 而且他們也不至於像禽獸一般 忍心去把一個女人絞死 他們是決不會的…… [emphasis added]
(Joyce, 1995, p. 1567)

In Xiao and Wen's translation, the verbal simplicity of Molly's monologue is well reflected; the only difference is that the missing punctuation marks, which work to highlight the fragmentary nature of the original, were "supplied" in the form of blank spaces. It should be worth noting here that although this is highly conducive to easier reading, it actually usurps Joyce's original of its Modernist appeal. We also take note of a distortion of meaning in "for what I wonder" in the line "take that Mrs Maybrick that poisoned her husband for what I wonder in love with some other man." In Xiao and Wen's translation, the clause is translated verbatim as 為的是什麼呢 真奇怪. In Xiao and Wen's reading, "for what I wonder" consists of two separate clauses: "for what" and "I wonder." Again, this may perhaps reflect mere comprehension problem of a common English expression such as this. In comparison, Jin renders the said clause correctly as 我納悶她是為了甚麼 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1358). The only misgiving is in why Jin transforms it into a complete sentence by supplying the subject, also a clear deviation from Joyce's Modernist original. Xiao and Wen's version is an example of how Joyce's unpunctuated text with incomplete phrases and clauses abutting one another could easily mislead readers.

James Joyce presented Molly as uneducated yet highly opinionated, putting into her mouth plain and simple words that project her coquettish personality. Yet while there is a conspicuous lack of sophistication in Molly's lexical

choices, her command of words does not hinder the achievement of high word density and richness of detail in some more protracted, more extensive recall passages. We also notice that this accumulation of small details tends to rival Bloom's discourse in the initial style where Joyce employs his technique of cataloguing, i.e. the endless insertion of countless details and trivia into the discourse in keeping with his adoption of the concept of *coupe en largeur* (Eco, 1982, p. 39). That goes to say that although some of the tonal, textual and stylistic features of the earlier episodes are virtually gone this time, Joyce retains his habit of cataloguing in this episode. Only that in the case of Molly's soliloquy, the simpler syntax lightens the burden of reading despite the heavier lexical baggage. This semantic density, a trait that reflects Molly's acumen and pictographic memory, partially contributes to the tension of reading "Penelope." A case in point is the following passage:

(Example C1)

**I want at least two other good chemises for one thing *and* but I dont know what kind of drawers he likes none at all I think didnt he say yes *and* half the girls in Gibraltar never wore them either naked as God made them that Andalusian singing her Manola she didnt make much secret of what she hadnt yes *and* the second pair of silkette stockings is laddered after one days wear I could have brought them back to Lewers this morning *and* kick up a row and made that one change them only not to upset myself *and* run the risk of walking into him *and* ruining the whole thing *and* one of those kidfitting corsets *Id want advertised cheap in the Gentlewoman with elastic gores on the hips* he saved the one I have but thats no good *what did they say they give a delightful figure line 11/6 obviating that unsightly broad appearance across the lower back to reduce flesh my belly is a bit too big Ill have to knock off the stout at dinner* or am I getting too fond of it the last

they sent from ORourkes was as flat as a pancake he makes his money easy Larry they call him the old mangy parcel he sent at Xmas a cottage cake and a bottle of hogwash he tried to palm off as claret that he couldnt get anyone to drink God spare his spit for fear hed die of the drouth or I must do a few breathing exercises I wonder is that antifat any good might overdo it thin ones are not so much the fashion now garters that much I have the violet pair I wore today thats all he bought me out of the cheque he got on the first O no there was the face lotion I finished the last of yesterday that made my skin like new I told him over and over again get that made up in the same place *and* dont forget it... [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1984, p. 618)

In Example C1 it is easy to observe the abundance of vivid details and disparate ideas (underlined words in the quotation) in Molly's discourse, considering that she's actually recalling people and events of the past.

