



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE
DIPARTIMENTO DI LETTERATURE COMPARATE

JSI – Joyce Studies in Italy

Founder: Giorgio Melchiori
General editor: Franca Ruggieri
Legal editor: Franca Ruggieri

Joyce Studies in Italy is a peer-reviewed journal aimed at collecting materials, which throw light upon Joyce's work and Joyce's world. It is open to the contributions of scholars from other academic institutions, both in Italy and abroad and its broad intertextual approach is aimed at developing a better understanding of the literary and human figure of Joyce, who, both as an individual and a writer, still represents an all-important crossroads in Western culture. The project was initiated in the early Eighties by a research team at the University of Rome, 'La Sapienza', led by Giorgio Melchiori. In line with the editorial policy of JSI, no house style is imposed regarding the individual essays in the collection.

Under the auspices of honorary members Umberto Eco and Giorgio Melchiori, the James Joyce Italian Foundation was founded in 2006 (website: <http://host.uniroma3.it/associazioni/jjif>). The work of the Foundation, and the issues of the Piccola Biblioteca Joyciana series, are also intended to promote and further the work undertaken by Joyce Studies in Italy.

- 1 – JSI (1984) **Joyce in Rome: the Genesis of Ulysses**, ed. Giorgio Melchiori.
- 2 – JSI (1988) ed. Carla de Petris.
- 3 – JSI (1991) **Names and Disguises**, ed. Carla de Petris.
- 4 – JSI (1995) G. Melchiori, **Joyce's Feast of Languages**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 5 – JSI (1998) **Fin de Siècle and Italy**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 6 – JSI (1999) **Classic Joyce**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 7 – JSI (2002) **The Benstock Library as a Mirror of Joyce**, eds. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Franca Ruggieri.
- 8 – JSI (2003) **Romantic Joyce**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 9 – JSI (2006) **Joyce's Victorians**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 10 – JSI (2007) **Joyce and/in translation**, eds. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Ira Torresi.
- 11 – JSI (2010) **James Joyce, Metamorphosis and Re-Writing**, ed. Franca Ruggieri.
- 12- JSI (2012) **Polymorphic Joyce**, eds. Franca Ruggieri and Anne Fogarty.

Board of Advisors: Jacques Aubert (Univ. Lyons), Rosa Maria Bosinelli (Bologna-Forlì), Anne Fogarty (University College Dublin), John McCourt (Roma Tre), Timothy Martin (Rutgers), Jacqueline Risset (Roma Tre), Franca Ruggieri (Roma Tre), Fritz Senn (Zurich), Enrico Terrinoni (Perugia), Carla Vaglio Marengo (Torino).

JOYCE STUDIES IN ITALY

13

**WHY READ JOYCE
IN THE 21ST CENTURY?**

Edited by
FRANCA RUGGIERI AND ENRICO TERRINONI

EDIZIONI 
ROMA, 2012

*Volume pubblicato con il contributo
del Dipartimento di Letterature Comparete
dell'Università degli Studi Roma Tre*

TUTTI I DIRITTI RISERVATI

È vietata la traduzione, la memorizzazione elettronica,
la riproduzione totale o parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo,
compresa la fotocopia, anche ad uso interno o didattico.
L'illecito sarà penalmente perseguibile a norma dell'art. 171
della legge n. 633 del 22/04/1941

ISSN 2281-373X

ISBN 9788897831051

© 2012, Edizioni Q – Roma

www.edizioniq.it

e-mail: info@edizioniq.it

CONTENTS

Enrico Terrinoni <i>Preface. Why read Joyce at all?</i>	p.	13
Spurgeon Thompson <i>Returning to political interpretation: a communist Finnegans Wake</i>	»	17
Claire Culleton <i>Strick's Ulysses and war: why we read Joyce in the 21st Century</i>	»	37
Paul Fagan <i>"a mixer and wordpainter": Finnegans Wake in the age of remix culture</i>	»	49
Jonathan McCreedy <i>The Death of a Joyce Scholar and The Further Adventures of James Joyce: the crossroads of two reading publics</i>	»	69
Erika Mihálycsa <i>Horsey women and arse-temises: wake-ing Ulysses in translation</i>	»	79
Benjamin Boysen <i>Joyce's "politicoecomedie": on James Joyce's humorous deconstruction of ideology in Finnegans Wake</i>	»	93
Ilaria Natali <i>Joyce's "corpo straniero": the European dimension of Irishness in four border crossings</i>	»	105

Maria Vaccarella <i>A medical humanistic exploration of James Joyce</i> »	121
Emanuela Zirzotti <i>Have you ever “seen” Joyce? The role of the Internet in the popularization of the man and his work</i>	» 131
Patricia Pericic <i>The limits to literature in Ulysses in the 21st Century</i> »	145
Ivu I-chu Chang <i>Ulysses backed against the sea: Taiwan’s alternative modernity in Wang Wen-hsing’s Backed Against the Sea</i> »	155
Thierry Robin <i>Joyce’s “ghosts”..., Flann O’Brien, Samuel Beckett and John Banville</i> »	169
Maria Grazia Tonetto <i>The body of finitude</i>	» 185
Federico Sabatini <i>Contemporary Joyce: Joycean themes and stylistic techniques in William Trevor’s writings</i>	» 193
Andrea Binelli <i>Joyce and what is to become of English</i> »	209

CONTRIBUTORS

Andrea Binelli obtained his PhD from the University of Pisa in 2004 and has taught English Language and Translation at the University of Trento ever since. His latest book is *Of Englishes and Styles*, a socio-linguistic investigation of why and how the advertising discourse and the English language are going increasingly global in the age of social media networks and electronic reproduction. He is co-editor of *The Internationalist Review of Irish Culture*.

Benjamin Boysen (1975) has just defended a doctoral dissertation *The Ethics of Love: An Essay on James Joyce* which will be published this year. He is currently working on a book, *Gifted with Madness: On Philosophy and Literature*, on the relationship between philosophy and literature by pursuing the question of madness. The book will offer analysis and discussions of thinkers and poets such as Plato, Virgil, Molière, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Friedrich Nietzsche, H. C. Andersen, James Joyce, Jacques Lacan, and Stanislaw Lem.

Ivy I-chu Chang is currently Professor at the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department at National Chiao Tung University in Taiwan. She received her Ph.D. in Performance Studies from New York University. Her research interests mainly focus on modern literature, political theater, queer studies, and globalization theories. Her major books include *Remapping Memories and Public Space: Taiwan's Theater of Action in the Opposition Movement and Social Movements from 1986 to 1997*, and *Queer Performativity and Performance*. In addition to a great number of academic journal essays, she has also been engaged with creative writing. A winner of major prizes for novel, drama, poetry, and fiction over the decades, she has published many novels, short stories, poems, and plays.

Claire A. Culleton is a Professor of Modern British and Irish literature at Kent State University. Her books focus on twentieth-century culture and include: *Names and Naming in Joyce; Working-Class Culture, Wom-*

en, and Britain, 1914-1921; Joyce and the G-Men: J. Edgar Hoover's Manipulation of Modernism; and two co-edited collections, Modernism on File: Writers, Artists, and the FBI, 1920-1950 and Irish Modernism and the Global Primitive. She is General Editor of Palgrave Macmillan's Irish Studies series.

Paul Fagan is the co-founder and current co-president of the *International Flann O'Brien Society*, and co-chief editor of the society's E-Journal *The Parish Review*. Paul is currently completing his doctoral dissertation on Gricean violations and comic and sublime effects in the works of Swift, Sterne, Joyce, O'Brien and Beckett at the University of Vienna, where he teaches modernism and the Irish fantastic tradition.

Jonathan McCree is a PhD student at the University of Ulster, Northern Ireland. He is currently writing a thesis on the shapes of Joyce's compositional sigla in *Finnegans Wake*, which uses a genetic methodology. He is a native of the town of Derry.

Erika Mihálycsa obtained her PhD from Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj, where she currently teaches seminars in 20th century British fiction and drama. Her thesis explored the linguistic poetics in the fiction of Joyce, Flann O'Brien and Beckett; her fields of research cover Joyce and Beckett studies, poststructuralist theories, 20th century British and Anglo-Irish fiction and drama, as well as translation studies. Her work on Joyce, Beckett and Flann O'Brien has appeared in various, mainly Joyce-related volumes and periodica, including *Joyce Studies Annual*. In 2010 she co-organized, together with Fritz Senn, a workshop on specific translation problems in Joyce's *Ulysses*, at the Zurich James Joyce Foundation, the materials of which are forthcoming in the e-journal *Scientia Traductionis* (2012). Translator of modern and contemporary Irish and British prose and poetry into Hungarian, including Flann O'Brien's novel *At Swim-Two-Birds*.

Ilaria Natali has been Research Fellow at the University of Florence since 2008. She has published two books about genetic approaches to James Joyce criticism and an essay on the supernatural in Defoe's works. As a translator, she has focused on texts by Dryden, Kipling and Joyce. She has produced various articles and spoken at numerous international

conferences over the past ten years. Her current research is devoted to the work of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets who were imputed as being insane.

Patricia Pericic is a PhD research student in the English department at Kings College London. Her thesis explores the problem of alterity in James Joyce's poetics. Her main interests lie in the ethical relationship between being and alterity in modern literature. She completed her BA (Honours) in English, and MA in Critical Theory by research at Monash University. She is currently teaching 'Language in Time' at KCL.

Thierry Robin is a lecturer at the European University of Brittany, Brest. He is a current member of the research team HCTI-CEIMA EA4249 in Brest. His research focuses on contemporary Irish literature and the connections between ideology, epistemology and the concept of reality. He has written numerous articles about his favourite writers, including Oscar Wilde, Flann O'Brien, Samuel Beckett and John Banville. He has also published a book devoted to the study of Flann O'Brien's novels, entitled *Flann O'Brien, Un voyageur au bout du langage* (Rennes, 2008) and coedited a collection of essays bearing on political ideology, *Political Ideology in Ireland from the Enlightenment to the Present* (Cambridge Scholars publishing, 2009).

Federico Sabatini is a temporary lecturer at Turin University and the author of the books *Immarginabile. Lo spazio di Joyce, Beckett and Genet* (2007) and *James Joyce. Scrivere pericolosamente* (2011). He has published a number of articles on Modernism, Joyce, Woolf, Beckett and Pound both in academic journals such as *Comparative Literature Studies*, *Nebula-Nobleworld*, *The Anachronist* and in book collections such as the proceedings of the Virginia Woolf Annual Conference and the forthcoming proceedings of the James Joyce Symposium, edited by Daniel Ferrer, Sam Slote and André Topia. He has extensively worked on intertextuality, modernism and philosophy (especially on Giordano Bruno) and modernism and science.

Enrico Terrinoni is Associate Professor of English Literature at the University for Foreigners, Perugia. Among his works are *Occult Joyce* (2007),

Language Lies (2008) and *Working on Texts* (2012). His annotated Italian translation of *Ulysses* was published in 2012. He is currently working on the new Italian edition of Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* and on a book on literary translation.

Spurgeon Thompson teaches at Fordham University and Adelphi University. He has published articles on James Joyce, W. B. Yeats, James Connolly, and other Irish writers in *Irish Studies Review*, *Eire-Ireland*, *The Irish University Review*, the *International Journal of English Studies*, *The Irish Journal of Feminist Studies*, *Cultural Studies*, and *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*. He is the editor of the 'Irish Cultural Studies' special issue of *Cultural Studies* (2001) and the March 2008 special issue of *Interventions* on James Connolly. He is currently at work on the book project, *English is Dead: The Politics of Finnegans Wake*.

Maria Grazia Tonetto has completed a Ph.D. at the University of Rome "Sapienza" with a dissertation on Embodied Subjectivity in the Twentieth-century Novel. She has written on Paul Muldoon, DH Lawrence, Samuel Beckett, and, above all, James Joyce. She is author of *The Beauty of Mortal Conditions*, a monograph for the Piccola Biblioteca Joyciana.

Maria Vaccarella is based at the Centre for the Humanities and Health, King's College London, where she also teaches for the Comparative Literature Programme. Her background is in Anglo-Irish literature, cultural studies, and postcolonial studies. Her main research interests are narrative medicine, graphic illness narrative and their role in medical and patient education, and cancer narratives. She is in the organizing committee of "Irish Eyes: Vision in Modern Irish Culture", which will lead to a first event (early December 2012) in a larger project on cultural representations of medicine and medical issues in the British 'white' colonies.

Emanuela Zirzotti is teaching assistant at "Sapienza" University of Rome, where she graduated with a thesis on W. B. Yeats and Jonathan Swift and where she obtained her PhD in 2008 with a dissertation on Greek and Latin influences in the work of Seamus Heaney. She has

worked extensively on modern and contemporary poetry (English, Irish, American, and Postcolonial). Her publications include essays on W. B. Yeats, Joyce, American Graphic Novels and a translation. She has been a member of the James Joyce Italian Foundation since 2007.

PREFACE

ENRICO TERRINONI

WHY READ JOYCE AT ALL?

Judging by the attendance at Joycean symposia and gatherings around the globe, one would believe that those good crowds of readers are just the tip of the iceberg, and that Joyce is still an important presence in the reading market nowadays. One might even be tempted to suspect that our modern societies are full of crypto-Joyce scholars, who are not joiners and therefore rather prefer to adhere to their own personal forms of Joyceanism, without feeling the need to be part of any of the known sects. In fact, if modern and contemporary literature is quite unimaginable without the many echoes of Joyce's works that surface here and there, at times unexpectedly, in other writers' writings, one wonders whether Joyce still has a real impact on the common reader today. If the early works, *Dubliners* and *A Portrait*, are indeed an important part of our cultural heritage, due also to the fact that they are still read and studied at school, to say that *Ulysses* or even the *Wake* enjoy the same status can be to overstate the actual presence of Joyce in the literary scenario, especially for new generations of readers.

Nowadays, with all our free and shared knowledge, and despite our precious Wikipedia summaries of books, we have to acknowledge the sad truth that while some of Joyce's works are known, almost by heart, by many interpreters and fans around the world, they still remain obscure, or even neglected and forgotten, by an enormous number of readers.

Why read Joyce at all, then? The question comes to one's mind as a sort of reflection on the title of this collection, a title which implies that Joyce was indeed read in the 20th century. Alas, that century is gone. To be sure, that was a century we would not be in a position to interpret without including Joyce in the picture. Joyce helped us make sense of what happened in the short century we left behind, but not only that. Joyce's rethinking of

the world of literature shed light also on past centuries, on our common history, East and West, North and South. Joyce helped us spot the futility of partitions and sectarianisms in his attempt to bring together the culture of mankind by building encyclopedic masterpieces which became in turn almost reference books for many readers.

But what about today? Are Joyce's works still to be considered unavoidable by readers, as Joyce scholars often seem to take for granted? Do we still need those books to understand better not only modern and contemporary literature and culture, but the world that surrounds us, with the many others we meet every day outside our doors, with their untold stories and their unsaid truths?

We need a better excuse to describe his works as fundamental as far as modern culture is concerned than stylistic mastery, literary cunning, or the capacity to map our unconscious. Though Joyce's books help make visible what is thought to be invisible and immaterial in our lives, we need something better than that to "sell" them to younger generations of readers.

In recent times, youths have been exposed to all sorts of complex representations of reality, they know well the potential of fast links and connections through technology, they can retrieve even obscure information through channels that would be a mine of gold for wise researchers. The fear is that Joyce, for all his pre-post-modernism, will not stupefy anymore those young kids who are used to the possibilities afforded them by the Internet—to mention only one of the big changes and challenges of our modern world.

What do new readers need to know that they do not know yet in order to persuade them that to read Joyce, when they are still young, will open their minds? When you have been exposed to the infiniteness of the universe, the utterly complex story of our wonderful world seems but an atom. And, what was the role of Joyce criticism in all that? Did it help find new reasons why Joyce *has* to be (re)read? No doubt, the Joyce industry is one of the most flourishing in the literary scenario, and every day a new approach to Joyce is presented. But how self-enclosed is the community of Joyce experts? How far does the impact of their discoveries go? And, does the humanism of Joyce's message not get lost along the way, in our attempt to dig up the secrets he left for us to discover, in years, decades, and centuries of hard exegetic work? Finally, is the pleasure of reading Joyce really passed on to new readers outside the academic circles through our specialist readings?

Of course, nobody could realistically be nowadays in a position to find comprehensive answers to all the above questions. However, some suggestions may come from the words of another master of the 20th century, Jorge Luis Borges, who in his “Invocation to Joyce” wrote:

what does my lost generation matter,
that dim mirror,
if your books justify us?
I am the others. I am those
who have been rescued by your pains and care.
I am those unknown to you and saved by you. (<2012>)

Is Borges’s confession enough to persuade everybody that Joyce is still there to help us when we need him? Of course not. Let’s look then at the “wisdom” of another Irish writer, who also provided a very personal interpretation of the role of James Joyce in modern culture: a famous communist Irish republican by the name of Brendan Behan. He was an IRA volunteer with little time for linguistic abstrusity. His language is always very direct, and he was never lost for words. When he went to Spain in the fifties he declared to the custom officer there: “I have come to attend the funeral of General Franco,” and when the man answered “But the Generalissimo still lives,” Brendan said, “in that case, I’ll wait.” Like Joyce, he was something of an exile. He spent much of his life away from his country, and from his family too. Ireland, he said, was a nice place to get a card from. He was often away also because he was forcefully kept from home. Being, as he boasted, the “most captured Irish republican in history,” he spent several years in prison. He lived for some time in Paris, and though Joyce was not there when Brendan was haunting bohemian cafés and bars, the Irish master helped him all the same, just as he helped Borges:

Here in the Rue St André des Arts,
Plastered in an Arab Tavern,
I explain you to an eager Frenchman,
Ex-G.I.s and a drunken Russian.
Of all you wrote I explain each part,
Drinking Pernod in France because of your art. (1960, 179)

A good reason to read Joyce today is that he can still save us. One would be wrong, though, if one thought of redemption, of course, or any-

thing to that extent. The type of rescue involved here is a bit more profane, if you like. Joyce can help us see through the surface of what we take to be “discourse”, but which is actually nothing but another masked version of reality. He can help us understand that our existence is, in the end, a material affair, and that even when we deal with immaterial stuff (memory, the soul, psyche), a good way to make sense of the world is to understand that the surface of things is nothing but a shadow.

Men constantly live in the shadow, as Giordano Bruno taught us (see 1997). Joyce was fond of Bruno and perhaps one of the most important teachings he got from the Nolan is that, though always encompassed and constrained by the changing countours of this worldly shadowiness, we can still attempt to grasp what is beyond “our mortal world”, only to know that the outside of our shadows is still “a darkness shining in brightness which brightness could not comprehend” (1992, 28).

References

- Behan, Brendan. 1960. *Brendan Behan's Island*. Hutchinson: London.
- Borges, Jorge Louis. 2012. “Invocation to Joyce”, transl. Norman Thomas Di Giovanni http://www.themodernword.com/joyce/joyce_influence_borges.html
- Bruno, Giordano. 1997. *Le ombre delle idee, Il canto di Circe, Il sigillo dei sigilli*. Milano: BUR.
- Joyce, James. 1992. *Ulysses*. Penguin: London.

RETURNING TO POLITICAL INTERPRETATION:
A COMMUNIST *FINNEGANS WAKE*¹

I'd like to recall an age when we knew less about *Finnegans Wake*. If possible, I'd like to recover that sense of estrangement paired with interpretive freedom we had about the text before the arrival of genetic criticism in full force in the last 15 years, before we all knew and used the annotated Buffalo Notebooks, before we knew what Sam Slote and Luca Crispi have titled their book, that is, *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake* (2007), indeed before we had access to the advanced critical apparatus Finn Fordham has made available to us in his *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake* (2007) and his excellent new Oxford World Classics edition of the novel (2012) alongside the revised standard, McHugh's *Annotations* (2006). I want to turn the clock back, in short, to a time when we didn't know what we were doing. I believe our methods of approaching *Finnegans Wake* have fallen into somewhat inhibiting, rigid patterns and need to be shaken up or revised. And the attempts we've made in the past have something to teach us about where to go next.

I. Why we need new ways to interpret *Finnegans Wake*

Just before the ascendancy of genetic criticism, a wave of interpretations—especially raw or *strong political interpretations*—suddenly invested the act of reading *Finnegans Wake* with an urgency it hadn't had before; I'm recalling the rise of controversial works like Colin MacCabe's *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* (1978) (which he later, himself, calls "Leninist")

¹ This article is based on a plenary delivered for the James Joyce Graduate Conference IV: 'Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?' University of Rome Tré, Rome, Italy, 2 February 2011. I would like to thank the organizers of the conference, Enrico Terrinoni, Franca Ruggieri, and John McCourt for making the occasion of its presentation possible.

and then Manganiello's magisterial *Joyce's Politics* (1980) and Seamus Deane's *Celtic Revivals* (1987) (as well as his 1992 introduction to the UK Penguin edition). Then came the early nineties-critics like James Fairhall, Vincent Cheng, and Emer Nolan who all tried their hand at political interpretations of *Finnegans Wake*. Back in 1995 we knew so little; the first of the published Buffalo Notebooks, for example, were six years away. And while all the notes were there—for decades—to be edited, commented on, sorted and annotated, most of us had no real idea how *Finnegans Wake* came into existence by that point. Only a handful of scholars understood the compositional history of the text. Without the notebooks, without an authoritative history of the composition of the book, without the web-based version or FWEET to aid us, without a revised *Annotations*, so many of us were just reading in the dark. I remember, in fact, two decades ago, as an undergraduate in a Joyce honors seminar in which we had to read all four of Joyce's big books, our professor had decided that the best way to deal with *Finnegans Wake* was to simply cover a book per week reading out loud passages we found interesting, and just letting the associations flow; while I look back to that kind of communal, out-loud reading of the book as being unique in all my experience, I also remember being completely lost—and remaining so, for a good month. Reading *Finnegans Wake* in the dark like this, though, was hardly a new condition, and it has long been the way the book was encountered.

So, to try and defamiliarize the text (or to recover a sense of innocence about approaching it) I will turn the clock back even further, to the months of its publication. Its earliest major reviewers give us a good sense of what it was like to encounter *Finnegans Wake* in all its radical strangeness. The question asked by the 2011 Fourth James Joyce Graduate Student Conference in Rome was, "Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?" And many of the earliest reviewers of *Work in Progress* and *Finnegans Wake* were posing the more fundamental question of "why read Joyce—in any century?" Like the hostile critics of fascist Italy (and post-fascist Italy) that Umberto Eco so carefully documented in "Joyce's Misfortunes in Italy," very few early reviewers had anything good to say about the book (2008). Take the reviewer of the *Atlantic Monthly* in June of 1939 who suggested it was probably better to take the five-dollar bill it costs to buy the book and burn it to light a cigarette, which would be far more satisfying anyway. "Translated," he says, "into native Tasmanian, this book should have a well deserved sale" (Fagnoli 2003, 353). (The last known speaker of any of the Tasmanian languages died in 1905.) Or the *Irish Times*, which, poetically suggests that, "after *Ulysses* he had no more

to say, in *Finnegans Wake* he went on saying it” and May 1939’s *Times Literary Supplement* which heartily recommends it for “a splendid audience of one,” that is, for James Joyce himself to read (*Ibid.*, 354). Looking at early responses to Joyce, John Nash, in a 2008 article, has gone so far as to say that Joyce’s “reception, then, also consists in his not being read (a fact of which he was well aware)” (2008, 109). In these negations, then, I will argue, are important triggers or start-points to interpretation. When we are in the dark, the direction we reach out our hands or what actions we take first tell us much.

Even though it is embarrassing and a little amusing for us, today, to watch early readers grope and try to interpret or even to reply to what they saw in *Finnegans Wake* when it was first published, their value lies in their radical innocence. Imagine being a book reviewer at the *New York Herald Tribune* in early 1939, handed a copy of *Finnegans Wake*, and told to write about it for the next printing of the paper. No critical equipment to guide you, no “keys” to unlock its mysteries, no idea what this book is except that it took 16 years to write (as the blurb on the back informs you), you are truly lost. Here’s what a diligent *New York Herald Tribune* reviewer came up with. First of all, according to his reading, the book’s hero is a Norwegian living in Dublin, who has been a postman, brewery worker, and a shop assistant at various points in his life. His name is mysteriously HCE and he is “carrying on a flirtation with a girl named Anna Livia”. According to the reviewer, Alfred Kazin, there are 17 or 18 languages present in the book, and it is, he concludes, “the sleep, in truth, not of one man, but of a drowsing humanity” putting his finger on a debate John Bishop would make widely influential. He also concludes, “As one tortures one’s way through *Finnegans Wake*, an impression grows that Joyce has lost his hold on human life” (Fargnoli 2003, 352). Harsh words, but nowhere near as harsh as Sean O’Faolain’s judgment in a letter to *Criterion*, reiterating that *Finnegans Wake* “comes from nowhere, goes nowhere, is not part of life at all” (*Ibid.*, 353) not to mention that it’s “morally deficient”. “628 pages of pedantic nonsense,” a “ghastly stodge,” concludes the *Atlantic Monthly*, which is certain that readers someplace will be found, if not in Tasmania, somewhere, for this kind of writing (a particular brand of reader, that is). “Readers [who] are not interested in what the author’s words mean to him, but in what they mean to them” (*Ibid.*, 353). There is something in each one of these dismissals that should catch our attention. What are they each reaching for?

