

JOYCE STUDIES IN ITALY

2017 (19)

**JOYCE'S FICTION  
AND  
THE NEW RISE  
OF  
THE NOVEL**

*A special volume to celebrate the X Annual Conference organized  
by  
The James Joyce Italian Foundation*

*edited by  
Franca Ruggieri*

**ea**  
ANICIA

*Volume pubblicato con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi Roma Tre  
e di The James Joyce Italian Foundation*

**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

Direttore responsabile: Franca Ruggieri  
Registrazione Num.R.G. 1885/2016, Tribunale Ordinario di Cassino

**ISSN 2281 – 373X**

© 2017, Editoriale Anicia s.r.l.- Roma  
<http://www.edizionianicia.it/store/>  
[info@edizionianicia.it](mailto:info@edizionianicia.it)

Single copy price: €18.00  
Subscription rates (one annual issue):  
Personal: €18.00  
Institutional: €30.00

The journal will be published on the following website:

**<https://thejamesjoyceitalianfoundation.wordpress.com/>**

Purchases can be made by directly contacting the publisher and then completing a bank transfer covering the price of the book and the postage costs (this is € 5.00 within Italy, but varies according to the country of destination).

Address: James Joyce Italian Foundation  
Dipartimento di Lingue, Culture e Letterature Straniere  
Via Valco di San Paolo, 19  
00146 Roma  
[joyce\\_found@os.uniroma3.it](mailto:joyce_found@os.uniroma3.it)  
[franca.ruggieri@uniroma3.it](mailto:franca.ruggieri@uniroma3.it)

# CONTENTS

## **Franca Ruggieri**

*Foreword: Joyce's Fiction? "Oh! It is only a novel"*  
(Northanger Abbey, 1798)

9

## **1. JOYCE'S FICTION AND THE NEW RISE OF THE NOVEL**

### **Talia Abu**

*Defecation and the Other – Performing Autobiographical  
Art in the "Haunted Inkbotle" Scene*

19

### **Olha Bandrovska**

*The Anthropology of Odour in James Joyce's Ulysses*

31

### **April Capili**

*'Yes, yes: a woman too. Life, life'. Lucia and the Life-Writing  
Aspects of Joyce's Novels*

47

### **Annalisa Federici**

*Word and World, Fiction and Reality in Ulysses:  
Joyce as Realist/Hyperrealist/Antirealist*

61

### **Dieter Fuchs**

*James Joyce's Ulysses – A Menippean Satire?*

79

### **Allen C. Jones**

*Stephen "(looks behind)": A New Paradigm  
for Reading Stage Directions in "Circe"*

91

<b>Peter R. Kuch</b> <i>“A Handful of Tea”</i> : Money and Monster Novels	105
<b>Michal Moussafi</b> <i>A Mirror up to Nature:</i> <i>The Artistic Role of Reflection in James Joyce’s Ulysses</i>	115
<b>Ennio Ravasio</b> <i>Realism and Allegory in “Cyclops”</i>	131
<b>Simone Rebora</b> <i>Encyclopedic Novel Revisited.</i> <i>Joyce’s Role in a Disputed Literary Genre</i>	147
<b>Fritz Senn</b> <i>Mercurial Interpolations in Ulysses</i>	169
<b>Katherine E. Smith</b> <i>A Spinster by Choice, Circumstance, or Calamity?</i> <i>Potential Reasons for Physical and Emotional Spinsterhood</i> <i>in James Joyce’s Dubliners</i>	189
<b>Sara Spanghero</b> <i>“The incompatibility of aquacity with the erratic originality</i> <i>of genius (U 17.247)</i> <i>Considerations on Stephen Dedalus’ Fluid Development</i>	203
<b>Carla Vaglio Marengo</b> <i>Tobias Smollett, Joyce’s Grandfather: Circulation</i> <i>and Recirculation, Satiety, Eructation, Regurgitation,</i> <i>“Cursing and recursing” in Viconian Cycles</i>	219
<b>Jolanta Wawrzycka</b> <i>‘Tell us, aren’t you an artist?’ (SH: 26) – Revisiting</i> <i>Joyce’s Künstlerroman</i>	233

## 2. JOYCEAN GLEANINGS

### **Andrea Cortellessa**

*Forse che sì forse che no. Joyce tra Pascoli e Gadda* 251

### **Finn Fordham**

*Joyce in the Shadow of War and Fascism:  
A Review of Finnegans Wake by Mario Praz (1939)* 301

