

**Against Joyce:**

***Ulysses*, Authorship, and the Authority of the Reader**

Sophie Catherine Corser

Goldsmiths, University of London

PhD in English

**Declaration of Authorship**

I, Sophie Corser, hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly stated.

Signed:

Date:

*To David and Alice*

## Acknowledgements

I wish to first thank Isobel Hurst and Stephanie Nelson, my classicist guides: to the former for an invaluable tip and fantastic early guidance, and the latter for her encouragement and understanding shared over my Homeric research, over email, and over excellent food and wine. I am grateful to numerous excellent Joycean friends met at symposia, conferences, and summer schools – particularly several Joycean women who have offered encouragement and inspiration in both work and life. Victoria Leveque, Stephanie Boland, Katie Mischler and many others whose thesis writing coincided with my own: thank you for providing space for laughter in intense environments.

Thanks go also to those who so generously read some of what follows: especially to Katie Mischler, Jacob McGuinn, Stephanie Boland, Annabel Corser, and Stephanie Nelson. Many other friends and colleagues helped in some way (whether knowingly or not) – but I'd like to single out Richard Bolley in the English and Comparative Literature department at Goldsmiths, for providing the essential: places in which to write. And to the Joycean woman who started it all: Lucia Boldrini, in whose *Ulysses* lectures I first sat and marvelled many years ago. I do not quite know how to thank you for supervising my work from BA to PhD, for the support you have given, and endless understanding you have shown. It means a very great deal to me.

I must give big, sloppy thank yous and love to the people who had relatively little to do with the content of this work, but so much to do with its *getting done*. To my closest friends Phoebe and Mindy, who know they have supported me through more than the challenges of hard work. And to my family: my parents, to whose memories this thesis is dedicated, and to Annabel, Elisabeth, and Ben. Burak Cetindag deserves, finally, a special thank you – for our home, and for not letting me give up.

## Abstract

This thesis considers James Joyce's *Ulysses* as a text that plays with its own relationships to the author and the reader. It draws out the complexities and contradictions of a Joycean – and Barthesian – sense of 'play', by exploring the activity of reading prompted by the novel's intertextuality and narrative. Alongside such investigation, I trace the history of approaches to the author within and without Joyce studies – to unravel how reading *Ulysses* interacts with such shifting sand. Through a methodology of 'reading reading', I analyse overlooked layers of Homeric orality and scholarship in 'Eumaeus', the development of Joyce studies from the 1920s to the present, modern understandings of the concept of the author, irreverent approaches to biography, and how reading 'Calypso' and 'Wandering Rocks' enacts a clash of readerly and authorial authority. This results in an unusual, looping structure, alternating analysis of *Ulysses*, Joyce studies, and other texts: exhibiting the impossibility of separately discussing author, reader, text, or – as chapters progress – critic. The thesis asks how one can place limits on where readings of *Ulysses* take us; how to discuss anti-authorialism in a field as author-centric as Joyce studies; and how the oft-asserted idea that opposites can be simultaneously true in *Ulysses* offers a valuable way to approach and query critical and theoretical understandings of how authors, readers, and texts interact. Writing 'against Joyce' (resisting, preparing for, leaning on) responds to theoretical and critical approaches and habits that pitch reader against author: that declare the birth of the reader must come at the cost of the author, or give greater currency – however veiled – to an author's understanding of their text, over a reader's. Above all else, this thesis proposes that to unpick the author question we should focus our attention on the activity of reading: self-aware, self-interrogative reading.

## Contents

<i>Abbreviations and a note on editions</i> .....	7
<b>Introduction</b> .....	8
<b>Part One</b>	
<b>1. Rewriting the Author I: The Life and Death of the Author</b> .....	23
1. A Brief History of the Author .....	25
2. The Death of the Author .....	32
3. Long Live the Author! .....	41
<b>2. Reading Joyce I: Early Criticism</b> .....	50
1. ‘Critical propaganda’ .....	52
2. ‘The mind that informs <i>Ulysses</i> ’ .....	59
3. ‘The half-erased writing of our predecessors’ .....	66
<b>3. Reading Homer: ‘Eumaeus’ and the Homeric Question</b> .....	76
1. ‘ <i>My Experiences</i> , let us say, <i>in a Cabman’s Shelter</i> ’ .....	79
2. A ‘printed matter’ .....	85
3. ‘Assuming he was he’ .....	89
4. ‘give us a squint at that literature’ .....	96
<b>Part Two</b>	
<b>4. Reading Joyce II: Late Criticism</b> .....	108
1. The forerunners .....	110
2. Two readings of <i>Ulysses</i> : 1984 .....	114
3. Joyce and theory .....	118
4. The author in Joyce studies .....	122
5. Two readers of <i>Ulysses</i> : Senn and Attridge .....	130
6. How to read Joyce .....	135
<b>5. Reading <i>Ulysses</i>: ‘Calypso’, ‘Wandering Rocks’, and the Role of the Reader</b> .....	142
1. ‘Thumbed pages. Read and read’ .....	145
2. ‘Very large and wonderful and keeps famous time’ .....	152
3. ‘James Joyce was an artist. He has said so himself’ .....	161
4. ‘Victory to the critic’? .....	165
<b>6. Rewriting the Author II: Legacies and <i>Travesties</i></b> .....	174
1. ‘so does the artist weave and unweave his image’ .....	177
2. ‘My memories, is it, then? Life and times, friend of the famous. Memories of James Joyce. James Joyce As I Knew Him. The James Joyce I Knew’ .....	182
3. ‘if the whole thing wasn’t a complete fabrication from start to finish’ .....	189
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	195
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	203

### **Abbreviations**

Abbreviations refer to the following editions of texts by James Joyce:

<i>FW</i>	<i>Finnegans Wake</i> (London: Faber, 1975)
<i>P</i>	<i>Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i> (London: Penguin, 1984)
<i>U</i>	<i>Ulysses: the 1922 text</i> , ed. Jeri Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Texts by Roland Barthes:

'DA'	'The Death of the Author', in <i>Image-Music-Text</i> , trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), 142-8
'FWT'	'From Work to Text', in <i>Image-Music-Text</i> , 155-64
'OR'	'On Reading', in <i>The Rustle of Language</i> , trans. Richard Howard (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989) 33-43
<i>S/Z</i>	<i>S/Z</i> , trans. Richard Howard (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990)
'WR'	'Writing Reading', in <i>The Rustle of Language</i> , 29-32
<i>Zero</i>	'From <i>Writing Degree Zero</i> ', trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith, in <i>A Barthes Reader</i> , ed. Susan Sontag (London: Vintage, 2000)

Texts by Hugh Kenner:

<i>D'sJ</i>	<i>Dublin's Joyce</i> , Morningside Edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987)
<i>J'sV</i>	<i>Joyce's Voices</i> (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1978)
<i>Pound</i>	<i>The Pound Era</i> (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971)
<i>Stoic</i>	<i>Flaubert, Joyce and Beckett: The Stoic Comedians</i> (London: Dalkey Archive Press and Normal, 2005)
'U'	' <i>Ulysses</i> ' (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980)

The *James Joyce Quarterly* will be abbreviated as *JJQ*.

Further abbreviations introduced within specific chapters will be indicated in footnotes.

### **A note on editions**

I refer throughout to the Oxford World's Classics facsimile of the 1922 *Ulysses*, except where later corrections are relevant. Where this occurs, later editions will be referenced in full.

## Introduction

*Ulysses* is infamously unread. Yet this reputation, each reference to it, and every time it persuades a potential reader to take down instead another book from the shelf, constitute indirect readings of James Joyce's 1922 novel. The text is read as elitist, excessive, difficult, or silly; not for everyone, needlessly complicated, or over-hyped; and all before one glances at its first page. In his short, irreverent 2007 work *How to Talk About Books You Haven't Read*, Pierre Bayard notes that not only has he not read Joyce, he furthermore can allude to both Joyce's texts and his not-reading of them and feel neither shame nor anxiety.<sup>1</sup> Bayard perpetuates a reading of Joyce: a reading of his texts via reputation and therefore of what Joyce signifies. Complicated texts, rarely read. Responses such as these – the prerogative of any reader (direct or indirect) – also rely on and perform readings of Joyce as an author. As an author of such a difficult, complicated, 'important' text as *Ulysses* Joyce must be extraordinary. Or is it that as a novel by a famous, canonical genius, *Ulysses* must be remarkable, complex, and out of reach? How does one separate the author's infamy from that of the text? This same quandary is enacted by actual readings of Joyce's texts: to what extent is our reading of *Ulysses* informed by how we view Joyce, and how much is our idea of Joyce dictated by what we find in the novel? In order to respond to this, and ask why it matters, we must pull at the relationships between author, reader, and text – an endeavour which has fallen out of fashion in both Joyce studies and the wider literary world.

It has been fifty years since theorist and critic Roland Barthes proclaimed 'The Death of the Author' and 'the birth of the reader' ('DA', 148); the complex response to and influence of his provocative 1967 essay continues, though interest in it has somewhat waned. Though it is, for example, now difficult to completely escape the idea that the author no longer controls the correct interpretation of a text, literary culture continues to be the author-centric world Barthes describes and decries in his essay. Joyce is an example of this, heightened despite and due to his 'unreadability'. Joyce admirers have many opportunities to indulge their fandom: we can go on Joycean walking tours of Dublin, Trieste, Zurich, Paris; we can buy bits of Joyceana such as postcards, posters, T shirts, mugs, fingerpuppets (I have two); we can visit the Dublin chemist Sweny's, and take lemon soap home: 'Mr Bloom raised a cake to his nostrils. Sweet lemony wax' (*U*, 82). This literary tourism and curio collection overlaps in no small part with Joyce studies, with an academic field which has its own calendar of summer schools, conferences, workshops, and symposia. We present research to specialists, to an audience of whom we presume not only a detailed knowledge of Joyce's texts but of his life

---

<sup>1</sup> Pierre Bayard, *How to Talk About Books You Haven't Read*, trans. Jeffrey Mehlman (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007), 11.

too. Joyceans collect translations, misprints, oddities, Joyceana banned by the Joyce estate; we like to follow up a conference paper with a pint in a pub from *Ulysses*; we enjoy knowing that Joyce preferred white wine to red. Much of this is ensured by the autobiographical nature of Joyce's texts, but is that all? What are the effects in terms of how we understand author, reader, and text? Does our Joycean paraphernalia affect the way we read *Ulysses*, the way we read its author? Or is it the other way around? Is it emblematic of an attitude, or does it contribute to one? How would we ask these questions in such an author-centric environment, or, what difference does it make if I read 'The Death of the Author' at a desk surrounded by postcards of Joyce?

The interactions of authors, readers, and texts have been the topic of literary theory, literary criticism, and literature itself. One way in which literature plays with, explores, or provokes questions of authorship is by presenting authors, readers, and texts within works of fiction. This ranges from novels or short stories about writers (including *Künstlerromane* both autobiographical and not), to uncanny metatexts. In his 2004 collection *Borges' Travel, Hemingway's Garage: Secret Histories*, Mark Axelrod places real authors into miniature, fictional pieces of biography inspired by actual business and brand names: in 'Borges' Travel, Tustin' we are told that 'One only needs to read such magnificent short stories as "Tlön Uqbar, Orbis Tertius" or "Death and the Compass" or even "Utopia of a Tired Man" to realize that Borges would eventually expand those artistic interests in travel into something less metaphysical and more lucrative'.<sup>2</sup> The 'James Joyce Irish Pub, Brussels' riffs in one long sentence on Joyce's style from *Dubliners* to *Finnegans Wake*, opening 'Joyce had had enuf of Dubl/ein after all there was no rhym for werks of hiz kin(d) in ire land', stringing most of the titles of *Dubliners* together, and ending 'without the finite loss of metaphor like the Andalusian girls under the Moorish wall to the whims of whores and whirls that wind there ways past the if fey and won't we have a merry time drinking whisky, beer, and wine at the James Joyce Irish Pub today'.<sup>3</sup> Axelrod's joking versions of famous authors play with their literary styles – such as Borgesian references to several chronicles, reports, and published chats in 'Borges' Travel' – and parody literary trivia. Poking fun at our interest in the lives of the famous and the secrets of great authors, Axelrod's games culminate finally in the utterly self-conscious 'Axelrod's Toys, La Jolla'. The author, ignored for years, gives up and finds his fame elsewhere: 'with little to show for 30 years of literary effort, Axelrod decided to give up the literary life altogether and enter the toy business. Toys, of course, were a natural extension of the kind of work Axelrod had been engaged in for over three decades since most of his work

---

<sup>2</sup> Mark Axelrod, *Borges' Travel, Hemingway's Garage: Secret Histories* (Normal and Tallahassie: Fiction Collective Two, 2004), 155.

<sup>3</sup> Axelrod, 59.

was considered, by those who knew it best as “light, playful, and jocular,” so the transition from writing fiction to peddling toys was perfect’.<sup>4</sup>

Axelrod’s light-hearted histories owe something to one of their subjects: several of Jorge Luis Borges’ short stories from the 1950s and 1960s are also fictional histories of authors – but authors who cannot exist. Borges’ ‘Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*’ unsettles understandings of authorship, literary relations, reading and rewriting, reporting the tale of a writer who ‘did not want to compose another *Quixote* – which is easy – but *the Quixote itself*’.<sup>5</sup> The two *Quixotes*, we are told, ‘are verbally identical, but the second is almost infinitely richer’ (Borges, 69). Unravelling the presumed logics of chronology and provenance, Menard’s ‘technique’ apparently ‘prompts us to go through the *Odyssey* as if it were posterior to the *Aeneid*’ or attribute the *Imitatio Christi* to James Joyce (Borges, 71). In ‘The Garden of Forking Paths’, we are told of a potentially infinite book by the mysterious Ts’ui Pên: ‘In all fictional works, each time a man is confronted with several alternatives, he chooses one and eliminates the others; in the fiction of the almost inextricable Ts’ui Pên, he chooses – simultaneously – all of them. *He creates*, in this way, diverse futures, diverse times which themselves also proliferate and fork’ (Borges, 51). The concept of infinity is also played with in ‘The Library of Babel’, where ‘The universe (which others call the Library) is composed of an indefinite and perhaps infinite number of hexagonal galleries’ (Borges, 78). Containing every possible combination of letters in an unknown number of books, the Library is not quite infinite, yet its size is incomprehensible. The unsettling thought of textual exhaustibility haunts the short story’s narrator: ‘The certitude that everything has been written negates us or turns us into phantoms’ (Borges, 85). Borges plays with the activity of authorship by ostensibly creating worlds in which the usual rules of writing do not apply – where all texts have been written, or a novel can be infinite, or a rewriting exact – but which in fact play with our own understandings of reader and author roles. As we encounter a fictionalisation and extension of what our reading can achieve, or what is possible of a text, we question our own preconceived ideas. Borges’ fiction thus explores ideas and prompts (and pre-empts) questions relevant to several strands of literary theory. The authorship of literary theory itself becomes a source for fiction in Gilbert Adair’s 1992 novella *The Death of the Author*, a murder mystery which draws on Barthes’ ‘The Death of the Author’, the popularity of imported literary theory in North American universities, and the scandal of theorist Paul de Man’s revealed Nazi-collaborationist past. The theoretical death of the author spills over into murder, and the author-protagonist’s famed Theory is revealed as a ploy to ‘exonerate’ him for his anti-Semitic

---

<sup>4</sup> Axelrod, 187.