Of course the most intriguing dismissal was to come from Rebecca West, who, when meeting the text of *Work in Progress* in January of 1930,

would make the following argument against reading Joyce. The one who would read *Finnegans Wake* is a “dithering spendthrift of time”. She argues:

[If...] Mr. James Joyce is to take ten, or twenty, or thirty years packing allusions into portmanteau words; and if his readers are to take twelve ... or twenty five, or forty years unpacking these allusions out of portmanteau words, it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that troops have been marched up a hill and then down again. A work of art planned in a medium and then executed in a second medium, which cannot be comprehended by any audience unless they can transport it by mental effort back into the first medium, is a crazy conception, and even Mr. Joyce's most devoted followers do regard it as essential that they should unmake his words into constituents of which he made them, and should acquaint themselves with his subject matter as it appeared to him before he clothed it in these words (*Ibid.*, 327).

According to her reasoning here, Joyce should just tell them what he was thinking about, proffer to his followers his subject matter plainly, and talk to them directly about the things he's alluding to. To a rightly humorless Rebecca West, with urgent socialist and feminist projects absorbing her time constantly, writing at the very onset of the Great Depression, this was a relevant issue indeed. Who would waste their time breaking down into elements something that had already existed in those elements before? What's the point of that? “A cipher [always] takes longer for a stranger to read,” she says, “than for its inventor to write” (*Ibid.*, 327). West's argument against reading Joyce, then, hinges on a particular mode of interpretation that she assumes the book calls for: the “unpacking” type of interpretation, a hermeneutics of rational explanation set ticking like a machine, systematically disassembling *Finnegans Wake* so we can see how it works, and read what it alludes to. To West, it's just common sense that this is what portmanteau words and extensive allusion calls for. As a cipher, naturally it requires time-consuming decoding. The other early reviewers bring other assumptions to the table: 1) they seek characters and narrative, as Kazin does, 2) they seek morality and purpose like O'Faolain, and, 3) they imagine readers' responses, speculating about the book's reception and worth—like *The Atlantic Monthly*, *The Irish Times*, etc., and they all wonder about the author's intentions. Assumptions about interpretation have evolved considerably since 1939. Or at least they ought to have; the assumptions, however, resting at the base of the field of Joyce Studies have shifted little. While growing quantitatively at an exponential rate (Joyce Studies is second only to

Shakespeare studies in terms of the volume of literary criticism produced), its guiding assumptions remain close to what these early reviewers—each coming to the book blind—articulate.

For example, Derek Attridge, notes, just four years ago, that “we have only just begun the task of understanding *Finnegans Wake*” (2008, xx). And then he says he was surprised by the absence of any extended discussion of the book among papers gathered together in the proceedings of a graduate student conference:

Is this a sign that, although the *Wake* is no longer the awkward and, for many critics, unapproachable oddity in the canon that it was when I was a graduate student, it remains a hard nut to crack...? (*Ibid.*, xviii)

Attridge and West seem to agree here: crack the nut, break it down into its elements. Seek to “understand” the book this way. Find out how it functions by reducing it to its constituent parts, the way a mechanic takes apart an automobile or a chef names the ingredients in a soup by taste alone.

Or we could pose the task Eco posed in 1962 when he wrote, “Having determined what Joyce wished to do, we must now ask why he proposed this task” (1989). Not the question of how, not what, but *why*, Eco seeks an answer to. But broader-minded than Rebecca West, Eco imagined,

An infinity of allusions, contained in a word or resulting from the coupling of two words, escape the reader. Many of the allusions, in fact, escape the author himself, who has prepared a machinery of suggestion which, like any complex machine, is capable of operating beyond the original intentions of its builder (1989, 67).

A Cusanian vision of a “polydimensional reality,” Eco calls it almost 50 years ago, a “grandiose epistemological metaphor” (*Ibid.*, 74) or a “universe of relativity” (*Ibid.*, 76) requiring his famous ideal reader. He concludes that “the main lesson that we can draw from the Joycean experience is a lesson in poetics” (*Ibid.*, 85) indeed a lesson in the “internal coherence” of artistic expression.²

² Almost 50 years ago, Eco asserts, “*Finnegans Wake* is the first and the most notable literary example of this tendency of contemporary art. To say that such universes of artistic discourse need not be immediately translatable into concrete ‘utilization’. [...] This discourse

Finnegans Wake has always exceeded attempts to understand it reductively, though, regardless of our repeated attempts. In one of the best books written on Joyce in the last decade, *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (2003), Tim Conley notes that,

The challenge Joyce's last book poses to criticism's tendency towards allegory [...] has not been directly accepted [...] The unchecked urge to simplify, to reduce what may be more than metaphor to something less than metonymy is ridiculed by Joyce's language's own self-awareness... (2003, 18).

The language itself seems to ridicule reduction, unhinge allegorical interpretations, and leave "understanding" of the kind Attridge recommends impossible. Calling attention to the extreme difficulty posed to any set of assumptions about interpretation a reader brings to the book, Conley reminds us of Fritz Senn's cautioning, "Its compressed, fractured language can be seen [...] as an attempt to rectify the errors of assertive simplification at once" (*Ibid.*, 20). Conley reminds us that Terry Eagleton, long ago, called *Finnegans Wake* a "trial by fire for any hermeneutic theory one cares to advance" (*Ibid.*, 19). A trial by fire, I should add, that nobody passes. Think of Alfred Kazin sitting in his Brooklyn study, faced with this incredibly strange text, having to make some sense of it for his *Tribune* readers—charged with assessing its literary and artistic value and probably calling upon the expertise of his friend Hanna Arendt as he tried. He decodes what he reads as a Norwegian "carrying on a flirtation" with a girl named Anna Livia in Dublin inside the dream of a drowsing humanity. A long history of such valiant interpretive failures, surely, is part of what makes Seamus Deane *begin* his "Introduction" to the book (almost 20 years ago) with the sentence, "The first thing to say about *Finnegans Wake* is that it is, in an important sense, unreadable" (*FW* 1992, vii). Its first interpreters's first readings attest to that, partly because they failed to examine their assumptions.

In 1997, Thomas Jackson Rice noted the fact that, "those who have been boring into [the] mountain of *Finnegans Wake* from the top down, analyzing its grand themes and meaning, have yet to meet those who have tunneled into the novel from the bottom up" (Conley 2003, 113). This characterization still holds, a decade and a half later. Further, geneticists

no longer makes statements about the world; rather, it becomes a mirror-like representation of the world" (*Ibid.*, 86).

perceive that the field of Joyce Studies has become swamped with reductive postcolonial and Irish-related approaches to Joyce; and postcolonial critics think geneticists have swamped the field with author-worshipping intention-seeking forays into minutiae. This is only a broad-strokes version of a divide within the field that I think, however, also divides us interpretively.³ That is, one side seeks history, the other seeks the author; one side seeks the social determinants of textual productions, and the other seeks the individual “in charge” of what happens in the text dropping hints here and there. The greatest achievement for a geneticist is the discovery of a new source for *Finnegans Wake* (and there are dozens out there waiting to be found)—or better still a new draft of the book; the greatest achievement for the postcolonial critic is a new reading based on Irish historical-archival materials—or better still newly uncovered materials. Whether those tunneling from the top or from the bottom will meet, however, is a matter of interpretive priorities not time, as well as the models of interpretation being deployed. As John McCourt has recently demonstrated in *Joyce in Context* (2009) there are roughly 30 different contexts in which critics have researched Joyce’s work (there are many more, obviously, but his collection illustrates a kind of core set). In most, the intersection of Joyce’s works with particular claims or thematic concerns (say, gender, psychoanalysis, or medicine) allows scholars to chart new readings. Almost all of them share the same model of interpretation: show where particular themes appear in Joyce’s texts, and claim for Joyce the position of advocate for, mirror of, or elucidator of the issues stemming from them. That procedure is so often followed it has become a kind of static interpretive ritual.

Genetic criticism does not share this model, and has no such rituals. Even a cursory look at the 2010 *Genetic Joyce Studies* volume renders up articles like Robbert-Jan Henkes remarkable situating of Joyce in the summer of 1924 in a library in France, “Reading in the Rain” as his title indicates, taking notes. Henkes asks:

³ An attempt to suture this division in the field has been made by the James Joyce UCD James Joyce Research Centre and the National Library of Ireland, which has published, under the editorship of Anne Fogarty and Luca Crispi *The Dublin James Joyce Journal* since 2008 printing strictly geneticist articles alongside strictly historicist. The journal serves as an example of the best the field can become.

What is M. Joyce reading with nothing better to do? M. Joyce is reading about Brittany, its customs and traditions. He is skimming through articles and books of the great folklorist Paul Sébillot. And through the textual Hubble telescope of time, we slowly get to know what exactly he has lain his lone and tired and sick eyes upon (2010, 1).

Then he gives us exact copies of what Joyce read and noted. This is far more like biography than literary criticism. In fact, genetic criticism is a kind of literary micro-biography. It's a scientific biography of reading and drafting practices, particularly in the case of *Finnegans Wake*—and hence Finn Fordham's urgent, and justified, recent call for a new biography of Joyce, given what we've been learning in the last 15 years alone about his reading. Far from faulting genetic criticism, however, for its "hypnotic fascination with the isolated author" as Jerome McCann has called it in another context, geneticists and postcolonial/historicist critics can and often do meet on the ground of new interpretive strategies (1991, 20). Not only do I find the *Finnegans Wake* Notebooks research, for example, as essential to the field of literary studies in general, but foundational to any new interpretive strategies we in postcolonial studies may deploy. It is not only possible but necessary to consider both authorial intention and social determinants of textual production, preferably simultaneously. The so-called divide between them is false, and the patterning of analyses along one or the other interpretive trajectories weakens both.

Mark Wollaeger, in a sophisticated 2008 critique of postcolonial readings of Joyce, entitled "Joyce and Postcolonial Theory: Analytic and Tropical Modes," argues:

Theory will always be crucial to opening up new ways to make literature matter to our own moment, but the routinized redeployment of theory untempered by new archives, new forms of contextualization, and a keen sense of rhetorical complexity—a kind of tone-deaf textual processing—tend to give theory a bad name by blunting its vision and wadding its ears (2008, 186).

The routinized redeployment of thinkers from Said, to Bhabha, to Spivak in postcolonial theory, surely, has had a deadening effect on the political purchase of the field as a whole. Wollaeger has, in fact, declared dead the metaphors driving the "first and second waves" of postcolonial approaches to Joyce. In order, then, for postcolonial and Marxist approaches to Joyce to avoid the "beating a dead metaphor" trap Wollaeger has warned us away

from, interpretive strategies that incorporate the priorities of genetic criticism need to be deployed. Responding to Wollaeger's charge directly, then, I offer a handful of pointed micro-readings of moments in *Finnegans Wake* that allow experimental interpretive models to be deployed. And I conclude with a call to widen our understanding of what constitutes the text of *Finnegans Wake* to include the Notebooks themselves and the materials alluded to as part and parcel of the Joycean text we set our interpretation to work upon.

II. Marxist anticolonial micro-readings

Since Ellmann, it has been commonplace to reduce Joyce's relation to Marxism to a note he wrote for Herbert Gorman's biography, in which he listed the books he was reading at the turn of the twentieth century. Joyce writes, about himself: "He never read anything by Karl Marx except the first sentence of *Das Kapital* and he found it so absurd that he immediately returned the book to the lender" (Ellmann 1982, 142). Just who that lender may have been remains open to speculation—possibly Francis Sheehy-Skeffington. It was definitely not, however, James Connolly, who never met James Joyce and further, didn't own a copy of *Capital, Volume 1* nor had he read even its first sentence until a friend bought it for him abroad and mailed it to Dublin in February of 1903. Connolly had, by that time, been the leader of the Irish socialist movement for a full seven years and would go on to become Ireland's most important Marxist. And he had never read *Capital*. Joyce and Connolly, it seems, had at least one thing in common.

If Connolly vanishes into the presence of a significant absence in Joyce's earlier fiction—he never appears in *Ulysses*—to figure the invisible elephant in the room, i.e., the inordinate attention paid to "the question of wages" in "A Painful Case," and into "the style and political manner" of "Ivy Day," as Anne Fogarty has it, he reappears late in a Benjaminian flash, and with force, in Joyce's last work, in *Finnegans Wake* 2.2. (Gibson 2006, 104-118). Connolly appears in the notoriously difficult night lesson section in a relatively clear historical ensemble of three key Irish leaders, as part of a history lesson for the children. The passage reads:

This is brave Danny weeping his spache for the popers. This is cool Connolly wiping his hearth with brave Danny. And this, regard! how Chawleses

Skewered parparaparnelligoes between brave Danny boy and the Connolly. Upanishadem! (*FW* 303, 8-13).

This parade of national figures at first appears to be an interpretation of events, squaring off Daniel O’Connell’s mass parliamentary movement for repeal and reform against the revolutionary socialist politics of Connolly. Then Parnell weaves between them, negotiating, as he did, between the mass movement and the parliamentary imperative. But how exactly did “cool Connolly” wipe his hearth with Daniel O’Connell? In what sense can this be an interpretation of events unfolding? It isn’t.

It is, on the contrary, a meta-historiographical commentary. It is a comment specifically on the writing of Irish history, and how histories compete with one another. I’ll explain by taking the sentence, “This is cool Connolly wiping his hearth with brave Danny,” and broadly historicizing it. In his 1910 text *Labour in Irish History*, James Connolly shatters conventional glorifications of O’Connell in a brilliant sustained critique he entitles “A Chapter of Horrors: Daniel O’Connell and the Working Class.” He mops the floor with O’Connell—or wipes his hearth.

In his article, “Connolly, the Archive, and Method,” in *Interventions* 10.1, Gregory Dobbins explains Connolly’s methodology, “Rather than reiterate positions regarding Irish history in the wake of colonization according to conventional values of the archive, Connolly’s method centers upon recovering evidence misinterpreted according to those values or offering positions far from them” (2008, 64). Aside from the chapter-long critique of O’Connell, one excellent example of this is his treatment of “The Liberator” himself in what appears to be an aside to a longer discussion of Robert Emmet. Connolly notes that O’Connell was among the militia in Dublin whose job it was to search out rebels during the Emmet rebellion, and how he pointed out a rebel house and conducted a raid for arms. Then he inserts the following:

The present writer has seen in Derrynane, O’Connell’s ancestral home in County Kerry, a brass-mounted blunderbuss, which we were assured by a member of the family was procured at a house in James’s Street, Dublin, by O’Connell from the owner, a follower of Emmet, a remark that [...] gave rise to a conjecture that possibly the blunderbuss in question owed its presence in Derrynane to that memorable raid (1987, 91).

The blunderbuss is still there, and I personally have seen it and been told by the tour guide that it was presented to O'Connell by Robert Emmet as a gift—as the house's OPW guide-book also claims it was, similarly, “a blunderbuss belonging to Robert Emmett which was presented to O'Connell after Emmett's execution.” Connolly's “conjecture” here about a blunderbuss mounted on a mantelpiece over a “hearth” in Derrynane is a devastating indictment drawing upon unconventional, oral, informal sources. It is behind this historiography lesson in *Finnegans Wake*, as a story like this would not have escaped Joyce's attention in the pages of *Labour in Irish History*, a book Joyce's friend Francis Sheehy-Skeffington advocated on behalf of and worked hard to see into print. Placing Connolly's account of national hero O'Connell conducting an arms raid against rebels next to the line “This is cool Connolly wiping his hearth with brave Danny” allows us to re-read it as a mediated negotiation of Connolly's method of subaltern historiography.

In this first micro-reading of three lines of *Finnegans Wake*, my aim is to take our idea of contextualization and to expand it. Not, to the point of Patrick McGee's work on Joyce and Marx, which, though suggestive, in places amounts to simple speculation about whether Joyce had read Marx. McGee “assumes” that “Joyce would have read *The Communist Manifesto*” (2001, 220). Far from speculation and guess-work, my interpretive method here is to open out the text to the possibility of the history and cultural production happening around it, while simultaneously reading it as historiography itself. Not as a book simply residing in or saturated by history, but as a book both in and about history's production, then, is how I'm reading *Finnegans Wake*. My next reading, of a single phrase from the “Shem the Penman” section, models another interpretive procedure.

In *Finnegans Wake* 1.7 we observe what happens when its author's concern about the civil war in Ireland, well documented by Nicholas Allen in his recent *Modernism, Ireland, and Civil War* (2009) in a chapter he entitles, “Irregular Joyce,” links up with Joyce's own, *lexical* guerilla war (2009, 20-41). One of the ways that *Finnegans Wake* operates “against English,” in Seamus Deane's words, is to counter the lateral movement across grammar with a forward or inner movement into words themselves—as Eco has demonstrated. The portmanteau word, for example, jams grammar, and signifies by associating, and then the free play of associations lingers like dust after

dynamite as one tries to return to a lateral movement across meaning. I want to lift one phrase up out of the dust of the Shem the Penman section and move “forward” through its associations, just to demonstrate the kind of jamming or derailing Joyce enacts against English. The phrase is: “Move up. Mumpty! Mike room for Rumppty!” Try to follow the associations, if you can. At about the same time he was writing a well known letter to his beloved Aunt Josephine during the civil war, Joyce took a note in his first *Finnegans Wake* notebook from an English newspaper. The newspaper article he read, entitled, “Iron Rule in Ireland,” in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* runs as follows:

“Mulcahy has now placed himself definitely on the danger line, and nothing is more significant of this than the doggerel: Move up Mick / Make room for Dick. Translated into plain English this means: We have killed Michael Collins, we are after you now, General Richard Mulcahy” (Joyce, 2001, VI.B.10: 64).

One can of course imagine Joyce’s reaction to words like, “translated into plain English,” “doggerel,” “the danger line,” and the title of the article, all of which signify the writer’s pro-British bias, particularly since it was anonymously written by somebody using the byline, “Dubliner.” Joyce jotted down the words “Move up Mick, Make room for Dick,” and then inserted them into a draft of the novel in about November or December of 1923 as, “Move up, Dumpty. Make room for Humpty!” He next changed it by severely nuancing a couple of key words; he placed a full-stop/period after the “up” deliberately recalling the “U.P. up.” insult of *Ulysess*, which adds a sectarian resonance recently explored by Luke Gibbons (2009, 18-19). He changed Dumpty to Mumpty, inserting, therefore, a word signaling the oral or mouth; then changed Humpty to Rumppty, triggering the association with “rump” (from mouth to rump).

But this was not doggerel; it was a piece of Dublin graffiti, a potent form of unofficial writing, chalked up by the dissident IRA or its socialist supporters to signal the derivativeness of the state from the colonial state that preceded it. And it was likely the work of members of Cumman na mBan, the women’s revolutionary organization supporting the dissident IRA; Mick and Dick are like Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum to the sophisticated writers of the graffiti, showing a high level of consciousness regarding the key issue at stake in postcolonial succession, that is, whether, as a liberated people, a nation chooses to derive its state forms from its oppres-

sors, or to invent new ones. So many postcolonial civil wars were fought on precisely this issue, which often also took the extremely bitter and personal form of debating about whether one is part of the comprador class, a lackey or sell-out, or one takes inventing a nation anew seriously. Joyce clearly liked the graffiti, enhancing its message, and pushing on its initial play on words (Mick and Dick) like a graffiti artist himself, tagging over tags. His first nuance is to use the British, Mother Goose nursery rhyme, Humpty Dumpty, to signal the precariousness of the new state, as if it were teetering on a wall. His second nuance is to reverse the order of the names: making Dumpty first, and Humpty second, implying the interchangeability of leaders when an oppressive state form is retained, and the lack of difference between new postcolonial state leaders and the British who preceded them. And then, to nuance it even further, and more ingeniously, he suggests that the mouth should make room for the ass, that one orifice be replaced by another, more insulting one, in a remarkable addition to or elaboration upon a highly charged original text (the graffiti). Joyce derails English grammar by inserting a piece of revolutionary graffiti marking derivativeness and the key issue of postcolonial succession; instead of moving forward across the line, one must move into the range of associations Joyce layered into this short civil war phrase and his changes to it. This is a double dose, in other words, of his being highly conscious of the civil war when writing this novel, as Allen indicates, and detonating associational depth charges under the lexicon of the English language.

Luke Gibbons makes the point that with Joyce the context isn't simply "background" but it is what makes Joyce's texts intelligible and possible, and that's what I want to insist on here. Rather than providing useful footnotes to this moment when James Connolly ghosts into Joyce's text, or offering historicization for historicization's sake (to "brush in a little local colour"), I read these two moments in the text as significant *interruptions*—the way that the earlier sentence speaks out from some of the densest pages of *Finnegans Wake* in crystal clear grammar—"This is cool Connolly wiping his hearth with Brave Danny"—without so much as a single shift, letter change, or rearrangement. They signal a negotiation of the politics of anticolonial socialism in Ireland with its analysis of state derivativeness and its highly innovative—bordering on Gramscian—historiographic methodologies.

My final set-piece interpretive maneuver in this article is very different from the two I demonstrate above. In the first, I modeled a broadening of what we conventionally understand as historical contextualization by letting

the text instruct us on historiographic practice; in the second, I modeled a reading down a chain of associations to recover a radical political content, possible only with the help of geneticist research into the compositional history of *Finnegans Wake*. Indeed, in the editing, re-drafting, and re-writing of words/lexemes lay most of the politics—not in the “finished” text itself (whatever that may be). I conclude with a final set-piece reading of communism and allegory in *Finnegans Wake*.

Allegory has been given a bad name, most famously in Derek Attridge’s “Against Allegory”. But in 1986, in perhaps the most important Marxist foray into postcolonial theory (if not the most controversial), Fredric Jameson argued that in Third World fiction “the story of the ‘the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society’” (1986, 67). Emer Nolan, one of the founding voices of postcolonial readings of Joyce, and whose “Poor Little Brittle Magic Nation: *Finnegans Wake* as a Post-colonial Novel” in *James Joyce and Nationalism* (1995) is the first reading consciously to set the novel in dialogue with postcolonial theory, claims *Finnegans Wake* for the Third World as an allegorical text. In my final reading, I want to recover the power of allegory (which both Luke Gibbons and myself have researched in Irish cultural production)⁴ partly because allegory has always been the hermeneutic outcast, the picked-on awkward little brother of big literary critical terms like representation or narrative; Benedetto Croce once called allegory “monstrous,” for example (Owens 1984, 215). But the anticolonial Irish left have long had their uses for it, as the allegorical play “Under Which Flag?” staged by James Connolly a week before the Easter Rising in 1916 clearly shows (Thompson 2008).

Nolan argues that *Finnegans Wake* is legible as a Jamesonian national allegory, particularly when “familial” matters are mapped onto national historical issues. “[...] when these familial adventures are matched up with their Irish historical counterparts, we can see that the arrival of HCE in Dublin (the ‘originary’ moment of colonization) the parricidal ambitions of his sons (anti-imperialist war) and the fraternal antagonism or succession disputes (post-colonial power-struggles) are not at all clearly dissociable” (Nolan 1995, 146). From the perspective of Irish history, it becomes hard not to see two brothers fighting over power (especially *these* two brothers—

⁴ See: Luke Gibbons. 1996. *Transformations in Irish Culture*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP. 1-10, as well as Spurgeon Thompson 2008. 9-11.

Shem and Shaun) as anything but the Irish Civil War expressed in terms of “private individual destinies.”

But of course Joyce’s text itself has something to teach us about politics and *allegoresis* (reading for allegory). In 1.5, the nightletter section, in which various “interpretations” of the Boston letter are put forward, we have, first of all the appearance of what looks like an innocent letter, “from Boston (Mass.) of the last and the first to Dear whom it proceeded to mention Maggy well & allathome’s health well only the hate turned the mild on the van Houtens and the general’s elections with a lovely face of some born gentleman with a beautiful present of wedding cakes for dear thankyou Christy and with grand funferall of poor Father Michael don’t forget...” (FW 111.8-14). This “letter” is, pages later, interpreted as allegory by an insistent voice of authority, presenting us with, in McHugh’s words, “a parody of [the] ‘Aesopian language’ of early Bolshevism” (2006, 116). The interpretation reads as:

for we also know, what we have perused from the pages of *I Was A Gemral*, that Showting up of Bulsklivism by ‘Schottenboum,’ that Father Michael about this red time of the white terror equals the old regime and Margaret is the social revolution while cakes mean the party funds and dear thank you signifies national gratitude (FW 116.5-10).