James Joyce portrays Molly as having a dynamic mind and a person prone to self-contemplation, though more physical, and not in a philosophical or psychological way (Wales, 1992, p. 95), as for instance, Stephen's monologue bursts are in the opening episodes. A classic example of this contemplative mood is typified by the italicized segment in the long example quoted immediately above (Example C1). Having said that, while in some sections of the episode Molly gives way to her higgledy-piggledy colloquial chatter, we also observe that there are certain moments when her discourse pursues a semantically richer, tonally deeper development. This observation contrasts strongly with Steinberg's report that Molly's monologue communicates less lexical meaning per given number of words, compared to Bloom in "Lestrygonians" and Stephen in "Proteus" (1973, p. 159). In fact, as we have observed earlier, it is the evidently unsophisticated syntax and quotidian lexis

that help create such a questionable impression. It would therefore be right to assert that Molly's voice moves beyond figurative language and oftentimes, her language represents a "plainspoken alternative to the poetry of the initial style" as Kelly also argues (1988, p. 95). Interestingly, this also implies, rather evidently, that Joyce has set aside much narrative craft he was highly used to in writing the first seventeen episodes just so as to create the rhythm of Molly.

Let us now compare the original with Jin's version. In his translation, Jin renders "chemises" as 襯衫 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1366), an obvious mistranslation. We also observe that Jin at times tries to explicitate what were originally unclear and incomplete sentence fragments. For instance, while Molly mentions the advertised price of the corset in a very succinct "11/6," Jin translates it into 花上十一先令六 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1366), supplying a verb and the denominational unit he thought would be conducive to easier reading. Several lines later, "getting too fond of it" became 已經喝慣捨不得了 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1367). Further down, the adjective phrase "as flat as a pancake" used to describe poor quality stout was translated as 完全走氣和水差不多了 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1367). "A cottage cake" is translated as 一塊家常蛋糕 (Joyce, 1993, p. 1367), just a slice, an obvious mistake. Domesticated translations such as these indeed make Jin's Chinese version more readily understandable, but they hardly reflect the succinct vagueness of Joyce's Modernist original.

Other than the above mistranslations, Jin's reading of the original passage is adequate, perhaps suggesting just how the patent simplicity of Molly's vocabulary assists the reader in construing meaning, that despite the disconcerting absence of orthographic markers made worse by the inclusion of abundant detail as also reported by Joyce scholars such as Lawrence (1982, p. 83) and Gillespie (1989, p. 148) in most of the Bloom episodes.

Moreover, reading "Penelope" is made relatively easier than the monologues of Stephen and Bloom as gone now are the challenges of figuring

meaning out of those confusingly sketchy stream of consciousness bursts, especially when point of view becomes blurred as monologues dovetail into psycho-narration, or when they are expressed in the “condensed” form and other modes of Joycean textual manipulation. In “Penelope” there is no possibility of confusing point of view as it is Molly alone who speaks in the whole episode. And as Attridge puts it, the interior monologues of Stephen and Bloom infringe grammatical conventions far more radically than the autonomous monologue of Molly (2000, p. 96). As we have seen above, although Molly lumps together clauses and phrases using the connective “and,” these fragments are, by themselves, internally coherent, and semantically discrete despite their often unsophisticated syntax. They just miss their punctuation and more often than not, they are expressed in a truncated though still intelligible form. However, it requires more effort from readers to clearly figure out strands, clauses and phrases with distinct word order and forming a syntactical grouping where there is concurrence in meaning. Xiao and Wen’s use of blank spaces to suggest punctuation once again shows his strategy of explicitation in translating Joyce’s Modernist discourse, an approach quite similar with his renditions of the previous episodes.

In some of the examples above, we have mentioned how Molly’s monologue features the all-too-frequent use of the connective “and.” The resulting fluidity of her rivulets of words thus helps create the impression, or as we shall realize later, “illusion” of a continuous flow or of an “oleaginous moving stream” (Steinberg, 1973, p. 114). In fact, it was Joyce’s intention to create this impression of fluid garrulity (Steinberg, 1973, p. 114). To be able to do that, Joyce had to combine and pile up short, truncated thought bursts. That way, Molly’s coordinate structuring using the conjunction “and” maintains a sense of flow while it conjoined clauses expressing disparate ideas. Joyce’s frequent use of coordinating ands and subordinating conjunctions leading to

this piling up of clauses directly echoes Molly's frame of mind. If not for these connecting words, we may therefore say that her discourse would have read like threadbare fragments—flimsy and disjointed—certainly not too different from the short snatches of quoted monologue in Bloom's earlier episodes both in rhythm and reading effect. The role of these connecting words could be better appreciated if we take note that the ideas they link together are the outcomes of Molly's mental association of things and events, frequently random and spur of the moment, and more often than not, bereft of either consequential rationality or temporality.