<sup>5</sup> Jorge Luis Borges, ‘Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*’, trans. James E. Irby, in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. Donald A. Yates and Irby (London: Penguin, 2000), 65. All the Borges stories referenced are in this edition; references will appear in parentheses with the author’s name. ‘The Library of Babel’ is also translated by Irby, and ‘The Garden of Forking Paths’ by Yates.

past writings.<sup>6</sup> *The Death of the Author* takes an interpretation of the de Man scandal – that his advocacy of anti-authorialism was driven by self-interest – and dramatizes it through games of narrative. The ‘I’ that controls narration and is capable of reporting events which ‘followed my death by no more than a matter of days’ allows for a reappraisal of authorship and responsibility while retaining the excitement of a murder mystery.<sup>7</sup>

Writing authors, readers, and texts into the worlds of works of fiction creates an alternative space in which notions of authorship can be discussed. These discussions can draw from and inform debates which take place in texts of literary theory, but often become even more difficult to pin down as they are subject to the tropes and effects of literature. Irony, for example, has thrown sizeable spanners in the works of critics who have attempted to determine the literary theories of one Stephen Dedalus. Stephen’s starring role as a version of young Joyce in 1916’s *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is reduced in *Ulysses*, but his tendency to spout theories of authorship remains strong. Echoing Gustave Flaubert, in *A Portrait* Stephen argues that ‘The artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, paring his fingernails’ (*P*, 215). In the ‘Scylla and Charybdis’ episode of *Ulysses* Stephen debates the relevance of an author’s life to their work in the National Library, presenting a theory about *Hamlet*. He defends error (‘Bosh! Stephen said rudely. A man of genius makes no mistakes. His errors are volitional and are the portals of discovery’ (*U*, 182)),<sup>8</sup> references Percy Bysshe Shelley (‘In the intense instant of imagination, when the mind, Shelley says, is a fading coal’ (*U*, 186)), and in bits and pieces outlines his own theory. Stephen repeats himself at least once (‘Said that’ (*U*, 187)), as his ideas compete with his companions’ in displays of youthful macho intellectualism; they laugh at actresses playing Hamlet and wonder if anyone has argued the Dane were Irish, reference theories of Shakespeare’s identity, and giggle over Buck Mulligan’s ‘contribution to literature’ (pissing on Synge’s door) (*U*, 191). Stephen closely reads Shakespeare’s life – or what has been guessed of it – and through his life reads his works, even ‘all the other plays which I have not read’ (*U*, 204). He does not actually believe his theory, and, after nearly 30 pages of discussion, confesses so ‘promptly’ upon being finally asked (*U*, 205). The extent to which Stephen believes his own theories has posed less of a critical issue than the extent to which Joyce did: a debate which has, for some, boiled down to how much irony one reads in

---

<sup>6</sup> Gilbert Adair, *The Death of the Author* (New York: Melville House, 2008), 96.

<sup>7</sup> Adair, 133. More recently, Laurent Binet makes a tongue-in-cheek crime thriller out of the death of the author of ‘The Death of the Author’ in his 2016 novel *The Seventh Function of Language*, which speculates that Barthes’ death in 1980 was no accident, but part of an international conspiracy. Binet tasks theoretically-informed reading with crime solving, while self-consciously and affectionately laughing at self-aware metafiction: our semiologist-turned-detective protagonist Simon Herzog increasingly fears he is ‘trapped in a fucking novel’. *La Septième fonction du langage* was first published in French in 2016. Laurent Binet, *The Seventh Function of Language*, trans. Sam Taylor (London: Harvill Secker (Vintage), 2017), 268.

<sup>8</sup> In the 1922 text this is ‘man or genius’, but we find ‘man of genius’ elsewhere, including Joyce, *Ulysses* (London: The Bodley Head, 1960), 243.

Joyce's presentation of Stephen; how autobiographical, and how parodic; how much a mouthpiece for his own, still held notions, and how much a joke at his younger self's expense. Stephen and his theories have been an enduring focus of Joycean critical work on authorship, as *Finnegans Wake* and its games have tended to be the subject of criticism on reading – particularly work which also engages with poststructuralist theorists such as Barthes and Jacques Derrida. But *Ulysses* explores and provokes questions of authorship, and of how authors, readers, and the text relate to one another, beyond Stephen's library musings. The insistent focus on Stephen in discussions of how authorship functions in Joyce's texts perhaps reveals an unswerving weighting in favour of the author over the reader in Joyce studies. Turning to Stephen, particularly when read as an author-foil, shows from one perspective an interest in seeking a direct statement of authorial intent and strategy, rather than an interest in how the modes in which we have cause to read Joyce's texts arguably unravel the validity of such definitive statements.

This thesis treats *Ulysses* as an exploration of authorial and readerly roles: a text which plays with its own relationships to the author and the reader, which pre-empts and challenges the efforts of theory to question what we understand by author, reader, and text. Through examining the activity of reading that the novel effects through its intertextuality and narrative, I will draw out the textual specificities which engender a reassessment of this author, reader, text triad. Alongside such investigation, I will look at the history of approaches to the author within and without Joyce studies – enabling me to unravel how reading *Ulysses* interacts with such shifting sand. Running through and informing each discussion of this thesis is my assertion, and that of many Joyceans, that opposites are frequently simultaneously true in *Ulysses*. We learn to embrace the disconcerting state of being trapped within various paradoxes when reading the novel: the excellently-written bad writing of 'Eumaeus', the excessive accuracy and multiple mistakes of 'Ithaca'. If 'The Death of the Author' and vast swathes of literary theory and criticism defend or enact a binary division of author and reader, where the authority or determination of meaning of one must supersede that of the other, then in reading *Ulysses* we find a refusal of such notions. This refusal, like all the paradoxes of *Ulysses*, is both confusing and absorbing. A lesson of holding two conflicting realisations together in harmony leads to a rewarding, valuable way of approaching and querying theoretical and critical understandings of reading, textuality, and authorship. Above all else, this thesis argues that to unpick the author question we should focus our attention on the activity of reading: self-aware, self-interrogative reading.

A small body of work exists in Joyce studies which explicitly focuses on the author as a site for critical enquiry, often as part of a wider examination of, for example, authority or intertextuality. These works of criticism sprung up after Joyce studies began to engage with

predominantly French literary theory from the late 1970s onwards, but it is important to note that inquiries relevant to notions of authorship were being explored by much earlier criticism. Influential, early analyses of *Ulysses* from Stuart Gilbert's *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (1930) to Hugh Kenner's 1980 study '*Ulysses*' develop discussions, for instance, of intention, the schemata, intertextuality, Stephen/Joyce, and – more generally – how to read *Ulysses*. These inquiries have continued through and beyond the more theory-engaged studies of authorship, which is one reason why the development of Ulyssean criticism is a significant focus of my research. Furthermore, how the field perceives the author, and the relationships between author, reader, and text, is inferred by all acts of Joycean criticism individually and *en masse*. This creates obvious difficulties in terms of identifying which works of criticism are relevant to my topic: where do I place limits? My response is to include Joyce studies itself as part of my research, tackled in two chapters split by the 'arrival' of literary theory. What follows here, then, is only a brief overview of some of the relevant, existing work on the topic. After looking more broadly at understandings of the concept of the author, I will turn to work on authorship both in and out of Joyce studies – primarily to situate my own approach.

Modern understandings of the author figure grew in the European and Anglophone world from the literature and literary criticism of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, though the roots of such romantic ideas can be found much earlier. The author as a person of interest, with a life and personality of great relevance to their works, faced various challenges in the twentieth century. This includes the author-ignoring, anti-intentionalist habits of New Criticism; the anti-authorialism or authorial querying found in the 1960s and 1970s work of Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida; and the challenge formed by theorisations of intertextuality. I find something very familiar in Vicki Mahaffey's 1988 claim, 'I learnt from Joyce what others were learning from contemporary theory', and to aid my investigation into the ramifications of such an idea I will in my first chapter discuss how the author has been theorised since the romantics.<sup>9</sup> This forms a sort of secondary introduction to this thesis, allowing me to refer back to different understandings of authorship, and the author-reader-text relationship, as and when they arise in my readings of *Ulysses* and Joyce studies. While Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' and 'From Work to Text' (first published 1967 and 1971 respectively) combine to form his argument against the author as a closure of signification, they also provide useful, provoking analysis of the text and the reader. The latter in particular is taken up in 'Writing Reading' (1970) and 'On Reading' (1976). For Barthes in these essays the reader and their reading are free and unconstrained, responding to an infinite text. What *else* the author is, is explored in Foucault's 1969 essay 'What is an Author?', which analyses and outlines the function of the author. A little earlier, in Julia Kristeva's 1966 work on

---

<sup>9</sup> Vicki Mahaffey, *Reauthorizing Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1.

intertextuality, the author is removed from the equation of how texts relate to one another – an idea then developed by Barthes. These poststructuralist theorisings, including deconstruction and the writings of Derrida, are relevant to this thesis not only for their arguments, but for how they were responded to and reacted against by Joyce studies in the decades that followed.

The Joycean reaction to the literary-theoretical approaches which boomed from the 1960s was, and continues to be, mixed – if I can be forgiven an understatement. Several studies and articles responded specifically to the anti-authorialism of Barthes *et al.* over the following couple of decades, almost unanimously arguing for an authorial return and focusing on Stephen Dedalus. Jean-Michel Rabaté's *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* is perhaps the best known Joycean study of authorship. Published in French in 1984, then in English seven years later, it includes an extended, direct engagement with 'The Death of the Author' and, particularly in its last chapter, a detailed analysis of how authorial authority relates to acts of reading and criticism. It also reads Stephen's authorial theories as Joyce's, a focus which set the tone for such studies. Stephen is the subject of Christopher Butler's 1982 essay 'Joyce and the Displaced Author', Susan Stanford Friedman's 'Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author' in 1991, and Steven Connor's 1992 essay 'Authorship, Authority, and Self-Reference in Joyce and Beckett'. Not all of these critics read Stephen's words as Joyce's, and each makes significantly different, complex critical arguments, but their shared focus on Stephen is interesting. Mahaffey's 1988 study *ReAuthorizing Joyce*, meanwhile, discusses monological authority in broader terms and spends much less time on authorship specifically – and less time on Stephen.

Mahaffey's study perhaps proves the norm: discussions of the author in Joyce studies have tended towards the author-character, towards the author's representation of (nascent) authorship. This suggests that *A Portrait* and the Stephen-focused episodes of *Ulysses* offer the most significant provocations of Joycean author questions, in turn implying that valuable engagement with authorship occurs primarily where the Joycean text is at plot and character level *about* authorship: a restriction I seek to challenge. As I will discuss in later chapters, the arguments of these Stephen-focused critics do take in much more – but Stephen is their key source. Rabaté, Butler, Friedman, and Connor furthermore have a crucial aim in common, one found also in studies which specifically discuss the author and *Ulysses*, such as Brook Thomas' 1982 work *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Book of Many Happy Returns* and Michael Patrick Gillespie's *Reading the Book of Himself: Narrative Strategies in the Works of James Joyce*, published in 1989. This aim is to argue for a return to, or of, the author, and is often linked to Stephen's theories of authorship – though the significance of these theories was not universally agreed. Karen Lawrence, for example, provides a lone early suggestion that

Stephen's theories of authorship might no longer be relevant, in her 1981 *The Odyssey of Style in 'Ulysses'*.

Discussions of authorship appear elsewhere in Joyce studies from the 1980s onwards, notably in Derrida's 1982 talk 'Two Words for Joyce', and his keynote lecture to the 1984 International James Joyce Symposium in Frankfurt: 'Ulysses Gramophone'. The uncanny qualities Derrida ascribes to *Ulysses* and its author are of particular relevance to this thesis, as is his method of bringing the 'Joyce industry' into his complicated explorations. His Joyce, and his *Ulysses*, are capable of pre-empting everything, yet limiting nothing: readings, tourist shops, or keynote speeches. The overwhelming majority of Derridean Joyce studies, nevertheless, have focused on the *Wake* over *Ulysses*. Work on Joycean intertextuality and Joycean comparative studies, however, continue to provide a place for analysis of the author's role – reaching back to Kristeva's citation of Joyce in her development of the theory of intertextuality. A recent monograph in the field, Scarlett Baron's 2012 study '*Strandentwining Cable': Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality*, also discusses Barthes: consistently rare in Joyce studies. In *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (2003), meanwhile, Tim Conley picks up and defends the contentious issue of authorial intention – matching it with a notion of readerly intention. Baron and Conley's studies are two of the very few more recent works which address questions of authorship in Joyce and Joyce studies relevant to my own explorations, and yet their discussions of the author are framed within other focuses: an intertextual relationship, or the notion of error. Authorship is highly important to, yet only part of, both topics.

The Joycean encounter with poststructuralist questions of authorship tends towards defences against anti-authorialism, or assertions of the author's return – despite a significant lack of a body of work arguing the opposite. In a roundabout way, Joyce studies pre-empted a more general 'return of the author', exemplified by Seán Burke's 1992 study *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Now in its third edition, Burke's study has superseded many other reassessments of the death of the author in literary theory studies. Burke reads the anti-authorial texts of Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida, along with critical misuses of their theses, arguing that the author returns in each of their works. The 'return' of the author in literary criticism and theory is clear in the growing sub-field of literary celebrity studies, a more recent arena for analysing authorship. Both Loren Glass's 2004 study *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980* and Aaron Jaffe's *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*, published the following year, discuss the literary author as determined by literary authors. Rebecca Braun's 2008 work *Constructing Authorship in the Work of Günter Grass* draws on literary celebrity studies' reassessment of Barthes and Foucault, and in a reading of a specific author echoes Glass and Jaffe's focus on authorial self-image and self-fashioning. An early topic of Jaffe's study is

Stephen Dedalus, who also continues to be of interest to criticism which investigates authorship in the context of writing the self; Stephen is included, for example, in Max Saunders' 2010 work *Self-Impression: Life-Writing, Autobiography, and the Forms of Modern Literature*. Elsewhere, Paul K. Saint-Amour's 2003 text *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Intellectual Imagination* reads Joyce and Oscar Wilde in the context of intellectual property law; Saint-Amour finds in 'The Oxen of the Sun' an engagement with implications of the legal frameworks of authorship.