Finn Fordham has read this as “an allegorical reading of the letter as encoding a ‘social revolution,’ expanding the trivial contents of the letter into something substantial and historically significant” (2010, 140). Rather than being a parody of Bolshevik allegorical writing as McHugh sees it, it is, on the contrary, a parody of the anti-communist trying to decode communist code. Whether it is read this way or not, however, it raises the question of how we interpret *Finnegans Wake* politically, since the “letter” in this section of the book so often is referring to the book itself. It is this exact passage, in fact, that, in one of the first detailed interpretations of the book ever published, Communist critic Margaret Schlauch, in her pioneering 1939 article, “The Language of James Joyce,” in *Science and Society: A Marxian Quarterly*, would single out as Joyce instructing his readers how to view allegory. Schlauch hints at the affinity between *Finnegans Wake* and communist allegorical code when she says, “An obscured language with doubled meanings is nothing new, continues Joyce; it has been used by plotting revolutionaries” and then she quotes the passage above (Schlauch 1939, 494).

Lenin called it, in *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1918) “that accursed Aesopian language” that he was obliged to use. According to the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, it was “the technique worked out in the Russian press... [in] the early 20th century—that is, a system of “deceptive means,” or of encoding (and decoding) freely conceived ideas—as a reaction against the ban that forbade mention of certain ideas, subjects, events, and persons” (Grigor’ev 1975, 456). It is a system, also, that Antonio Gramsci would come to know and use, throughout his *Prison Notebooks*. It is also a system of communication that struck fear into the hearts of many a reactionary, anti-communist, as expressed in, for example, the American McCarthy Era’s near-paranoid *The Techniques of Communism* (1954) by Lois Francis Budenz: “without a mastery of this communist phraseology, it is most difficult to analyze communist actions in the nation or community” (1954, 41). Discussing Aesopian language, Budenz notes that both Lenin and Stalin recommended it; and he quotes a Russian criticism of Italian communists from 1934 that claims “they have not mastered the secret of using that language of Aesop, that, without diminishing its revolutionary class contact, may stir, and capture the imagination of the workers” (*Ibid.*, 44). Allegory was something everyone on the left should be able to use well.

I read the passage above both, with Schlauch, as a signal to the allegorical character of *Finnegans Wake* itself and, with Fordham, as a mockery of anti-communists struggling to read a text written in a code they don’t understand, and to which means they forced a text through their original censorship; when Fordham sees Wyndam Lewis’s persona shadowing in behind the mocked, authoritative narrator, I concur; and further I see in Joyce’s 1937 inserted references to G.B. Shaw, a reference to that other Shaw Joyce knew well, Harriet *Shaw* Weaver, who that year joined the Communist Party of Great Britain as “Comrade Josephine” as her biographers have uncovered, and whom Joyce mocked for it (Lidderdale 1970, 370-373).

Speaking in code is one thing; reading code is another. The most recent full-length study of allegory has observed that *allegoresis* actually came first, prompting Medieval authors and artists to write or paint in allegory (Tambling 2010, 166). As Jeremy Tambling has put it, “Allegorical interpretation, while perhaps revealing a truth that allegory seems to seek, can never reach it; it can only generate further allegorical writing” (*Ibid.*, 167). While, as Tim Conley notes—as I quoted above—the tendency to reduce or simplify seems to come with allegory-seeking, I would argue that, and

perhaps especially with political allegory—reduction or simplification is not predominantly a feature of its manifestations. In fact, allegorical interpretation is a mode of reading politically that, as it does for Emer Nolan and a number of others, allows critics of the left both to multiply and energize approaches to Joyce, as well as to shore up a kind of interpretive solidarity, to be partisan in a way that does not reduce the complexity or sheer variety of the texts that comprise *Finnegans Wake* but rather generates that kind of radical innocence, and interpretive freedom we felt before the ascendancy of genetic criticism. In conclusion, I'll gesture toward a way of deploying allegorical interpretation that exemplifies this, that is, reading the *Finnegans Wake* Notebooks as composing part of the text itself.

We are accustomed to reading Benjamin's notes in fragments; we read Gramsci's notebooks in fragments; and postcolonial theory as a discipline has been enormously enriched by the process. I believe a comparable manner of reading to that which we deploy with Gramsci and Benjamin can be deployed with the Buffalo Notebooks, so much of which is never incorporated into the "finished work." Seamus Deane has recently described it as follows: "[T]he text of *Finnegans Wake* was, in one sense of the word, composed of those notebook materials and yet, in another sense of the word, created out of them. This is a fascinating example of composing and composition, of one becoming the other and yet both remaining distinct" (Deane 2010). It is therefore not enough to simply track Joyce's reading practices and leave it at that, as, for example, Robbert-Jan Henkes does in his article on notebook B.14. We should, rather, read Joyce's reading practices—now that we can in fact read "over his shoulder" in such enormous detail—and read them allegorically. To begin, take the enormous number of notes he jotted down in 1923-1924 from Irish newspapers, mainly about court cases and murder trials, jotting down witness testimony; how, as allegorical readers do we understand an Irish writer in the wake of a bitter, personal Irish Civil War that caused the deaths of thousands, jotting down countless notes from Irish court cases; as merely a search for quaint "Irish turns of phrase" to add "local colour" to *Finnegans Wake*? There is a politics to Joyce's reading practices that has yet to be read out loud. Reading Joyce's notebooks as valuable documents in themselves, as *composing* the text, as *texts-of-the-text*, or *back-texts* fully absorbed into a "final" text (as labour is absorbed into the value of a commodity), and deploying allegorical interpretation as a strategy to generate vital new interpretive methods, I think, is one of the next steps we need to make in the field.

References

- Allen, Nicholas. 2009. *Modernism, Ireland and Civil War*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Attridge, Derek. 2009. "Introduction." *Joyce in Progress: Proceedings of the 2008 James Joyce Graduate Conference in Rome*, eds. Franca Ruggieri, John McCourt, Enrico Terrinoni. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. xvii-xxi
- Conley, Tim. 2003. *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Connolly, James. 1987. *Labour in Irish History*. London: Bookmarks.
- Deane, Seamus. 1987. *Celtic Revivals*. Durham: Wake Forest UP.
- . 2010. "Note," in James Joyce, *The Restored Finnegans Wake*, ed. with preface, Danis Rose & John O'Hanlon. London, Penguin Classics.
- Dobbins, Greg. 2008. "Connolly, the Archive, Method" in "Under Which Flag? Revisiting James Connolly, Special Issue," eds. Spurgeon Thompson & Catherine Morris. *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge, V. 10, No. 1.
- Eco, Umberto. 2009. "Joyce's Misfortunes in Italy" in *Joyce in Progress: Proceedings of the 2008 James Joyce Graduate Conference in Rome*, eds. Franca Ruggieri, John McCourt, Enrico Terrinoni. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 248-57.
- . 1989 (1962). *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: The Middle Ages of James Joyce*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Ellmann, Richard. 1982. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Fargnoli, A. Nicholas. 2003. *James Joyce: A Literary Reference*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Fordham, Finn. 2007. *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unravelling Universals*. New York: Oxford UP.
- . 2010. "Finnegans Wake in a Dentist's Waiting Room," in Joyce's Disciples Disciplined: A Re-examination of the "Examination of Work in Progress," ed. Tim Conley, Dublin University Press, Dublin. 128-142.
- Gibbons, Luke. 2009. "'Famished Ghosts': Bloom, Bible Wars, and U.P. up in Joyce's Dublin," in *Dublin James Joyce Journal*, UCD James Joyce Research Centre & The National Library of Ireland, No. 2. 1-23.
- Gibson, Andrew & Len Platt, eds. 2006. *Joyce, Ireland, Britain*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.
- Henkes, Robbert-Jan. 2010. "Reading in the Rain: Newer Sources and Holiday Reading in the Prairies (VI.B. 14) Notebook" in *Genetic Joyce Studies*, Antwerp: University of Antwerp, at <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1986. "Third-world literature in the era of multinational capitalism," in *Social Text* 15. 65-88.

- Joyce, James. 1992. *Finnegans Wake*. Ed. Seamus Deane. New York: Penguin, 1992.
- . 2001-. *The Finnegans Wake Notebooks at Buffalo*. Eds. Vincent Deane, Daniel Ferrer, Geert Lernout. Amsterdam: Brepols Publishers.
- Lidderdale, Jane & Mary Nicholson. 1970. *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver 1876-1961*, Faber and Faber, London.
- McGee, Patrick. 2001. *Joyce Beyond Marx: History and Desire in Ulysses and Finnegans Wake*. Gainesville, University Press of Florida.
- MacCabe, Colin. 2003. *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word, Second Edition*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McCann, Jerome. 1992. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: Virginia UP.
- McCourt, John, ed. 2009 *James Joyce in Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- McHugh, Roland. 2006. Annotations to *Finnegans Wake*, Third Edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Manganiello, Dominic. 1980. *Joyce's Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Nash, John. 2008. "In the Heart of the hibernian Metropolis?' Joyce's Reception in Ireland, 1900-1940." In *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown, London: Blackwell.
- Nolan, Emer. 1995. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Owens, Craig. 1984. "The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism," in *Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation*, ed. Brian Wallis, The New Museum of Contemporary Art, NY. 203-235.
- Rice, Thomas Jackson. 1997. *Joyce, Chaos, and Complexity*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Slote, Sam & Luca Crispi. 2007. *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter –By-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Madison: Wisconsin UP.
- Tambling, Jeremy. 2010. *Allegory*. Routledge, London.
- Thompson, Spurgeon. 2007. "The Subaltern *Finnegans Wake*." *Internationalist Review of Irish Culture* (Rome) 1.1 (2007).
- . 2008. "Indigenous Theory: James Connolly and the Theatre of Decolonization." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 10.1. 7-25.
- Wollaeger, Mark. 2008. "Joyce and Postcolonial Theory: Analytic and Tropical Modes," in *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown, London: Blackwell.



STRICK'S *ULYSSES* AND WAR:
WHY WE READ JOYCE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

“Why read Joyce in the 21st century?” The panel on Joyce and Film at the Rome 2011 Birthday Conference was an attempt to respond to the conference theme question by calling attention to Joyce’s works that were produced in another medium: film. The 2009 Trieste conference on Joyce and Cinema, and the subsequent publication of John McCourt’s (2010) edited volume of conference papers, *Roll Away the Reel World. James Joyce and Cinema* has called Joyce, his works, and his interest in cinema into the proverbial spotlight. Most readers have seen Joseph Strick’s 1967 film of *Ulysses*, I imagine, and not only that, but that many have read the McCourt volume as well as Margot Norris’s (2004) book on the film. In both of these texts, writers address Strick’s surprising decision to set his film in the contemporary Dublin of the 1960s. In this essay, I explore the appropriateness of Strick’s decision, and cast his film, surprisingly, against the backdrop of the Vietnam War.

Margot Norris explains Strick’s decision to contemporize the film: “While the budgetary constraints dictated the film’s conventional length of 132 minutes, the decision to set the film in 1960s Dublin rather than at the turn of the century was both a pragmatic and an artistic one” (2004, 21). She quotes Strick from his 1966 interview with Stephen Watts: “That one day in 1904 which Joyce so voluminously describes could not be recreated in modern Dublin even on an epic budget, so there was no question of making a period picture” (2004, 21). Strick insisted that the decision to update the time of the novel in the film was not specifically financial, and he explained to Norris in an e-mail that he was interested in the idea “that if Joyce had taken a liberty with over 2,000 years, [he] could take the same liberty with 60” (Norris 2004, 21). She writes:

Although Joyce wrote the novel during the years which saw Ireland fighting for its independence from Britain, Joyce set *Ulysses* in 1904, at a time when the scandal and ensuing death of Parnell had made the prospect of a Free State unlikely and unpromising in the future. In contrast, Joseph Strick set the film of *Ulysses* ... in the contemporary decade in which it was filmed: the 1960s, when Ireland was already a republic, albeit divided. (2004, 72)

Strick's choice is an interesting creative decision, and while several scholars and reviewers have discussed the movie in terms of 1960s Ireland, no one to my knowledge has discussed Strick's relationship with 1960s America or investigated that decade's effect on his work filming Joyce's 1922 novel.

No other decade in the twentieth century has acquired the mythological status or the polemic reputation of the 1960s. It was a decade marked internationally by political strife, split by Generation Gaps, and divided by trenchant pro- or antiwar positions. It was an era of timeless and universal upheaval, an era synonymous with the Vietnam War, the Peace Movement, the Civil Rights Movement, and bureaucratic intransigence; consciousness raising, counterculture rebellion, sexual liberation, and psychedelia; nonviolence, direct action, urban disorder, and widespread college and university campus activism. 1960s America inspired Panthers as well as Pranksters, sit-ins as well as stand offs, demonstrations to end the war and violence intended to "bring the war home." It produced the Chicago Eight as well as the Oakland Seven, and gave rise to demagogues as different as chalk and cheese.

As the tumultuous decade drew to a close, the nation still reeled from the dynamic social, cultural, and political events of the 1960s. In fact, scholars now generally refer to the period as the "long 1960s," dating the era from 1960 to 1974, and it is a period that cultural anthropologist Marshal Sahlins (1999) has called "the longest decade of the twentieth century." As such, the 1960s has been examined internationally from several angles, discussed in a variety of viewpoints, critiqued not only for its complexities but also for its contradictions, and represented as much for its glories, triumphs, and failures, as its quirkiness, generosity, and activism.

After watching Joseph Strick's BBC documentary, *The Hecklers* (1966), a film about heckling in the British general election of that year, I was taken by how much cinematic attention Strick paid to youth and protest culture in that documentary. The film examines early examples of the counterculture emerging in Britain—longhaired students, hippies, and young upstarts brandishing slogans such as "Anarchy. Don't Vote!" It also documents the

widening generation gap, and at times evinces the disgust Old Britain had with Young Britain. For example, one heckled speaker asks the longhaired youth whether he is a little boy or a little girl. The audience laughs. His film ends with panelists singing “God Save the Queen” while their audience violently sways backwards and forwards. Camera cuts show clips of audience members punching one another and reviews various hecklers featured in the film. It ends with a close-up on the angry mob. Adam Curtis (2010) argued recently in his BBC blog “Do People Heckle?” that Strick’s film “documented the beginning of the rise of individualism and the modern retreat from politics.” Indeed it did.

Joseph Strick introduces his film in a two-minute prologue, where he explains his personal attraction to the heckling phenomenon:

Heckling is something that the people in Britain can well be proud of... and frightened of. It’s an extremely democratic confrontation between audience and speaker, no matter who it is... This is unknown in other countries. I’ve never, in an American political medium, heard a heckler who wasn’t immediately evicted... It’s a very personal film. I guess it’s really about the way I see life. I’m sure another director would have made a completely different film about the same institution. This, then, is the way I see it: *The Hecklers*. (1966)

As I watched *The Hecklers*, I recalled scenes from several American documentaries on the 1960s—Academy award winning films like *Berkeley in the ‘60s* (Kitchell 1990) or Academy award nominated films like *The Weather Underground* (Green and Siegel 2002), for example. These American documentaries showed the same kinds of young people dragged out of meetings for their heckling, beaten with batons, ripped out of their seats, or pushed around by authoritarians to silence and punish them. Noticing the congruence and similarities between Strick’s film and other 1960s documentaries, I began to wonder whether any of Strick’s personal views—what he called “the way I see life”—could be traced in his 1967 film, *Ulysses*. And even though he argued about his *Ulysses* that he couldn’t afford to make a “period picture,” I want to suggest that he very much did.

Joseph Strick was a product of the 1960s as much as James Joyce was a product of turn of the century Dublin, and they were less than ten years apart in age when they began work on their *Ulysses*. Throughout his career, Strick would remain focused on issues of war, freedom of speech, and sexual expression; and the films he would create before and after his 1967 *Ulysses* tell the story of a creative mind focused not so much on “filming the

unfilmable”—a catchphrase that made it into several obituaries published after his death in 2010—but a creative mind bent on the very same issues we associate with Joyce’s *Ulysses*: national identity, civil rights, youth culture, and the rejection of political and cultural hegemony. In fact, after *Ulysses*, Strick was intending to direct Carson McCuller’s *The Heart is a Lonely Hunter* in Selma, Alabama, site of the “Bloody Sunday” melee just one year earlier when at the Edmund Pettus Bridge civil rights demonstrators advocating for black voting rights were violently attacked by white police. Due to “script disagreements,” Strick was dropped from the production in the fall of 1967.

I contacted Strick’s daughter Betsy to ask about her father’s views on the Vietnam War, which loomed so largely and was a strong contributor to 1960s protest culture. She told me in a 2011 e-mail she checked with her brothers and they remember it as she did: “He [her father] was very focused on *Ulysses* and that’s what he often talked about. However, my father was opposed to the Vietnam War from the outset. As time and the war went on, he sought to express his views about the war through later movies.” In fact, he did, and he won an Oscar from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences for his documentary, *Interviews with My Lai Veterans* (1970), a film that explored the 1968 massacre of hundreds of South Vietnamese civilians by American soldiers from Charlie Company’s 11th Brigade.

As Strick was filming *Ulysses* there were several antiwar demonstrations staged in Dublin and regularly scheduled public meetings on the Vietnam War. One such meeting took place on 26 July 1966 at the Mansion House and featured Conor Cruise O’Brien and Con Lehane. According to the *Irish Times*, nearly five hundred attended, and a resolution was passed that likened American involvement in the war to “Black and Tannery.” Many Irish drew historic parallels between Vietnam and Ireland’s struggles, and at this meeting, Maher noted that:

Mr. Con Lehane ... compared Vietnam to Ireland in its struggle for independence. ‘The Vietnamese people were an ethnic entity before the Mayflower sailed. They were an old and highly civilized people 1,000 years ago, when they withstood invasion from the Chinese. They were many times defeated, and never conquered.’ The chairman, Mr. Peadar O’Donnell, opened the meeting by saying that ‘Vietnam was now in the vanguard of the anti-imperialist struggle, a proud position Ireland occupied for a brief period.’ He added, ‘Oppressed countries should not have to bear the agony of a long and drawn-out war in their own land.’ (Maher 1966, 13)

In addition to these meetings, Ireland's youth were active in forming parades and demonstrations. An *Irish Times* article titled "Students parade at US Embassy" (Maher 1966, 13) reported that hundreds of students marched on the American Embassy at Ballsbridge bearing banners that read, "Every Sunday is Napalm Sunday" and "Uncle Sam's Black and Tans get out of Vietnam." At this particular march, the students clashed with pro-war students who bore banners in support of the US effort in Vietnam. "America go Bra," their banners read. As one side chanted "Hey, hey, LBJ, how many kids have you killed today," the other side responded with "Hey, hey, Ho Chi Min, how many kids have you done in?"

Other antiwar organizations formed quickly. Two prominent Irish organizations were formed in Ireland to protest against the war in Vietnam—the Irish Voice on Vietnam (IVOV) and the Cork Vietnamese Freedom Association (CVFA). Many union figures from the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union (ITGWU) and other labor unions comprised the membership of these antiwar groups. They published their own magazines, flyers, and leaflets, and papered these all over Dublin. A few hundred people turned out to march against the war when either of these groups organized a demonstration. The CVFA even picketed the US warship *Courtney* in 1967, and led a branch of its membership to Tipperary to protest against the American ambassador, Raymond Guest. The Connolly Youth Movement was also quite significant in Dublin, as well, and they formed protest marches and collaborated with other antiwar groups. People's Democracy, which emerged late in 1968, was also involved in the anti-Vietnam movement, and the Irish Pacifist Movement was a significant force to be reckoned with, as well, as Strick was filming *Ulysses* in Dublin. Of course, these demonstrations attracted negative press at the time, and at least one of the CVFA marches in Dublin was reportedly booed by supporters of the Vietnam War who carried rosaries and waved American flags at protestors ("Irish Protests Against the Vietnam War"). Though fractious, these periodic demonstrations were successful in raising political consciousness and in garnering signatures on petitions to end the war. A petition carrying some 38,500 signatures was presented to the Irish government in 1968 appealing for peace in Vietnam—this only one year after the Irish Appeal for Peace in Vietnam was launched in Dublin in 1967.

Eamonn McCann, one of the original organizers of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA), remembers his involvement in anti-Vietnam War protests in Ireland. In an interview with Margot Backus,

McCann said he had been involved in antiwar demonstrations in London, as well, and was active in the Vietnam solidarity campaign:

[T]here was always a sense that we were a part of that. Not only did we not look backwards--speaking for myself and the people immediately around me in that period--into Irish history, but we actually believed that we were leaving that behind. This seems terribly naive, looking back. Indeed, it was terribly naive! But my sense was that we'd consigned all that to the past. That our own nationalism, whatever progressive social role it ever had, had come to an end long ago, and this was now a new generation with new politics and so forth. Looking back on it, we seemed to be winning people to this point of view, but it actually was just the aggressive rhetoric that was associated with the youth movement and the student movement of the time. (Backus, 2001)

Another antiwar movement in Ireland, the Irish Voice on Vietnam (IVOV), led regular street marches to the United States embassy in Ballsbridge. "Even as early as 1962, opposition to the war provided a focus for political protest and cultural rebellion in Ireland and Britain, uniting (as it did in America) students, dissidents, activists, and cultural rebels into a single-issue campaign" ("Irish Protests Against the Vietnam War"). By 1965, after the US began bombing Vietnam and then introduced ground troops, protests sparked all over Ireland and the rest of the world, and in 1966 the Vietnam Solidarity campaign (VSC) was formed and aligned Irish antiwar demonstrators with their counterparts in Britain.

My point in bringing all of this up is to argue that war, the culture of war, and the antiwar movement must have affected the director, actors, the production crew, the extras, and so forth, who worked on Strick's *Ulysses*. If nothing else, they must have read daily newspapers that covered antiwar demonstrations. Perhaps direct actions even interfered with the filming, editing, and production of the film. Certainly on Tuesday, March 8th, 1966, the startling bombing of the 184-foot Nelson's Pillar on O'Connell Street affected Strick's filming timetable: he had to wait until the pillar was torn down and removed entirely before beginning production. Because budgetary constraints limited Strick's shooting in Dublin to three months, Margot Norris (2011, *pers. comm.*) suggested in an e-mail that the filming "must therefore have been done between April and September 1966. It was done in time for a nomination for the 1967 Academy Awards." An August 3rd article in the *Irish Times* reports that "the screen version of Joyce's novel [is] at present being made in Dublin," and suggests it "will take about three and

a half months to shoot altogether, and should be finished by the middle of October” (Linehan 1966, 8).

I am deliberately situating Strick’s *Ulysses* amid war, conflict, and antiwar activity because war, the culture of war, and its dissidents affected the original *Ulysses*—Homer’s work—and Joyce understood this. In fact he reminded Frank Budgen that Homer’s Ulysses was against war and that he “was a war dodger who tried to evade military service by simulating madness” (1972, 16). Importantly, Declan Kiberd also suggests in *Ulysses and Us* that “the whole of *Ulysses* might be taken as ... an extended hymn to the dignity of everyday living, when cast against the backdrop of world war,” and adds, “it is as if Joyce had anticipated Tom Stoppard’s little joke: ‘What did you do in the Great War, Mr. Joyce?’—‘I wrote *Ulysses*—what did you do?’” (2009, 288). In his 1975 *Travesties*, Stoppard alludes to one of the most famous recruiting posters of World War I, where a comfortable post-war father seated in an easy chair is asked by his children, “Daddy, what did YOU do in the Great War?” It was a poster that was mass-produced to shame the British nation’s at-home fathers, husbands, and fathers-to-be into war service.

This poster is not alluded to in Joyce’s *Ulysses*, but Mark Wollaeger has traced another World War I recruiting poster in Joyce’s work; it appears while Bloom is waiting at the Post Office to retrieve any letters sent to his alter-ego Henry Flower. Bloom gazes at a modern recruiting poster, one “with soldiers of all arms on display” (Joyce 1986, 59). Wollaeger notes:

Given that pictorial recruiting posters of the kind Bloom goes on to describe were not produced before World War I, Bloom’s poster is probably a Joycean invention [...but] known for his pedantic fidelity to the historically verifiable, here Joyce indulges in an anachronism that distinctly foregrounds the text’s complex historical layering, a layering that needs to be acknowledged by situating *Ulysses* more insistently in the period of its composition than is often the case. (1999)

In a subsequent revision to the Lotus-Eaters passage, Joyce expanded it, and has Bloom “reviewing again the soldiers on parade,” Wollaeger notes, and adds:

Here Joyce highlights the moment of reading in which an Irish subject internalizes, restages, and revises the ideological messages that were formulated during the war by the British government and obligingly designed and

disseminated by Irish advertising agencies, including, as it happens, the agency for which Bloom once worked, Hely's. (1999)

Complicit in their own recruitment into the war and guilty of shaming the civilian population into joining the war effort, Irish production and dissemination of British World War I posters and ephemera conspired to popularize the war by reproducing romanticized and sentimental propaganda.