## 3. BOOK REVIEWS edited by Fabio Luppi

Muriel Drazien, *Lacan Lettore di Joyce* (Gabriela Alarcon) 323

Enrico Frattaroli, *Envoy verso: in: attraverso: da:*  
Giacomo Joyce (Annalisa Federici) 326

James Joyce, *Best-Loved Joyce* (edited by Jamie O'Connell)  
Anthony J. Jordan, *James Joyce Unplugged* (Fabio Luppi) 330

Geert Lernout, *Cain: but are you able?*  
*The bible, Byron and Joyce* (Enrico Terrinoni) 335

James Joyce, *Pomi un penny l'uno / Poesie una pena l'una*  
(edited by Francesca Romana Paci) 338

James Clarence Mangan, *Il mio cuore è un monaco*  
(edited by Francesca Romana Paci) (Enrico Terrinoni) 338

*CONTRIBUTORS* 342

FRANCA RUGGERI

*FOREWORD*

---

JOYCE'S FICTION? "OH! IT IS ONLY A NOVEL"  
(*NORTHANGER ABBEY*, 1798)

---

More than two hundred years have elapsed since Catherine Morland uttered these words in her meek defence of the novel, a poor new literary genre at the time with no precise rules and often disregarded by mainstream criticism.

Over these two centuries, the production of novels, their potential variety and the ambiguous fluidity in how they might be defined and structured, is, and continues to be, prolific, despite the immediate death of the genre being announced on several occasions. This is what T.S. Eliot asserted in "*Ulysses*, Order and Myth" in 1923, claiming that Joyce's use of the mythical method "had the importance of a scientific discovery" and predicting the end of the kind of fiction known as the novel. Indeed, he also observed that Joyce's *Ulysses* was not really a novel: might it be called an epic instead? It could not be a novel; this was a form that would no longer serve. The novel, after all, had ended with Gustave Flaubert and Henry James.

And yet in a letter written in Italian on 21st September 1920 to Carlo Linati, Joyce defined *Ulysses* as his "maledettissimo roman-zazione"; a novel, therefore, albeit a "damnedest, horribly enormous novel", which, as would be repeated on various occasions, was also "the epic of two races, the cycle of the human body as well as a little story of a day (life). Also a kind of encyclopaedia." We should also stress here that the actual word Joyce uses in the letter is "roman-zazione" where the noun (*romanzo*) is modified by the pejorative suf-

fix (-*accio*), as well as an augmentative second suffix (-*one*). This is not rendered particularly well in English by “monster novel”, a term introduced by Richard Ellmann and generally used ever since. Indeed, “romanzaccione” does not bear any monstrous associations, and Joyce’s description is perhaps best read as an understatement, underpinned by his full awareness of his novel’s undoubted merit, expressed here with ironic fake modesty (G. Melchiori, J. Joyce, *Lettere*, Mondadori, Milano 1974, 366 / R. Ellmann ed. James Joyce, *Selected Letters*, Faber & Faber, London 1975, 270).

Towards the middle of the last century, Ian Watt, literary critic of formal realism and commentator on the rise of the novel, saw Joyce’s *Ulysses* as the pinnacle of the development of the genre. A pinnacle which coincided with its manner of narration, shifting between the poles of subjectivity and objectivity, that is, the twin poles of the reality of the ego and the reality of the external world. It was Descartes – Watt added – who was the founder of modern realism and raised the question of dualism, making it one of the central philosophical issues in the three centuries that followed. It is worth adding that Watt disagreed with T.S. Eliot’s comment that the use of epic parallels in *Ulysses* was revolutionary; he put forth Fielding’s fragmentary application of a similar idea, and the definition of his “comic romance” as “a comic epic poem in prose” that is given in the preface to *Joseph Andrews*.

Contemporary with Watt, Giorgio Melchiori, in *The Tightrope Walkers, Studies in Mannerism in Modern English Literature*, was among the first to distinguish the common thread that runs from the formal and linguistic experimentation of the early English novelists, that is to say, Defoe, Swift and Fielding – and Sterne and Smollett in particular – to modernist fiction, above all to *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. Through an abundance of detail and close reference to the texts, Melchiori demonstrated the links between the form of those early challenges to the limits of formal realism and Joyce’s hyperrealism.