This thesis asks how *Ulysses* provokes a questioning of the roles and interactions of authors, readers, and texts. My explorations focus on how the novel has been read and how it makes us read: the development and habits of its criticism, and the effects of the intertextual relationship between 'Eumaeus' and the Homeric, of the intratextuality found within a sentence of 'Calypso', and of the difficulties posed by the narrative structure of 'Wandering Rocks'. These investigations will be framed by discussions of how approaches to authorship have changed in literary theory and criticism, and how Joyce's life has been read and written in Joyce studies and literature. I am looking at how Joyce's writing raises questions of authorship, and at how such texts demand an active, participatory readership; so then why not look at the discussions of authorship in *A Portrait* or 'Scylla and Charybdis', why not at the polysemia of *Finnegans Wake*? As touched upon above, this is due in part to my response to previous criticism. I am building on the work of the aforementioned critics in several ways: explicitly bringing together analysis of both *Ulysses* and its criticism; revisiting a now neglected site of inquiry, the death of the author; reviewing the Homeric within the context of early critical debate; focusing pointedly on the activity of reading and the reader; and moving away from Stephen Dedalus as the go-to figure for discussions of authorship. This shift of emphasis from Stephen to the reader informs my focus on the developments of criticism – a history of readers and readings – and the attention I pay to unknowns, difficulties, and provocations experienced by the reader. One defence for my limited scope is prosaic: as I have discussed, a significant amount of criticism on the topic of the author focuses on Stephen and his theories. Furthermore, much existing criticism on Joyce, theory, and/or reading deals primarily with the *Wake*. My choice of *Ulysses* not only grows, however, from a desire to avoid rehashing earlier work: it is a response to what I perceive as a gap in Joyce studies. The styles of *Ulysses* and overlooked aspects of its Homeric intertextuality inform the ways in which we read the novel, which in turn form our understandings of the text, its author, and our own activity of reading. Perhaps one way to put this is that I am less interested in what the text, via Stephen, might explicitly tell us about authorship, and more in what it might show us through the ways in which our reading responds to its stylistic, narrative, inter and intratextual games.

My emphasis on the importance of the reader and text when discussing authorship is one reason why the anti-authorialism of Roland Barthes forms a significant focus of this research. Barthes discusses the role of the reader and the text more comprehensively than Foucault in ‘What is an Author?’, and thus Barthes complements my turn away from Stephen. Conversely, the stress I place on the reader and the text is also my defence for the repeated presence in this thesis of three Joycean critics who discuss neither Barthes nor authorship at length – if at all. Hugh Kenner’s work on narrative, Fritz Senn’s readings of language, and the fascination of both with the Homeric rewritings of *Ulysses* are present in my own approach to the novel. Their disinterest in literary theory is substantial and provocative; and matched by Derek Attridge’s various and extensive engagement with and promotion of theory in Joyce studies. Though they would not all admit it, these three critics explore how responding to *Ulysses* inevitably raises questions of authorship. To return to Barthes: I am aware that my preference requires some clarification, as it is a significant movement away from critics who read Stephen’s impersonal author and the anti-authorialism of Barthes as one and the same. This is related to a broader connection drawn by some critics between Barthes and modernism. Though this will arise in the following chapters, it is not part of or particularly relevant to my main topic: this thesis is not about modernism. My focus is specifically on *Ulysses* and what reading *Ulysses* prompts – treating neither as archetypes of modernism – while the questions I explore have relevance beyond modernism or modernist studies. Furthermore, I disagree with the connection: Stephen’s god-like creator has little to do with the freedom of reading advocated by Barthes. I will touch on this again briefly towards the end of my fifth chapter, but for now will remark that Stephen’s theories centre on the author only – ignoring the roles of reader and text which are so important for the death of the author.

Claiming to write ‘against Joyce’ needs explication. Though this research revolves around the figure, role, and activity of the author, my interest in Barthes’ anti-authorialism and in the authority of the reader results in a somewhat oppositional position. This position is, however, unfixed – as it is in the 1988 essay by Leo Bersani to which this thesis title in part refers. In ‘Against *Ulysses*’ Bersani capitalises on his position as non-Joycean, offering a critique of both ‘The community of *Ulysses* and its exegetes’.<sup>10</sup> He adopts a challenging position in order to better analyse *Ulysses* and its readers, but despite writing ‘against’ the novel he notes how painful it is ‘to stop working on *Ulysses*’.<sup>11</sup> Writing ‘against Joyce’ does not mean to be anti-Joyce, but it does play with an idea – never popular in Joyce studies – of criticism which reads ‘without’ the author. ‘Against’ then connotes a sort of preparation, a defence – shielding the

---

<sup>10</sup> Leo Bersani, ‘Against *Ulysses*’, in *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’: A Casebook*, ed. Derek Attridge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 201-29 (228).

<sup>11</sup> Bersani, 228.

reader and the text from the directives of the author, from any limitations the author imposes on reading. Yet to be ‘against Joyce’ could also suggest being next to, leaning on, supported by: the polar opposite mode of criticism. This thesis explores the notion that authorship and a reader’s authority are oppositional, and responds to theoretical and critical approaches and habits which pitch reader against author: whether by declaring the birth of the reader must come at the cost of the author, or by giving greater currency – however veiled – to an author’s understanding of their text, over a reader’s. As for what I, or we, mean by ‘Joyce’: that is what I also set out to read.

The topics of this thesis are interrelated, and this interrelation is an important part of my approach. The result is an unusual chapter structure: three uneven pairs of chapters split across two halves. Chapters one and six address ‘Rewriting the Author’. Discussing the theoretical and biographical author respectively, they bookend my arguments by examining texts in which the author is an explicit focus. Chapters two and four analyse Joyce studies: their joint titles ‘Reading Joyce’ describe not only how early and later criticism has read Joyce’s texts, but how critics have read Joyce as an author. Chapters three and five, ‘Reading Homer’ and ‘Reading *Ulysses*’, provide the core of this research, and are detailed discussions of the text itself, how we read it, and where that takes us. These three sets of companion chapters probe texts about authors, critical texts, and the textuality of *Ulysses*; how the author has been read and written in theory, criticism, literature, and biography; and the significance of our own activity of reading. The topics of each chapter intersect one another, exhibiting the impossibility of separately discussing author, reader, text, or – as chapters progress – critic. Questions are raised by the discussions of part one, and investigated in part two: what happened, for example, when poststructuralism and Joyce studies met, what happens if one pushes creative reading, what role does authority or biography play in our reading, and what counts as reading *Ulysses*? Throughout I return to such questions, developing my response and spiralling my focus through the roles of author, reader, and critic – maintaining the text as the central source for my explorations. My approach teases out contradictions: the coexisting opposites and fecund paradoxes of the author, reader, text relationships I discuss. This informs the unusual, looping structure of this thesis, and forms many of its arguments and focuses.

Chapter one, ‘Rewriting the Author I: The Life and Death of the Author’, outlines a history of ‘the author’, of our author-centric attitudes in academia and popular culture. It focuses on a period from the romantics to the present day, hinging on the death of the author. This is a chronology of theoretical and critical understandings of authorship rather than a methodology for my approach, but it does also introduce and analyse theoretical texts which I refer back to throughout the thesis. The chapter explores how modern understandings of the role of the author developed, and how those understandings were challenged by anti-authorial

poststructuralist literary theory. The second chapter, ‘Reading Joyce I: Early Criticism’, investigates the critical response to *Ulysses* following its publication and up to the 1980s. The chapter begins by looking at the reception of Stuart Gilbert’s Joyce-authorized 1930 study *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’* and its emphasis on the Homeric in *Ulysses*, then details how *Ulysses* was read by early critics, and suggests how Joyce studies became a self-reflexive critical field which pre-empted the concerns of poststructuralist literary theory. Chapter three follows on from chapter two’s linking of the early reception of *Ulysses*’ Homeric intertextuality with Joyce studies’ early and ongoing focus on *how* to read the novel. ‘Reading Homer: “Eumaeus” and the Homeric Question’ is an analysis of how the *Odyssey* is rewritten in the sixteenth episode of *Ulysses*, and how this is relevant to questions of authorship. Arguing that the episode’s narrative plays with not only the *Odyssey* but with Homeric scholarship, I unravel how the way in which we read ‘Eumaeus’ forms its own rewriting – a repetition of the authorially-seeking, never-answered Homeric Question. This investigation takes in ideas of orality, the pseudo-academia of Samuel Butler, and contemporary short stories by Zachary Mason, while developing a close reading of ‘Eumaeus’ to discuss a hitherto overlooked aspect of *Ulysses*’ relationship with its Homeric precursor.

‘Reading Joyce II: Late Criticism’ opens the second half of the thesis. This fourth chapter takes a broader look at Joycean criticism from the late 1970s to the present, focusing on the boom of Joyce studies and the impact of literary theory. In it I pay particular attention to the mixed reaction of the discipline to poststructuralism and deconstruction, but also to a more general idea of ‘theory’ as another provocation for Joyce studies to pay attention to its own activity and method. Chapter four is also an overview of Joycean authorship criticism, of how it has understood the relationships between author, reader, and text – and an account of how Joyce studies has turned away from such topics. Chapter five, ‘Reading *Ulysses*: “Calypso”, “Wandering Rocks”, and the Role of the Reader’, brings together many aspects of earlier chapters. It begins with a close reading of one sentence, before developing into a questioning of how authority functions within the role of the author, reader, and critic, and how the intertextuality and styles of *Ulysses* provoke such questions. Looking at how we read *Ulysses* and, by focusing on the narrative of ‘Wandering Rocks’, the effects of the novel’s ‘difficulties’, this chapter asks what we mean by and what we can do with a Barthesian dead author, a deified genius author, and our own authority as readers of texts. The final chapter, ‘Rewriting the Author II: Legacies and *Travesties*’, addresses the autobiographical elements of Joyce’s work by exploring how Joyce has been read and written outside his own texts. It continues a mode of querying begun in chapter three and developed in chapter five, where boundaries of author, reader, reality, fiction, or the logics of time and place can be bent. As a result, I read the Joyce of approved-anecdote and canonical biography, the Joyce of recollected memoir, and the Joyce of Tom Stoppard’s 1974 play *Travesties* alongside one another:

comparing biographical and fictional portrayals of the author. This discussion of written Joyces is a somewhat light-hearted preamble to the conclusion, but it asks yet further questions about how the way we read an author has an impact on how we read a text, and vice versa – and about the endlessly complex entwined interactions of critics with author, reader, and text.

The methodology of this thesis is a facet of its argument. *Ulysses* incites us to read our own readings – to ask what reading is, what it entails, where it ends. Reading reading queries our understandings of author, reader, and text; the method of this thesis is to describe and analyse how this happens. This methodology leads me to not only look at my own reading, but also look at histories of how reading a text is informed by and constructs an author: tracking the developments of author theory, Joyce studies, Homeric scholarship, Homeric composition. My chapters on criticism, theory, or biography are extensions of my close readings of *Ulysses*: I trace these evolutions much as I trace versions of ‘Homer’ in chapter three and etymologies in chapter five, seeking an awareness of the previous readings, interpretations, uses, and associations that are layered into our modern understandings and usages. Digging into my own responses to ‘Eumaeus’, ‘Calypso’, and ‘Wandering Rocks’ leads me to a variety of seemingly far-reaching areas of investigation: the author from the eighteenth century to today, Homeric orality, Victorian satire of classicist scholarship, twenty-first century short stories, 1930s novels, self-conscious drama, and Joyce studies from the 1920s to the present day. These disparate sites are, however, within my readings, and help me to understand what my readings do. I am asking questions of authorship that arise from my reading of *Ulysses*, rather than examining *Ulysses* through a set of externally imposed questions. This distinction is vital, and it helps to explain the shape of my thesis. Placing an overview of theory upfront and giving separate chapters to discussions of Joyce studies enables my chapters on *Ulysses* to move *from Ulysses* outward – and inward. I am following leads I find in the novel, and thus burrowing into it. Chapters three and five can thus describe and dissect the activity of reading that I am fascinated by: one which reaches unexpected places, without ever leaving the text.

Much of chapter three hinges on a part of ‘Eumaeus’ that returns us to a gap in ‘Calypso’: Molly’s misreading or misarticulation of ‘metempsychosis’ as ‘met him pike hoses’. Her pronunciation of the word she wants her husband to explain is not narrated, it is only referred back to. Repeating this movement, my fifth chapter returns to the same unnarrated moment. Of all the text of *Ulysses* that I could choose from, my two chapters which directly read the novel return to one particular unsaid. This gap, however, represents a great deal. It is a moment of absolute confusion for Molly as reader, and an unknown which we as readers must first become aware of and then attempt to fill in. It is also a point where we are actually reading a reading of another text, Paul de Kock’s salacious novel in Molly’s hands. Furthermore, it refers us back to the Homeric: as I will explore in chapter five, this word takes

us back to the *Odyssey* by circuitous paths. It is also one of many gaps in narration to which the text consistently returns: which Bloom returns to in his thoughts, and which we flip back pages to locate. In many ways, this describes the movement of reading the author. A gap or unknown, of importance and having an impact on the text; a gap that we keep returning to, urged in part by the text itself. This recurring focus betrays my interests, which are less in what – for example – Stephen has to say about authorship in the National Library, and more in how readers and authors reside in the lacunae of the text. Metempsychosis itself is also significant: it concerns survival after death, rebirth, or return, and as a result is a relevant recurrent notion for a thesis which assesses how both a death and a return of the author has been and can be argued for in Barthes and in *Ulysses*. Metempsychosis furthermore brings together several aspects of the novel as a whole: it connotes Bloom, Molly, Ancient Greek, the death of Patrick Dignam (and Bloom's father and son), suggests the activity of reading and of reading difficulties, and is finally illustrative of how small parts of *Ulysses* can contain traces of so much of the text – and so much beyond.