Joyce wrote *Ulysses* during the First World War and suffered as one might the chaos into which it hurtled civilians, cities, and countries. John McCourt notes that although Trieste was “plunged into chaos” in 1915 at the announcement of Italy's entry into the First World War, “extraordinarily, none of [Joyce's] letters contains any reference to the events going on around him in Trieste or in Europe. It is as if he was too absorbed with *Ulysses* to notice” (McCourt 2000, 245). Maura Elise Hametz also notes in her *Making Trieste Italian, 1918-1959*, that

In 1915, on the entry of Italy into the First World War, pro-Austrian elements, aided by Austrian police, destroyed several cafes in the city in protest against their hospitality to irredentist intellectuals. The Caffé San Marco, perhaps the most noted among them, re-emerged in 1919. (2005, 147)

After the predictable news arrived on 23 May that Italy had joined the war effort, a series of consequential events followed, McCourt explains:

The Lieutenancy of Trieste ordered the closing of the borders and within a couple of hours anti-Italian demonstrations had already broken out at various hot-points around the city. Pro-Austrian mobs roamed the city attacking irredentists and key irredentist symbols. The irredentist clubs and gyms were destroyed, their caffes, such as the Caffé San Marco, the Milano, the Fabris and the Stella Polare, were ransacked and vandalized, the statue of Verdi demolished, and the offices of *Il Piccolo* destroyed by arsonists. The rioters were, in the main, aided and abetted by the Austrian police.

Despite the tensions and tumult around him, Joyce forged ahead with his work... (2000, 246)

So, here we have Joyce writing *Ulysses* during the First World War without acknowledging the war or the riots, protests, and destruction around him—of course he couldn't in a novel set in 1904—but he appears nonplussed and focused on *Ulysses* even though one of his favorite cafés in

Trieste had been destroyed, the Caffé San Marco where he regularly met Italo Svevo. Joseph Strick, too, appears nonplussed as he worked to film *Ulysses* during the year that marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Easter Rising; and during the tumultuous Vietnam War amid heavy antiwar demonstrations in Dublin, he, too, remained (as his daughter notes) “focused on *Ulysses*,” and like Joyce, “too absorbed with *Ulysses* to notice.” If we contextualize yet another version of *Ulysses*, Sean Walsh’s 2004 *Bloom*, Walsh’s movie was also filmed during some of the largest antiwar demonstrations in history. In 2003, as Walsh was wrapping up the filming and moving into post-production at The Farm Recording Studio in Dublin on Upper Mount Street near Merrion Square and close to nearby Stephen’s Green, more than 100,000 antiwar protestors marched in January and again in February to voice popular opposition to the war in Iraq. These were part of a large global protest against the war and were international in scope. In Dublin, on January 18 and February 15, more than five times the expected crowd showed up to march from Parnell Square to the Department of Foreign Affairs at Stephen’s Green, and on to Dame Street for a rally with speakers and popular musicians. In Rome, a crowd estimated near three million gathered in St. John Lateran square, and the event is now recorded in the *Guinness Book of World Records* as the largest antiwar rally in history. On that same day, protestors gathered in nearly six hundred cities in a coordinated global effort to express moral outrage against the US invasion of Iraq. This included 1.3 million protestors in Barcelona, 1.5 in Madrid, and between 750,000 and two million protestors in London. Back in Dublin, the march disrupted traffic for more than four hours. All this as another artist was “absorbed with *Ulysses*.”

When we think of war, the culture of war, and its counterpart the antiwar movement, these were strong presences during Homer’s work on *Ulysses*, during Joyce’s work on *Ulysses*, during Strick’s work on *Ulysses*, and during Walsh’s. All of these artists were working on versions of *Ulysses* amid a context of war and antiwar, in an atmosphere of “force, hatred, history, all that,” as Joyce would write in *Ulysses* (1986, 273). You can call this historical coincidence if you like, but I think of it more in the sense that the work acts as a social palliative during times of tremendous social upheaval, and it reminds us that human dignity can not only be restored, but it will also prevail. Strick seemed to indicate this in an interview in the documentary *A Portrait of Joe as a Young Director*, where he spoke about “equilibrium” and his work on *Ulysses* with special effects artist, Dennis Lowe:

We all live in the present but we also have a stream-of-consciousness [that is] reviewing the past at every moment and integrating the past with the present and satisfying ourselves of the equilibrium of our existence [...] and the equilibrium is between what we think the world is, what we want the world to be, what we feel we can do in the world, and what the world is doing to us. All those things are linked together in every moment of our existence. (2010)

This equilibrium, this journeying over and across decades, produced the very “period picture” Joseph Strick said he could not afford to film. The film alludes to the contexts of Joyce’s work yet it is undeniably a product of the 1960s and of the cultural and political climate in which it was made. Similarly, we can demonstrate that Joyce’s “equilibrium” certainly allowed him to integrate his own and Irish public opinion on the bitterly controversial Boer War (1899-1902) into *Ulysses*. Not only is Molly’s amorous Lieutenant Gardner killed in that war but several references to it, not least among these Bloom’s recollection of participating in a demonstration against it in Dublin, can be traced throughout the novel. Like many critics of the Boer War, the Irish were for the most part disgusted by Britain’s methods of barbarism and by their concentration camps. According to Denis Judd and Keith Surridge,

when the Boer War began, the British found themselves very much alone as public opinion around the world was virtually solid pro-Boer [...] During the war about 2,000 foreigners volunteered to fight for the Boers and were organised in several national units or placed within Boer commandos. (2002, 247)

Some three hundred Irish volunteers fought against Britain—so many that there were enough men to form two brigades led by an Irish-American former soldier, Colonel John Blake, and his Irish deputy, John MacBride, the same John MacBride who would later be executed for his participation in the Easter Rising.

Like Homer’s and like Joyce’s, politics in Strick’s *Ulysses* are not simple; and when the politics of *Ulysses* are transported to a different time, there can be danger; there can be consequences. Frank Budgen warned of this in his *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*, originally published in 1934 and written during those terrifying years that saw the rise of Austrofascism and Hitler’s and Mussolini’s ascent to absolute power. He wrote, “Bloom’s politics are as little spectacular as are his good deeds, and yet I fear that they are

of the kind that in the days that are with us and near us lead to the dungeon and the firing squad” (1972, 284). Strick’s decision to set his film in 1960s Dublin invites questions about and comparisons between Joyce’s work and its particular relevance to 1960s culture and the culture of war. But Joyce was not drawn to Homer’s *Ulysses* because it was a war epic. In fact, he reminded Budgen, “the history of *Ulysses* did not come to an end when the Trojan War was over. It began just when the other Greek heroes went back to live the rest of their lives in peace” (1972, 17). “The rest of their lives in peace”—this is why we still read Joyce in the twenty-first century. If the story of the human race is the story of War, as Winston Churchill would assert in 1925, then Joyce presented us in 1922 with an alternate possibility, a way to live our lives in peace, with optimism and grace. Such is the uncreated conscience that Joyce creates for us all, and such is the unmistakable and perpetual draw of this work during war, social upheaval, and political turmoil.

References

- Backus, Margot Gayle. 2001. “Not Quite Philadelphia, is it?': an interview with Eamonn McCann. *Eire-Ireland: Journal of Irish Studies*. Fall-Winter. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FKX/is_2001_Fallinter/ai_83447254/?tag=mantle_skin;content
- Budgen, Frank. 1972. *James Joyce, The Making of Ulysses, and Other Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curtis, Adam. 10 February 2010. “Do people heckle?” http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/adamcurtis/2010/02/do_people_heckle.html
- Guinness Book of World Records*. 2004. <http://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/index.asp?ID=54365>.
- Hametz, Maura Elise. 2005. *Making Trieste Italian, 1918-1959*. A Royal Historical Society publication. Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- “Irish Protests Against the Vietnam War” at <http://www.politics.ie/history/23844-irish-protests-against-vietnam-war-2.html>
- Joyce, James. 1986. *Ulysses*. New York: Random House.
- Kiberd, Declan. 2009. *Ulysses and Us. The Art of Everyday Living*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Lamb, Robert. n.d. “What was the largest protest in history?” <http://people.howstuffworks.com/largest-protest1.htm>
- Linehan, Fergus. 1966. “Filming *Ulysses*.” *Irish Times* 3 August.

- Maher, Mary. 1966. "Irish Silence on Vietnam War Condemned." *Irish Times* 27 July.
- McCourt, John, ed. 2010. *Roll Away the Reel World: James Joyce and Cinema*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- . 2000. *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste, 1914-1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Norris, Margot. 2011. *Personal Correspondence*. 01 February.
- . 2004. *Ulysses*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Sahlins, Marshal. 1999. "Two or Three Things That I Know About Culture." *Magazine: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. [http://www.tazi.net/JFriedman/IMG/pdf/MS Two or three things that I know about culture.pdf](http://www.tazi.net/JFriedman/IMG/pdf/MS%20Two%20or%20three%20things%20that%20I%20know%20about%20culture.pdf)
- Strick, Betsy. 2011. *Personal Correspondence*. 25 January.
- Strick, Joseph. 1966. *The Hecklers*. Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/adamcurtis/2010/02/do_people_heckle.html
- Watts, Stephen. 1966. "Movies: 'If You Censor *Ulysses* There Will be a Scandal.'" *New York Times*. 2 Oct.: D11.
- Wollaeger, Mark. 1999. "Seduction and Estrangement: World War I Recruiting Posters and the Politics of *Ulysses*." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies* 2 (1). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v2/wollaeger/index.html#throng>

“A MIXER AND WORDPAINTER”:
FINNEGANS WAKE IN THE AGE OF REMIX CULTURE

While James Joyce’s *Ulysses* stands as one of the most fertile literary texts within which to explore the key linguistic, philosophical, and cultural theories of the twentieth century,¹ this article will argue that *Finnegans Wake*, with its polyglot and hyper-allusive assimilation of cultural bricolage, is uniquely positioned to illuminate the changing natures of cultural consumption and (re)production in the nascent twenty-first century’s emerging and evolving Remix Culture. This argument for the *Wake* as both the product of such a nascent culture—with all of its seeming attendant anachronisms—and as the richest text through which to access these uniquely twenty-first century questions will be unfolded in four basic moves; (1) by explicating the concept of Remix Culture with reference to its most commonly considered subject, the music industry, (2) by exploring how *Finnegans Wake* both preempts and exemplifies the consequences of Remix Culture for the production and consumption of cultural artifacts, (3) by demonstrating how the ongoing deconstruction of Author-centric models for conceptualizing culture are localized in literature through the theories of the death of the Engineer and the (re)birth of the Bricoleur and the technologies of hypertexts, and (4) by examining the *Wake*’s key trope of ‘forgery’ within this deconstructive context to exemplify how the text’s marriage of technology, theory, and cultural communication is closely aligned to a contemporary remix aesthetic.

¹ *Ulysses* has been treated as the high-water mark of both modernism (Beebe 1972, 176) and postmodernism (McHale 1992, 42), as a key text for exploring Saussurean or Peircean semiotic models (Milesi 2003) and Derridean deconstruction (Slote 2003), as a “thesaurus of Bakhtinian discourse types” (Lodge 1990, 86), as well as a key text for exploring twentieth-century cultural and political theories, such as Marxism (Booker 2000), and post-colonialism (Duffy 1994).

I. “pricking up ears to my phono on the ground” (FW 452.12)

The term Remix Culture will be applied in this article to any culture that allows and encourages derivative creative activity through increased freedom of access, modularity, and remixability, as opposed to any culture that insists upon concepts of authorial intention, intellectual property, and the immutability of cultural artifacts, and which implements stringent copyright laws in order to keep these structures in place. To begin, we turn to Lawrence Lessig, an American writer on law and ethics, whose study *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy* will shape the theoretical approach in this paper.² Lessig’s account begins in 1906 with the submission by John Philip Sousa, a popular composer of American military and patriotic marches, to a congressional hearing on the sudden snowballing of sound reproduction and mass production technologies, such as the phonograph or player piano, which meant that “for the first time in history, a musical composition could be turned into a form that a machine could play” (2008, 24). Of greater concern to Lessig’s study than Sousa’s ultimately successful campaign to change copyright law to cover these reproductions, however, is the part of Sousa’s testimony in which he argued that

these talking machines are going to ruin the artistic development of music in this country. When I was a boy [...] in front of every house in the summer evenings, you would find young people together singing the songs of the day or old songs. Today you hear these infernal machines going night and day. We will not have a vocal cord left. The vocal cord will be eliminated by a process of evolution, as was the tail of man when he came from the ape. (*Ibid.*, 24-25)

One might dryly observe that despite a century of sound reproduction technology we remain, by and large, well in command of our vocal cords. As Lessig elucidates, however, what Sousa is describing is a philosophical concern, couched in a context of Neo-Luddism, that these reproduction technologies “would change our relationship to culture” and force the gen-

² Lessig’s primary argument, which remains outside of the scope of this paper, is that amateur appropriation in the digital age cannot be prevented but merely illegalized, and that treating whole generations as ‘criminals’ for engaging in culture as it is known to them has drastic societal implications.

eral public to become “just consumers of culture, not also producers,” as culture would no longer be a living organism constantly adapting in an integrated and participatory environment, but would become “the product of an elite, even if this elite, this cultural monarchy, was still beloved by the people” (*Ibid.*, 25).

If we consider, by way of example, the fate of the authorless and adaptive nature of various strands of folk music, which constantly evolved through processes of “hearing, repeating, and improvising” (Benkler 2006, 50), it would seem that the fears of this Cassandra have largely come true. In this folk model of culture, “stories and songs circulated broadly, well beyond their points of origin, with little or no expectation of economic compensation; many of the best ballads or folktales come to us today with no clear marks of individual authorship” (Jenkins 2006, 135). This fluid and adaptive musical tradition is nicely elucidated, for example, in Gerry Smyth’s study of the various uses of music in Joyce’s “The Dead”, in which Smyth exemplifies the “notoriously protean” nature of ballads through a history of “The Lass of Aughrim” and its “multiple forms, with various lyrics, melodies and narrative structures dispersed over numerous versions” throughout its mixed Irish and Scottish pedigree (2009, 33). This possibility for cultural artifacts to “constantly mutate in relation to the environment through which they move” (*Ibid.*, 33) was suppressed through a combination of technologies of mass production, copyright laws,³ and theories of intellectual property and authorial intention that nurtured the view of cultural artifacts as immutable to the point that even as prominent an artist as Bob Dylan can be accused of plagiarism for engaging in the predominantly fluid discursive practices of folk music.⁴ Lessig characterizes this shift from a reciprocal relationship between production and consumption to a model that “described the movement of information in one direction from a source

³N. Stephan Kinsella, for example, denounces copyright laws as creating artificial scarcities of non-scarce goods (2008, 34-35).

⁴In the last decade, Dylan has been accused in various media outlets of plagiarizing numerous passages from Junichi Saga’s novel *Confessions of a Yakuza* on his appropriately-titled 2001 album “*Love and Theft*”, and the Civil War poetry of the Confederate bard Henry Timrod for his 2006 album *Modern Times*. As Jonathon Lethem highlights, however, “Dylan’s art offers a paradox: while it famously urges us not to look back, it also encodes a knowledge of past sources that might otherwise have little home in contemporary culture.” If “Dylan’s originality and his appropriations are as one,” Lethem concludes, “the same might be said of all art” (Lethem).

to a receiver,” (Manovich 2009, 43), as a shift from “Read/Write” (“RW”) to “Read/Only” (“RO”) culture (Lessig 2008, 28).⁵

In *Finnegans Wake*, this transformation from RW to RO cultures is most explicitly dramatized through these tropes of music and balladry—indeed, Len Platt has argued for considering “popular music culture as an important contemporary site of an engagement between *Finnegans Wake* and the modern” (2007, 144). After HCE’s encounter with “a cad with a pipe” (*FW* 35.11) in Phoenix Park, when he suspiciously defends himself against accusations that the cad has not made against him, episode I.2 follows a game of Chinese whispers as gossip about HCE’s supposed crime spreads and evolves: the Cad tells his wife (his “bit of strife,” *FW* 38.9) the story over supper; she passes it on to her priest, the Reverend Browne (“trusting [...] that the gossip so delivered in his epistolar [...] would go no further than his jesuit’s cloth,” *FW* 38.20-24); the Reverend Brown, “in his secondary personality as a Nolan” (*FW* 38.27-8) pours the gossip into the “aurellum of one Philly Thurnston” (*FW* 38.35); Treacle Tom and Frisky Shorty overhear the story from him at the racetracks; Tom mutters the story in his sleep and is overheard by a trio of tramps, and so on. Here Joyce’s employment of gossip as a means of broadcasting and creating myth exemplifies Manovich’s description of Remix or RW Culture as one in which “the reception point is just a temporary station on information’s path” (Manovich 2009, 43). Finally the various crimes attributed to HCE by the masses are compiled and written down (hence fixed) in “The Ballad of Persse O’Reilly” (*FW* 44-47), fourteen stanzas replete with musical notation that are given an author in the shadowy figure of Hosty.

The ballad and oral culture represented in episodes I.3 and I.4 are still open to some degree of flux,⁶ yet this mode of cultural communication comes

⁵ As Lessig explains, “the analogy is to the permissions that might attach to a particular file on a computer. If the user has “RW” permissions, then he is allowed to both read the file and make changes to it. If he has “Read/Only” permissions, he is allowed only to read the file” (2008, 28). This binary opposition is a relatively reductive when applied to cultures—a continuum of cultures with varying abilities to perform and reproduce consumed culture would be preferable—yet hugely illustrative way of thinking about the roles of technology, theory, and law in cultural communication.

⁶ As seen, for example, in the many “mixed sex cases” (*FW* 48.2) on display (“His husband” (*FW* 49.2), “her wife Langley” (*FW* 50.6)); the transformation of refrain of the song “Percy French” (“Has anybody ever been to Mick’s Hotel”) to “whoever’s gone to *mix* Hotel” (*FW* 50.34, emphasis added); and the fact that “it is a slopperish matter, given the wet and low visibility [...] to idendifine the individuone” (*FW* 51.3-6) due to the ‘fact’ that

to an end with the introduction of The Reverend Letter in I.5, a supposedly authoritative document that would cut through the mass of contradictory information amassed in the RW culture depicted in the previous chapters. Book II marks a significant institutionalization of RO culture, as the HCE myth is consolidated in performances (II.1), studies (II.2) and, finally, radio and television (II.3). Interestingly, the latter are referred to in the Wake as “Infernal machinery” (FW 320.33)—the same term Sousa used before congress to describe the technologies of mass production that he believed were ruining culture (Lessig 2008, 24). By the time of II.3, the characters who had both consumed *and* (re)created the HCE myth in Book I have become passive consumers of that myth. As the HCE myth, which had previously been so adaptive and fluid, becomes fossilized in its various written and broadcast forms, we see the introduction of an RO model of cultural communication, which “described the movement of information in one direction from a source to a receiver” (Manovich 2009, 43).

II. “*His producers are they not his consumers?*” (FW 497.1-2)

Yet—back in the non-Wakean world—over the course of the second half of the twentieth century a strong counter-discourse to this prevailing model of Read/Only musical culture slowly developed from a narrow group of well off and technologically savvy consumers to a counter-culture movement in impoverished inner-city American communities. From the exponents of *musique concrete*,⁷ to the early pioneers of Jamaican dance hall culture, to the loops and tape edits of discothèque DJs, local music mixers began to deconstruct and reconstruct disparate elements of musical texts from various genres to produce new compositions, culminating in hip-hop, a form of musical and artistic RW culture originating in the Bronx, New York in the late 1970s (see Chang 2005). Using vinyl records on a phonograph—the very “Infernal machinery” Sousa claimed would signal the end of RW culture—the hip-hop technique of appropriating samples of one sound recording and reusing it as an instrument in a new collage of such samples—with the practice of reincorporat-

“the unfacts, did we possess them, are too imprecisely few to warrant our certitude” (FW 57.16-17)

⁷ An experimental genre of music, pioneered by Pierre Schaeffer in the late 1940s, that exploited the advent of easily editable magnetic tape to splice together extracts from existing recordings to create new sound compositions (see Holmes and Holmes, 79-84)

ing these collages into ever newer collages, and so on, resulting in a kind of *mise en abyme* or series of “forged palimpsests” (FW 182.2)—marked “a major conceptual leap” towards “making music on a meta-structural level, drawing together and making sense of a much larger body of information by threading a continuous narrative through it” by “pulling together the efforts of others into a multilayered multireferential whole which is much more than the sum of its parts” (Seggern).

The result of this marriage of theory, cultural practice, and the democratizing power of new digital technologies (such as affordable personal computers, cheap software programs, and the internet) is that while “the traditional twentieth-century model of cultural communication described the movement of information in one direction from a source to a receiver, in the current era the reception point is just a temporary station on information’s path” (Manovich 2009, 43)—much as the graffiti murals and sampled records of hip-hop culture are constantly tagged and retagged. This dismantling of RO culture by the means of its own mechanisms of promulgation and its replacement with a new and still evolving paradigm shift returning to, but not replicating, a previously displaced RW culture, means that the creation of cultural artifacts again would seem to have the potential to take place “in a networked, participatory environment which breaks down the boundaries between producers and consumers and instead enables all participants to be users as well as producers of information and knowledge” (Bruns 2008, 21).

During his bizarre interrogation by the Mamalujo in *Finnegans Wake* III.3, Yawn, in the process of relating the events of Finnegan’s wake, asks “*Qui quae quot at Quinnigans Quake*” (who, which, how many at Finnegan(?)’s Wake?) before proclaiming: “His producers are they not his consumers?” (FW 497.1-2). Thus the Wake signals, with a typically meta-reflexive flourish, its own discursive processes as being founded on strategies of eliding or challenging the RO relationship between producers and consumers of texts that constitutes its ostensible narratological concern with the authority of the (illegible) Reverend Letter. One sense in which this aspect of the Wake’s discursive strategies is borne out is the unusual process of its composition. Given the problems of Joyce’s failing eyesight, his barely decipherable handwriting, and the unusual manifest forms of which the book is composed, a vast number of copyists’s errors made their way into the finished text.⁸ In addition, Joyce—

⁸ Many important genetic studies of *Finnegans Wake* have been undertaken over the last decade, which unpack this issue in much greater detail than is possible here. For the most recent

who between 1927 and 1929 briefly signaled the possibility that he might hand over the book to James Stephens for completion (see Crispi and Slote 2007, 23)—was aided in composition by “a number of aspiring young writers,” including a young Samuel Beckett, who “read to the optically troubled Joyce and wrote down, at his dictation, passages for what was still called *Work in Progress*” (Gluck 1979, 27). Both of these procedures form feedback loops in which accumulated errors stay in the system, which are then amplified and even developed further in the direction of the mutations—the famous incident when Joyce allowed Beckett’s mistaken inclusion of the phrase “come in”, directed at a knock at the door but assumed by Beckett to be part of the dictation, to remain in the text exemplifies Joyce’s dedication to this approach (Gluck 1979, 27). In Shaun’s estimation, the Letter (and hence the Wake itself) is “Nothing beyond clerical horrors *et omnibus*” (FW 419.33-34), and the text itself proudly boasts of its “hides and hints and misses in prints” (FW 20.11) brought about by “the continually more and less intermisunderstanding minds of the anticollaborators” (FW 118.25-26). Given these practices of composition and the Wake’s discursive strategies, Tim Conley persuasively contends that “Joyce’s aesthetic ‘progress’ occurs apace with his appreciation and integration of error as a principle of composition and publication” (2003, 6). In the Wake’s expansive discursive circuit (or complex), the roles of author, transcriber, printer, editor, critic, in the discursive process are acknowledged, and even encoded at the level of the text. Primary here too, of course, is the reader or consumer: as Vicki Mahaffey observes, the missing apostrophe in the title of *Finnegans Wake* functions “to inculcate an awareness that [...] reading is itself a transitory editorial practice” (1991, 186).

This Read/Write aesthetic in the Wake is both exemplified and deepened through its more micro-level remix strategies. In one sense, the Wake achieves this remix aesthetic through its protean and fluid approach to characters, as we are told, evoking Giordano Bruno’s theory of the coincidence of contraries, that the Wake’s “centuple celves [...] by the coincidance of their contraries reamalgamerge in that indentity of undiscernibles” (FW 49.33-50.1). Elsewhere, the three soldiers and two girls that seem to be involved in the incident in the park are referred to as “three tommix” (FW 58.24, emphasis added) or “the three *blend* cupstoomerries” (FW 312.28, emphasis added) and “the two *mixers*” (FW 65.28, emphasis added), while

and comprehensive account of the Wake’s genetic history, see Slote and Crispi’s *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake*.