This brings us to a discussion of how Joyce employed the connective “and” in “Penelope.” Molly's use of “and” is not evenly spread all throughout the episode. In some instances in the episode, her discourse shows a higher occurrence of the connective, particularly when her reminiscences lead to emotional agitation. To illustrate this, let us go back to one excerpt we have previously examined (Please refer to indented quotation labeled C1 above for the text).

In that passage, Molly is obviously agitated after recalling her need to buy more chemises, and after feeling upset by the poor-quality of the stockings she had bought at Lewers'. In this section, we notice the abundance of ands that directly reflects her being emotionally carried away by the bad experience. Then, as she digressed and cooled off a while later with thoughts inspired by the corset advertisement, the ands abruptly disappear. The succeeding lines show her finally calming down as she self-consciously focused vain attention on herself and pondered how she could watch her weight, an idea which later inspired yet another burst of thought on how to keep her complexion looking great through that much-wanted skin lotion. Notice how the missing ands resurfaced after many lines.

In the opening sections above, we have discussed how scholars describe

“Penelope” as a “torrent of memories” (Kelly, 1988, p. 98), “an oleaginous, slow stream” or even “flood” (Steinberg, 1973, p. 113), and “effortless flow of details” (Wales, 1992, p. 91), etc. That appears to be the general impression of the episode as a whole but a careful scrutiny of Molly’s reminiscences, notably when the connective “and” is used, unmasks some non-linear structure Joyce employs in this episode. A case in point is the following excerpt:

(Example D1)

**yes that was why I liked him because I saw he understood or felt what a woman is *and* (1) I knew I could always get around him *and* (2) I gave him all the pleasure I could... [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1984, p. 643)

While there appears nothing out of the ordinary in this passage when compared with the rest of Molly’s discourse, the use of the connective *ands* polysyndetic as they may seem at first glance, is different from the usual modes of usage in the episode. In fact, the consecutive use of “and” (1) and “and” (2) misleadingly creates an impression of a linear juxtaposition of the clauses in the passage.

In this excerpt, not all of the three clauses conjoined by the two *ands* that come after “because” share the same level of discourse. Only the first two clauses belong to the same level, both being the “reason” that links up with “because.” The last clause conjoined to the second “and” shares a causal relationship with the preceding two clauses. Here, the successive *ands* create a textual illusion of linearity and the passage appears to possess that oleaginous fluidity described by Joycean scholars such as Kelly (1988), Steinberg (1973) and Wales (1992). Indeed, the three clauses may, like a mirage of some sort, appear linearly juxtaposed but a careful logical-semantic scrutiny reveals a two-tier structure. This is yet another instance when, contrary to what Joycean scholars

say about Molly's fluidity, readers actually have to proceed in a stop-and-go fashion more pronouncedly in their text processing to better figure out the real meaning of Joyce's sentences. Let us take a look at the Chinese translations. Xiao and Wen's version reads as follows:

(Example D2)

** 這麼一來我才喜歡上了他 因為我看出他懂得要麼 就是感覺到了女人是啥 而且我曉得 我啥時候都能夠隨便擺佈他 我就盡量教他快活…… [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1995, p. 825)

In comparison, Jin translates the passage as:

(Example D3)

** 我就是因為這個才喜歡他的因為我看得出他理解或感覺到女人是怎麼一回事兒而且我知道我總能讓他聽我的那天我盡給他甜頭…… [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1993, p. 1416)