In the context of the topic of this thesis some of my usages need a little exposition. I refer, for example, to *Ulysses* as a 'novel' without addressing the critical debate that has surrounded this categorisation: that it might move beyond the novel, or that the label does not match its games with symbolism, myth, style, and genre itself. Though this debate was important to the early reception of *Ulysses*, it will not be part of my focus; nor will I be, for instance, discussing 'novelist' as a distinct category of authorship. More significantly, while in some theory and criticism writers have found it useful to differentiate between an 'Author' and an 'author', I have chosen not to. I am troubled by where one draws the line between the two entities or modes: what are the divisions? One theoretical, one of popular culture? One as concept, the other as specific? One in question, the other understood? Any separation I can conceive would overlook how different roles and treatments of the author feed into one another. 'Authorship' is another term I must use often, so it is worth clarifying that I use it to encompass several questions relevant to the author, but also the relationship between author, reader, and text. As will become swiftly apparent, given my interest in the reader's activity rather than the author's, I am not referring to how the text was written, to the processes of writing, revision, or publication – and thus will also not be discussing genetic criticism at length. I am aware that genetic criticism is one of the most prevalent modes of research and criticism in the field today; as a type of criticism, and as a source of authority, I discuss it briefly in chapters four and five. Approaching genetic criticism as an archival act of reading in which one constructs an author or authorship could be an intriguing avenue of inquiry. This construction is not, however, the creative reading I explore in this thesis – rather than complicating the authority of the author, it arguably seeks that authority out. Writing at length on genetic criticism would thus skew the focus of my research towards authorial, rather than

readerly, authority. Lastly, when using ‘the death of the author’, as is common, I denote a general shift away from the author that may or may not have ever actually occurred in criticism or theory, as opposed to ‘The Death of the Author’, with which I refer of course to the specific Barthes essay.

Several linked key questions of authorship emerge from my readings of *Ulysses*: these form the aims of this thesis. What is it about this novel that encourages a reader to query the authority of an author? How does the novel emphasise the reader’s role? How do these effects work together? What is the relevance of revisiting the Homeric to such questions? How have these questions been acknowledged and responded to in Joyce studies? What is the impact of an author-centric scholarly environment on reading and criticism? What bearing has Barthesian anti-authorialism on *Ulysses*? Why have questions like these been put on a back burner? Is *Ulysses* a special case? Are the questions *Ulysses* prompts of author, reader, and text relevant to the wider literary field? And if so, how? It would be misguided to attempt a definitive conclusion, and misleading to claim a comprehensive exploration of questions of authorship. My aim is rather to show and investigate how such questions arise from the creative reading *Ulysses* encourages, and to respond to those questions with suggestions for how we can think of the relationships between author, reader, and text. The value of these suggestions, and of this research, to Joyce studies and the wider field of literary studies – or even beyond – depends on how we view the importance of authorship. As Seán Burke observes, ‘One can understand authorship as a minor adjunct of literary studies or as a concept central to our understanding of the great achievements of the human mind.’<sup>12</sup> When ‘authorship’ is considered as signifying the interactions of author, text, and reader, discussions of authorship are of how literature is created and received, of who determines meaning and how. Questioning the relationships between author, reader, and text is thus of intrinsic pertinence to any literary encounter.

---

<sup>12</sup> Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), xxii.

## Part One

### Chapter One

#### Rewriting the Author I: The Life and Death of the Author

It alone had to be read and interpreted as its author meant it to be read and interpreted and no other way – thereby confounding the very principle of the death of the Author and the plurality of possible meanings that it was also expounding. For, after all, if I had really believed in the death of the Author, why should I have bothered to ensure that my name appear on the jacket of the book?

Gilbert Adair, *The Death of the Author*<sup>1</sup>

‘The Death of the Author’ holds a peculiar position in humanities academia and literary culture. It is strangely well-known outside the academy for a short, fifty-year-old essay by an author who is generally agreed to have later changed his mind: the centenary of Barthes’ birth in 2015, for example, inspired write-ups discussing ‘The Death of the Author’ in national newspapers.<sup>2</sup> Though the essay had great impact within the academy, it is now predominantly discussed and studied as part of histories of changing attitudes to authorship, readership, and textuality. It did not result in an abandonment of interest in authors, leading some – provoked further by the rhetorical style of its central arguments – to characterise it as a failure. Authors continue to enjoy a revered status in both popular and academic culture, and in this chapter I will to varying degrees be outlining a history of this status. Structured around three developments in literary criticism – how the figure of the author became important in nineteenth-century romanticism, how that importance was rejected by the poststructuralism of the 1960s, and how such rejection has been received since – this chapter will establish and question general critical perceptions of the life and death of the author. Throughout I will refer to many critical interpretations of authors: those which seek to define or explain the romantic genius author, modernist impersonal author, poststructuralist dead author, or modern day unharmed author – and those which aim to unravel such concepts. To present a history of the author is to navigate authored histories, and I am just as interested here in how others have understood the history of the author figure as I am in the figure itself, and in how our modern notions of the author refer to or ignore earlier conceptions of it. This chapter sets up an arc – before, during, and after poststructuralism – which I will track and question in two chapters on Joyce studies, before complicating such challenges in chapters on *Ulysses*.

---

<sup>1</sup> (London: Melville House, 2008), 94.

<sup>2</sup> To give two examples: Andrew Gallix, ‘Roland Barthes’ challenge to biography’, *Guardian*, 14<sup>th</sup> August 2015, Books Blog <<https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/aug/14/roland-barthes-challenge-to-biography>> [accessed 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017], and Lidija Haas, ‘Roland Barthes: “Author, I’m Sorry”’, *Telegraph*, 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015 <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/books/what-to-read/roland-barthes-centenary-death-of-the-author/>> [accessed 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017].

A central argument of this thesis is that any act of literary criticism requires a decision regarding the relationship between author, reader, and text – and that in the majority of critical acts this decision goes unacknowledged, let alone explored. This poses problems of scope and focus for this chapter, as a history of attitudes towards authors could include all literary criticism. I am narrowing my focus to western European and Anglo-American criticism from the nineteenth century onwards, but the scope remains laughably vast. Some necessary restrictions come with attendant issues. First of these is my reference to authorial histories by, among others, M. H. Abrams and Seán Burke. Abrams' study of romantic literary criticism and theory was published in 1953, and so is perhaps somewhat dated. Burke's studies of authorship bear the marks of his own critical agenda: an assertion of the total failure of anti-authorialism. However, Abrams' analysis of how the romantic interest in authorial personalities remains relevant – particularly when augmented with more recent criticism which situates such interests within socioeconomic contexts – and this continuing relevance, despite 60-plus years of literary criticism, is an additional reason for my use of his study. Burke's work, meanwhile, is useful not only in providing an additional, broader overview of critical shifts, but also for his vehement disagreements with the texts of anti-authorialism. Burke's texts constitute one of the most recent extended critical engagements with the author question, and are an example of the more general shift away from the death of the author. A second issue is formed by what I have had to leave out. There is simply not room in this chapter or elsewhere in the thesis to discuss in depth the authorial implications of identity-related or political literary theory and criticism. The questions of responsibility and ethics raised by, for example, feminist, queer, or post-colonial readings form a significant and relevant refusal of anti-authorialism. My aim in this thesis is not to advocate another death of the author, so there is neither the necessity nor the room to critically engage with every approach in which a contextualised and biographical author is important. My focus is how questions about the author-reader-text relationship arise, and this helps to explain another narrowing of focus in this chapter (and the thesis as a whole): Roland Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' is the best-known, most provocative questioning of the relationship between authors, texts, and readers of the last century. It is the most explicit and most ambiguous exploration of this triad, and furthermore implies that it is that triad itself which provokes the stance of the essay. As noted in my introduction, it is for this reason, for the importance placed on the text and the reader, that 'The Death of the Author' figures so largely in this thesis; it is for its impact that it forms the centre of this chapter.

## 1. A Brief History of the Author

In ‘The Death of the Author’ Barthes states that ‘The author is a modern figure, a product of our society’ (‘DA’, 142). It is far from simple to trace the history of what has been and what is meant by ‘author’, of the shifting understandings of the role, function, and activity of authors: there are differing histories because they are each the product in turn of an author. Yet tracing these histories can offer a richer understanding of what led to the anti-authorialism that was (by some) so explicitly demanded from the late 1960s onwards in the European and American academy, and help to contextualise both the debates around the death of the author and the ways in which we currently perceive authorship. In this section I will offer a chronology of the author, from the eighteenth century up to Barthes’ polemic, referring to several accounts by literary and critical authors. With an eye on the subjectivity inherent in authored histories of authorship, I will draw on three different perspectives of how modern notions of the author emerge. These can broadly be described as authorial, critical, and economic, and include the development – often by literary authors – of ideas of the author as original, inspired genius; critical arguments linking the author’s life and work; and interrelated shifts in the financial pressures and legal rights of authors. These different narratives of authorship combine to present a complex impression of the author figure – the author figure against which Barthes reacted with a counter-narrative of anti-authorialism.

In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries our understandings of inspiration underwent a marked transformation. Romanticism relocated inspiration from the divine external to the fundamentally internal: the author ceases to be what Burke describes as the ‘messenger, avatar or mouthpiece’ of South American shamanic culture or of the Hellenic Muse, and moves beyond medieval Christian notions of authorship as an expression of ‘divinely-related truth which at the same time prescribed against any sense of individual originality’.<sup>3</sup> Percy Bysshe Shelley’s 1821 ‘A Defence of Poetry’ enriched ideas which Burke observes first with eighteenth-century poet Edward Young: of an ‘inner god’, a ‘stranger within’. ‘Rather,’ Burke comments, ‘than see inspiration in conflict with the originality of the work, Shelley affirmed a model of the poetic self generous enough to bound not only that which is given to it in consciousness but also those intuitions which arise unbidden from the unconscious’.<sup>4</sup> Crucially marrying inspiration and originality, Shelley claims that ‘the mind in creation is as a fading coal with which some invisible influence, like an inconstant wind, awakens to transitory brightness: this power arises from within, like the colour of a flower

---

<sup>3</sup> Seán Burke, ‘Changing Conceptions of Authorship’, in *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, ed. Burke (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), 5-11 (5-7).

<sup>4</sup> Burke, *Authorship*, 9.

which fades and changes as it is developed'.<sup>5</sup> The author now has what she needs within herself, the same power seen in nature's transformational abilities. The discourse of the original genius changes the relationship between the author and a Christian God from privileged communication to comparison: the author 'is now,' Burke notes, 'seen as imitating the act of creation itself'.<sup>6</sup>

Authors at this time were also becoming self-sufficient in more prosaic terms. The romantic original genius has the isolation and privacy required to perform great acts of creativity: the end of patronage in the eighteenth century brought such independence to writers and artists. The independent author, however, needed to make a living – a dilemma explored by Michael McKeon in his 1991 essay 'Writer as Hero'. McKeon picks up a thread of a 1982 article by Robert Folkenflik: the developing figure of the isolated, anti-political, outsider author as a product of '[t]he decline of the private patron and the growth of the bookseller' and how the same figure was, in turn, key to an increasing interest in authors themselves within and without literary works.<sup>7</sup> McKeon characterises the switch 'from a system of aristocratic patronage to a system of capitalist publication and exchange' as 'widely experienced by writers as a liberation from a direct dependence on superiors into the freedom of writing according to one's "own" unfettered sensibilities and of being read in acknowledgement of one's own intrinsic literary worth'.<sup>8</sup> The bond between the individual and their work was strengthened, as the individual was remunerated by good sales. As McKeon summarises, 'the independence of private subjectivity was reconciled with the independence of public self-sufficiency. And the modern type of the artist as a man of letters – private genius confirmed by its public reward – was born'.<sup>9</sup> The capitalist marketplace calcified the link between the writer and their work, and the image of the work as the expression of the writing subject contributed to an increasing cultural interest in authors: the popularity of writers and artists 'as heroes', that McKeon and Folkenflik analyse. Folkenflik summarises the way in which authorship changed during the romantic period by identifying this increased admiration of the author figure: 'I can best mark the shift which came about by observing that in the Renaissance Tasso wrote *Gerusalemme Liberata* and Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*; but in the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, Goethe wrote *Torquato Tasso* and Blake wrote *Milton*'.<sup>10</sup> Folkenflik's observation neatly expresses a shift in sources of fascination: from explaining 'the ways of God to man', to detailing the mysterious ways of authors.

---

<sup>5</sup> Percy Bysshe Shelley 'From "A Defence of Poetry"', in *Authorship*, 43-50 (45).

<sup>6</sup> Burke, 'Introduction: Reconstructing the Author', in *Authorship*, xv-xxx (xxii).

<sup>7</sup> Robert Folkenflik, 'The Artist as Hero in the Eighteenth Century', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 12 (1982), 91-108 (107). Folkenflik references the work of Abrams, among others.

<sup>8</sup> Michael McKeon, 'Writer as Hero: Novelistic Prefigurations and the Emergence of Literary Biography', in *Contesting the Subject: Essays in the Postmodern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Criticism*, ed. William H. Epstein (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1991), 17-41 (22).

<sup>9</sup> McKeon, 22.

<sup>10</sup> Folkenflik, 91.

As the author became a more popular subject for literature, the importance of the author's life and personality to their work was also increasingly asserted by romantic critics. In his influential 1953 study *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*, M. H. Abrams details the complex theoretical manoeuvres behind the notion of (as he titles his chapter) 'Literature as a Revelation of Personality'. Tracing the ways in which the developments of romantic criticism transformed the way we read literature, Abrams underscores the magnitude of the changes: from a pre-romantic approach, in which discussing an author's personality was the 'antithesis to the practice of critics', to the enduring appeal of the romantic attitude.<sup>11</sup>

Furnished with the proper key, the romantic extremist was confident he could decipher the hieroglyph, penetrate to the reality behind the appearance, and so come to know an author more intimately than his own friends and family; more intimately, even, than the author, lacking this key, could possibly have known himself. (Abrams, 228-9)

Abrams charts the evolution of this critical attitude back to a disagreement between the German writers and critics Friedrich Schiller and Friedrich Schlegel. Schiller and Schlegel's readings of William Shakespeare appear intrinsically incompatible. Schiller finds 'the naïve poet': 'Like the Deity behind this universe, he stands behind his work; he is himself the work, and the work is himself' (Abrams, 131-2).<sup>12</sup> To Schiller, the author 'like God, is not visible in his work' (Abrams, 238). In *Hamlet*, however, Schlegel finds that 'the spirit of the author is at its most visible [...] It has often been remarked, that the original impress of his individual manner is unmistakable and inimitable' (Abrams, 239).<sup>13</sup> Schlegel finds a way to resolve these opposing readings in an argument that would prove persuasive, turning to what Abrams describes as 'an ancient and persistent concept about the relation of God to the universe' (Abrams, 239). In doing so, Schlegel relies on the comparison between the author and the divine creator that we also see in Shelley's 'Defence' – a comparison with its roots in the Renaissance. Schlegel's approach imported readings of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1. 20, into literary criticism: 'For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead' (Abrams, 239).<sup>14</sup> Schlegel renews 'the Renaissance metaphor of the poet as creator, with its implicit analogy between God's creation of the world and the artist's making of a poem' as a

---

<sup>11</sup> M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 226. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>12</sup> *Über naive and sentimentalische Dichtung*, in *Schillers Werke*, ed. Arthur Kutscher (Berlin, n.d.), vol. VIII, 128, 135, 162.