Shem—who stands as an indexical cipher for the text of the *Wake* itself—is described as a “hybrid” (FW 169.9). Furthermore, in the bricolage nature of its hyper-allusive and peregrinistic neologisms—famously blending myriad references ranging from popular music, nursery rhymes, and advertising jingles to the world’s central religious and literary texts—*Finnegans Wake* would seem the quintessence of Seggern’s characterization of hip-hop sampling as “pulling together the efforts of others into a multilayered multireferential whole which is much more than the sum of its parts” (Seggern). While literature is no stranger to allusion, the *Wake* stands out as a particularly contemporary case by virtue of the micro-level modularity and remixability of its allusive technique. To take just one brief illustrative example from literally thousands, in the phrase “frai is frau” (FW 94.15) one may detect traces of *both* Hamlet’s “frailty thy name is woman” (in the German “Frau,” I.ii. 146) and Macbeth’s “fair is foul and foul is fair” (I.i. 10), in a simultaneous and modulated remix that, like the graffiti and sampling traditions of hip-hop culture, tags and retags cultural artifacts in an act of innovative creativity.

III. “*Gutenmorg [...] must once for omnibuss step rubrickredd out of the wordpress*” (FW 20.7-9)

These two paradigm shifts, approximately a century apart, from RW to RO culture through technologies of mass production, copyright law, and theories of authorial intention, and back again through the theory of remix and a democratizing technological advance, might seem unique to music over the course of the twentieth century. Literature, however, also suffered a paradigm shift with the invention of a new technology, and the artistic, cultural, and philosophical anxieties about the resulting transformation from RW to RO culture have been interminably more prolonged and painful. I am talking, of course, about the Gutenberg press and the printing revolution that Francis Bacon, writing in 1620, claimed had “changed the appearance and state of the whole world” (2008, 370).⁹

⁹ For a more in-depth historical treatment of the advent of printing and its importance as an agent of change, Eisenstein’s *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe* is recommended. For a more controversial approach, which keeps *Finnegans Wake* to fore in its depictions of pre- and post-printing societies, see McLuhan’s *The Gutenberg Galaxy*.

The cultural transformations produced by the printing press stand in a complex relation to those brought about by the phonograph and internet. As with the internet, the printing press was a crucial step towards the democratization of knowledge, yet it was also “frequently accused of disseminating fictions and falsehoods” (Walsham and Crick 2004, 20). However, the printing press served as a mechanism that has also, by no means exclusively at all times and places but gradually and surely, created “a dichotomy in literature” in which “the author is on one side of the production process” and the consumer on the other (Barker 2009, 5). As Foucault contends, the Author as a figure in cultural production *came into being* at the point at which discourse became “goods caught up in a circuit of ownership”—as the printing press at once made authorship more meaningful and more profitable, and increased the imperative of highlighting individual responsibilities for texts to enable the punishment of transgressive voices—and as such, it is conceivable that the Author could *go out of being* at some point in the future. Furthermore,

once a system of ownership for texts came into being, once strict rules concerning author’s rights, author-publisher relations, rights of reproduction, and related matters were enacted—at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century—the possibility of transgression attached to the act of writing took on, more and more, the form of an imperative peculiar to literature. (1998, 212)

Foucault’s portrayal splits the history of authorship into a pre-authorial RW culture, a period of author-centered RO culture brought about by the “strict rules concerning author’s rights” and “rights of reproduction,” and a post-authorial RW culture brought about by not only the possibility but the imperative of transgressing this RO model.

Much as with the emerging theories of musical remix in the 1960s, a sense grew in the theoretical circles of the mid-twentieth century that the RO culture in which cultural producers and consumers found themselves was an artificial and constructed model, and that a displaced previous RW culture might, in fact, be culture’s default setting. Such an altered view of texts as processes rather than products is summarized in Roland Barthes’s by now well-rehearsed dictum that a text “is not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning (the message of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and crash”, thus signaling “the destruction of every voice, of every

point of origin” (2008, 170) and thus proclaim the death of the Author. With this sense came an increasingly self-conscious approach to the novel as mix or remix of discourses,¹⁰ and new concepts of culture arose to fill the void left by the felled Author-Figure, largely based around, or in opposition to, Claude Lévi-Strauss’s notion of the bricoleur, “who creates improvised structures by appropriating pre-existing materials which are ready-to-hand” (Chandler 2002, 203; Lévi-Strauss 1996). This seeming critical rediscovery of RW culture also brought with it new distinctly RW compositional strategies, such as William Burroughs’s use of the cut-up technique in *Naked Lunch*, in which various textual sources, including his own, would be cut literally into pieces with scissors, rearranged on a page, and pasted to form new sentences. Vicki Mahaffey suggests that the *Wake* is “an immensely subtle critique, or “reading,” of the limitations of monological authority that anticipates many of the arguments advanced on different theoretical and political fronts” since the 1960s (1988, 2). In this context it is not difficult to see the *Wake*’s “practice of using bits and pieces of heterogeneous materials without regard to their specific function” (Norris 1976, 130), as a watershed moment for this nascent remix culture.

As with musical texts in the twenty-first century, the revolutions of digital technology have shed constraints of access, recomposition, and redistribution with regard to literary discourses to the point that knowledge and manipulation of digital multimedia technologies is “becoming an increasingly dominant form of ‘writing’” (Lessig 2008, 69). As Louis Armand highlights,

the book is entering a distinct epoch in which it will no longer be possible to limit the range of a material body of writing by enclosing it within a published volume [...] With the advent of hypertext and of the World Wide Web this marriage [between the book and technology] seems to have at last been consummated, linking together both the means, medium and matter of publication as something like an open, universal ‘mechanized text.’ (2003, 31)

Indeed, the main trope that has been used over the course of the last decade for connecting the *Wake* to this expansive marriage of text and technology is that of the hypertext, a “branching and responding text” (Nelson

¹⁰ In this Bakhtinian context, it is interesting to note David Lodge’s characterization of *Finnegans Wake* as “a book written in doubly-, or rather trebly-, quadruply-, multiply-oriented discourse” (1990, 39).

1993, 1) that elides the borders between texts in a syncretic network of hyperlinks. As George P. Landow points out, “over the past several decades literary theory and computer hypertext, apparently unconnected areas of inquiry, have increasingly converged” to the extent that both “argue that we must abandon conceptual systems founded on ideas of center, margin, hierarchy, and linearity and replace them by ones of multilinearity, nodes, links, and networks” (2006, 1). Donald Theall insightfully places Joyce in a literary context at the outset of this merging of literature and technological possibility, “with the techno-scientific and electromagnetic interests of Klee, Duchamp, Picabia, Ernst, the Dadaists, Surrealists and Expressionists,” highlighting that if these artists “explored the impact of techno-scientific phenomena such as X-Rays, atomic structure, electricity and magnetism, Joyce extended this exploration into their impact on language, gesture, speech and print/writing” (2006, 29).

While considering the *Wake* as a hypertext can be a fertile means of opening up its unusual processes and strategies to scrutiny, I want to make the case that the *Wake* functions much more in the line of the Remix, particularly as manifested in Hip-Hop culture. This difference, I want to suggest, can be found in the *Wake*'s prominent trope of forgery, which stands as a challenge to the erasure of hierarchy that such hypertextual conceptualizations of the *Wake*'s systems seem to suggest.

IV. “*piously forged palimpsests*” (FW 182.2)

Speaking at the 15th International PEN Congress in Paris, 20-7 June 1937, Joyce addressed the issue of copyright and “the moral right of authors” in conjunction with “unscrupulous American publisher” Samuel Roth's pirated version of *Ulysses*, arguing,

while unprotected by the written law of copyright and even if it is banned, a work belongs to its author by virtue of a natural right and that thus the law can protect an author against the mutilation and publication of his work just as he is protected against the misuse that can be made of his name. (216)

While this argument for the “natural right” of the author, and Joyce's contention elsewhere that in writing *Work in Progress* he was perhaps the greatest engineer (Joyce 1966, 251), positions Joyce the author on the side

of RO culture, it also aligns him more closely with Sousa's view. Like Sousa, Joyce reveals a philosophical concern with the problems of authority and authorship, as the imperative of transgressing these ideas through a program increasingly dependent upon the mutability, intertextuality, and the mixability of language and literature occurs within a context of telephobia (to compliment Sousa's technophobia) about losing control of authority and meaning. This is a tension encoded throughout Joyce's fiction—perhaps most explicitly with regard to Shem's fore figure Stephen Dedalus, ("B.A., described in the calendar as a mixer and wordpainter"; *FW* 87.13), in the contradiction between Stephen's rebellious "*non serviam*" and his passivity to the authorities of Haines, Deasy, et al. As David Spurr highlights, the tension between the two senses of Joyce the forger (as the inspired creator from crude matter, and as deceptive imitator) is everywhere present in the *Wake*:

On one hand, Joyce's distinctive mark is immediately recognizable on every page; every word, letter, penstroke is a perfect signature of its own. On the other hand, no other work of Joyce is so clearly a pastiche, a pell-mell assemblage of fragments forged and plagiarized from the cultural memory of western Europe and beyond. (1998, 259)

Peppered throughout with references to notorious forgers, such as William Henry Ireland,¹¹ Richard Piggott,¹² and James MacPherson,¹³ this trope of forgery becomes one of the primary means by which the *Wake* signals

¹¹ "Mister Ireland" (*FW* 608.14), an infamous English forger of would-be Shakespearean documents and plays is alluded to in the *Wake* in conjunction with his play "Vortigern" (*FW* 565.12), a Shakespeare hoax.

¹² Piggott, in an effort to destroy Charles Stewart Parnell's political career, produced fake letters, which purported that Parnell had supported one of the Phoenix Park murders; Piggott's forgery was ultimately uncovered by his misspelling of hesitancy as 'hesitency', and "the spell of hesitancy" (*FW* 97.25) arises in various forms throughout the *Wake*, such as "Hasatency" (*FW* 16.26), "hecitency" (*FW* 119.18), and Pigiott's "hesitancy" (*FW* 35.20; 82.30; 97.25; 599.14). As Spurr highlights, "The entire affair is a classic case of alliance between the press and the government in enforcing colonial rule" (1998, 246). Interestingly, the "spell of hesitancy" is also the spell under which another forger finds himself: Hamlet, who, as Stephen remembers in *Ulysses*, forged a letter that sent Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to their deaths (Spurr, 248).

¹³ For a more detailed analysis of the role of James MacPherson's *Ossian* and forgery in the *Wake*, see Barlow, Richard. 2011. James Macpherson in *Finnegans Wake. Founder to Shore: Cross-Currents in Irish and Scottish Studies*, eds. Alcobia-Murphy, S. et al. Aberdeen: AHRC Centre for Irish and Scottish Studies.

this tension between the imperative to transgress RO culture and the power of signatures.¹⁴ One of the most prominent of the many forgers to inhabit the Wake is James Townsend Saward—nickname: ‘Jim the Penman’—a Victorian English barrister who forged signatures on money orders for almost thirty years. Similarly, we are told, the supposed author (or forger) of the Reverend Letter “Shem the Penman” (*FW* 125.23) would “study with stolen fruit how cutely to copy all their various styles of signature so as one day to utter an epical forged cheque on the public for his own private profit” (*FW* 181.14-17). Pressing the point, of Shem we are asked

Who can say how many pseudostylic shamiana, how few or how many of the most venerated public impostures, how very many piously forged palimpsests slipped in the first place by this morbid process from his pelagiarist pen?” (*FW* 181.36-182.3)

In contrast to the previously outlined dramatization of the transition from RW to RO culture in Books I and II of the Wake, the “Shem the Penman” episode (I.7) stands as a bold counter-discourse to this RO model, as Shem’s role as writer of the Reverend Letter increasingly takes on that of forger and bricoleur. Indeed, it is interesting to note that in this episode describing a writer that copies and pastes his work by “treasuring with condign satisfaction each and every crumb of trektalk, covetous of his neighbour’s word” (*FW* 172.29-30), we find an allusion to that champion of RW culture (and author of popular marches) John Philip Sousa in the phrase “John Phibbs march!” (*FW* 187.20), encoded in terms that suggest the idea of progress within cyclicity (Jan, Feb, March).

It is revealing that forgery, rather than plagiarism, should be a more dominant trope in the Wake—after all, if forgery is the act of an author claiming her work is by another person (i.e. a name is stolen in order to add value to the wrong work) and if plagiarism is the act of an author claiming another person’s work as her own (a work is stolen in order to give credit to the wrong name) then most usually the Wake is considered in terms of the latter. The difference, it would seem, is a matter of intention—in the theories of intertextuality, plagiarism is unavoidable, forgery is not. In so

¹⁴ Other notorious non-literary forgers are incorporated; for example, David Spur points out how “as a kind of primal scene of forgery, the *Wake* continually re-enacts Jacob’s usurpation of his brother’s birthright, where Jacob’s kid gloves forge the “signature” of Esau’s hairy hands” (1998, 245).

far as the primary intention behind forgery is deception, this is a dynamic that is not operative in a hypertextual and syncretic textual landscape, where extremes of transparency and accessibility somewhat erase the notion of intentionality, whether deceptive or otherwise, and of the differences between center and margin.

Contrastingly, the remix aesthetic that has been outlined in this paper is not only a process of drawing together various cultural bricolage into a narrative strand, but also a distinctly subcultural and countercultural strategy, deauthorizing dominant discourses from which the artists are excluded, while reclaiming both these texts and discourses and the excluded voice's own position in that culture. Part of the language game of the remix, then, is not only to elide the difference between consumers and producers, but also to confront the authorized with a vision of the un/deauthorized and redacted aspects of society. From myriad potentially rich texts with which to make this comparison to the remix aesthetic of *Finnegans Wake*, I should like to turn to one provocative example from the hip-hop canon in KMD's "Who Me? (With an Answer from Dr. Bert)", from their 1991 album *Mr. Hood*. The track opens with a piece of found dialogue from an audio book of *The Story of Little Black Sambo*, a 1899 children's story written and illustrated by Helen Bannerman: "Once upon a time there was a little boy who lived in the deep, dark jungles of Africa: his name was Little Sambo."¹⁵ The collective's lead MC Zev Love X takes this racial stereotype as a launching point for challenging both the discourses of the racist ("Holy smokes! I see it's a joke / To make a mockery of the original folks") and those who claim racism ("Whoever said that coon was me?"), all over sampled and remixed elements from other sources, such as Doug E. Fresh, Slick Rick, and The Get Fresh Crew's "The Show" and "I Turned You On" by The Isley Brothers. Discouraged, Zev Love X eventually turns to the Dr. Bert of the subtitle, who, it turns out, is the muppet Bert of Bert and Ernie fame, interpolated in dialogue with the MC through samples from the long-running children's television show *Sesame Street*:

ZEV LOVE X: Ah man, damn, man. Yo, they wanna call me a monkey, a coon, a jiggaboo a boogieman... Yo Bert. Yo... Bert

¹⁵ This is a slight variation on the opening line of Bannerman's original text, which reads "Once upon a time there was a little black boy, and his name was Little Black Sambo" (2007, 7).

BERT: Um, what is it?
 ZEV LOVE X: Yo G, they wanna call me all these names.
 BERT: Aha, I know what we can do.
 ZEV LOVE X: What can we do?
 BERT: We'll ask someone out there to find:
 NARRATOR: "Little Sambo"
 ZEV LOVE X: What you be meanin', G?
 BERT: Okay, pick up a crayon...
 UNIDENTIFIED: (Who me?)
 BERT: No, them
 ZEV LOVE X: Us?
 BERT: Yes. Kids pick up a crayon, look for:
 NARRATOR: ("Little Sambo")
 BERT: When you find him, draw a circle around him.¹⁶

The defiant act in this remix is the appropriation of a piece of mainstream culture (and children's culture at that) for a subculture—rendered particularly poignant in the fact that the usual positions of exclusion and inclusion, of authorized and unauthorized speakers and audiences, are reversed ("UNIDENTIFIED: (Who me?) / BERT: No, them / ZEV LOVE X: Us? / BERT: Yes). In the audio book sample of *Little Sambo* that begins the track we see an example of RO culture in which only the authorized voice may speak, excluding the voice of the "little boy who lived in the deep dark jungles of Africa"; in the remixed dialogue between Zev Love X and the Sesame Street character we find the counter-discursive (and comic) potential of RW culture to include the voice of the disenfranchised, exploiting a tension wrought of negotiations of and challenges to authorship and authority, and ultimately turning the tables by drawing a circle around the "Little Sambo." This, then, is more forgery than plagiarism, in so far as the remix does not claim the texts of Helen Bannerman and Sesame Street as its own work, but invests their signatures with the intentions and readings of the forger.

Much as hip-hop sampling assumes its transgressive force not by denying the origins of its samples but rather by challenging them with unauthorized uses that (mis)appropriate their original intentions, the Wake's primary dynamic might be said to be that of a 'mix'—in which elements are juxta-

¹⁶ KMD. 1991. *Who Me? (With an Answer from Dr. Bert)*. *Mr. Hood*. Elektra Records.

posed to form a whole, the constituent parts of which are still distinct—rather than a ‘merge’—in which elements are juxtaposed to form a single entity. That this is the tension on which the Wake’s transgressive dynamic rests can be seen, I would suggest, through its dominant trope of forgery: as David Spurr highlights, in *Finnegans Wake* “the particular form of transgression represented by forgery” can be seen as a “as a figure for the nature of writing, and as a metaphor for artistic creation” in so far as Joyce’s work erases the boundary between forgery and forging (1998, 246). However, Spurr continues, forgery is also a challenge to authority and a transgression of RO culture in so far as such palimpsestic forgeries expose that “the notion of authenticity is a human invention designed to confer privilege, protection, and value: as such it participates in the fictive constructions belonging to what we more commonly recognize as forgery” (1998, 259). In this context we might see that in its constant reference to an origin that is unobtainable and most likely non-existent—primarily in its manifold interpretations of the illegible Reverend Letter written by the forger—the Wake might preempt Barthes’s view of “the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin,” but it does so in a way that is invested in the dialogue between authorized and unauthorized narratives and perspectives in the negotiation of authority that emerges from this absence of a primary signature. Here, then, we find the tension between the forger/creator and the forger/imitator in Joyce’s “very many piously forged palimpsests” (*FW* 182.2):

In the act of signing, the signatory makes provision for his or her own absence and even death, as the laws of probate make clear. [...] But not to sign is to relinquish authority, and even not to exist in a certain legal sense. In a very concrete way, then, the signature both affirms one’s presence and creates the conditions for one’s absence: we live and die not by the sword but by the pen. (Spurr 1998, 251)

Conclusion

Book IV, the Wake’s ‘Ricorso’, seems to map a reverse course to the first five chapters of Book I, returning to ALP’s Reverend Letter’ (*FW* 615.12-616.19) and closing the book on her monologue (or dialogue with her silent partner HCE), an oral (or perhaps mental) document of her memories of her and HCE’s history peppered with the fear of forgetting and of being

forgotten as ALP “signs her final tear. Zee End” (*FW* 28.28-9). This lone signatory voice stands in marked contrast to the communal oral RW tradition outlined in the *Wake*’s opening chapters, yet this fact mirrors the *Wake*’s own backwards movement to a RW culture with a difference. Rather than a RW culture based on the mutual ownership and adaptation of cultural artifacts by members of that culture, the remix culture of the twenty-first century—and *Finnegans Wake* as a key literary representation of this movement in its nascent state—is founded in the conscious return to and exploitation of RW cultures of the past as initiated by individuals and in the context of the inerasable conflict between authorized and unauthorized voices. If a remix is a return, it is by no means a replication. As with *Ulysses*, the *Wake* closes with a provocative space for the deauthorized female voice claiming and re-appropriating the authority and contents of memory, and in this sense, perhaps, we can see that the defining mode of the *Wake* is not that of syncretism (the cultural acceptance of alien or previous traditions) but of the conflict for authority, the pitting of authorized against unauthorized discourses, of which culture is made in the absence of origins. It is in this sense—as well as and beyond the genesis of its composition and its primary aesthetic of remixing allusions, language systems, and various strands of cultural bricolage—that Joyce’s final “piously forged palimpsest” (*FW* 182.2) offers the ideal terrain within which to explore this reemergence of a Read/Write culture that constitutes the present, tentative, and still emerging philosophical transformative moment.

References

- Bacon, Francis. 2008 (digitized). *The Works of Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England*, ed. Basil Montague. Digitized on Google Books, <http://books.google.com/ebooks/reader?id=6DVhAAAAIAAJ>
- Bannerman, Helen. 2007. *The Story of Little Black Sambo*. Minneapolis: Filiquarian Publishing, LLC.
- Barthes, Roland. 2008. The Death of the Author. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, Third Edition, ed. David Lodge. Harlow: Pearson. 313-316.
- Beebe, Maurice. 1972. Ulysses and the Age of Modernism. *James Joyce Quarterly* 10 (Fall). 172-88.
- Benkler, Yochai. 2006. *The Wealth of Networks*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Booker, M. Keith. 2000. *Ulysses, Capitalism, and Colonialism: Reading Joyce after the Cold War*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bruns, Axel. 2008. *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second life, and Beyond: From Production to Producersage*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chandler, Daniel. 2002. *Semiotics: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.
- Chang, Jeff. 2005. *Can't Stop Won't Stop: A History of the Hip-Hop Generation*. Introd. DJ Kool Herc. New York: Picador.
- Conley, Tim. 2003. *Joyce's Mistakes*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Crispi, Luca and Sam Slote, eds. 2007. *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Duffy, Enda. 1994. *The Subaltern Ulysses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. 1980. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1998. *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Vol. 2). Ed. James B. Faubion. New York: The New Press.
- Gluck, Barbara Reich. 1979. *Beckett and Joyce: Friendship and Fiction*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Holmes, Thom and Thomas B. Holmes. 2002. *Electronic and Experimental Music: Pioneers in Technology and Composition*. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Joyce, James. 1999. *Finnegans Wake*. Penguin Classics. Introd. John Bishop. New York: Penguin.
- . 2000. *Occasional, Critical, and Political Writing*. Ed. Kevin Barry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1966. *The Letters of James Joyce: Volume 1*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Kinsella, N. Stephan. 2008. *Against Intellectual Property*. Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Landow, George P. 2006. *Hypertext 3.0: Critical Theory and New Media in an Era of Globalization*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lessig, Lawrence. 2008. *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Lethem, Jonathan. The Ecstasy of Influence: A Plagiarism. *Harper's Magazine* (Feb 2007). harpers.org/archive/2007/02/0081387.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1996. *The Savage Mind*. Nature of Human Society series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lodge, David. 1990. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. New York: Routledge.

- Mahaffey, Vicki. 1988. *Reauthorizing Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1991. Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce's *Ulysses*. *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bernstein. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McHale, Brian. 1992. *Constructing Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- Milesi, Laurent. 2003. *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manovich, Lev. 2009. Remixability. *We are the Machine: The Computer, the Internet, and Information in Contemporary German Literature*, ed. Paul A. Youngman. Rochester, NY: Camden House.
- Nelson, Ted. 1993. *Literary machines 93.1*. Sausalito, CA: Mindful Press.
- Norris, Margot. 1976. *The Decentered Universe of Finnegans Wake: A Structuralist Argument*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Osborn, Guy and Steve Greenfield. 2006. *Readings in Law and Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Platt, Len. 2007. *Joyce, Race and Finnegans Wake*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seggern, J. "Postdigital Remix Culture and Online Performance." *Exhibition at University of California at Riverside*. ethnomus.ucr.edu/remix_culture/remix_history.htm
- Smyth, Gerry. 2009. *Music in Irish Cultural History*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.
- Walsham, Alexandra and Julia Crick. 2004. "Introduction: Script, Print, and History." *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, eds. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spurr, David. 1998. "Fatal Signatures: Forgery and Colonization in *Finnegans Wake*." *Joyce: Feminism/Post/Colonialism* (European Joyce Studies 8), ed. Ellen Carol Jones, 245-260. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Theall, Donald. 2006. "Transformations of the Book in Joyce's Dream Vision of Digiculture." *Joycemia: James Joyce, Hypermedia & Textual Genetics*. Ed. Louis Armand. Prague: Literaria Pragensia. 28-43.



THE DEATH OF A JOYCE SCHOLAR *AND*
FURTHER ADVENTURES OF JAMES JOYCE:
THE CROSSROADS OF TWO READING PUBLICS

The contemporary fictional texts, *The Death of a Joyce Scholar* by Bartholomew Gill and *Further Adventures of James Joyce* by Colm Herron are rare in that they are books consciously written for two audiences, or reading publics, without compromise. They defy conventional literary classification, bridging the cultural gulf between commercial and academic fiction, being *both* simultaneously and in equal proportion. *Death of a Joyce Scholar* and *Further Adventures* may be read in two legitimate ways, with both reading publics finding content suited to their specialised taste, without noticeable interference from the other. These reading publics don't cross, or meet on any subject except that of James Joyce, who permeates the narratives of *Death of a Joyce Scholar* and *Further Adventures* on the surface and genetic level.

Death of a Joyce Scholar is a 1989 crime novel written by Irish American author Bartholomew Gill. It is part of a series collectively titled: *The Peter McGarr Mysteries* centralised on the life of a Garda Siochana Peter McGarr from Dublin. In *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, Professor Kevin Coyle, a lecturer at Trinity College Dublin is fatally stabbed on Bloomsday and found at a location called "Murderer's Ground" in Glasnevin Cemetery. Bloom coins the phrase "Murderer's Ground" (*U*, 82) to describe 5 Begnal Terrace, a house he passes in "Hades", which was the location of the murder of Thomas Childs on 2 September 1898 (Gifford 1988, 115). In *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, Coyle is found dead 'propped against the granite block wall of the Prospect Cemetery' (Gill 1989, 2), which is equated precisely as being the 'Murderer's Ground' of *Ulysses* by Detective McGarr.