We notice that both translators correctly observe the linear juxtaposition of the first two clauses with their use of 而且 to translate the first “and.” Xiao and Wen (Example D2) correctly allude to the causal relationship existing between the first two clauses and the last using the character 就, albeit the rather weak emphasis. In Jin's version (Example D3), the non-linear, two-tier structure of the original text is totally ignored with his non-causal rendition of the last clause as 那天我盡給他甜頭. Apparently, Jin misses this non-causal relationship made less apparent by Molly's wanton use of the connective all throughout the episode. A similar example is the following passage:

(Example E1)

**God be merciful to us I thought the heavens were coming down

about us to punish when I blessed myself and said a Hail Mary like those awful thunderbolts in Gibraltar and they come and tell you theres no God what could you do if it was running and rushing about nothing only make an act of contrition the candle I lit that evening in Whitefriars street chapel for the month of May see it brought its luck though hed scoff if he heard *because* (1) he never goes to church mass or meeting he says your soul you have no soul inside only grey matter *because* (2) he doesnt know what it is to have one yes when I lit the lamp yes *because* (3) he must have come 3 or 4 times with that tremendous big red brute of a thing he has... [emphasis added] (Joyce, 1984, p. 611)

Just like in the previous Example D1, the successive use of a conjunction (the subordinating “because”) creates an impression of textual linearity but careful scrutiny reveals that only the first two directly share a subordinate relationship with the previous lines. The third “because” is semantically unconnected to the previous lines, much less share any parallel relationship with the previous two “because,” revealing perhaps a logical lapse on Molly’s part or maybe some direct consequence of her sexual excitement after reminiscing about Bloom’s sexual prowess, all made too vivid in her visual imagination of his tumescent member. Yes.

In view of the above analysis of how Joyce’s successive employment of the conjunctions “and” and “because” may at times create a false impression of linearity, it would suffice to say that the disturbed structure of passages like the above example actually debunks the absolutist way Joycean scholars describe Penelopean text as a continuously “flowing,” uninhibited stream. In fact, such a “hidden” two-tier structure actually retards readers’ text processing.

Overcoming Difficulties: A Hermeneutic Problem

We saw above how “Penelope” differs from the rest of *Ulysses* in many ways, and how the reader who has reached this last episode would surely find the thought representation techniques Joyce used on Molly to be utterly different from the other styles. Molly tells her story by drawing from her memories and her present circumstances, and her flights of fancy often touch on unexplained allusions to details from the other episodes. This makes reading “Penelope” all the more challenging, and when thought representational aspects related to autonomous monologue, as well as the absence of punctuation, exacerbate the difficulty of interpreting her mental excursions, the obstacles to a clear, unequivocal reading are multiplied several fold. Since Molly engages in reveries of events and people, it would be implausible to expound to herself facts she already knew, and for this reason, all exposition is barred from the text (Cohn, 1978, p. 221). In fact, the task of exposition is, in more traditional narratives, best assigned to the omniscient narrator, who has already been divested of this functional role right from the very beginning in the autonomous monologue milieu of this episode. This implicit occurrence of Molly’s facts of life partly explains why reading her thought streams sometimes does not lead to real closure. Indeed, there are missing pieces needed for us to complete the picture pattern of *Ulysses*’ final jigsaw puzzle.

While in earlier episodes that spliced narrated monologue with psychonarration the reader goes to great pains to find his way in the forest of words just so as to tell who is, or are, speaking at any given passage, the pleasantly beleaguered reader discovers the singular voice of Molly reverberating all throughout this final episode as we have noted earlier. Joyce adopts the

autonomous monologue mode as a fictional technique to project the character of Molly the way he did narrated and quoted monologues to project Stephen's and Bloom's. And he is certainly successful enough in using this mode to present to us the inner world of so unique a *dramatis persona* as Molly Bloom. However, as shown by our analysis in the previous sections, Joyce's attempt to suggest that her silent soliloquy is an unbroken stream through the abundant use of the connective "and" and the absence of punctuation marks, really confuses the reader and actually "calls attention to the technique" (Schute & Steinberg, 1970, p. 174).