<sup>13</sup> *Prosaische Jugendschriften*, ed. J. Minor (Wien, 1882), vol. I, 107-9. This debate is to a certain extent re-enacted in the 'Scylla and Charybdis' episode of *Ulysses*.

<sup>14</sup> Romans 1. 20.

method for literary analysis.<sup>15</sup> Reading Giovanni Boccaccio, for instance, he finds that ‘everywhere the feeling of the author – even the innermost depths of his most intimate individuality – gleams through, visibly invisible’ (Abrams, 241).<sup>16</sup> An increasing critical focus on the individual personality of the author develops, based on a paradoxical defence in which being unable to see the author in the work proves the author is everywhere within it. As McKeon wryly comments, ‘The Renaissance doctrine of the artist as creator first broached the daring notion of a human spirituality imitative of the divine, but it remained for the Enlightenment to accept the challenge by propounding a doctrine of aesthetic creation that effectively replaced God’s authority with that of the human author.’<sup>17</sup>

Reading the personality of the author in the work became the dominant critical mode; Abrams focuses particularly on scholarship on Shakespeare, Milton, and Homer during the romantic period. He concentrates on the author-focused arguments of critics such as Thomas Carlyle and John Keble, noting that the latter had the same ‘pregnant idea’ as Schlegel, though it ‘was to be independently derived and much more thoroughly exploited’ (Abrams, 240). Though crediting Keble as ‘the founding father of what is now one of the most prominent and intensively cultivated systems of critical premises and procedures’, he analyses some of the oddities of the age: for example, the similarities between a critic’s Milton and that critic her/himself, or between Keble’s Homer, Keble’s Walter Scott, and Keble himself (Abrams, 248-61). Carlyle’s 1841 *On Heroes, Hero Worship, and the Heroic in History* neatly betrays the habits of the age: alongside lectures from the previous year on the heroic in mythology, religion, and history, two lectures address ‘The Hero as Poet’ and ‘The Hero as Man of Letters’. ‘The method he employs in the two lectures,’ Folkenflik fumes, ‘with its facile shifts from factual to fictive worlds, is subject to some of the worst excesses of nineteenth-century biographical criticism.’<sup>18</sup> The afterlife of this romantic ‘system’ or ‘method’ is complicated by Gustave Flaubert’s return to ‘the original oxymoron of the visibly-invisible God’ in an 1852 letter: ‘The author in his work ought to be like God in the universe, present everywhere, and visible nowhere. Since art is a second nature, the creator of this nature ought to act in analogous ways, so that one may feel in all its atoms, and in every aspect, a hidden, infinite, impassibleness’ (Abrams, 262).<sup>19</sup> In Flaubert’s handling of the author-God doctrine the comparison is used to defend authorial impersonality – and it is echoed by Stephen Dedalus in *A Portrait*. Stephen’s fingernail-paring artist and T. S. Eliot’s ‘Impersonal theory of poetry’,

---

<sup>15</sup> Slightly differentiating his approach from A. E. Lussky, who reads this in terms of Schlegel’s concept of ‘romantic irony’. A. E. Lussky, *Tieck’s Romantic Irony* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1932) (Abrams, 239-40).

<sup>16</sup> Friedrich Schlegel, ‘Nachricht von den poetischen Werken des Johannes Boccaccio’, *Jugendchriften*, vol. II, 411-12.

<sup>17</sup> McKeon, 20.

<sup>18</sup> Folkenflik, 93.

<sup>19</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Eugène Fasquelle (Paris, 1900), vol. II, 155. Abrams’ footnote reads ‘C.f. Stephen Dedalus’ (378).

where poetry is ‘an escape from emotion; [...] an escape from personality’, are oft-referenced epitomes of modernist impersonality as a reaction against the excesses of romanticism.<sup>20</sup> Impersonal re-framings of the author do not however remove or reduce the author’s importance: the Flaubertian author is still ‘like God’, while Eliot’s author’s disappearance is made possible only by their maturity, or even exceptionalism.<sup>21</sup> Additionally, the well-developed public personas of modernist authors somewhat undermined their critical statements of impersonality.<sup>22</sup> The image of the romantic solitary, original genius endures in popular culture, and, to a certain extent, in literary criticism – an observation made by Abrams in 1953 yet pertinent today.<sup>23</sup> This image infers a fundamental link between the author and the work, encouraging a view of literature as the expression of an individual whose life and personality are of high relevance to the critic or reader.

The relationship between author and work is also enshrined in law: the concepts of intellectual property and copyright ensure that, for a total length of time dependent on yet extending past the author’s life-span, the author and their heirs own the work. In the introduction to his 2003 monograph *The Copywrights*, Paul K. Saint-Amour explores the ways in which the formation of intellectual property law not only solidified romantic attitudes to authorship, but also contributed to them. Saint-Amour details a ‘highly idealized’ version of copyright history:

By granting creators limited property rights in their creations, copyright also helped emancipate writers from their dependence on aristocratic patrons, eventually giving them financial leverage in their relationships with publishers; in this respect, copyright was indispensable to the development of the “author” as a propertied, professional, and financially self-sufficient figure.<sup>24</sup>

Furthermore, as he describes, ‘copyright has shaped not only the field on which the figure of the author moves but the identity of that figure as well. Authors, according to the law, win the laurel of intellectual property through the creation of *original expression*’ (Saint-Amour, 3). Ideas are not covered by copyright, but ‘original expression’ is in the law ‘a highly specific kind of creation, one that society deems sufficiently valuable to warrant the incentive and reward of exclusive rights’ (Saint-Amour, 3). As Saint-Amour argues, in practice copyright does not live up to such noble standards – and from the twentieth century in particular laws have been adjusted to protect the special interests of corporations rather than authors (Saint-Amour, 4-6). The complicated relationship between romanticism and copyright is difficult to

---

<sup>20</sup> T. S. Eliot, ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber, 1975), 37-44 (40 and 43), and Burke, *Authorship*, xxii.

<sup>21</sup> Eliot, 40. Loren Glass discusses this aspect of Eliot in *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2004), 6.

<sup>22</sup> Glass, 5.

<sup>23</sup> Abrams points out the author-seeking activities of 1930s critics Edmund Wilson and F. L. Lucas (227-8).

<sup>24</sup> Paul K. Saint-Amour, *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003), 3. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

unpick: ‘originality’ in legal terms, for instance, is of a far lower standard than that held by the romantics – it is only ‘the absence of verbatim copying and the demonstrable presence of a modicum of creativity’ (Saint-Amour, 7). Yet the association remains:

intellectual property law is frequently employed to assert [...] that the self and its expressions are singular, inimitable, authentic, and utterly original; that each of us is Keats. And when relatively thin requirements of originality native to copyright are hitched to the Romantic notion of radical originality, copyright no longer functions simply to reward modest creative labor; instead, it has been enlisted in the projection and consecration of a model of the self as original genius. (Saint-Amour, 7-8)

Copyright makes authors the owners of their work, and this development not only contributed fundamentally to the shifts towards independence that I have outlined above, but also emphasised literature as something to be owned and therefore to be fiscally valued. Authorship and literature are thus absorbed with the systems of capitalism, an individualist creation of a product, a commodity with a value determined by market demand and competition.

The enduringly-romantic author finds inspiration within, and thus the personality, opinions, and life of the author can explain the work. This literary work is legally tied to the author’s life – as much of Western copyright law extends fifty or seventy years past the author’s death (Saint-Amour, 4)<sup>25</sup> – and the ownership of the work by the author and their heirs continues to reassert the notion that works of literature are the individual expression of original genius. It is against this romantic and capitalist model of authorship that Barthes explicitly positions ‘The Death of the Author’:

[...] the epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology, which has attached the greatest importance to the ‘person’ of the author. The *author* still reigns in histories of literature, biographies of writers, interviews, magazines, as in the very consciousness of men of letters anxious to unite their person and their work through diaries and memoirs. The image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his life, his tastes, his passions [...] The *explanation* of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the *author* ‘confiding’ in us. (‘DA’, 143)

Barthes implies the connection between ‘capitalist ideology’ and the activity of seeking explanations in the author. He responds to this capitalist author with his own history of anti-authorialism, a move against authority and the establishment which resonates with the iconoclasm of the May ’68 protests and strikes that took place in France the same year as the French publication of his essay. Barthes places Stephane Mallarmé at the root of the author’s death – a move echoed by Michel Foucault – and refers to Mallarmé’s ‘Crisis in Verse’, written between 1886 and 1895:

The pure work implies the disappearance of the poet-speaker who yields the initiative to words animated by the inequality revealed in their collision with one another; they

---

<sup>25</sup> This aspect of copyright is of particular interest to Saint-Amour: he discusses the connection between the length of copyright and the author’s life and therefore body in a chapter on ‘Oxen of the Sun’ (which I will return to in chapter four), and in an account of the Joyce Estate’s attitudes towards intellectual property.

illuminate one another and pass like a trail of fire over precious stones, replacing the audible breathing of earlier lyrical verse of the exalted personality which directed the phrase.<sup>26</sup>

The speaker's voice and control are emptied out of the text in Mallarmé's description, 'to reach that point', in Barthes' reading, 'where only language acts, "performs", and not "me"'. Mallarmé's entire poetics consists in suppressing the author in the interests of writing' ('DA', 143). The idea of alterity in the origin of literature, located previously in either the Muse, God, or the romantic imagination, is by Mallarmé 'now discovered within language itself'.<sup>27</sup> For Barthes, what Mallarmé begins is taken up 'through Valéry, Proust and the Surrealists'; he tracks what he sees as their attempts to disrupt the relationship between an author and the texts they write ('DA', 143-4). His history is pulled apart by Burke in *The Death and Return of the Author*, who names 'this lineage' as 'palpably false', conceding that 'only Mallarmé has any place as a harbinger of authorial demise' (*DR*, 8). Burke nevertheless also sees problems with the invocation of Mallarmé by both Barthes and Foucault for three reasons: first, due to 'the obvious contradiction of establishing Mallarmé as the *author*, as it were, of the author's disappearance'; secondly, for what he reads in Mallarmé's ideas as 'a tenebrous culmination of the romantic doctrine of inspiration', and a description of a mode of writing rather than a theory of it; and, finally, because Burke sees the use of Mallarmé as a 'shield' for 'a more difficult and serpentine history of influences' (*DR*, 9-10). Plotting the development of a turn away from the author-figure so aggressive as to form a deletion, Burke points instead to the delayed reception of structuralism by a French academia rooted in phenomenology. He highlights the belated impact of Ferdinand de Saussure via the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss, and the publication of Lévi-Strauss' *Tristes Tropiques* and Jacques Lacan's 'The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious, Or Reason Since Freud', arguing that Barthes, Foucault, and Jacques Derrida, the 'three founding figures of poststructuralism[,] might well have developed into the most exciting phenomenological revisionists of their time were it not for the surfacing of structural linguistics in French thought during the mid-1950s' (*DR*, 11-12). Burke argues that 'a phenomenological training had taught them that the subject was too powerful, too sophisticated a concept to be simply bracketed; rather subjectivity was something to be annihilated'. Structuralism's prioritisation of language could not be reconciled with how French phenomenology privileged subjectivity, and the clash, Burke argues, produced 'an iconoclastic and far-ranging form of antisubjectivism' which included the death of the author (*DR*, 10-14). Barthes' history of anti-authorialism locates the death of the author in the

---

<sup>26</sup> Stéphane Mallarmé, 'From "Crisis in Verse"', in *Authorship*, 51-3 (51).

<sup>27</sup> Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 9. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the abbreviation *DR*.

developments of literature, but within this Burke finds an alternate history: one firmly rooted in the academy.

## 2. The Death of the Author

A provocative, ambiguous essay, Barthes' 'La mort de l'auteur' was published first in an English translation by Richard Howard in 1967 in the multimedia magazine *Aspen*, and then in French the following year in *Manteia*.<sup>28</sup> It followed work including *Le degré zéro de l'écriture* and *Mythologies*, published in 1953 and 1957 respectively. In 'The Death of the Author' Barthes develops Mallarmé's prioritising of language over author to argue that 'writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin' ('DA', 142). Though often paraphrased with its famous and final point – that 'the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the author' – doing so overlooks the complex rhetoric and style of the essay ('DA', 148).<sup>29</sup> Whether the death of the author has occurred, is occurring, or must occur is unclear; it appears to have never been alive within a text, but is still to experience a cultural death. The vague figure of 'the modern scriptor' is outlined as an alternative to the author: where the author precedes a text the scriptor is 'born' with it and 'traces a field without origin – or at least, has no other origin than language itself, language which ceaselessly calls into question all origins' ('DA', 145-6). Yet this 'SCRIPTOR' is undeveloped, almost abandoned in the essay as Barthes moves on to make his central claims on the link between author, text, and critic:

To give the text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing. Such a conception suits criticism very well, the latter then allotting itself the important task of discovering the Author (or its hypostases: society, history, psyche, liberty) beneath the work: when the Author has been found, the text is 'explained' – victory to the critic. Hence there is no surprise in the fact that, historically, the reign of the Author has also been that of the Critic [...]. ('DA', 147)

The author is asserted here as the creation of criticism, even a tool for the critic, and the use of 'victory' and 'reign' reach back to the idea of a tyranny to declare an authority held by the author and absent with the scriptor. While this authorial authority is identified earlier in the essay as something that functions in a wider sense of 'ordinary culture', it is situated here with the critic and the critic's author; a move from a cultural interest in authors phrased in doomsday terms to a more serious analysis of the author as a structural aspect of literary criticism ('DA', 143).

---

<sup>28</sup> *Aspen* no. 5 and 6, 'The Minimalism issue', was a box containing three essays, several phonograph recordings, poems, musical scores, cardboard models, a reel of film, and advertisements. It was dedicated to Stéphane Mallarmé, and edited by Irish critic and artist Brian O'Doherty. <<http://www.ubu.com/aspen/aspen5and6/index.html>> [accessed 21<sup>st</sup> April 2017].

<sup>29</sup> 'cost of' is rendered as 'ransomed by' in Howard's translation.