It is a tightly plotted mystery with structural elements befitting the literary crime genre. Themes of sex, jealousy and revenge feature heavily in the narrative and at the novel's conclusion, following convention, Peter McGarr

solves the case and the correct murderer is arrested. McGarr uses Holmesian counter-intuition to solve the mystery, so the novel ends with a satisfying twist ending. *Death of a Joyce Scholar* is marketed to readers of contemporary murder mysteries, including the works of Hennig Mankell, Jo Nesbø, and James Patterson. This specific reading public will receive *Death of a Joyce Scholar* as a crime thriller, and position it comfortably within the boundaries of the genre. The second reading public of *Death of a Joyce Scholar* are fans of James Joyce who have been attracted to the book by the inclusion of their hero's name in the title. They read *Death of a Joyce Scholar* with a total fixation on references to Joyce, with secondary attention to the plotline. In polar opposite to the crime genre reading public, Joyceans may read *Death of a Joyce Scholar* using genetic and other academic methodologies. In total, there are at least a dozen *Ulysses* quotes hidden within the text of *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, as well as three from *Finnegans Wake*.¹ You do not have to be a *Ulysses* reader to understand the plot, however. A non-Joycean reader is introduced to *Ulysses* very basically in *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, with simplified synopses of chapter content explained in dialogue. In chapter 5, Peter McGarr, who studies *Ulysses* to help him solve the crime, is told about the "Penelope" chapter by his wife Noreen: "I'll read it to you in bed. It ends with a soliloquy that you'll enjoy hearing and it'll tell you more than you ever wanted to know about women." (*Ibid.*, 47). To a reader familiar with "Penelope", its proposed recitation in the marital bed instantly associates the feminine tone of Noreen's voice with Molly Bloom's. The chapter progression in *Ulysses* and its Dublin locations are given exposition through McGarr's research of the modern Bloomsday celebrations, primarily the themed walking tour organised by the suspect Fergus Flood, a professor at Trinity College. The accompanying extracts from *Death of a Joyce Scholar* plot landmarks in the "Telemachus", "Lestrygonians" and "Sirens" chapters of *Ulysses*. In an official interview, in his office in Trinity College, Professor Fergus Flood retells the Bloomsday experience to Detective McGarr: "[I'd] choose the soft or picturesque spots. The Martello Tower, if the weather was fair. Davey Byrne's or the Ormonde, when the food was better, for a few jars and a bite to eat" (*Ibid.*, 33). For lunch, Flood purposely takes the tourists to

¹ Joyce's use of the Viconian cycle of birth, marriage, death and ricorso as motif within *Finnegans Wake* inspires the re-iteration of the four-part order in *Death of a Joyce Scholar* specifically when McGarr muses upon Irish farming: 'Having dismissed all the standard explanations for digging in the earth from re-establishing touch with his ecology to taking direct part in the cycle of birth, growth, harvest and rebirth.' (Gill 1989, 6). See also, Joyce, 1939, 58.8-9.

the same locations where Bloom eats his meals in “Lestrygonians” and “Sirens”, which is subtle intertextuality that only a *Ulysses* reader will notice.

But the advanced Joycean, the academic or scholar, is addressed in *Death of a Joyce Scholar* also, albeit in a manner in which a Joyce novice cannot see. In fragmented and disorganised parts, quotes from *Ulysses* are sampled throughout the narrative, making it an unexpected genetic source within *Death of a Joyce Scholar*. The hot weather during the June 1988 time-frame of *Death of a Joyce Scholar*: “It began with an unprecedented period of June heat” (*Ibid.*, 3)², means that due a lack of rain in Dublin: “The farmers were [...] making hay with dried grasses” (*Ibid.*, 3). “Making hay” is a unit from the “Calypso” chapter of *Ulysses*: “Make hay while the sun shines” (*U*, 49). Dozens of genetic units from *Ulysses* are incorporated into *Death of a Joyce Scholar* with this technique, which is cryptic but not obscure in its application. McGarr’s discovery of soap at a suspect’s house, and his subsequent comment: “Soap, and as oft and sweet as could be” (Gill 1989, 42), is a reconstruction of the passage: “Mr Bloom raised a [*soap*] cake to his nostrils. Sweet lemony wax” (*U*, 69). The respective genetic units from “Nestor” and “Aeolus”: “bullockbefriending bard” (*U*, 29) and “DEAR DIRTY DUBLIN” (*U*, 119) are both integrated within Peter McGarr’s troubled thoughts in chapter six: “[...] staring up over the house tops for one last glimpse of dear, dirty Dublin, the city of which he was the buttocks-befriending bard” (Gill 1989, 66); “A fly buzzed from the hall through [*McGarr’s*] kitchen” (*Ibid.*, 25) takes the units “flies buzzed” from “Lestrygonians”: “Stuck, the flies buzzed” (*U*, 144) and the kidney which Bloom cooks in “Calypso” becomes the kidney of “Bang”, a murder suspect whom Peter McGarr punches: “The kidneys were next. McGarr would have to lead him through a gauntlet of journalists, and the less obviously pummelled they looked, the better” (Gill 1989, 163). The iconic first four words of *Ulysses*: “Stately plump Buck Mulligan” (*U*, 3) are quoted in *Death of a Joyce Scholar* on multiple occasions. But in one instance, it is accompanied by a genetic unit from the second sentence of *Ulysses*: “A yellow dressing gown, ungirdled, was sustained gently behind [*Buck Mulligan*] on the mild morning air” (*U*, 3). In *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, these genetic units unite to create a parallel visual image between Peter McGarr’s wife and Buck Mulligan:

2 This cites *Ulysses*’ warm setting on June 16th 1904: “Be a warm day I fancy. Specially in these clothes feel it more” (46).

“But [*Peter McGarr’s*] eyes fell on [*Noreen’s*] shoulders and chest and silky dressing gown, and the other promise made him say, “Stadely ploomp Book Molligun – what’s the rist of it?” (Gill 1989, 54)³ “The dressing gown” is rewritten as “silky” and feminine, since it is worn by McGarr’s wife. In chapter 18, the “Penelope” chapter of *Ulysses* intertextually structures the scene in which Detective Bresnahan sits in the bath and remembers her childhood in Kerry. Bresnahan’s thoughts at this time about having sex in her apartment the previous afternoon is a narrative parallel with Molly’s affair with Blazes Boylan at 4pm in *Ulysses*: “And suddenly a pall of guilt fell over [*Bresnahan*] like a leaden curtain, and, love or no love, she felt like an utter slut who had abandoned everything decent in her life for drink and easy sex *in the middle of the afternoon*, for heaven’s sake” (*Ibid.*, 228). Bresnahan’s feminine monologue is delivered from a relaxed reclining position in the bath, reminiscent of Molly’s bed and the imagery of the walls and mountain in her memory are genetic units sourced from “Penelope”: “Flower of the mountain ye” (*U*, 643) and “kissed me under the mountain wall” (*U*, 643) and this constructs an intertextual visual parallel.

And the high pastures, every stone in the *walls* of which she once knew from helping her father lift and tug and rebuild the grey line which seemed to rise up to heaven. And the *mountain* with the sheet they “left out to God” and collected every now and again and how on a good day on one spin of a heel you could see Tralee, Castlemaine, Killarney, Cahersiveen, and Dingle. (Gill 1989, 298) [*My emphasis*]

Further Adventures of James Joyce by Irish author Colm Herron, published in May 2010, is a work of fiction set in the Northern Ireland town of Derry or Londonderry⁴ at the height of the recent “Troubles”. Like *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, *Further Adventures* is written for two simultaneous audiences, or reading publics. Colm Herron defines clearly on his website the reading publics he has written *Further Adventures* for:

A perfect recipe for laughter and relaxation. [*Further Adventures of James Joyce*] tells what happens on the day James Joyce returns from the dead and shacks up

³ See (3).

⁴ As of 2010, the city is titled ‘Derry/Londonderry’ in tourist literature. Quoting R.L. Trask, the title dispute between ‘Derry’ and ‘Londonderry’ is a ‘political problem’ and there is ‘no politically neutral name’. (Trask 2001, 179)

with book loving nymphomaniac Melanie Muldoon. It's a novel that will have ordinary readers laughing themselves silly while Joyce scholars sit and work out what the hell's behind it all. (Herron)

The first reading public of *Further Adventures* are the 'ordinary readers', whilst the second are 'Joycean scholars'. Herron's 'ordinary' reading public are fans of comic fiction in its most spirited and joyful form, receiving *Further Adventures* within the fixed boundaries of humour and as a recreational pleasure without intellectual complication. Joyce is a ridiculous comic character to the 'ordinary' reading public of *Further Adventures*. Flann O'Brien's similar clown-like presentation of Joyce in *The Dalkey Archives* notably influences Herron's jocular, non-serious form of appreciation. In addition, O'Brien's paranoid hero in *At Swim Two Birds*, who questions his own existence as a literary character, directly inspires the similar figure of Myles Corrigan who completes *Further Adventures of James Joyce* once the author 'Colm Herron' contracts writers block. From page 193 onwards, Myles writes two chapters of *Further Adventures* using the titles of Joycean works including the *Dubliners* short stories "A Painful Case" and "A Little Cloud" as well as subsequent sections called "A Portrait of the Artist in his Prime" and "Exiles (Act 1)".

In a 2010 article for the *Derry Journal*, Herron attributes a Flann O'Brien-esque level of absurdity to his writing process, stating that James Joyce is currently living in Derry writing the follow-up novel to *Finnegans Wake*. Herron's treatment of Joyce as a comic figure is not vitriolic or disrespectful to the author, but rather his personal style of artistic homage:

I've always wanted to bring James Joyce [to Derry]. The furthest north he got was Belfast and he went there to see about opening of a cinema. This was about 101 years ago. So I thought 'It's never too late. He may be dead but that won't stop me. [...] And he loved it here [in Derry]. He loved it so much he didn't want to leave. In fact he rented a wee flat in Bishop Street⁵ and that's where he is now, writing like mad. (Quinn 2010, 10)

To Herron's second reading public, the 'Joyceans', *Further Adventures* is inherently received with a degree of seriousness. A Joycean, in an attempt

⁵ A street located within Derry's city walls, close to Herron's birthplace: Marlborough street.

to ‘work out’ the novel, in Herron’s words, may analyse with a great deal of emphasis Herron’s intertextual usage of *Ulysses* to construct *Further Adventures*. Indeed, Herron composed *Further Adventures* with a copy of *Ulysses* at his side at all times.⁶ Owing to its required knowledge of *Ulysses*, this is an approach to *Further Adventures* of interest to Joyceans and not ‘ordinary readers’.

Stephen Dedalus’ altercation in “Circe”⁷ with the drunken Englishmen Privates Carr and Compton is the intertextual model for the scene in *Further Adventures* when Myles Corrigan is questioned by two British soldiers, Soldier A and Soldier B, on patrol in Derry. (Herron 2010, 7-16) Stephen is beaten up for insulting King Edward VII: ‘PRIVATE CARR: ‘Here. What are you saying about my king?’ (*U*, 485) whereas Myles, who has been drinking all day, angers the British soldiers upon being questioned, by insisting that he is James Joyce:

- Okay, mate. Name? said Soldier B.
- You want my name?
- Yeah. Name.
- James Augustine Joyce.
- Very impressive, said Soldier A. – That’s Roman, isn’t it?
- Cork, actually, said Myles. – Though I have heard it said –
- Address?
- The Martello Tower...
- Martello Tower.
- ... but I’m not going back.
- Why’s that then?
- Two people tried to kill me there last night.
- Really? How was that? Did you report it?
- They both had drink taken, explained Myles. – But I want to make it clear right now that Samuel Trench shot at me in good faith. *He* took me for a panther. The other, however –
- And who was the other party?
- The other bastard was Oliver Saint John Gogarty. (Herron 2010, 8-9)

⁶ My Interview with Colm Herron in Derry. Dated December 6th, 2010.

⁷ See (479-480).

In *Further Adventures*, the revised intertextual names for Privates Compton and Carr are Soldiers ‘A’ and ‘B’ since during the ‘Saville Report’, the public enquiry into the deaths of thirteen civilians by British paratroopers on “Bloody Sunday” in January 1972, such alphabetical pseudonyms were used in the official documentation.⁸ Since Soldier B has knowledge about Joyce’s writing, despite being a non-reader, Myles is exposed as lying about his name, which places him in danger:

- Hang on, said Soldier B. – I know now. Isn’t [Joyce] the writer? [...] He did porn, didn’t he? said Soldier B. – He had to leave the country. Roight?’
- What! Snapped Myles. – How dare you! Hah! (*Ibid.*, 11)

Myles is subsequently suspected of criminal involvement by the soldiers as he has given “false information” (*Ibid.*, 11) and he is nearly arrested.⁹ Although Myles is not beaten up by Soldier A or Soldier B, he encounters a revised form of danger specific to the “Troubles” era. Nothing newsworthy happens in *Ulysses*, but in *Further Adventures* there are acts of violence throughout, including a police raid of Myles’ house, a paramilitary punishment shooting of an alleged informant, a notorious sectarian massacre, and the public lynching of two soldiers. Herron frames *Further Adventures* alongside a series of “Troubles” killings in March 1988 which began with the deaths of the “Gibraltar Three” and followed by the retaliatory murders at the “Milltown Massacre” and “Corporals Killings”. In total, eight people died and over sixty were injured during these incidents, and they are iconic moments in the “Troubles” owing to the heinous and bloody manner of the attacks perpetrated.

The approaching Republican funeral in Belfast for three IRA members shot dead by the British in Gibraltar is discussed at length during Myles Corrigan’s taxi ride through Derry with Conn and Danny. The “Gibraltar

⁸ Since the beginning of the Saville Report in 1998, the phrases ‘Soldier A’ and ‘Soldier B’ have entered into the Northern Ireland lexicon meaning: ‘An anonymous, generic British soldier.’

⁹ In a “Circe” parallel, with genetic sourcing, Myles is protected and helped by a character during the interrogation. Bloom is the genetic model for Conn Doherty in this chapter of *Further Adventures*. Bloom’s statement to the soldiers—“[Stephen] doesn’t know what he’s saying. Taken a little more than is good for him” (*U*, 483)—uses verbal reasoning to prevent the soldiers beating Stephen up. Conn’s insistence that Myles is incapable of rational thought: “He’s not fit to be questioned” is genetically sourced from Bloom’s statement. See Herron 2010, 193-249.

Three”, which they became titled, were surprised in a van by SAS troops prior to a bombing campaign and shot dead:

- Are you sure you're wise going up to Belfast? said Conn.
- The soldiers are going to attack the funerals. Sure you know that.
- I heard the IRA fired a military salute this evening already, said the driver. - [The soldiers] are not going to be there. (*Ibid.*, 78)

Myles attends their funeral in the subsequent section of *Further Adventures*, but he is primarily visiting the graves of his deceased girlfriend and infant son. His statement about his son: ‘– Twenty-seven, said Myles. – That’s about the age my boy would have been.’ (Herron 2010, 103) is a genetic unit adapted from “Calypso”: “He would be eleven now if he had lived” (*U*, 54). These are Bloom’s thoughts about his son Rudy, who also died after several days. To the Joycean reader of *Further Adventures*, Myles’ intertextual connection with Bloom, in regards to their dual parental grief, reveals that Herron structures the scenes at Belfast’s Milltown Cemetery upon “Hades” in *Ulysses*. Indeed, even prior to Myles’ arrival in Belfast, his journey to the funeral, firstly by taxi ride and secondly by car (*Ibid.*, 80)¹⁰ are intertextually modelled on Bloom’s carriage ride through Dublin, before reaching Glasnevin (72-83). At the cemetery, Myles experiences first-hand the events of the “Milltown Massacre” on 16th March 1988 wherein he is nearly killed by a lone Loyalist paramilitary, Michael Stone, who ambushed the funeral armed with grenades and semi-automatic pistols. Stone threw grenades at the coffins of “The Gibraltar Three” and shot dead three Republican mourners, seriously injured sixty others before making his failed escape:¹¹

The man was firing into the crowd of diving running falling people. [...] Like someone playing bowls he leaned forward and rolled one grenade after another towards the parked hearses. The air splintered. The screams grew shriller and, above the screams, hoarse loud voices. (*Ibid.*, 82)

¹⁰ Myles Corrigan’s car journey over the Glenshane mountain, from Derry to Belfast, like Bloom’s carriage trip, incorporates many thoughts about death. Whereas Bloom mourns Rudy and his father Virag, Myles is devastated by the loss of his girlfriend thirty years previously: “*I lost everything. All she lost was the moment she died in*” (Herron 2010, 80).

¹¹ For a detailed account of events see Dillon 1993.

The thoughts of inevitable mortality which permeate Bloom's mind, upon being surrounded by graves and coffins: "I daresay the soil would be quite fat with corpsemanure, bones, flesh, nails" (*U*, 89) are passing musings. However, in *Further Adventures* the process of death, through violent murder, is contemporaneous narrative action and Myles does not walk peacefully around the cemetery like Bloom, but is shot at by Stone with the bullet missing him by inches and hitting his girlfriend's gravestone (Herron 2010, 80). Myles is subsequently traumatised and psychotically believes, owing to a bold-typed dialogue with his author, that the experience was not reality and that, like Bloom, he is a fictional character:

- Am I dead? Are you finished with me?
- You're not dead.
- Why did you spare me?
- Respect. Respect for the dead. (*Ibid.*, 84)

Myles is mentally disturbed by the shock caused to him, like many "Troubles" victims, and his idiosyncratic psychosis that he is trapped inside a book is sourced from his obsession with Joyce, whom he extensively quotes from in the novel.¹² In a moment of pure insanity, Myles interviews Joyce from beyond the grave using 'Electronic Voice Phenomenon' technology, (179-188) a paranormal technique used to contact the dead via a radio, computer and tape recorder. Many incidents from Joyce's life, which Herron sources from Ellmann's biography,¹³ are incorporated into their resulting conversation.

My definition of fixed reading publics in *Death of a Joyce Scholar* and *Further Adventures* insists upon a hypothesis that no reader can belong to both groups, and that they are mutually exclusive. But, in the case of *Death of a Joyce Scholar*, for example, this is not empirically so, since there *are* crime genre fans who like *Ulysses*, and vice versa. Such a reader, a fan of crime fiction *and* Joyce, will begin *Death of a Joyce Scholar* with an unbiased approach to its content, so in theory they alone can review and appreciate it without built-in literary prejudices. However, in practice *Death of a Joyce Scholar* does not allow for such equality since its reader is quickly drawn to

¹² For Myles' recitation from "Gas from a Burner" see: Herron 2010, 51.

¹³ See Ellmann 1983, 592 in relation to biographical material about how Joyce once asked James Stephens, an Irish novelist, to complete *Finnegans Wake*. Herron details this extensively in Joyce's conversation with Myles (187).

certain aspects of the novel more than others, so even the most impartial of these crime /Joycean fans will find their allegiance to one of their reading publics challenged. As *Death of a Joyce Scholar* progresses, a conscious preference to one reading public will be unconsciously made, and the remainder of the novel will be received in this way. In conclusion, Bartholomew Gill and Colm Herron demonstrate accomplished knowledge of Joyce's works, but they are careful not to alienate the non-Joycean by the integration of *Ulysses* genetic units within their texts. Gill and Herron occupy the middle ground between the oppositional reading publics, who will believe their approach to *Death of a Joyce Scholar* or *Further Adventures* is definitive. The Joycean reading public, with its collective expert knowledge of *Ulysses*, can enjoy deciphering the content in both novels, which initiates genetic research and academic appreciation. The genetic units from *Ulysses* will not be off-putting to commercial and crime fiction reading publics since they are covertly incorporated, and are unobtrusive within the narratives. *Death of a Joyce Scholar* and *Further Adventures* therefore subvert our literary conventions, uniting two reading publics thought to be irreconcilable within a text's totality. It is suitable that is the figure of James Joyce who structures this complex arrangement by standing at the crossroads which links the reading publics together.

References

- Dillon, Martin. 1993. *Stone Cold: The True Story of Michael Stone and the Milltown Massacre*. New edition. London: Arrow Books.
- Ellmann, Richard. 1983. *James Joyce: New and Revised Edition*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Gifford, Don. 1988. *Ulysses Annotated*. Second edition. USA: University of California Press.
- Gill, Bartholomew. 1989. *Death of a Joyce Scholar*. U.S.A: Avon Books.
- Herron, Colm. 2010. *Further Adventures of James Joyce*. Chatham: Dakota.
- . <http://www.colmherron.com/reviews.html>.
- Joyce, James. 1986. *Ulysses: the Gabler Edition*, ed. Gabler, Hans Walter with Stepp, Wolfhard and Melchior, Claus. New York: Vintage.
- 1939. *Finnegans Wake*. Great Britain: Faber and Faber.
- Quinn, Andrew. “Derry Author’s Book to be Focus of Attention at Rome Conference”, *The Derry Journal*, December 24th 2010, 10.
- Trask, R.L. 2001. *Mind the Gaffe: The Penguin Guide to Common Errors in English*. England: Penguin Books.

HORSEY WOMEN AND ARSE-TEMISES:
WAKE-ING *ULYSSES* IN TRANSLATION

Translation brings the news of things, not the things themselves, as an avid Joyce reader, novelist Péter Esterházy stated in his opening lecture at the 2006 International Joyce Symposium in Budapest. The news of Joyce's *Ulysses* was twice brought into Hungarian: after a first translation by Endre Gáspár which, published in the unlikely year 1947, never had the chance to become embedded in cultural memory, a second translation version by novelist Miklós Szentkuthy came out in 1974, to be hailed as one of the greatest achievements of literary translation into the language. The text which is referred to as Szentkuthy's *Ulysses* as often as Joyce's, has enjoyed since publication the status of a cult book, obviously aided by the common critical topos—or misprision rather—of Szentkuthy as “the Hungarian Joyce.”¹ If “what can best be described by the name James Joyce is something that failed to happen in Hungarian fiction” (Esterházy 2006), the news of *Ulysses*

¹ The attribute which probably harmed rather than aided Szentkuthy's literary career was given by one of the most influential critics of the interwar period, the poet Mihály Babits, who wrote a hostile review on Szentkuthy's first, monumental novel *Prae* (1934) which, according to him, strove to resemble *Ulysses* even in its lack of structuring, paragraphs and punctuation. Babits's reluctance to warm to Joyce, whom he considered inferior to near-classic Proust, was transferred to Szentkuthy's experimental novel, an oppressive, “dreadful baroque monster” or “gigantic parody” (Rugási 2007, 735). The still widely held topos is founded on a number of correspondences in the work of the two authors as critic Dávid Szolláth shows: firstly, both novels use expansive narrative structures, style parodies, catalogues. If the single most important narrative technique of *Ulysses* is interior monologue/stream-of-consciousness, then with Szentkuthy's *Prae* it is (self-)commentary progressing from digression to digression; the structural link with both is free association. Both works employ the strategy of contrapuntal montage, manifest in the liberal amalgamation of high and low cultural registers, often deployed in the context of a blasphemous Catholicism. Both authors weave their fictions around subtexts and intertextual allusions, their novels being travesties/parodies of classical/mythological narratives (the *Odyssey* vs. the myth of Orpheus); even the patterns of erudition of the two novelists show surprising similarities (Szolláth 2010, 65-6).

arriving via Szentkuthy's idiom had far-reaching effects on the postmodern prose turn of Hungarian literature in the 1970s-80s, best illustrated by the work of Esterházy himself—who even chose June 16 for the setting of his 1985 novel *Helping Verbs of the Heart* (*A szív segédigéi*)—and gave a decisive impulse to the disseminative language poetics of writers Győző Határ, Dezső Tandori, Lajos Parti Nagy, to name but a few.