Schute and Steinberg (1970) are right in saying so for quite a number of reasons. For one, the absence of punctuative and typological markers we have mentioned above is quite problematic. Thornton argues that we find ourselves "stumbling over puzzles" created by their absence (2000, p. 132). Indeed, any reader of "Penelope" has to constantly go back and forth a passage to glean meaning from the text (Yee, 1997, p. 66), just like an auto-focus camera rotating its lens clockwise and counterclockwise just so as to capture the sharpest image of its subject. Easier said than done as this "gleaning" further requires from the reader an excellent command of grammar, coupled with no-ordinary mastery of the wires of English syntax. Without the orthographic aid provided by punctuation, a reader is compelled to figure out for himself the demarcations among the sentences, clauses and phrases that haphazardly abut one another in Molly's discourse. There is a constant ordering, comparing, rearranging, and comparing again going on in the busy mind of the reader as s/he plods on through the text, often forced to employ the same degree of "scrupulous meanness" Joyce has put into his writing just so as to arrive at the meaning of a Molly passage. After all, reading Ulyssean text is akin to forensic work, forcing the reader to search for meaning by way of a scrupulously thorough investigation of textual fingerprints left by James Joyce.

At this juncture, we must point out that in order for one to carry out an interpretive analysis of Ulyssean texts, the hermeneutic circle plays an important role. As Ricoeur writes:

...the reconstruction of the text's architecture takes the form of a circular process, in the sense that the presupposition of a certain kind of whole is implied in the recognition of the parts... It is in construing the details that we construe the whole. (1976, p. 77)

A concept perennially recurring in reading and interpretation discourse, the hermeneutic circle will serve as a tool in our analysis and interpretation of Molly's oleaginous soliloquy in the following examples. To better understand the demands and mechanics of this mental word game, let us try to unravel a couple of thought streams in "Penelope," as follows:

(Example F1)

**no thats no way for him has he no manners nor no refinement nor no nothing in his nature slapping us behind like that on my bottom because I didn't call him Hugh the ignoramus that doesnt know poetry from a cabbage thats what you get for not keeping them in their proper place pulling off his shoes and trousers there on the chair before me so barefaced without even asking permission and standing out that vulgar way in the half of a shirt they wear to be admired like a priest... (Joyce, 1984, p. 638)

Looking at the first three lines, we notice that the first group of words giving a coherent meaning is "no thats no way for him," realizing that the next word, "has," cannot, following the rules of English syntax, form part of the first

group of words, the words “him” and “has” being impossible to sit side-by-side in proper English. The next coherent group of words begins just where the first group ended, “has,” which links up with the succeeding string of words that extends all the way down to the word “nature.” Armed with our knowledge of grammar and syntax, we identify the question “has he no manners nor no refinement nor no nothing in his nature.” The next word is “slapping,” which does not link with the last word of the previous word group, “nature.” Although Joyce omitted the question mark, we recognize that the above sentence is interrogative not just by the sense of the train of words but also by the key word “has” coming at the head of the sentence. Applying this mechanism of textual analysis, the next coherent group of words is “slapping us behind like that on my bottom because I didn’t call him Hugh.” This sentence fragment has a missing subject. If we go back to the earlier part of the passage, we arrive at the word “he.”

By repeating this cyclic hermeneutic process, a reader identifies each coherent grouping of words in “Penelope” in a way resembling a succession of awakenings, or perhaps, epiphanies of the cognitive kind. This description of the steps may sound overly simplistic and naïvely straightforward, as the actual psycholinguistic processes leading to understanding Molly’s reveries are a whole lot more complicated, involving various factors such as excellent command of English grammar, idioms and syntax, as well as cognitive-interpretive operations needed for identifying the discrete assemblage of words that concur to make coherent sense. Here, it should be noted that the comparison of parts with the whole, and the whole to its parts, or what we have called “hermeneutic circle” above, plays an important role in textual exegesis. This is exactly what Yee meant when he writes that the reader has to constantly go back and forth a passage to glean meaning from the text (1997, p. 66). And as Steinberg aptly puts it, a reader is constantly feeling for the ends of sentences as he progresses

and he is continually reminded of the difficulty of the reading (1973, p. 283). It then suffices to say that although Molly's discourse is more than often hailed as a continuously flowing "stream," in all actuality, readers comprehend her reveries in staccato intermittent spurts. Again, this observation of ours contrasts strongly with the "uninhibited" flow reported by Beeretz (1998) and others. Indeed, readers have to tackle Molly's relentless verbosity in a stop-and-go fashion, hardly what some scholars label as "flowing."