Since then, Joycean studies, like comparative studies in general, have fully explored these issues in the light of a tradition of the novel that continues to be extremely dynamic and productive, just as it con-

tinues to be varied, but also ‘conventional’. Nowadays novels flood the market and fill the bookshops in cities, railway stations and airports. Very often these are anything but demanding reads and are in no way experimental, but are pitched by author and publisher to capture the attention of a certain readership, thus earning recognition and commercial success. But the new rise of the novel is not necessarily based on sheer numbers, even though this might be the most evident sign. Indeed, in the post-Joyce creative stew we regularly find, either in the original language or in translation, many other voices, such as Samuel Beckett, Brendan Behan, Flann O’Brien, B.S. Johnson and Alasdair Gray, to name but some authors writing in English. They are the literary heirs of that tradition of experimentation, of that *other* rise of the novel, which, according to Eliot, supposedly ended with Flaubert and James, but which experienced a rebirth, a new ‘rise’, as it were, with Joyce. Indeed, not only can we trace Joyce back to the rhapsodic and irregular writings of Sterne, but forward to the experimental blend of satire, fantasy and farce in *At Swim-Two-Birds*, the disintegrating surreal cities of Unthank/Glasgow in *Lanark*, and B.S. Johnson’s concern with expressing happenstances and the structureless way we receive and record impressions (which even led to his refusal to have his novel bound in any specific order). These novels were responses to that quotation from *Tristram Shandy*, not by chance also chosen by B.S. Johnson as the epigraph to *The Unfortunates*: “I will tell you in three words what the book is. – It is a history. – A history! Of who? What? Where? When? Don’t hurry yourself. – It is a history book, Sir, (which may possibly recommend it to the world) of what passes in a man’s own mind” (Laurence Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, Vol. II, Ch. II, Penguin 1984, 105). It is the story of what goes through a man’s own mind, roundly coming up against the uncertainty of one’s own identity: an unstable, ephemeral condition that is as much a recognizable sign of the existential unease and instability of the “ubi consistam” of the narrator of stories and novels as it is of the philosopher. In fact Tristram remains an elusive figure, perhaps because philosophy – bearing in mind Hume’s scepticism on this subject in the *Treatise of Human Na-*



ture – has taught him, to quote Ian Watt, that “personal identity is not so simple a question as is commonly assumed”. So much so that when the commissary asks Tristram ‘– And who are you?’ he can only reply, ‘Don’t puzzle me’ (Vol. VII, Ch. XXXIII, 500). The identity of Tristram is hard to pin down, despite being both author and central player in this preposterous, eccentric, rhapsodic biography of self.

From this, the perception of the ineffable nature of an identity that the individual wants to comprehend, this contradictory and heightened self-consciousness, triggers two reactions: a search, to distinguish the features of one’s own portrait over time, and the urge to widen the scope, both in content and linguistic expression, as regards the narrative discourse that opens up around that subject.

Sterne/Tristram imagined that he could take a man’s character from “the fixture of Momus’ glass in the human breast” (Vol. I, Ch. XXIII). In 1904, the young Joyce claimed in the first paragraph of *A Portrait of the Artist*, that a portrait “is not an identificative paper, but rather the curve of an emotion” with features which, in the unrelenting flow of a present caught between past and future, might express “their individuating rhythm” (James Joyce, *Dubliners and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, a casebook edited by Morris Beja, London: Macmillan, 1973, 41). Michel Foucault wrote from a very different perspective in the Introduction to *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon Books 1972, 17). In the course of his consideration on the epistemological mutations of history with regard to the notions of rupture and discontinuity, he questioned the inevitable mutability of the self: “Are you going to declare yet again that you have never been what you have been reproached with being? Are you already preparing the way out that will enable you in your next book to spring up somewhere else and declare as you’re now doing: no, no, I’m not where you are lying in wait for me, but over here, laughing at you?” And he cannot avoid the question of his own identity when he says he is not the only one who writes in order to have no face. We should neither ask him who he is nor ask him to remain the same: “leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in

order. At least spare us their morality when we write.” Thus speaks the philosopher ...

But acknowledging just how elusive the writer’s identity might be is also a precondition for total freedom without the risk of being judged by the reader/commentator/translator, with no historical burden of authorial intention. And this also explains the long supremacy of various forms of criticism that privilege the reader: from the open text of Umberto Eco to the growth of various forms of reader-oriented criticism, or at least those forms where the focus is on reader response. These are all variants on the principle that a literary work exists only when it is read, as Wolfgang Iser observed in *The Act of Reading* at the end of the 1970s, and again in the late 1980s with his thorough reading of *Tristram Shandy*. It is a current that has held sway right through to the emergence of more recent intertextual/intercultural approaches and the input of cognitive criticism.