In the multiplicity of writing, everything is to be *disentangled*, nothing *deciphered*; the structure can be followed, ‘run’ (like the thread of a stocking) at every point and at every level, but there is nothing beneath: the space of writing is to be ranged over, not pierced; writing ceaselessly posits meaning ceaselessly to evaporate it, carrying out a systematic exemption of meaning. In precisely this way literature (it would be better from now on to say *writing*), by refusing to assign a ‘secret’, an ultimate meaning, to the text (and to the world as text), liberates what may be called an anti-theological activity, an activity that is truly revolutionary since to refuse to fix meaning is, in the end, to refuse God and his hypostases – reason, science, law. (‘DA’, 147)

The author becomes something used by the critic to exert authority, to promulgate a myth of ‘ultimate meaning’ that critics have claimed to mine from the depths of a text; for Barthes, as language resists fixed meanings and ‘question[s] all origins’, there is no ultimate meaning.

The style of ‘The Death of the Author’ is as provoking and demanding as its central concept: its didacticism, along with that of Foucault’s ‘What is an Author?’, leads Burke to comment ‘Statements of this cast – characteristically of modern anti-authorialism – are not made in a conventionally expository or discursive framework. What is presented is not offered as though it were open to question’ (*DR*, 16). The contradictory authority with which the author expresses this argument against authority is read, however, in a less negative light by Susan Sontag in ‘Writing Itself: On Roland Barthes’, her 1981 introduction to *A Roland Barthes Reader*. She suggests:

Intellectual terrorism is a central, respectable form of intellectual practice in France – tolerated, humoured, rewarded: the “Jacobin” tradition of ruthless assertion and shameless ideological about-faces; the mandate of incessant judgement, opinion, anathematizing, overpraising; the taste for extreme positions, then casually reversed, and for deliberate provocation.<sup>30</sup>

Though not explicitly referring to ‘The Death of the Author’ (or Barthes’ later contradiction of its arguments), Sontag presents this style of didacticism as a charming form of discourse with an historical place in French culture.<sup>31</sup> To move even further from Burke, the ‘ruthless assertion’ we can read in Barthes’ phrasing can itself be overturned by looking at the structure of the essay, as Michael Moriarty argues in his 1991 study *Roland Barthes*. Describing ‘The Death of the Author’ as a ‘verbal performance’, Moriarty highlights the disjointed, fragmentary structure of the text and how its argument resists linearity: ‘The fragment [...] prevents the discourse cohering into the continuous utterance of a single subject: it de-authorizes discourse.’<sup>32</sup>

Moriarty’s reading of how ‘The Death of the Author’ subverts its apparent didacticism relies upon an argument linking the form of the essay to the concept of a ‘text’ as expressed by Barthes – on which I will now focus, before returning to Moriarty’s argument. Notions of

---

<sup>30</sup> Susan Sontag, ‘Writing Itself: On Roland Barthes’, in *A Barthes Reader*, ed. Sontag (London: Vintage, 2000), vii-xxxviii (xxxiv).

<sup>31</sup> Sontag also leaves ‘The Death of the Author’ and ‘From Work to Text’ out of *A Barthes Reader*, something she regrets in her editorial note.

<sup>32</sup> Michael Moriarty, *Roland Barthes* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 100-1.

an active reader and open-ended text form the substantial argument of Barthes' essay and are developed in Barthes' later essay 'From Work to Text' and the study *S/Z*. Without an author a text is limitless, devoid of a 'final signified': multiplicity is inferred in the preferred activity of disentangling rather than deciphering, and made explicit where Barthes' arguments relate to literary relations and intertextuality:

We know now 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 clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. [...] the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them. ('DA', 146)

The text becomes, in the above passage of 'The Death of the Author', not only open-ended but of open, multiple, and far-reaching origins. Returning to the sentence from Balzac's *Sarrasine* that opens his essay (a move Moriarty sees as 'the trajectory of Barthes' favourite figure, the spiral. It returns to its point of departure, but at a higher level, producing hitherto absent meanings from the same words, and thus manifesting the inexhaustibility of discourse'),<sup>33</sup> Barthes establishes a definition of writing, of the text, in terms of the reader:

Thus is revealed the total existence of writing: a text is made up of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the author. The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. Yet this destination cannot any longer be personal: the reader is without history, biography, psychology; he is simply that *someone* who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted. ('DA', 148)

The impersonal is applied here to the reader, in a particularly ambiguous part of the essay that is not developed further. What is clearer here is that the reader, not the author, is the counterpart to the text. The relationship between reader and text takes precedence, and crucially – if paradoxically – both relies on and affirms the absence of the author. Barthes begins to elaborate his notion of the text, a text's relation to other texts and to the reader and an author, in the 1970 study of *Sarrasine*, *S/Z* – of which he was at an early stage of writing when he published 'The Death of the Author'. The text, described as 'a tissue' in that essay, becomes in *S/Z* 'like a piece of Valenciennes lace' and 'a braid (*text, fabric, braid*: the same thing)' of voices or codes (*S/Z*, 160). *S/Z* is perhaps best known, however, for the delineation of 'writerly' and 'readerly' texts – a division very much linked to the concept of active reading. The 'writerly' text is preferred, as it 'make[s] the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text', while the 'readerly' text leaves the reader idle, 'intransitive' (*S/Z*, 4). 'Writerly' texts maintain 'the plurality of entrances, the opening of networks, the infinity of languages'

---

<sup>33</sup> Moriarty, 102.

and are ‘*ourselves writing*’ (*S/Z*, 5). Barthes’ definition of an ‘ideal text’, the ultimate ‘writerly’ text, is remarkably close to *Finnegans Wake*:

this text is a galaxy of signifiers, not a structure of signifieds; it has no beginning; it is reversible; we gain access to it by several entrances, none of which can be authoritatively declared to be the main one [...] the systems of meaning can take over this absolutely plural text, but their number is never closed, based as it is on the infinity of language. (*S/Z*, 4-5)

In ‘Writing Reading’, published the same year, Barthes defends his elaborate dissection of *Sarrasine* in *S/Z* as a description of reading: an analysis of text is an analysis of reading, the reader firmly established as a necessary part of the text.

Another division of writings takes place in the 1971 essay ‘De l’oeuvre au text’, published in *Revue d’esthétique*: a treatise on the ‘text’ in opposition to the ‘work’. Barthes outlines ‘the Text’ as ‘a methodological field’; while ‘the work can be seen (in bookshops, in catalogues, in exam syllabuses), the text is a process of demonstration, speaks according to certain rules (or against certain rules); the work can be held in the hand, the text is held in language’ (‘FWT’, 157).<sup>34</sup> In accordance with what he began in ‘The Death of the Author’, the multiplicity of the text is detailed:

The Text is plural. Which is not to simply say that it has several meanings, but that it accomplishes the very plural of meaning: an *irreducible* (and not merely acceptable) plural. The Text is not a co-existence of meanings but a passage, an overcrossing; thus it answers not to an interpretation, even a liberal one, but to an explosion, a dissemination. The plural of the Text depends, that is, not on the ambiguity of its contents but on what might be called the *stereographic plurality* of its weave of signifiers (etymologically, the text is a tissue, a woven fabric). (‘FWT’, 159)

Affirming again the etymological roots of ‘text’, Barthes establishes the aptness of the word he has chosen to use to refer to pieces of writing and argues that these woven, plural qualities have always existed:

[The Text is] woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?), antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony. The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with some origin of the text: to try and find the ‘sources’, the ‘influences’ of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation; the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*: they are quotations without inverted commas. (‘FWT’, 160)

As we can see above, Barthes makes this idea of the intertextuality of all texts explicit, linking it to the impossibility of fixing origins in a mode of ‘filiation’ – which, he claims, is a process that functions only in ‘the work’ (‘FWT’, 160). The text, instead, ‘reads without the inscription of the Father’ (‘FWT’, 161).

[The work] refers to the image of an *organism* [...] the metaphor of the Text is that of the *network*; [...] Hence no vital ‘respect’ is due to the Text: it can be *broken* [...] it can be read without the guarantee of its father the restitution of the inter-text paradoxically

---

<sup>34</sup> Something I disagree with, due to the importance of the physicality of *Ulysses*. I will discuss this in chapters two and three, but for now can note that playing with a Joycean text often relies on holding the printed text in our hands.

abolishing any legacy. It is not that the Author may not 'come back' in the Text, in his text, but that he then does so as a 'guest'. If he is a novelist, he is inscribed in the novel like one of his characters, figured in the carpet; no longer privileged, paternal, aletheological, his inscription is ludic. He becomes, as it were, a paper-author: his life is no longer the origin of his fictions but a fiction contributing to his work [...]. ('FWT', 161)

Different again from the sriptor, here we have 'a paper-author', who is only another part of the text, of the fiction. The reader, not the author, is again the figure of importance in this essay, as the text 'asks of its reader a practical collaboration' ('FWT', 163). As in 'The Death of the Author', the plurality of the text is focused on the reader; the relationship between reader and text is fundamental, revolving around the activity of the reader:

The work is normally the object of a consumption [...] the Text (if only by its frequent 'unreadability') decants the work (the work permitting) from its consumption and gathers it up as play, activity, production, practice. This means that the Text requires that one try to abolish (or at the very least to diminish) the distance between writing and reading, in no way by intensifying the projection of the reader into the work but by joining them in a single signifying practice. The distance separating reading from writing is historical. ('FWT', 161-2)

Defining the work as something to be consumed, Barthes refers again to the 'capitalist ideology' the author's death undermines. The text disrupts the process of consumption and disposal implied in the work, and is removed from the capitalist systems of the literary marketplace. Stating finally that 'The theory of the Text can coincide only with the practice of writing', Barthes affirms that the text relies upon the activeness of the reader, the reader playing, no longer a passive consumer but a part of the production ('FWT', 164). Unlike the labels 'readerly' and 'writerly', which seem to apply to different pieces of writing, here the work can be treated as text. Reading and writing are 'join[ed] in a single signifying practice', which further attests to the absence of authority in the author or 'father': it is the active reader and the intertextual text that defies this authority. The text as a tissue of quotations is a facet of 'The Death of the Author' that is then developed in *S/Z* and 'From Work to Text'. Moriarty's defence of 'The Death of the Author' argues that the essay embodies this concept of text, rather than relying on the authority of the authors it names: 'The writer does not express a non-linguistic inner reality (as we have seen) but simply brings forth words from the great dictionary of culture, words that, like the dictionary definition, simply refer interminably to other words.'<sup>35</sup> In Moriarty's reading, the form of Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' – its fractured paragraphs and loose ends – echoes and contributes to its content: 'Forestalling as they do the unification of the text under a single authoritative message, the fragmentation of discourse, and the multiplicity of all discourses, are thus the indispensable conditions in which writing about writing can be true to its object, to itself.'<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Moriarty, 101-2.

<sup>36</sup> Moriarty, 102.

Foucault's '*Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?*' is implicitly phrased as a response to 'The Death of the Author', and has a markedly different style: it is dense, analytical, and philosophical, and exceeds the length of 'The Death of the Author' and 'From Work to Text' combined. Though Foucault references Barthes' notion of *écriture* (elaborated in *Writing Degree Zero*), he does not name him in relation to the declaration of the 'event' of the 'disappearance or death of the author'.<sup>37</sup> This contributes to yet more vagueness of tenses: though the title of the essay asks 'What is an Author?', implying the author exists in the present, the context of the essay itself is stated as one in which the author has already gone – only this 'event' is not explicitly 'The Death of the Author', which gives the impression that this disappearance is something that has occurred beyond the confines of Barthes' polemic. As 'What is an Author?' was presented as a lecture and published in 1969, this implies the death of the author came about as an immediate effect of Barthes' 1967/8 essay, or had already occurred. Aside from this confusion, Foucault's essay takes a more detailed look at the author, at how 'as a privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas, knowledge, and literature, or in the history of philosophy and science, the question of the author demands a more direct response' (Foucault, 115). As he outlines, asserting the pertinence of the question, 'Even now, when we study the history of a concept, a literary genre, or a branch of philosophy, these concerns assume a relatively weak and secondary position in relation to the solid and fundamental role of an author and his works' (Foucault, 115). This less-provocative version of Barthes' 'tyranny' of the author is not, however, the focus of Foucault's essay: he 'set[s] aside a sociohistorical analysis of the author' such as:

how the author was individualized in a culture such as ours; the status we have given the author, for instance, when we began our research into authenticity and attribution; the systems of valorization in which he was included; or the moment when the stories of heroes gave way to an author's biography; the conditions that fostered the formulation of the fundamental critical category of "the man and his work." (Foucault, 115)

The analyses of Folkenflik, McKeon, and Saint-Amour that I have discussed above pick up and elaborate aspects of this miniature 'sociohistorical analysis', and respond also to ideas expressed in Walter Benjamin's 'The Author as Producer'. As Burke outlines, the 1934 essay 'opposes to the romantic notion of a writer's creative genius an artisanal view of authorship as analogous to any act of socio-economic production'.<sup>38</sup> 'Before I ask,' Benjamin states, 'what is a work's production *vis à vis* the production relations of its time, I should like to ask: what is its position *within* them?'<sup>39</sup> Foucault's essay is informed by the process of

---

<sup>37</sup> Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977) 113-38 (117). All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>38</sup> Burke, *Authorship*, 216-7.

<sup>39</sup> Walter Benjamin, 'The Author as Producer', in *Understanding Brecht*, trans. Anna Bostock (London: Verso, 1998), 85-103 (87).

individualisation he refers to, even if he chooses not to detail that process; his focus is more explicitly on ‘the singular relationship that holds between an author and a text’ (Foucault, 115). The reader is notably absent from his essay, and the author or writer is again the central figure: ‘If we wish to know the writer in our day, it will be through the singularity of his absence and in his link to death, which has transformed him into a victim of his own writing’, claims Foucault, citing Flaubert, Proust, and Kafka as ‘obvious examples of this’ (Foucault, 117).