In the reading process we have cited above, syntax plays a pivotal role. Syntax is the agreement and right disposition of words in a sentence and a sentence is the assemblage of words, expressed in the right order, and joining together to make a complete sense. In *Ulysses*, Joyce manipulates the order of words and their agreement to achieve the many modes of expression we now see in his novel. Such a distortion of syntax towards the unconventional is one major source of reading difficulty in Molly's discourse. Comparably, however, such "reordering" is considerably less intense in "Penelope" than in the other preceding stream-of-consciousness episodes. Molly's thought streams come in statements consisting of orthographically indiscrete though semantically recognizable strands of words made so by the relative lack of sophistication in Molly Bloom's language. In contrast, in the rest of the episodes where psycho-narration, narrated monologue and quoted monologue techniques mix, match, and often, also compete with one another, syntax is corrupted down to degenerate levels of even-lower intelligibility. In "Penelope," Joyce creates a well-controlled scenario "involving no exchanges with other characters or with the public world, and few perceptions or sensations that are not easily conveyed" (Thornton, 2000, p. 132). In the earlier episodes, a reader constantly faces the challenge of understanding a discourse where authorial and figural voices overlap, thus impeding the task of distinguishing point of view. Just to compare, here's one typical passage from "Lestrygonians":

(Example G1)

With ha keep quiet relief, his eyes took note this is the street here middle of the day of Bob Doran's bottle shoulders. (Joyce, 1984, p. 137)

Reading this passage consisting of one psycho-narration sentence that hosts three quoted monologues is made difficult by the mindboggling overlap of point of view. Sentences like this are certainly much more challenging than Molly's monologue.

The much more simplified narratological conformation of the "Penelope" episode therefore gave Joyce the wherewithal to rid his text of all typological markers, something that would have made Bloom's stream of consciousness passages extremely unintelligible. Just to illustrate, let us try removing all such markers from a passage, also from "Lestrygonians," viz:

(Example H1)

sardines on the shelves almost taste them by looking sandwich ham and his descendants mustered and bred there potted meats what is home without plumtrees potted meat incomplete what a stupid ad under the obituary notices they stuck it all up a plumtree Dignams potted meat cannibals would with lemon and rice white missionary too salty like pickled pork expect the chief consumes the parts of honour ought to be tough from exercise his wives in a row to watch the effect. [alterations mine] (Joyce, 1984, p. 140)

Here, in the absence of punctuation, we observe that the vagaries of Bloom's thoughts, expressed in choppy monologue moieties, coalesce into a turbid brew of stunted sentences, phrases and clauses—some barely discernible, others perplexingly run-on—that are generally quite challenging to comprehend.

Gottfried argues that in *Ulysses*, it is syntax that marshals the parts into a unity and infuses the novel with a sense of control, and which gives meaning, proportion and effect to Joyce's expressive forms (1980, p. 47). Well said, for indeed, it is syntax that largely makes Molly's unpunctuated reveries relatively easier to unravel.

Let us take a look at how Xiao and Wen read the excerpt above:

(Example F2)

** 不行 他這個人簡直無可救藥 他天生就不懂禮貌 不文雅
 啥都不會 因為不肯稱他作休 就從背後像那樣拍我的屁股 是
 個連詩和白菜都分不清楚的蠢才 都怪你不教他們放規矩點兒才
對你這樣的 臉皮真厚 甚至都沒問一聲可不可以 當著我的面
 兒就在那把椅子上將鞋和褲子扒下來啦 上半身兒光剩件襯衫
楞頭楞腦地站在那 還指望著人家像神父啦…… [emphasis added]
 (Joyce, 1995, p. 1611)

In the first few lines, we notice the original question “has he no manners nor no refinement nor no nothing in his nature” was turned into a declarative sentence with a less feminine tone. The second 他 is also unnecessary for it tends to polish the rough, stunted syntax of the original. Also notice how Xiao and Wen embellish Joyce's original text by explicating his Chinese translation (see the Chinese characters in bold type). Other than the stylistic deviation and his attempt to gloss over some of the truncated clauses, Xiao and Wen's translation of the passage is generally commendable for its semantic and tonal fidelity to Joyce's original.