As regards the role of the reader, and the readiness of the artist, writer or painter to grant the reader total freedom to interpret their work regardless of intention, Joyce once said to Arthur Power, “What do we know about what we put into anything? Though people may read more into *Ulysses* than I ever intended, who is to say that they are wrong: do any of us know what we are creating? Did Shakespeare know what he was creating when he wrote *Hamlet*; or Leonardo when he painted ‘The Last Supper’?” (Arthur Power, *Conversations with James Joyce*, Dublin: The Lilliput Press 1974, 102-3). On the other hand, this very free, possibilist approach towards the future of a work and its independence from the author once it has been published, was also underscored by Joyce’s characteristic indifference to errors and typos in his manuscripts and eventual publications, even when they were brought to his attention by the typesetter. The outcome is that, in spite of, and in addition to, the huge mass of notes and details supplied by schemes, guides and keys to his works, Joyce’s ideal sleepless reader is always free to interpret the open text in his or her own way. The reader recomposes an apparently fragmented text, making sense out of it, giving a new meaning to every reading. This calls to mind an episode from Vol. VII of *Tristram Shandy*, when the Abbess and the

novice of Andoüillets are forced to say out loud three times in succession – and more quickly each time – the magical but sinful words, “bouger” and “fouter”. Doing this can save them from danger by getting the mules to move forward and take them back to the abbey. So as not to commit a mortal sin, the two nuns decide to utter just one half of each word apiece, though even when the words are divided into two, *the Devil does understand*. In a similar way, the reader of Joyce hears the two separate parts of the word, and the devil of Tristram in us all supplies the overall meaning.

Indeed, the looming presence of the reader has been seen in the world of western literary criticism since the 1960s and Wayne Booth’s *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, and this has spawned various theories. The emphasis on the act of reading, on interpretation, on the collaboration of the addressee/receiver has become the all-important concern, to the point that it has even affected the sphere of translation as interpretation/ communication. In this case any investigation focuses on the fact that the text is created as it is being read; this is the necessary condition for activating the text. A text functions, therefore, in relation to the comprehension and the interpretation of the addressee, in addition to the way the text itself might direct this participation. However, in the different, but similar, cyclical history of things and ideas, it must be history that provides the context for any work, just as it does for the corresponding analysis of the creative process. And sometimes greater, sometimes less emphasis is granted to either the author or the reader, just as simple or more sophisticated instruments of analysis are called into play.

Because it is also true, as Eco says in *The Limits of Interpretation* (Indiana UP 1994, written 1958-62 and republished by La Nave di Teseo, 2016) that ever since Aristotle the history of aesthetics can be linked to a history of theories of interpretation and the impact that a work has on its addressee. In the case of Joyce, ongoing research, and the amount of papers that put his work at the centre of so much thought, is rooted in the fact that his readers are provoked by his textual strategies and can thus explore the texts in an infinite variety of ways.

Volume 19 of “Joyce Studies in Italy” evidences this, providing further instances of how variously Joyce’s work can be interpreted and reinterpreted, and how this is a prerequisite for a new generation of readers. In many respects, therefore, this is an extremely varied collection. Some of the authors are established, well-known names, while others are young: proof of the commitment that has been undertaken in recent years by “Joyce Studies in Italy” and The James Joyce Italian Foundation to support the work of emerging scholars. The essays range from explorations of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* to *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, focussing on specific textual details and references or else taking up more general themes using various tools of investigation.

And this edition of “Joyce Studies in Italy” is special not just for purely formal reasons. It is, in fact, a double issue: on the one hand it celebrates ten years of The James Joyce Italian Foundation, which organized the X James Joyce Birthday Conference in Rome this year, and on the other it opens up to a new focus of investigation, that is, to considerations made by Italian scholars of Italian literature who also happen to be passionate readers of Joyce (and we should not forget that Italian was a lingua franca in the Joyce household). With this in mind, for the first time in its fifty-year history, the present volume contains a long essay written in Italian (followed by a brief abstract in English) by an accomplished young scholar of Italian and Comparative Literature, who examines the occasional, evident, links between Joyce’s work and the poetry of Giovanni Pascoli and the fiction of Carlo Emilio Gadda.

In the last few years we have suffered first the loss of Giorgio Melchiori and then of Jacqueline Risset, Umberto Eco and Rosa Maria Bollettieri. We have, however, also welcomed the arrival of a promising new generation of young, creative and interactive scholars and translators, readers and artists as well as literary critics, experts in music, painting and computer studies, all ready and willing to respond to the inexhaustible forms and the infinite play of Joyce’s stories and language. In this way they help us to reflect on the state of Joycean studies in Italy, to draw a balance, and to suggest new horizons.

I am again particularly grateful to Peter Douglas for his contribution in editing the book.