Foucault extends questions of the absent author beyond the literary text, looking for example at what counts as an author’s ‘work’ if ‘the individual is not an author: what are we to make of those things he has written or said, left among his papers or communicated to others? Is this not properly a work?’ Asking ‘what if, in a notebook filled with aphorisms, we find a reference, a reminder of an appointment, an address, of a laundry bill, should this be included in his works? Why not?’, Foucault highlights the ways in which an author’s life, his biographical self, complicates ‘the equally problematic nature of the word “work” and the unity it designates’ (it should be noted that he is not using ‘work’ in Barthes’ sense, and that this essay predates ‘From Work to Text’) (Foucault, 118-9). Nearing the crux of his essay, Foucault states that it is ‘insufficient to repeat empty slogans’:

Rather, we should reexamine the empty space left by the author’s disappearance; we should attentively observe, along its gaps and fault lines, its new demarcations, and the reapportionment of this void; we should await the fluid functions released by this disappearance. In this context we can briefly consider the problems that arise in the use of an author’s name. What is the name of an author? How does it function? Far from offering a solution, I will attempt to indicate some of the difficulties related to these questions. (Foucault, 121)

Investigating the name of an author, Foucault describes it as ‘more than a gesture, a finger pointed at someone; it is, to a certain extent, the equivalent of a description’ (Foucault, 121). Looking briefly at Shakespeare and Homer as examples, he notes that ‘an author’s name is not simply an element of speech’, that it ‘can group together a number of texts and thus differentiate them from others’, and that it ‘also establishes different forms of relationships among texts’ (Foucault, 123). He brings together his arguments to ‘conclude that, unlike a proper name, which moves from the interior of a discourse to the real person outside who produced it, the name of an author remains at the contours of text’:

It points to the existence of certain groups of discourse and refers to the status of this discourse within a society and culture. The author’s name is not a function of a man’s civil status, nor is it fictional; it is situated in the breach, among the discontinuities, which gives rise to new groups of discourse and their singular mode of existence. [...] the function of an author is to characterize the existence, circulation, and operation of certain discourses in society. (Foucault, 123-4)

Foucault then begins to make the best-known argument of his essay: the concept of the ‘author-function’. He outlines features of ‘the “author” as a function of discourse’, before summarising them as follows:

the “author-function” is tied to the legal and institutional systems that circumscribe, determine, and articulate the realm of discourses; it does not operate in a uniform manner in all discourses, at all times, and in any given culture; it is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a text to its creator, but through a series of precise and complex procedures; it does not refer, purely and simply, to an actual individual insofar as it simultaneously gives rise to a variety of egos and to a series of subjective positions that individuals of any class may come to occupy. (Foucault, 130-1)

Again, we can see the legacy of Foucault’s essay in works such as Saint-Amour’s *The Copywrights* or Molly Nesbit’s 1987 article ‘What Was an Author?’: investigations of how the author or the ‘author-function’ are connected to legal systems.<sup>40</sup> Foucault then moves on to a long discussion of non-literary authors, but I would like to focus on the third feature of the ‘author-function’ outlined above. In more detail, Foucault notes

these aspects of an individual, which we designate as an author (or which comprise an individual as an author), are projections, in terms always more or less psychological, of our way of handling texts: in the comparisons we make, the traits we extract as pertinent, the continuities we assign, or the exclusions we practice. (Foucault, 127)

The author is here again dependent on the mode of reading or mode of criticism, rather than existing as a category which supersedes both. The definition, or use, of the author in the text is described in terms of ‘explaining’, echoing Barthes but stopping short of the explicit claim of the author placing a limit on a text. The ‘subject’ for Foucault ‘is not to be totally abandoned. It should be reconsidered, not to restore the theme of an originating subject, but to seize its functions, its interventions in discourse, and its system of dependencies’, yet ‘the subject (and its substitutes) must be stripped of its creative role and analysed as a complex and variable form of discourse’ (Foucault, 137). Foucault argues that ‘the “author-function” is undoubtedly only one of the possible specifications of the subject’, and that ‘We can easily imagine a culture where discourse would circulate without any need for an author’ (Foucault, 137). Repeating the same Samuel Beckett line (‘What matter who’s speaking?’) referred to near the opening of the essay, Foucault ends with ambiguity, his answer to the question or to the relevance of the question remaining unclear. Though so different in style to ‘The Death of the Author’, more comprehensive and analytic or even scientific, ‘What is an Author?’ retains the ambiguity of Barthes’ essays and harks back to its structure in its return to a literary quotation. Having asked what an author *is*, while stating the author has already disappeared, the essay then ends by indicating such an authorless world is something to be imagined, something yet to come.

---

<sup>40</sup> Molly Nesbit’s 1987 article ‘What Was an Author?’ discusses the legal status of authors in a specifically French context. In Burke, *Authorship*, 247-62.

The author was also rephrased or removed in the formation of deconstruction, the theorisation of intertextuality, and reader response criticism; European approaches picked up by the Anglo-American academy. Jacques Derrida's famous pronouncement in 1967's 'The Exorbitant. Question of Method', '*il n'y a pas de hors-texte*' – often read as 'there is nothing outside the text', though wrought by Chris Baldick as 'language cannot take us outside itself'<sup>41</sup> – has led his work and deconstruction to be perceived too as anti-authorial in its privileging of the text and language (as evidenced by Burke's study of the trio). Along with the de-centering described in his 1966 lecture 'Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in 'Signature Event Context' (first published in French in 1972 and English in 1977) Derrida pronounces writing as 'cut off' or 'orphaned':

To write is to produce a mark that will constitute a sort of machine which is productive in turn, and which my future disappearance will not, in principle, hinder in its functioning [...] writing [is] an iterative structure, cut off from all absolute responsibility, from *consciousness* as the ultimate authority, orphaned and separated at birth from the assistance of its father.<sup>42</sup>

We can find a qualification of what Derrida means by an author's name in his essay 'Two Words for Joyce': by 'Joyce' '(I prefer to talk here of an event rather than a work or subject or author)' – and I will explore Derrida's responses to Joyce in detail in chapter four.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, in a prefiguration of Barthes, Julia Kristeva's notions of intertextuality in 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel' – her 1966 analysis of Michel Bakhtin – also respond to the author question: 'The writer [...] becomes an anonymity, an absence, a blank space'.<sup>44</sup> Her theory of intertextuality argues that 'each word (text) is an intersection of word (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read', and that 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another'.<sup>45</sup> In the next decade reader-response criticism developed, emphasising the role of the reader. As Wolfgang Iser describes in *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, published in German in 1976 and English in 1978, the approach 'brings into play the imaginative and perceptive faculties of the reader'.<sup>46</sup> Iser's theorising is not explicitly concerned with the author, and cannot be described as anti-authorial: he describes 'the literary work as two poles, which we might call the artistic and the aesthetic: the artistic pole is the author's text and the aesthetic is the realization accomplished

---

<sup>41</sup> Jacques Derrida, 'The Exorbitant. Question of Method', in Burke, *Authorship*, 117-24 (118); Chris Baldick, *Criticism and Literary Theory from 1890 to the Present* (London: Longman, 1996), 172.

<sup>42</sup> Derrida, 'Signature Event Context', trans. Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman, *Glyph 1* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), 180-1.

<sup>43</sup> Derrida, 'Two Words for Joyce', in *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, ed. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 145-58, (146).

<sup>44</sup> Julia Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel', in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 64-91 (74). This essay was written in 1966, but first published in 1969.

<sup>45</sup> Kristeva, 66.

<sup>46</sup> Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), x. (This translation has no named translator: it is owned by Johns Hopkins 1978, from 1976 *Der Act des Lesens. Theorie Ästhetischer Wirkung*.)

by the reader. [...] This is not to deny the vital importance of each of the two poles'.<sup>47</sup> Iser does, however, focus on an active reader with a role in the text: 'the message is transmitted in two ways, in that the reader "receives" it by composing it', he argues, further defining 'the meaning of a literary text' as 'not a definable entity but, if anything, a dynamic happening'.<sup>48</sup> This approach firmly focuses on effect rather than meaning, seeking for 'what literature *does* and not what it *means*'.<sup>49</sup> The active reader who participates in the text does not, however, here rely upon or cause the absence of the author; the author is rather put to one side, their importance preserved and the question of their authority left unasked.

### 3. Long live the Author!

The homogenised author-centric version of 'ordinary culture' and literary criticism presented by Barthes was not completely accurate. The above developments were not the first in European or Anglo-American academia to try and move emphasis away from the author; as Burke argues, the author had been or was being displaced within New Criticism, Russian Formalism, and Prague Structuralism (*DR*, 25). W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, for example, in the 1946 essay 'The Intentional Fallacy' state 'Critical inquiries are not settled by consulting the oracle' – an attitude that, though more by ignoring than removing, does not look to the author for explanations.<sup>50</sup> New Criticism and its attendant anti-intentionalism was well-established in American academia by the 1960s, though younger critics were beginning to turn to a phenomenology 'centred upon an all-inaugurating authorial *cogito*', according to Burke. One argument in *The Death and Return of the Author* is that the academic context of America in particular led to ways in which the death of the author was received and absorbed 'without essential modifications' (*DR*, 173). In 1966 Johns Hopkins University hosted an international symposium, 'The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man'. Burke describes 'the Anglo-American critical scene' as

completely ill equipped for what was in store, for not only had French theory effectively passed over into a structuralist methodology largely unknown outside Europe, but certain of the participants – Derrida in particular – were taken up with the necessity of moving beyond phenomenology *and* structuralism. (*DR*, 175)

Burke argues that following the impact of the symposium, particularly of Derrida's 'Structure, Sign and Play', 'the American avant-garde' now needed 'to think through and beyond a phenomenological methodology that had not yet been properly assimilated or understood' (*DR*, 176). With slightly patronising hindsight, Burke pulls apart the ways in which American

---

<sup>47</sup> Iser, 21.

<sup>48</sup> Iser, 21-2.

<sup>49</sup> Iser, 53.

<sup>50</sup> 'From "The Intentional Fallacy"', in Burke, *Authorship*, 90-100 (99).

critics then used the ideas of poststructuralism and the death of the author in the years that followed, detailing the reversals of younger phenomenology-aligned critics and the resultant similarity of the ‘new’ approaches to the old New Criticism: ‘Fragments of a specifically directed, rigorous, and highly technical critique have been put to the service of a freeplaying literary criticism eager to sideline the question of the author rather than to debate and contest the issues it raises’ (*DR*, 177). He sees little practical difference to the intentional fallacy in the way anti-authorial ideas were applied (a point he makes again in *Authorship*), arguing that critics behave as if Derrida, Barthes, and Foucault have ‘proved’ the death of the Author to such an extent that it no longer needs to be debated (*DR*, 16 and 179).

Burke is a little guilty of just what he accuses Barthes: adding urgency to his approach by declaring that ‘the texts of the death of the author remain closed to investigation, revision, or critique’; that ‘the author-question has largely been lost’ (*DR*, 17). Though the first full-length monograph explicitly on the topic, Burke’s 1992 *The Death and Return of the Author* (later editions in 1998 and 2008) appears now, twenty five years on, to be more a culmination of an increased engagement with and rejection of anti-authorialism. Jack Stillinger’s *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* for instance, published 1991, approaches the author question as part of a discussion of multiple, editorial authorship;<sup>51</sup> however direct engagement with Barthes et al played out mostly in journal articles and chapters from the mid-1980s to the early 1990s. These include Alexander Nehemas’ 1986 article ‘What an Author Is’, an exploration of interpretation which engages specifically with Foucault and claims that ‘No reading can fail to generate an author’;<sup>52</sup> Theresa Enos’ elaborately-titled 1990 article ‘Reports of the “Author’s” Death May Be Greatly Exaggerated but the “Writer” Lives on in the Text’, which tries to ‘acknowledge the presence of the writer in the text itself’;<sup>53</sup> Colin MacCabe’s chapter ‘The Revenge of the Author’, in 1991’s *Subject to History: Ideology, Class, Gender*;<sup>54</sup> and Moriarty’s aforementioned discussions in his 1991 *Roland Barthes*.<sup>55</sup> Though for the most part a discussion of how the death of the author does not work within a cinematic context, MacCabe’s arguments do include one of the rare instances of Barthes and

---

<sup>51</sup> The 1982 and 1991 work of Folkenflik and McKeon also suggest an ongoing academic interest in authorship.

<sup>52</sup> Alexander Nehamas, ‘What an Author Is’, *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 83, no. 11, Eighty-Third Annual Meeting American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division (Nov., 1986), 685-91 (690).

<sup>53</sup> Theresa Enos, ‘Reports of the ‘Author’s’ Death May Be Greatly Exaggerated but the ‘Writer’ Lives on in the Text’, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 4, Essays in Honor of George Yoos (Autumn, 1990), 339-46 (339).

<sup>54</sup> Colin MacCabe, ‘The Revenge of the Author’, in *Subject to History: Ideology, Class, Gender*, ed. David Simpson (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. 1991), 34-46.

<sup>55</sup> Other articles and chapters from this period include Nancy K. Miller’s ‘Arachnologies: The Woman, The Text, and the Critic’, in *The Poetics of Gender*, published in 1986; Susan Stanford Friedman’s 1991 essay ‘Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author’; Clara Claiborne Park, ‘Author! Author! Reconstructing Roland Barthes’, *The Hudson Review*, vol. 43, no. 3 (1990-1), 377-98; William H. Gass, ‘The Death of the Author’ *Salmagundi*, no. 65 (Fall, 1984), 3-26; and Denis Hollier, ‘Foucault: The Death of the Author’, *Raritan*, vol. 5, no. 1 (1985), 22-30.

Joyce being mentioned together. As part of his historicist reading of anti-authorialism MacCabe looks at the mass literacy of the early twentieth-century:

This historical situation is one of the crucial determinations of modernism, when all universal claims for art seem fatally compromised. Barthes' fundamental aesthetic is borrowed from the modernist reaction to this problem – a writing for an ideal and unspecified reader, for that reader who, in Nietzsche's memorable phrase is "far off," that ideal Joycean reader who devotes an entire life to the perusal of a single text.<sup>56</sup>

The strategy of linking modernism to the death of the author is not unrelated to Burke's reading of the similarities between New Critical removals of the author and later uses of Barthes et al, given the strong links typically seen between New Criticism and the modernist ideas of writers including T. S. Eliot.<sup>57</sup> The relationships between modernism and Barthes (and poststructuralism more generally) propounded by writers like Peter Ackroyd, whose 1976 *Notes for a New Culture* helped to introduce poststructuralist ideas to the United Kingdom, are used by MacCabe to challenge the death of the author.<sup>58</sup> In his highly enthusiastic *Notes* Ackroyd argues that 'borrowing from the modernist tradition is very much in evidence' in Barthes' work, citing his prioritisation of language; MacCabe also finds 'borrowing', but relates it negatively to Barthes' 'classless, genderless, completely indeterminate reader'.<sup>59</sup> It is worth observing that MacCabe is often similarly credited with bringing French theory into UK academia in the 1970s; his approach had changed significantly by 1991.<sup>60</sup> In the same year, Moriarty's study – lacking the explicitly New Historicist agenda of much of *Subject to History* – views Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' as 'one of his easiest pieces to misread'.<sup>61</sup> Moriarty's reading of 'The Death of the Author' is one of the very few at the time which does not seek to overturn its famous argument, though Moriarty does detail Barthes' changeability on the topic: 'the eclipse of the author in Barthes's work is merely temporary'.<sup>62</sup> Burke's *The Death and Return of the Author* is therefore a more general trend writ large, rather than the first re-opening of a closed discussion: those writers who engage critically with anti-authorial theory from the mid-1980s onwards tend to do so to resist the death of the author.

---

<sup>56</sup> MacCabe, 137.