Szentkuthy, whose vast (meta)fictional output remains an isolated experience and out of the groove of the mainstream narrative tradition in Hungarian, seems to have wanted to appropriate *Ulysses* as his own work and to become Joyce's co-author rather than a "mere" translator (Kappanyos 1997, 50); this statement alone accounts for much of the criticism directed at the translation since then. The novelist-translator—also the author of the canonical Hungarian version of *Gulliver's Travels*, a book whose irreverent satirical tone obviously suited him—came from a tradition of domesticating, poeticizing translation, a tradition of the *belles infidèles* that produced, quantitatively as well as qualitatively, the better part of the Hungarian versions of early 20th century prose and poetry in the interwar period. Telling in this respect is his translation "programme" published in a 1968 article in which he announces his intention to re-translate *Ulysses*: "it is unquestionable that the best translators in the history of world literature (Hungarians included) could never resist fusing (a) their own personalities and (b) their own most modern age with the style and age of the classics." Such a claim simultaneously signals a *domesticating* and *visible* translation poetics, one that willingly embraces the idea of cultural transfer and indigenizing translation—quite at odds with current translation norms. In the same article he argues that, on account of the actuality of Joyce's *Ulysses*, the translator must "resort to everything from slang to the language of fantasy in the Arabian Nights-bag of Hungarian vocabulary." Furthermore, no translation can aim to be the mirror image of *Ulysses* but rather, the translator has to "play chess" with the original—although he warns of the danger of "over-Ulyssesizing" (Szentkuthy 1968, 274-279). This warning is all the more surprising since Szentkuthy's *Ulysses*, a "fireworks of joint creation" was criticized for its tendency of "out-Joycing Joyce himself" and for treating literary translation as a field of poetic contest (Egri 1974, 433); in critic Tamás Ungvári's memorable phrase, Szentkuthy renders the "Joyce of the fool's cap" credibly, but falls short of the "Joyce of the bowler-hat" when he applies all his virtuosity to style parodies and the original's "verbal magic" but sins against the text's infrastructure of motifs and echoes. Ungvári blames this on Szentkuthy's

conception of literary (prose) translation, common in Hungarian culture as being “merely art, linguistic carnival and juggling with words: but it is much more, it is also a science” (Györffy 2007, 736). The novelist and translator was obviously interested, first and foremost, in Joyce’s excess of language and extraordinary affinity to play: as he states in an early, 1947 article on *Ulysses* and its first Hungarian translation, the novel which he describes in such terms as “sound-perversion” and “word-promiscuity” is but “one gigantic, fairy tale-like pun” (Goldmann 2005, 48). Rather than proposing a comprehensive critical analysis of Szentkuthy’s text—a task that would require a much wider scope—the present paper attempts to map the virtual chess-moves of the reading experience that the Hungarian *Ulysses* pre-programs.

To begin with, Szentkuthy’s text quite obviously suffers from a number of major fallacies, mostly due to the fact that the translation was carried out at a time when the bulk of Joycean textual criticism, the Gabler text, Gifford’s notes and the *Ulysses* concordance were unavailable.² Furthermore, neither the translator nor his editors (Tibor Bartos and Levente Osztoivits) were in contact with foreign or Hungarian Joyceans, and they lacked both the necessary Irish cultural and historical background and a working knowledge of idiomatic Hiberno-English to be able to decipher the novel’s dense network of Irish, local allusions. Consequently, with instances when specific (Anglo-Irish) cultural information is offered in the original, the translator rather too heavily relied on the technique of covering the original’s place up with something that might contextually fade into the background; in addition, Szentkuthy’s off-the-cuff “makeup” solutions tend to be ostentatious language games and effects, filling in the semantic gaps with flamboyant linguistic contrivances. An even more painful shortcoming regards editing and, in a broader sense, structural and stylistic fine-tuning, and is probably to ascribe to both Szentkuthy and his editor Bartos: the Hungarian text’s carelessness regarding the intricate interrelations between the episodes and the network of intratextual echoes often obfuscates the text’s arguably most important structural principle. Thus, the characters’ Homeric attributes are subject to wide variations across the episodes; an odd name that generates semantic nuclei, like the horse Throwaway, the man in the mackintosh or

² Although the second, 1986 edition, re-edited and often rather arbitrarily tampered with by Tibor Bartos (who didn’t submit his alterations to the translator) was allegedly revised in concordance with the Gabler text, several critics have shown that there is no evidence to support this claim; Szolláth demonstrates with a number of examples how far Bartos failed to take into account even the typographical errors corrected by Gabler (2010, 70).

Ruby Cohen (rebaptized Ruby Kohn, to chime in with *Rubicon*) are unsatisfactorily dealt with; since these recurrences are often the reader's only tool for recuperating the "plot", the Hungarian *Ulysses* risks becoming, by and large, more puzzlingly "unreadable" than the original (Kappanyos 1997, 46-50).

Although the topos "Hungarian Joyce" does little justice to Szentkuthy, not to mention the Irish master, the 1934 novel *Prae*, completed when the author was barely 23, can nevertheless be read as an illuminating subtext to Szentkuthy's Joyce. The metafictional work capitalizes chaos theory—it even uses the adjective "chaocosmic" (*káokozmikus*) some years before "in the chaosmos of Alle" was added to the galley proofs after 1936 (Szolláth 2010, 73)—and is built around a theory of wordplay that embraces everything from language to contemporary architecture, complete with the launch of a new editing style: detours (*Prae* I, 9). This theory, outlined in the treatise of the author's fictional alter-ego Leville-Touqué, shows what Szentkuthy assimilated from his Joycean—both Ulyssean and Wakean—readings:

The whole century progresses towards wordplay [...] Wordplay is the expression of the instinct by which we consider the relationships born out of chance to be more perennial realities and much more characteristic beings than the very objects that feature in the relationship. One can thus imagine the new setting of the world: trees will vanish from the alleys where only the patches of intertwining foliage remain; the elements will disappear from chemical compounds, leaving behind the vectors of their bindings as sole material realities [...] All left and right banks will fade, but the world will be filled with an infinite number of solid bridges. (*Prae* I, 30, my translation)

The linguistic mimicry of *Prae*, playing on a wide range of authorial registers, embraces a vast array of wordplay relying on the translation or interlingual trafficking of foreign-language (German, French, Latin and English) quotes, puns and turns-of-phrase; these ironic foreign sentence-collages are, however, mostly felt to be components of one language and style. As Gyula Rugási, Szentkuthy's most sensitive exegete writes, the English-ness or French-ness of some of his fictional characters is immaterial in that the author tends to produce the same puns in all languages; these contrivances function more as metaphors translatable from, and into, Hungarian, than idioms characteristic of the language in which they are voiced (2007, 316).

By critical consensus, *Prae* never quite lived up to its theory of wordplay which bore its finest fruit only several decades later, when translating *Ulysses*, in what became Szentkuthy's signature: his contrived, multiply allusive Szentkuthysms—especially when some contextual difficulty needed to be bridged. One instance of the translator filling in the semantic blanks with the *de rigueur* word-concoction, as if penned by his woman writer character dubbed Hippopochondra Stylopotama (*Prae* I, 28), occurs in *Lestrygonians* where Bloom indulges in erotic fantasies on an Amazonian widow: “Strong as a brood mare some of these horsey women... Born courtesan” (*U*, 8.345). Although the English original hardly presents the reader with interpretive difficulties, the Hungarian translation makes a point of punning: “Az ilyen *farmiszek* szívósabbak a tenyészkanacánál... Született *nimfomáriája* van” (196). *Fartemis* plays on the Greek goddess *Artemis* and the Hungarian for “backside” [*far*], giving birth to a buxom “Arse-temis,” while “born courtesan” is rendered with the phrase “(she) has an inborn *nymphomaria*”. What in the English original is a sexual innuendo is explicitated in conspicuous contrivances, ascribing an all-devouring sexuality to the chaste goddess' name and dragging in the Virgin Mary as her sexually voracious double.

In a neighbouring passage in *Lestrygonians*, Bloom vents his resentment against Purefoy, an aging Methodist vegetarian who annually presents his wife with an offspring: “Saffron bun and milk and soda lunch in the educational dairy. Eating with a stopwatch, thirtytwo chews to the minute. *And still his muttonchop whiskers grew*” (*U*, 8.358, my emphasis). The rationale for the appearance of Purefoy's “muttonchop whiskers” might be a belief that meat-eating made (male) hair grow (Gifford 1988, 166), besides increasing potency—both visibly disproved by Purefoy's diet and his large family. In translation, the ornamental facial hair mutates into the, faintly sexual, “bakkonbartoló kotlett” (196)—a nonce construct loosely based on *bak* [buck/goat], a self-coined word *bartoló* (present participle of a non-existent verb) and *kotlett* [cutlet]; the cluster chimes with *barkó* [whiskers]. The phrase can be “read”, however, as an interface between Hungarian and German, *Backenbart* and *Kotelette* being alternative terms for *whiskers* in German, the latter also standing for *cutlet*. Szentkuthy (born Pfisterer), of German extraction, knew German *von Haus aus*, obtained his degree in English and French and had more than a passing acquaintance with Latin and Italian; his translation offers us a slightly Wakean-leaning Bloom who, unlike his original, the timid *bricoleur* of the words of others, in his interior

monologues routinely lets loose idiosyncratic witticisms and “high falutin stuff” (*U*, 7.260).

If the Hungarian Bloom is linguistically promoted to the status of a “university wit”, then one might with some right expect Mulligan and Stephen to pour forth a deluge of verbal sparkles. Skimming the first pages of the Hungarian translation, one comes upon the following appellations: the memorable Mulliganism “jejune jesuit” (*U*, 1.45) is rendered as “*loy-oládé jezsuita*” (6) which combines the name of St. Ignatius Loyola and loyal(ly) with chocolate/marmalade, giving Stephen the nay-sayer a sweet tooth. Haines the “ponderous Saxon” (*U*, 1.51) is defined with an “essence” of Englishness—the War of the Roses—in the formula “*ponderosa Tudor Rózsa*” (6), punning on *tuberose* and *Tudor rose*, at the first occurrence of his name when the (Hungarian) reader needs to decrypt the information that he is English. The same character, dubbed a “woful lunatic” (*U*, 1.59) is turned into a syphilitic for the sake of alliteration (*lueszes lunatikus*, 7), coupling two terms that sit well in the mouth of medical Mulligan. Compulsive alliteration-cum-wordplay gets the upper hand in the following exchange between Mulligan and Stephen:

“Ah, poor dogsbody!... I must give you a shirt and a few noserags. How are the secondhand breeks?”

“They fit well enough,” Stephen answered. (*U*, 1.112)

Ó, *csorvasz csipkerózsám*... Adok neked inget és egy pár *fikafityulát*. *Antik gatyáiddal*, mondd, hogy állsz?

Fitten fittyengek – válaszolt Stephen. (8-9, my emphasis)

Mulligan’s patronizing “poor dogsbody” is transformed into the alliterating Hungarian “wither(ed) rose-hip,” the plant’s name also translating as Sleeping Beauty (*Csipkerózsika*), lending Stephen an air of a girls’ boarding school. The mock-Homeric compound “noserag” is turned, with a characteristic lowering of register, into an alliterating “snot-cap” (*fikafityula*), whereas the “secondhand” breeches are rendered “antique” by the translator’s antics of style. Stephen’s wry response to such teasing is turned into a phrase that would out-clown many a Mulliganism: *fitten fittyengek* is a disseminative construct that combines an adverb derived from the English adjective *fit* (which, decades before the global marketing of *fitness*, would hardly have been at the fingertips of Hungarian audience) and a self-coined verb that connotes *fityeg* (“to hang loose”) and *fittyöng*, itself derived from *fityül* (“to whistle”) with the addition of the verbal suffix *-(o)e/ö)ng* denot-

ing repetitive action (*gyakorító képző*). Thus the Hungarian syntagm relies on interlingual play, reading the English *fit* in at least two senses, yielding a Stephen fit as a *whistle* in his not particularly tight-fitting secondleg apparel. The fact that the alliterating syllable *fitty* also chimes in with words with sexual connotation—a mild slang for the male sexual organ (*fütyi*) and prepuce (*fityma*)—adds unorthodox overtones to the mutual teasing game which gleefully glosses over Stephen’s psychological unease.

Such examples where Szentkuthy camouflages relatively straightforward information in arcane cultural allusions are galore in *Telemachus* alone, baffling a reader already at a loss in the dense Joycean text. One gets the impression that the translator couldn’t resist dropping his “fahroots of cullchaw” (*FW* 303.20)—the exotic fruits, far-faring roots and contrapuntal farts, of his encyclopaedic erudition—on every occasion the text presented. For not only does Szentkuthy start off his word-machine at full gear, punning and alliterating even where the original doesn’t support such effects of language but, as the above example shows, he is not above slipping in allusions to the “abominable regions” (*U*, 14.1566), sensibly adding bawdry allusions (Kappanyos 1997, 48). The playful tautology in Mulligan’s exclamation, “We’ll have a glorious drunk to astonish the *druidy druids*” (*U*, 1.296, my emphasis), for instance, is rendered with the fourfold alliteration, “*Dicső dáridót rendezünk, ámuljatok durrantó druidák*” [‘We’ll organize a glorious revelry, marvel you banging druids’ (15)] where the onomatopoeic epithet *durrantó* is common euphemism for “farting.”

That translation is an opportunistic business relying on whatever linguistic opportunities the target language offers, is one of the clichés of translation studies. In this sense, Szentkuthy seems never to have let an occasion pass to “commit his filthy synecdoche,” to quote Beckett’s *Murphy*, especially when an occasion to alliterate presented itself. The *Oxen Coda* which, without the advantage of Gifford’s notes and recent textual criticism, must have seemed indeed one “giant, fairy tale-like pun” with its near-portman-teaux, egregious gaps and semantic obscurities, was in many respects an ideal terrain for Szentkuthy’s “word-promiscuity”. Where the English text demands that Stephen deliver his parody of the Apostles’ Creed—“Parson Steve, Apostates creed!” (*U*, 14.1451)—the Hungarian text (“Stephanosz Szentatya, aposztaták proosztatája,” 527) not only promotes Stephen to the status of *pope* (Holy Father), but also dubs him apostates’ *prostate*, grafting unholy body imagery onto anti-ecclesiastic *non serviam* (and oblivious to the fact that here “Apostates’ Creed” is not one of the many alternative names

of Dedalus, but hides an intratextual allusion).³ An apparently harmless interjection, “Steve boy” (*U*, 14.1528) yields the nickname *Dedili* (530) that amalgamates Dedalus, debil(ity)—the only meaning of *debilis* in Hungarian being idiocy, mental retardedness—and the slangy syntagm *de dili(s)*, “how bonkers,” that renders the Div. Scep. a dedal gaga. A reference to the Yeats sisters, Elizabeth and Lily—apostrophized “the weird sisters” in *Telemachus* (1.365)—and Dun Emer Press which they ran in Dundrum where several early volumes of Yeats were published, occasions a disseminative construct that asks for back-translation into normative Hungarian and raises the question, tongue-in-cheek, of what’s in a name:

To be printed and bound at the Druiddrum press by two designing females.
Calf covers of pissedon green. (*U*, 14.1454)

HU/Szentkuthy 527: Nyomtatták és kötötték imprimáturba pergamenten, borítót *pervezte rafinó*. [Printed and bound in *imprimatur+spit* parchment(+Lat. –er), cover *designed+pervert(ed)* by *refined/cunning female*.]

“Standard Hu”: Nyomtatták és kötötték imprimáturba pergament(er), borítót *tervezte rafinált nő*.

Szentkuthy’s translated version conflates the two sentences, adding a (mock-)pedantic Latinate inflection. The portmanteaux for “designing females” slip in a strong sexual innuendo, corroborated by the hint at perversion on design (*rafinált*, cognate and false friend of “refined,” means somebody cunning, worldly—said of a woman, it would connote a person who skilfully exploits her sex-appeal for achieving her goals), while also forsaking the metamorphic Homeric epithet “pissedon green” (a relative of “snotgreen”) for the sake of a full-blown Szentkuthysm. The internal correspondence with *Telemachus*⁴ is partially obscured, being transferred to another textual locus: the reference to the mucous substance coughed up (*turha*) in the distortion of *imprimatur* nevertheless creates a link to the “bard’s noserag” (*U*, 1.73) of that colour, *turhakarpa* (7), a mock-Homeric

³ According to J.N. Turner, the referred passage is “He Who Himself begot middler the Holy Ghost and Himself sent Himself, Agenbuyer, between Himself and others, Who, put upon by His fiends, stripped and whipped, was nailed like a bat to barndoor, starved on crosstree, Who let Him bury, stood up, harrowed hell, fared into heaven and there these nineteen hundred years sitteth on the right hand of His Own Self but yet shall come in the latter day to doom the quick and dead when all the quick shall be dead already” (9.492-499; Turner 1997, 84)

⁴ “Five lines of text and ten pages of notes about the folk and the fishgods of Dundrum. Printed by the weird sisters in the year of the big wind” (1.365).

compound of “spit/snot” and the pejorative *kapca*, foot-rag or any cheap piece of cloth, appositely illustrating the translator’s custom of *literally* lowering the register.

Many such translation choices give the impression that Szentkuthy was approaching the *Ulysses* text from, and with a background knowledge of, the unbound semiosis of the *Wake*—packaging, as it were, the experience of reading two texts in one for the Hungarian reader.⁵ He is known to have tried his hand at translating passages from *Work-in-Progress*—of which his library included *Anna Livia Plurabelle* (1930) and *Haveth Childers Everywhere* (1931) and with which he creatively engaged before 1939—although the results were never published.⁶ Many Szentkuthisms of the early episodes, as well as his rendering of the more experimental *Aeolus*, *Sirens* or *Oxen*, for instance, create the effect of actualizing the experience of the *Wakean* language—a language which already foreshadows the postmodern linguistic turn—in translating the previous work, pre-programming a reading that is not only linear but also aslant, askew, with multiple eyes⁷ to the lateral leaps and lapses of the tongue. This carnivalized and even babelized translation text raises the question of the fruitful illusion of translatability—what should a translator be faithful to, the signifier or the signified. Szentkuthy seems to have consistently opted for the former; playing on Martha Clifford’s lapsing letter, it is indeed seductive to affirm that he favours the word to the world, at only a letter’s remove from the latter, especially in translation where structural, allusive and rhizomatic connections, networks depend on a series of contextual negotiations.

However, it must be stated that, while Szentkuthy’s Hungarian version succeeds, with a creditable margin of honour, in making a notoriously difficult work even more difficult to read⁸ and pre-programs a reading of Joyce’s book-web as a gigantic carnival of language first and foremost, it also sensibly levels the styles and registers of Joyce’s original. Szentkuthy’s

⁵ Critic Dávid Szolláth, a member of the translator team working on the new Hungarian *Ulysses*, arrives at a similar conclusion in his 2010 article.

⁶ Ferenc Takács, oral communication.

⁷ Philosopher Béla Hamvas, one of Joyce’s first, and most discerning, critics in Hungarian wrote of the “mystical satirico-symbolical poem” *Finnegans Wake* in a 1931 article that its words are “multiple-eyed” and “live multiple lives” (Goldmann 2006, 230).

⁸ A view obviously not endorsed by Péter Esterházy who affirms in *Yes*: “For me, Joyce’s voice in Szentkuthy’s translation sounded very natural, I had no difficulty reading the book and it gave me much pleasure” (2006).

self-generating word-machine tends to take over; as Kappanyos and Szoláth argue in their 2010 articles, Szentkuthysms dominate the pages of the Hungarian *Ulysses* in such overwhelming density that they become its chief stylistic marker, obscuring thereby other important thematizations of language, diachronic as well as pertaining to the use of internal translations or dislocations. Moreover, Szentkuthy's theory of wordplay, applied full gear to *Ulysses*, is backed up by his own idiosyncratic, and encyclopaedic, patterns of erudition, liberally overlooking such considerations as the characters' distinct levels of education—to the effect that most characters in the Hungarian version tend to speak the Szentkuthyan idiom only.⁹

If Szentkuthy's juvenile fictional experiment was dismissed in 1934 by Babits, the most influential critic and poetaster of the age, for lacking in Joyce's "plurivocity and Rabelaisian richness" (Rugási 2007, 735), it seems that, by the time he came to translate *Ulysses*, he had learned his lesson *re* Rabelais and did everything to entwine the Hungarian *Ulysses* with laughs low. In contradistinction to the earlier, literalist translation by Endre Gáspár (1947) which, for all its attention to detail and its merits in transposing the original's "surrealist, expressionist, impressionist, naturalistic and symbolic effects" (Egri 1967, 234), generally fails to see Joyce's humour, Szentkuthy's version is explosively Gargantuan. Considering the reputation of the original—to which G.B. Shaw famously refused to subscribe, but considered that "every male Dubliner between 30 and 50 should be forced to read it" (Nash 2006, 100)—and the fact that the translation was published at a time when literary works, films with an openly sexual content were routinely censored, cut in communist countries, the unabashed salaciousness of Szentkuthy's version is even more striking.¹⁰ The rationale for this can be found, at least partially, in Szentkuthy's 1968 translator's program that announces an intention to actualize Joyce's novel—gargantualizing his text to achieve a linguistic and cultural shock-effect akin to that presumably produced by the original.

⁹ Famously, in *Prae* even the prostitute character has a Sorbonne degree and her lengthy philosophical excursions are on a par with those of the finest minds around.

¹⁰ A comparison might be made with the Romanian *Ulysses*, translated by poet Mircea Ivănescu and published in 1984, which was sensibly "tamed", cleansed of taboo words, its register de-slanged and heightened to be compatible with the aesthetics and public morals of communist Romania, as Arleen Ionescu shows in her case-study on Molly's monologue in Romanian.

The Hungarian translation, as even a casual leafing through demonstrates, tends to explicitate innuendos, renders slippery names more overtly sexual and is everywhere sprinkled with salacious points and puns. The French writer Paul de Kock for instance, whom Molly singles out for his “nice name” and who once had a wide Hungarian readership, is rebaptized Paul de Basoche: the Frenchified spelling hides a Hungarian four-letter word, the author of erotic novels translating as a Very Copulator; Boylan’s dandy appellative is rendered with the slightly folksy adjective *Bagzó* (horny, mating). Even more interesting are Szentkuthy’s, often entirely gratuitous, inserted points and witticisms. In the *Oxen Coda* for instance, where Joyce’s intimidating breakdown of idioms, coupled with lack of information, must have made every second word look potentially obscenable, the timid thunder-word “Thunderation” (*U*, 14.1462), patterned on Bloom’s “moderation” and the Cyclops narrator’s “botheration,” becomes “*Alea ejaculata est*” (527), in tune with a Nighttown-bound carnivalesque episode.

Szentkuthy uses several tactics in achieving linguistic and cultural shock-effect. He may resort to recondite *double-entendre*, playfully clothing openly sexual content in foreign phrases and quasi-medical-sounding Latinisms, as if acting on the Beckettian incentive to calculatingly deprave the cultivated reader. Such is the case of his rendering of a *Sirens* crux that combines the name Goodwin and the sound of woodwinds in a densely musical phrase: “Woodwind like Goodwin’s name” (*U*, 11.1050). Szentkuthy cuts through the Gordian knot with much aplomb, forsaking the problematic name: “*Fagott és fuvola mintha falliteráció*” [Bassoon and flute, as if falliteration] (353). The Hungarian sentence f-alliterates on two musical instruments in a word-amalgam with a recognizably phallic touch, from whose casual encounter with the (sexually charged) flute cultivated readers might also detect more than a hint at fellatio.

Another frequent device is to lay linguistic landmines, occasions in the Hungarian text that trigger salacious associations, as in the case of Joyce’s smart play on pun/punish in Martha Clifford’s letter in *Sirens*: “How will you pun? You punish me?” (*U* 11.891). As for the Hungarian version: “*Hogy fog megb? Büntet engemet?*” [How will you *f.* (*me*)? (Are you) *punishing* me?] (347), the coded linguistic ellipsis evokes the very taboo-word, a monosyllabic b-word complete with the verbal prefix *meg-*, conveying aspect (perfect). Part of the textual game in soliciting the reader’s filling in the four-letter word in the proffered gap is, to play the expected association innocently down in the next sentence, with a wink at the reader: *honi soit qui mal y pense*.

Reading *Ulysses* in Hungarian might give the impression that it was intended for a re-reading rather than the reading: that, just like Szentkuthy's chief works, *Prae* and *St. Orpheus's Breviary*, written as commentaries based on other narratives, the translation was a rendering-cum-commentary of Joyce's original. If the text, rather too willingly, forsakes much stylistic, structural fine-tuning, it does so to sin on the side of *transluding*. As Fritz Senn writes, "translations are off the toptic, are less dynamic, less Protean, less gushing, less self-righting, less looming, less weaving, less misleading—also *more* misleading—, less synecdochal, less dislocutory, less everything and—perhaps most bitterly—less transluding. They should be admired, not trusted" (1984, 37). Definitely a translation to be admired, not trusted, the "authoritative" Hungarian *Ulysses* noticeably strives to make Joyce's text more kaleidoscopic—as far as an inherently less kaleidoscopic language, Hungarian, allows—in a superlatively misleading way, in a collideorscape of transfers that often allows structurally vital senses to fade in favour of punning interlingual bridges.