This and Xiao and Wen's adopted strategy to make things explicit, combined with his approach of splitting the text by inserting blank spaces, make his version far more reader-friendly than Joyce's original. In that spaced-

segregated format, employment of the workings of the hermeneutic circle are made less necessary. Again, as in his translation of the other episodes, Jin followed Molly's monologue morphology and Joyce's original more closely than Xiao and Wen did in terms of format (no space breaks). In Xiao and Wen's version, the original's fragmentary thought streams pouring down *ad infinitum* are indeed made more readable by his explicitation strategy that gives Molly's soliloquy a more realistic touch. However, as we have seen above, the end result is a far cry from the deliberately Modernist tempo of Joyce's original work. After such an alteration by Xiao and Wen, we can say that Joyce is no longer Joyce.

Conclusion

The Chinese translations of *Ulysses* were largely completed in difficult times. Xiao and Wen were preoccupied with political matters as they worked on the translation in China. Xiao claims to have undergone persecution during the Cultural Revolution, and out of fear of a possible political reprisal were he to adopt a "decadently" bourgeois Modernist translation strategy, Xiao and his wife had to resort to a "politically-correct" approach that favored a realist translation of *Ulysses* (Tee, 2013a, p. 205). However, political winds changed for the better in the latter years of their translation project, emboldening the couple to somehow "reflect" Joyce's Modernist style by accomplishing the space-segregated translation we see today (Tee, 2013a, p. 206). Notwithstanding, readers of the Chinese versions deserve to enjoy the linguistically delectable experience of reading Joyce's masterpiece with all its "drama of writing" as Lawrence calls it (1982, p. 127). And as Wang also reminds us, in modern fiction, the plot is much less valued than the beauty and charm lying in the deliberate ordering of narrative events, details and wordplay (1997, p. 277). A

Joyce scholar who did his translation in the United States, Jin follows a style closely shadowing the original structure but he at times also gives way to an explicitation strategy that robbed the episode of some of its Modernist appeal. As our analysis also shows, both translators were often misled by Joyce's autonomous monologue expressions.

Indeed, reading Molly entails certain difficulties peculiar to this episode's style, language and content. We have seen above just how the absence of a third-person narrator has deprived "Penelope" of an overriding final voice (Wales, 1992, p. 102), leaving Molly's reveries to assume the pulsating form of a seemingly endless train of loosely connected sentence fragments all needing some conductor to direct them towards a cohesive plot. Monologic stories such as "Penelope" are especially disconcerting for readers, who by convention and reading habit, usually expect a complete picture in the realist sense. Precisely, Molly's discourse vibrates with incompleteness. While the simplicity of Molly's diction, in tandem with her epistolary style common in *fin-de-siècle* 19th century Dublin, makes her discourse relatively more understandable, Joyce's cunning design of stripping the text of all orthographic signposts adds a defamiliarizing touch, effectively retarding the reader from proceeding quickly down the text. We have seen above how, bereft of punctuation, Molly's thought streams are slower to read as they always require constant comparison of the parts with the whole, and the whole with its parts at a degree and frequency more pronounced than usual. The misreading by the Chinese translators we have seen above best illustrates this difficulty. Yet, compared with the more complicated initial styles of Joyce's oeuvre, reading "Penelope" is, undoubtedly, an easy undertaking, relatively speaking that is.

The omniscient, and at times, also omnipotent, narrator in the other episodes of the novel is glaringly absent in "Penelope." But this "totally effaced narrator," as Chatman (1990) once referred to him (as cited in Herman &

Vervaeck, 2001, p. 99), actually reminds us of the overarching presence of the author who, in ways similar to a marionette puppeteer's, wields pervasive control over how Molly is presented in the story. Molly is a figment of Joyce's literary genius, just as her experiences, her memories, her attitudes and her values are. While the autonomous monologue mode may not exactly be the optimum way of presenting the full complexity of a character and his relationship with the society he moves in, James Joyce's adoption of this mode of presenting conscious minds has successfully created a figure as intriguingly enigmatic as Molly Bloom, who, without any doubt, is one of the great characters of literature. Yes.