References

- Egri, Péter. 1967. James Joyce's Works in Hungarian Translation. *James Joyce Quarterly* 3. 234-236.
- . 1974. "Szentkuthy Miklós Ulysses-fordításáról" [On M. Szentkuthy's translation of *Ulysses*]. *Nagyvilág* 2. 433-437.
- Esterházy, Péter. 2006. "Yes." Transl. Ferenc Takács. Opening lecture read on June 11, 2006, at the XXth International James Joyce Symposium, Budapest.
- Gifford, Don. 1988. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 2nd ed., revised and expanded by Don Gifford. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goldmann, Márta. 2005. *James Joyce kritikai fogadtatása Magyarországon* [James Joyce's Reception in Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- . 2006. "Belated Reception: James Joyce's Works in Hungary." *Comparative Critical Studies* 3, 3. 227-248.
- Györffy, Miklós. 2007. "A modern regény magyarul. Musil: *A tulajdonságok nélküli ember* Tandori Dezső fordításában" [The modern novel in Hungarian. Musil's *The Man Without Qualities* in D. Tandori's translation]. Szegedy-Maszák Mihály et al., eds. *A magyar irodalom történetei* [Histories of Hungarian literature]. Budapest: Gondolat. 730-743.
- Ionescu, Arleen. 2010. "Un-Sexing Ulysses: The Romanian Translation "under" Communism." *Scientia Traductionis* 8. 223-238: <http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/scientia/article/view/17722>.

- Joyce, James. 1947. *Ulysses*. Transl. Endre Gáspár. Budapest: Franklin.
- . 1974. *Ulysses*. Transl. Miklós Szentkuthy, ed Tibor Bartos, with an Afterword by Mihály Sükösd. Budapest: Európa. (Sze1)
- Kappanyos, András. 1997. "Ulysses, a nyughatatlan" [Ulysses the restless]. *Átváltozások* 10. 44-53.
- . 2010. "Joyce mint klasszikus auctor és mint magyar invenció" [Joyce: classic author and Hungarian invention]. *Alföld* 9. 52-59.
- Nash, John. 2006. *James Joyce and the Act of Reception. Reading, Ireland, Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rugási, Gyula. 2007. "Leatrice görög arca. Szentkuthy Miklós: *Prae*" [The Greek face of Leatrice. M.Sz.: *Prae*]. *A magyar irodalom történetei* [Histories of Hungarian literature], eds. Szegedy-Maszák Mihály *et al.* Budapest: Gondolat, 310-322.
- Senn, Fritz. 1984. *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Szentkuthy, Miklós. 1980. *Prae* I-II. 2nd ed. Budapest: Magvető.
- . 1968. Miért újra *Ulysses*? [Why Ulysses again?]. *Nagyvilág* 13. 274-279.
- Szolláth, Dávid. 2010. "Leletmentés: Válogatott szentkuthysms az *Ulysses* szövegében" [Archiving the finds: selected Szentkuthysms in *Ulysses*]. *Alföld* 9. 64-74.
- Turner, John Noel. 1997. "A Commentary on the Closing of 'Oxen of the Sun.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 35. 83-111.



JOYCE'S "POLITICOECOMEDY":
ON JAMES JOYCE'S HUMOROUS DECONSTRUCTION
OF IDEOLOGY IN *FINNEGANS WAKE*

From all accounts Joyce is said to have claimed that World War Two need never have happened, if Europeans had read his last book *Finnegans Wake*. Whether true or not, the book is intensely anti-authoritarian and anti-fascist—not only in content, but also in its performative language. The radicality of this experimental text runs parallel with the radicality of its ethico-political scope. In other words, the language of the *Wake* plays an ideological-critical role that in a most powerful manner fuses the aesthetic with the political. The rampant laughter heard and experienced throughout the text performs an effective deconstruction of any political, religious, moral, or philosophical ideology that explicitly or implicitly lay obstacles in the way of man's birthright to freedom. The humour of Joyce's poetic language entails an unmasking of unuttered premises of the ideologies as well as a recognition of man's radical eccentricity and interdependence on the other; Joyce's immense language-experiment displays an ethical and political preoccupation issued forth via an intense fusion of humour and poeticity.

I. The Quest for Freedom

Like the laughing heard at the carnival, Joyce's unassuming laughter does not originate from a pent-up, bitter feeling of privation, but rather from a surplus of life, which is not determined by class (or other) distinctions or differences—only with excessive, transgressive, expansive, and inclusive affirmation. The person laughing is not burdened by formal respect, specific considerations, feelings of inferiority or fear, but is reversely inspired and animated by a self-transcending sense of self. The revolutionary potential inherent in the phenomenon of laughter is localized in an assumption

of equality and freedom, which in the nature of the case has constituted a major problem for those interested in elevating themselves morally or politically above others. Joyce relentlessly aims at such authorities that posit themselves at the seat of the superego, and who demand subjugation and conservatism – for as Helmut Bonheim notes in *Joyce's Benefactions*, the author carefully appeals in favour of freedom and joy: “Man’s birthright, Joyce argues repeatedly in *Finnegans Wake*, is to seek freedom from oppression of any kind” (1964, 127). This birthright is in many ways given as the right to laugh unhindered, because it is by means of laughter that the chains are loosened or even forced open. Hence, the text pleads for the rights of the individual to be free, whereby it proves to be “anarchistically respectful of the liberties of the noninvasive individual” (Joyce 1978, 72). None has the right to subdue the freedom of anyone. For this reason it becomes an important task “to explicate to ones the significat of their exsystems,” (*Ibid.*, 148) that is to say, to *explicate* the *significance* and value of the individual *existence* as a stepping out from a frozen and burnt-out *system*. In other words, it is about time that this system is replaced—not by a new one, but by an existence liberated from any system (*exsystems*).

II. The Deconstruction of the Proper

Through Shaun, Joyce’s overall work plan for *Finnegans Wake* is given in an inverted manner: “what do you think Vulgariano did but study with stolen fruit how cutely to copy all their various styles of signature so as one day to utter an epical forged cheque on the public for his own private profit” (*Ibid.*, 181). Shaun attacks Shem for allowing himself to write about ordinary, prosaic things (*It. vulgaria*) in diverse vernacular (*Lat. vulgarus*) languages about common people (*Lat. vulgus*); the result is nonetheless to be perceived as a secularized, existential translation of biblical dimensions, since *Vulgariano* brings the canonized, Catholic bible (the Latin translation, *Vulgata*) to mind. Yet the worst of all is, according to the moralistic Shaun, most likely that the poet blurs the boundaries between the private and the public, the ego and the other, whose sharp distinctions precondition the civil right of ownership, which secures a clear dividing line between what is mine and what is yours. To this, the anarchistic artist answers brashly with Proudhon (1809-65) that property is theft (the provoking answer given to the question of the book, *Qu’est-ce que la propriété?*).

It may very well be one of Joyce's greatest achievements that his work at one and the same time is the most private and the most general, the most original and the most tradition-bound, as well as the most groundbreaking praxis, which nevertheless bears witness to the greatest historical awareness. As a consequence, Joyce accentuates his holistic belief in the special interdependence between part and whole, between the individual and the community, which designates the very amorous space in which we are born, love—laugh—and die. Hence, he belligerently opposes every power-ideology that unceasingly strives to uphold the distinctions, the boundaries, and the dividing lines. It is also the reason why the *kleinbürgerliche* and conservative Mr Deasy from *Ulysses*, who is furthermore anti-Semitic and misogynous, becomes a negative of Joyce's humanistic vision when the former, on behalf of every authority, ejaculates: "*I paid my way [...] I owe nothing*" (Joyce 1986, 25). This conservative and rightist formulation is quite telling for the ideology that Joyce castigates, because it displays how one does not *need* to take care for others, since no-one is indebted to anyone. In other words, a notion like solidarity is no longer binding or consistent, if one is fundamentally of the belief that one does not owe anything to anyone. But the truth is rather, as Joyce discloses through his art, that one owes almost everything to others, and that the precondition for any thoughts of solidarity, not to mention love on a more atomic scale, is precisely given by the recognition of this basic circumstance.

It is a deeply rooted tradition within European thinking—such as conservatism, liberalism, and romanticism—to stress the independent nature of human individuals. This tradition stresses self-possessiveness as well as the autonomous and non-indebted essence of man implicitly engendering an appreciation of how everyone is left free from any obligations toward anyone. John Locke (1632-1704), for example, asserted the interdependence of selfhood and possessiveness in the *Second Treatise on Government*: "Every Man has a *Property* in his own *Person*" (1988, 27, 287). In an essential manner, every man belongs to himself and this self-possessive self-identity is what secures him his status, rights and dignity. This tendency peaked with Jean-Jacques Rousseau (and the romantics succeeding him), who stressed how the ego feeds on itself and is nurtured by itself: "Réduit à moi seul, je me nourris il est vrai de ma propre substance [...] je me suffis à moi-même," as it says hyperbolically (1959, 1075).

This logic of self-possessiveness, as outlined here by Rousseau, culminates in his dichotomy between authentic self-love (*amour de soi*) and vain

comparison with others (*amour-propre*). Self-love (*amour de soi*) designates an original and natural state of man before socialization, which, for example, is to be found in the “noble” savage, who lives independently and alone in the forests, and who is naturally good by and in himself. This son of nature nurtures but one passion, namely *amour de soi*, which is primarily tied to self-preservation, and which has nothing excessive about it. This love is characterized by a unity with oneself, i.e. by a state where one is not at the mercy of others or the opinion others have of you. In contrast to this splendid and contented solitude, *amour-propre* is characterized by the comparison with others and by the circumstance that one, in addition, wants others to do so as well. Even though, according to Rousseau, it is impossible to satisfy, and even though it leads one into a conflicting relationship with others, it nonetheless makes one desire the recognition of another—a yearning that one, for example, strives to satisfy by dissimulating oneself. When unaffected by the other, one experiences a happy, solitary narcissism (*amour de soi*), where one is entirely oneself, whereas the introduction to the other contrarily brings a split about between being (in oneself) and seeming (the appearance in and of the other), a state in which one is not oneself, where one is alien and non-similar to oneself. As in Augustine’s depiction of the perversion of Adam and Eve’s original and uncorrupted love in Eden (*amor dei*) that was perverted into vain and sensual love (*cupiditas, concupiscentia, or libido*), love was originally good and self-sufficient, but the introduction to the other entailed a break away from nature and oneself.

In other words, if we are to believe this ideological strand in the Occidental tradition, man is happy in an original union with himself when being alone, but falls when presented with the other. Hence, the other embodies the fall away from self-possessiveness and self-presence. It is this tradition, which Joyce deconstructs in his general subversion of the idea or sense of *property*. Hélène Cixous displays a keen sense of this when she asserts that: “*tous les gestes de Joyce, gestes d’écriture, gestes biographiques, sont allés dans le sens d’une contestation mondiale de la propriété sous toutes ses formes, de l’impérialisme, du capitalisme, du familialisme, du conjugalisme, du bureaucratisme, du formalisme, du psychanalysme, du paternalisme et de son semblable le maternalisme, etc.*” (1974, 233-34). Taking a stand for the heterogeneous entails ethical and political consequences, since the proper, the self, now comes to recognize that its ‘property’ of itself is only made possible by the grounding presence of another. In her wonderful study *Ethical Joyce* on the ethical dimension of Joyce, Marian Eide ascertains that

Joyce “suggests a variety of ethical responses to political inequity based on a destabilization of both opposition and identity based on a recognition of the proximity or even interdependence of self and other” (2009, 108).

III. The Deconstruction of Religion

Joyce’s criticism of the Christian God in *Finnegans Wake* is not merely limited to questioning the metaphysical dimension of this religion, but also the very authority which this heavenly, paternal embodiment exercises. By doing so Joyce seems to endorse the Russian anarchist Bakunin’s (1814–1876) famous inversion of Voltaire’s dictum—*if God really existed it would be necessary to abolish him*. The metaphysical collapse is brought to work by the blasphemous ridicule in which God (*Ger.* Gott), just to take one example among others, is juxtaposed with contagious veneric diseases: “Gotopoxy” (Joyce 1975, 386)—*got a pox* or *God a pox* (it is obviously not of little importance to bear in mind here that the last medical phase of pox syphilis often culminates in insanity). This manoeuvre runs parallel with the disrespectful metamorphosis of the religious supplicant’s ejaculation (‘My Lord! My Lord!’) to: “My Lourde! My lourde!” (*Ibid.*, 299). In the new modern world God is not only perceived to be a heavy (*Fr.* lourde) burden, he is also impiously reduced to the abject state of shit (*Dan.* lort). In other words, God (*Fr.* Dieu) is quite simply *deaf and dumb*: “Dieuf and Domb” (*Ibid.*, 149).

The Christian catechism is, in addition, associated with *Ku Klux Klan* as “K. K. Katakasm” (*Ibid.*, 533). A part of the reason why Christianity is directly linked with such a brutal and disgusting organisation must be sought in its conservative tendency working towards withholding *status quo*. Paul—and most notoriously Martin Luther after him—energetically and hysterically defended the ruling order and those in power, who were said to represent the will of God; and Jesus harshly rebukes the Jews’ longing for political and social change with words that inspire passivity and resignation: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s and unto God the things that are God’s” (*Matthew* 22.21). It is also Christianity’s immense cynicism and *laissez-faire* attitude toward human sufferings that refuses to work against eradicating suffering, and which (in spite of the overwhelming sum of human pains) finds that all is well and expresses the realization of God’s best intentions, that is castigated here.

This indignation at the Christian satisfaction with *status quo* which ignores and rejects the prospect of working towards a better life as well as reducing human sufferings, is clearly expressed by an *older Ku Klux Klan alderman* in the following: “the olderman K. K. Alwayswelly” (Joyce 1975, 365). The Christian code supports the *status quo* of power, for as the divine voice says in *Finnegans Wake*: “as it was let it be, says he!” (*Ibid.*, 80); and by doing so, it consequently supports suffering and suppression, which is why Joyce ties it to one of the most repulsive and callous movements of modern history. The Ku Klux Klan found a like-minded ideology in Nazism, a movement also mentioned by Joyce in the *Wake*. *Finnegans Wake* was published in 1939 at a time when the incredible atrocities and crimes of the regime were neither fully manifested nor fully known to the public; yet Joyce does not hesitate in his condemnation of “the Nazi Priers” (*Ibid.*, 375), whose fascist greeting (*Sieg heil*) is unequivocally rendered as: “Seek hells” (*Ibid.*, 228). As a consequence of this, it is an extraordinarily hostile assault on Christianity (as the religion with which Joyce happened to be most familiar), when the latter is fused and amalgamated with the Nazi greeting to Hitler (*Heil Hitler! Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer*): “heal helper! One gob [God], one gap, one gulp and gorger of all!” (*Ibid.*, 191). *One God, one leader* – this is the very quintessence of fascism and monotheistic religions, for as He says himself: “For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God” (*Exodus 34.14*). *One God, one leader*, leading His people to victory over all others as an omnipotent army commander – cf. the frequent invocation of Jehovah as the lord of army commanders (*jhw h s̄bā’ot*) in *The Old Testament* – and *one God, one leader*, unconditionally demanding bloodshed by everyone (*gorger of all*) as well as blind submission to His will.

The monstrous sacrifices effectuated by the blessings of the representatives of Christianity throughout time are also satirically castigated in *Finnegans Wake*, where the Christian evocation of the Trinity—‘In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost’—is tellingly rendered as: “In the name of the former and of the latter and of their holocaust” (Joyce 1975, 419). The elevated holiness of Christianity is hence made synonymous with the benediction of genocide – for as it also says in the *Wake*, the Trinity amounts to “the fetter [*Ger. fett*: fat, rich], the summe [*Ger. sum*] and the haul it cost” (*Ibid.*, 153). In other words, the praxis of Christianity is an exercise in power, primarily interested in consolidating its supremacy with all means available; the hunt for profit or to get a fine *haul* is executed

on the background of the *howls* of the suppressed and tortured—a praxis that will not refuse genocide (*holocaust*) if there is money in it. In addition, the Jewish and Christian expression of worshipping God, *hallelujah* (from Hebrew *hallelu yah* meaning ‘praise Jahve’), is reformulated by Joyce as “hilleluia, killeluia” (*Ibid.*, 83), thus stressing how praising God, in praxis, has been equal to *killing* in his name.

IV. The Deconstruction of Power

Joyce’s merry and anti-authoritative human comedy is not limited to the sacrilegious ridicule of the Christian god, but is also directed against the political establishment and the state as such – for as he told Georges Borach in a conversation: “As an artist I am against every state [...] The state is concentric, man is eccentric. Thence arises an eternal struggle” (Ellmann 1983, 446). What Joyce, then, also strove to achieve with his art was a political vision given as socialism without Marx’s revolutionary teleology and anarchism without violence. His political vision is therefore, to be more exact, a “politicoecomedie” (Joyce 1975, 540). By means of the puns the self-proclaimed authority and dignity of the tyrants are reduced to their rightful ridiculed and scorned abjectness—as, for example, the Italian fascist leader, Benito Mussolini, who was known under the pompous title *il Duce*, a word meaning “leader” but cognate with *Duke*, and who, in Joyce’s disrespectful and humanistic optics, is rather perceived as a *joke* as “the juke” (Joyce 1975, 162). It is through the war of language, and the succeeding laughter (*Lat. risus*) following in the wake of this, that *regicide* is performed as “risicide” (Joyce 1975, 161).

Art, pleasure, and love stand in a certain opposition to the state’s engagement with money, politics, and power. In continuation of this, Joyce explained why it simply was not possible for him to work as an artist in England: “I decided that I could never have become a part of English life, or even have worked there, for somehow I would never have felt that in that atmosphere of power, politics, and money, writing was not sufficiently important” (Power 1974, 64). The reader only has to direct his attention to the book itself to get confirmation of the fact that the book explicitly defines itself in opposition to English mercantilism and *common sense*: “You will say it is most unenglish and I shall hope to hear that you will not be wrong about it” (Joyce 1975, 160). In addition, England, the “nation

of shopkeepers” (in the words of Adam Smith) and conquerors, is understood as “Englend” (*Ibid.*, 170), i.e. as a nation that has brought much misery (*Ger.* Elend) about. The deconstruction of the English language is, as a matter of fact, equal to the author’s violent assassination of the idea of the unity of the British empire: “having murdered all the English he knew” (*Ibid.*, 93). To say it “inplayn unglisch [and not *plain English*]” (*Ibid.*, 609), the poetical gesture of *Finnegans Wake* consists in a *playing* (not *plain*) negation (cf. the suffixes in- and un-) of English language and ideological structure (as Joyce saw it). With Beryl Schlossman, we can in sum say that: “English becomes a series of enunciations that are undermined, pulverized, and pluralized by the lexical and syntactic presence of other languages. English as such begins to disappear into fragments. Its apparent unity has been invaded” (Schlossman 1985, 162). Joyce’s idiomatic language marks a revolt or violence toward the unifying function of everyday language that consolidates a cultural, national, and political centralization. Joyce’s war on the English language is not merely aggressive, for by its transgression it makes way for an openness and hospitality, which is why he, in one of the notebooks, writes: “JJ’s [James Joyce’s book] not hell open to Christians but English open to Europeans” (Joyce 1978, 13). And the liberating, inclusive, as well as welcoming gesture of his dissolution of English is furthermore evidenced inasmuch as the sternness of old Anglo-Saxon English (*Ger.* Altenglisch) is invested with laughter (*Ger.* lachen) “wherever my good Allenglisches Angleslachsen is spoken” (Joyce 1975, 532). Joyce replaces the ruling discourse of those in power with his own syntax, “sintalks” (*Ibid.*, 269), which inscribes the marginalized and repressed (*sin*) into the very core of authority, wherefrom *sin talks* freely now. Hence, Joyce’s writing works as a linguistic virus that in its capacity as *sintalks* goes directly in the veins of the authority, which henceforward is seriously weakened by this infection that thus fights the enemy on his own ground.

The ridicule and debasement of the heavenly as well as the earthly authorities do, then, serve the cause of deliberation, enjoyment, and *humanism*: “To the laetification of disgeneration by neohumourisation of our kristianisation” (*Ibid.*, 331). The passage does not only display how the *degeneration* and painfulness of existence has been made lighter, happier, and more joyous (*Lat.* laetus) by the recent ridicule and mocking of Christianity, it also shows how Christian (and other religious) rituals and credos are merely to be perceived as euphemisms. In continuation of Vico—who, though he

held his hand over Christianity, considered the early images of deities to be projections of humans living a long time ago—Joyce seems to claim that the Christian God is an anthropomorphic phenomenon originated from a deification of a departed patriarchy. Joyce celebrates a new joyous humanism that is intended to replace the grim and dark bitterness of Christianity with a merry and freedom-seeking art, which, in its modern and unprejudiced temperament, revolts against provincialism, petit bourgeois morality, repressive religiosity and conservatism. In other words, Joyce lets “jest come to crown [town]” (*Ibid.*, 331) as he replaces the *Christian civilization* (*kristianisation*) with Ibsen’s (the exemplary freethinker of modern time) hometown, *Kristiania* (Oslo today).

In an echo of the sentence engraved on the monument of the Irish champion of liberty, Charles Stewart Parnell (which is to be found at the end of Dublin’s O’Connell Street), and which is taken from a speech given in Cork in 1885, it says: “No mum has the rod to pud a stub to the lurch of amotion” (*Ibid.*, 365). Parnell’s words were: “No man has the right to put a stop to the march of a nation”. The sentence is in Joyce’s reformulation more general, inclusive (even cosmopolitical), and non-political in a sense, since it emphasizes how the *lurch* of *emotions* are immune toward the censorship of tyrants and oppressors. Hence, a common community is not defined in terms of nationality or political orientation, but rather from a common emotional and existential lot; and this emotional community primarily consists in love, i.e. a community in which no-one has greater rights than others as regards the feeling of others, which consequently makes this community more democratic and inclusive (cf. the transformation of *man* to *mum*).

With his *politicoecomedie*, Joyce endeavours to create the framework for such a community and to introduce the reader to a specific unworried and merry broad-mindedness that dignifies the latter to be addressed as: “My little love apprencisses [apprentices]” (*Ibid.*, 365). Or as it says in another wonderful pun—in which Issy’s rainbow-girls plea for a *separation* and *emancipation* from the oppressing and burdensome world of stern males in order to erect a utopian, female world of love (*Lat.* *amans*: lover)—it is only through love that freedom and emancipation makes sense: “And when all us [...] shall have ones for all amanseprated” (*Ibid.*, 239).

V. Conclusion

Joyce's self-declared war on language (see *Letters* 1, 237, 11 November 1925) effectively fuses the poetic with a hilarious socio-ideological critique. The negativity and linguistic violence of this manoeuvre is not merely negative and destructive, for as Julia Kristeva argued in her book on the avant-garde of the nineteenth fin-de-siècle (Mallarmé and Lautréamont), poetic language contains a revolutionary potential through its effects of negativity, striving "à remodeler le *dispositif signifiant* historiquement accepté, en proposant le représentation d'un autre rapport aux objets naturels, aux appareils sociaux et au corps propre" (Kristeva 1974, 116). That is to say, Joyce's new language thus paves the way—through the linguistic ridicule and deconstruction of the established, repressive power-ideologies—for an opening up of the new, i.e. of a dynamic potentiality stressing freedom, love, and solidarity. As Jean-Michel Rabaté has aptly shown, it is in this manner that Joyce succeeded in unleashing a veritable poetics of hospitality:

As he hoped, individual artistic toil might redeem and perhaps heal the diseases of the collective spirit such as xenophobic nationalism, fascism, and religious bigotry. The new language should in the end create a new and different reading practice strong enough to subvert those ideologically reactionary values that are still latent in the old *Sittlichkeit*. (2001, 82)

This new language of hospitality is erected on the powerful background of laughter and linguistic negation of the proper, thus disclosing how a sensitivity towards bathos, comedy, and negativity—i.e. the ability to laugh freely at this or that articulation of power—entails an ethical, amorous, and political chance or even necessity. For as one of Joyce's great predecessors energetically asserted: "Das Verlangen nach *Zerstörung*, Wechsel, Werden kann der Ausdruck der übervollen, zukunfts-schwangeren Kraft sein" (Nietzsche 1997, 245).

References

- Bonheim, Helmut. 1964. *Joyce's Benefactions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cixous, Hélène. 1974. *Prénoms de personne*. Paris: Seuil.
- Eide, Marian. 2009. *Ethical Joyce*. Cambridge University Press.

- Ellmann, Richard. 1983. *James Joyce*. New and revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1998. *On the Citizen*. Trans. Richard Tuck & Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joyce, James. 1975. *Finnegans Wake*. New York: Penguin Books.
- . 1978. *Finnegans Wake – A Facsimile of Buffalo Notebook VI.B.21-24*, ed. Danis Rose. New York: Garland Publishing.
- . 1957. *Letters: The Letters of James Joyce 1*, eds. Richard Ellmann & Stuart Gilbert. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1986. *Ulysses*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler. New York: Random House.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1974. *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Locke, John. 1988. *Two Treatises on Government*, ed. Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1997. *Werke in drei Bänden 2*, ed. Karl Schlechta. Darmstadt: Die Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Power, Arthur. 1974. *Conversations with Joyce*, ed. Clive Hart. London: Millington.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. 2001. *James Joyce and the Politics of Egoism*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1959. *Œuvres Complètes 1*. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard.
- Schlossman, Beryl. 1985. *Joyce's Catholic Comedy of Language*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