References

- Attridge, D. (2000). *Joyce effects: On language, theory, and history*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Beeretz, S. (1998). *Tell us in plain words: Narrative strategies in James Joyce's Ulysses*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Chatman, S. (1990). *Coming to terms: The rhetoric of narrative fiction and film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cohn, D. (1978). *Transparent minds: Narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Eco, U. (1982). *The aesthetics of chaosmos: The middle ages of James Joyce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- French, M. (1982). *The book as world: James Joyce's Ulysses*. London, England: Sphere Books.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1992). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. Marshall, Trans.). New York, NY: Crossroad. (Original work published 1960)
- Gillespie, M. P. (1989). *Reading the book of himself: Narrative strategies in the works of James Joyce*. Columbus, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Goldberg, S. L. (1961). *The classical temper: A study of James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*. London, England: Chatto & Windus.
- Gottfried, R. K. (1980). *The art of Joyce's syntax in Ulysses*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Hayman, D. (1970). *Ulysses: The mechanics of meaning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Herman, L., & Vervaeck, B. (2001). *Handbook of narrative analysis*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Joyce, J. (1984). *Ulysses*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

- Kelly, D. (1988). *Narrative strategies in Joyce's Ulysses*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Korg, J. (1979). *Language in modern literature: Innovation and experiment*. Sussex, England: Harvester Press.
- Lawrence, K. (1982). *The odyssey of style in Ulysses*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mahaffey, V. (1999). Sidereal writing: Male refractions and malefactions in Ithaca. In K. Devlin & M. Reisbaum (Eds.), *Ulysses—En-gendered perspectives: Eighteen new essays on the episodes* (pp. 254-266). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1983). *Narrative fiction: Contemporary poetics*. London, England: Routledge.
- Schute, W. M., & Steinberg, E. (1970). The fictional technique of *Ulysses*. In T. Staley & B. Benstock (Eds.), *Approaches to Ulysses: Ten essays* (pp. 157-178). Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Smurthwaite, J. (2006). Verbal or visual?: 'Penelope' and contemporary psychology. In R. Brown (Ed.), *Joyce, 'Penelope' and the body* (pp. 75-83). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Steinberg, E. R. (1973). *The stream of consciousness and beyond in Ulysses*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Tee, C. G. (2013a). *Reading Ulysses, translating stream of consciousness: A hermeneutic view* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Graduate Institute of Cross-Cultural Studies Comparative Literature Program, Fu Jen Catholic University, New Taipei City.
- Tee, C. G. (2013b). Stream of consciousness, peristalsis and translation: Lestrygonians from the narratological perspective. *NTU Studies in Language*

and Literature, 29, 53-85.

Thornton, W. (2000). *Voice and values in Joyce's Ulysses*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Tindall, W. Y. (1950). *James Joyce: His way of interpreting the modern world*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's.

Wales, K. (1992). *The language of James Joyce*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Wang, Y. (1997). Translations of the century: A careful reading of two Chinese versions of *Ulysses*. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 35(1), 269-279.

Yee, C. D. K. (1997). *The word according to James Joyce: Reconstructing representation*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Chinese References

Joyce, J. (1993). *Ulysses* (D. Jin, Trans.). Taipei, Taiwan: Chiuko. (Original work published 1922)

【喬伊斯 (Joyce, J.) (1993) 。尤利西斯 (金隄譯) 。臺北：九歌。(原著出版年：1922)】

Joyce, J. (1995). *Ulysses* (Q. Xiao & J. R. Wen, Trans.). Taipei, Taiwan: China Times. (Original work published 1922)

【喬伊斯 (Joyce, J.) (1995) 。尤利西斯 (蕭乾、文潔若譯) 。臺北：時報。(原著出版年：1922)】