<sup>57</sup> In Louis Menand and Lawrence Rainey's introduction to *Modernism and The New Criticism*, volume seven of *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, they urge caution of the link implied by the text's title: 'Although it is a commonplace to assimilate modernism and the New Criticism to one another, sometimes treating the latter as if it were merely a more systematic, more philosophical, or more academic articulation of formalist undercurrents within modernism, much is lost in assigning to either the kind of monolithic coherence such a claim presumes.' *Modernism and the New Criticism*, ed. A. Walton Litz, Menand, and Rainey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-14 (3).

<sup>58</sup> In his preface to the 1993 Revised Edition, Ackroyd acknowledges 'if I may indulge in a small bout of self-congratulation (if you cannot do so in a preface to one of your books, where can you?), I believe that this was one of the first works published in England to analyse the writings of Lacan and Derrida.' *Notes for a New Culture* (London: Alkin Books, 1993), 8-9.

<sup>59</sup> Ackroyd, 115, and MacCabe, 38.

<sup>60</sup> As I will discuss in chapter four; MacCabe's 1979 monograph *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* has significance in Joyce studies' engagements with literary theory.

<sup>61</sup> Moriarty, 2.

<sup>62</sup> Moriarty, 2.

*The Death and Return of the Author* has a clear primary aim: to re-examine the texts by Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida that have been received as anti-authorial. In doing so, Burke also analyses that reception itself, with resoundingly negative judgement. His central argument, that ‘the concept of the author is never more alive than when pronounced dead’, combines these readings of text and reception to outline a two-sided return: ‘the return of the author [...] as it inevitably occurs in the practice of anti-authorial criticism; and the return to the author that poststructuralism in general has yet to make at the level of theory despite its failure to circumvent subjectivity at the level of its readings’ (*DR*, 7). Burke prologues his study with a particular moment in history: the revelation in the late 1980s that Paul de Man wrote for a collaborationist newspaper between 1940 and 1942 in Nazi-occupied Belgium. As Burke describes, de Man’s secret past shed a new light on his anti-biographical and anti-authorial theoretical stances: ‘De Man’s denial of biography, his ideas of autobiography as de-facement, have come to be seen not as disinterested theoretical statements, but as sinister and meticulous acts of self-protection, by which he sought to (a)void his historical self’ (*DR*, 2). His interpretation of the response to de Man’s past, that ‘it shows how the principle of the author most powerfully reasserts itself when thought absent’, summarises the focus of *The Death and Return of the Author* (*DR*, 6). Turning first to Barthes, Burke’s reading includes dissection not only of his fictionalised author-centric context – Barthes’ attempt to add ‘a greater urgency’ to his arguments by presenting a picture of ‘ordinary culture’ in which ‘All author-positions are subsumed under an essentially nineteenth-century theocentrism’ – but also the relationship of ‘The Death of the Author’ to *S/Z* and Barthes’ later, increasingly autobiographical, writing (*DR*, 25). By reading ‘The Death of the Author’ as belonging to an early stage of the work that resulted in *S/Z*, Burke shifts the focus (or intentions) of Barthes’ work at that time: ‘the abolition of the author is the necessary and sufficient step to bring about the end of a representational view of language, for it is only through the function of the author as the possessor of meaning that textual language is made obeisant to an extra textual reality’ (*DR*, 41). He concludes that ‘Quite apart from being the God who dwells in the signified, the author is merely the *agent of verisimilitude*’ and that ‘What Roland Barthes has been talking of all along is not the death of the author, but the closure of representation’ (*DR*, 43 and 45). His analyses of Foucault and Derrida follow a similar strategy, correcting so-argued mis-readings and locating the return of the author in the work of each. Later, bringing together his discussion of the contradictory way in which critics seek the authority of these three writers in order to argue against authority, he concludes that ‘authorial absence can never be a cognitive statement about literature and discourse in general, but only an intra-critical statement and one which has little to say about the authors themselves except in so far as the idea of authorship reflects on the activity and status of the critic’ (*DR*, 169).

Burke worries finally that arguments against the death of the author have been and will become again arguments against theory, and claims rather that ‘the question of the author poses itself ever more urgently, not as a question within theory but as the question *of* theory’ (*DR*, 184). This concern is well-grounded, as a prevalent mode of refusing the death of the author has been, and continues to be, part of a more general turn from theory. This attitude plays out elaborately within Joyce studies, as I will explore in chapter four, but can for now be illustrated sufficiently with Patrick Parrinder’s 1987 *The Failure of Theory: Essays on Criticism and Contemporary Fiction*. Parrinder prefaces his study with a list of literary theory’s failed resolutions, including ‘There is not much to be learnt from contemporary novelists, dramatist and poets. The author is dead. Long live the Theorist!’<sup>63</sup> More specific objections to the death of the author have developed within literary theory, however: in the work of E. D. Hirsch, demanding in his 1967 text *Validity in Interpretation* the relevance of both author and authorial intention; in ongoing uses of and references to Wayne C. Booth’s 1961 *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (an updated and expanded edition of which also appeared in 1983) and the concept of an ‘implied author’ that readers find in texts; and in identity-related, political, and historical approaches to literature. Feminist literary theory, for example, had to address the incompatibility of its anti-authorial poststructuralist roots and its need to focus on the author at an early stage of its development. Cheryl Walker’s 1990 article ‘Feminist Literary Criticism and the Author’ explores this difficulty:

I wish to examine the ways in which feminist critics have moved away from what some would call the old-fashioned assumption that what we do when we read is try to decipher the intentions of the text in terms of what we assume to be the author’s deepest self. I also wish to make a further argument for reanimating the author, preserving author-function not only in terms of reception theory, as Foucault would seem at one point to advocate, but also in terms of a politics of author recognition.<sup>64</sup>

As Walker argues, at that point in American feminist critical theory approaches to the author were neither anti-authorial nor author-centric; ‘What we are often seeking as feminists, it seems, is a third position.’<sup>65</sup> Despite thorough readings of Barthes, Foucault, and contemporary literary criticism, Walker’s article expresses a need more than a solution. Solutions are offered, however, in Nancy K. Miller’s 1986 essay ‘Arachnologies: The Woman, The Text, and the Critic’. Reading the story of Arachne, and previous critical readings of the same, Miller opposes Barthes and those who would remove the author from a text. We should instead, she argues, ‘put one’s finger – figuratively – on the place of production that marks the

---

<sup>63</sup> Patrick Parrinder, *The Failure of Theory: Essays on Criticism and Contemporary Fiction* (Brighton: Harvester, 1987), ix.

<sup>64</sup> Cheryl Walker, ‘Feminist Literary Criticism and the Author’, *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 16, no. 3 (Spring, 1990), 551-71 (553).

<sup>65</sup> Walker, 555.

spinner's attachment to her web'.<sup>66</sup> Five years later, Susan Stanford Friedman addresses Kristevan and Barthesian ideas of intertextuality with Miller's arguments, advocating in her 1991 essay 'Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author' for a return to the author beyond the field of feminist literary criticism.<sup>67</sup>

More recently, the essays of anti-authorialism have been revisited. Adrian Wilson's 2004 close reading of Foucault's 'What is an Author?' in the *Modern Language Review* explicitly continues the early-1990s discussion that culminated in Burke's *The Death and Return of the Author* – and picks up the conclusion of authorial return – while 2008's *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*, edited by Stephen Donovan, Danuta Fjellestad, and Rolf Lundén, includes a rare beast of the last ten years: an article focusing on Barthes' 'The Death of the Author'. Jeremy Hawthorn, in 'Authority and the Death of the Author', seconds the observation of the editors, that

the figure of the author continues to thrive with undiminished if not unchallenged power in many areas of literary studies – in the production of scholarly editions, in learned societies organized around the figure of the author, in the awarding of Nobel and other literary prizes, and on numerous websites.<sup>68</sup>

Hawthorn uses an example from Woody Allen's 1977 film *Annie Hall* to illustrate popular views within and without literary studies. In the scene he references, Allen's character is stuck in a cinema queue near someone loudly interpreting several films and the work of Marshall McLuhan. Allen's character disagrees with him, and daydreams of summoning McLuhan to silence the interpreter. As Hawthorn notes, it 'encapsulates a complex of popular attitudes toward the issue of textual authority and authorship. The owner of meaning is the author'.<sup>69</sup> I would add that it also describes our urge towards the author, as Allen explicitly portrays the wish fulfilment of having the author explain the text to us in real time. The right interpretation is the author's, and the critic who follows the author is correct.<sup>70</sup> Advocating in his essay a middle ground of sorts, Hawthorn concludes that 'The author's authority is not fixed: it varies

---

<sup>66</sup> Nancy K. Miller's 'Arachnologies: The Woman, The Text, and the Critic', in *The Poetics of Gender*, ed. Nancy K. Miller (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 270-95 (288).

<sup>67</sup> Neither Miller nor Friedman's articles are discussed by Burke in *The Death and Return of the Author*.

<sup>68</sup> 'Introduction: Author, Authorship, Authority, and Other Matters', in *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*, ed. Stephen Donovan, Danuta Fjellestad, and Rolf Lundén (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008), 1-19 (13).

<sup>69</sup> Jeremy Hawthorn, 'Authority and the Death of the Author', in *Authority Matters*, 65-88 (65).

<sup>70</sup> The comedy of the scene rests on Allen's character's neuroticism, his inability to ignore a show-off intellectual and listen to Annie. We can find something more sinister at work, however. Allen has repeatedly been at the centre of discussions revolving around the significance of a creator's life to their creations, a debate relevant to this thesis but regrettably lying outside its scope. Commentators have begun to draw connections between accusations made about Allen and the content of his films – the frequent representations within them of older Allen-esque men with very young women, the jokes about abuse and incest – with one critic arguing in the feminist magazine *Bitch* that Allen has 'spent the last 40 years of his life making films about the abuse he commits in his personal life'. If Allen as director/author owns the meaning of his work, then he can silence such negative interpretations – which has troubling implications. Dahlia Grossman-Heinze, 'The witch hunt is coming for you, Woody Allen' published on *Bitch*, 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017 <<https://www.bitchmedia.org/article/woody-allen-witch-hunt>> [accessed 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017].

– along with other forms of authority – in relation to what we want of a literary work’.<sup>71</sup> Other more recent critical engagement with the death of the author has appeared in new contexts: Jane Gallop’s 2011 *The Deaths of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time* is an interesting instance of this, aiming to defamiliarize the term ‘death of the Author’ ‘to think the abstract theoretical death along with the real loss of the author’ and ‘reconsider[...] the death of the author in the era of queer theory’.<sup>72</sup> The field of celebrity studies, too, has provided a new mode of reading authorship in its focus on conscious constructions of self by authors as celebrities. Rebecca Braun’s 2008 study *Constructing Authorship in the Work of Günter Grass* draws on this, looking very much at public authorship and what she views as Grass’ conscious and purposeful engagement with ideas of authorship. Analysing, in a specifically German context, the contradictions between the theoretical death of the author and author-focused public culture, Braun rereads Barthes’ and Foucault’s anti-authorialism – with particular reference to Wilson’s readings of the latter – to inform her claims of Grass’ ‘developing manipulation of authorship as a cultural and textual construct’.<sup>73</sup> Braun draws also on the work of Aaron Jaffe, who in his 2005 monograph *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* re-examines both Barthes’ and Foucault’s essays in terms of celebrity as an authorial form of self-fashioning linked to modernism (and due to his direct engagement with Joyce, I will return to Jaffe in chapter four). Braun and Jaffe’s approaches form yet more returns to the author – not in terms of biographical positivism or as a means to close the meanings of literary texts, but rather by indirectly arguing that what an author ‘is’ can be controlled, or authorised, by the author. The question of the author falls out of fashion again beyond these limited contexts, either despite or due to the increasing popularity of author-centric historical, political, and identity-related approaches to literary theory and criticism.

Barthes’ representation of an ‘ordinary culture’ tyrannically focused on the author remains familiar, and we can find a contemporary version of Woody Allen’s cinema-queue online. Allowing unprecedented access to the thoughts and opinions of authors, Twitter has been host to passionate literary debate in recent years. As one of the world’s best-known and most successful living authors, J. K. Rowling’s significant Twitter presence garners immense response – whether she is discussing politics, charity work, or her own texts. Rowling often tweets extra-textual clarifications of *Harry Potter* plot points or characters; authorised interpretations which are not only broadcast on Twitter but re-broadcast on news blogs, online cultural magazines, and the websites of national newspapers. The interactions that follow these

---

<sup>71</sup> Hawthorn, 88.

<sup>72</sup> Jane Gallop, *The Deaths of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011), 5.

<sup>73</sup> Rebecca Braun, *Constructing Authorship in the Work of Günter Grass* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9.

authoritative statements re-enact the debates of anti-authorialism, with some commenters thanking Rowling for confirming their own readings or revealing the ‘right’ reading, while others lambast her for attempting to correct readers. When her revelations were more complex than simply detailing the motives of a character, extending instead to the hidden sexual orientations and religious identities of several characters, the response evolved one step further: questioning why Rowling had not written a more explicitly diverse set of characters to circumvent the need for later explication, one online writer was led to reference the ultimate authority to end authorial authority: ‘The Death of the Author’.<sup>74</sup> Meanwhile, at literary festivals or the readings of authors short-listed for literary prizes, audience members ask probing questions of method and intention; the same are asked in interviews on screen or in print. The way in which a writer’s personality and life influences their work continues to be the focus of popular literary culture, and their role as arbiters of meaning continues to be asserted. Where this also emerges in academia the question ‘why?’ rarely follows. The academic sphere currently most focused on authorship is the least able to question it: creative writing studies continues to gain strength and popularity and seems only to solidify the author’s control over their text, its meaning, how to read it, where it came from. Genetic criticism, which we could see as its counterpart, might achieve the same: constructing an author and their intentions from drafts and notes. The enduring popularity of fiction about authors, meanwhile, reveals cultural tastes: we are fascinated by authors and authorship, by the ‘artist as hero’, but we like it best seen through the lens of an author.

In his introduction to *Authorship* Burke argues that ‘the inability of theoretical models to encompass the disruptive enigma of authorship strengthens rather than weakens its claim on our attention’.<sup>75</sup> This suggests to me two things. The first is how remarkable it is that statements describing romantic attitudes towards authors, written by Abrams before the arrival and reception of poststructuralist ‘theoretical models’, are enduringly accurate descriptions of general attitudes towards the figure of the author. The second is that for Burke, despite the inclusion of a few short works of literature in *Authorship* and the odd literary reference in *The Death and Return*, it is up to theory – not literature – to encompass ‘the disruptive enigma of authorship’. The theoretical and philosophical focus of his studies suggests this, and his own history of the author and analyses of anti-authorialism do not entertain the notion that a questioning of author, reader, and text can be provoked by literature – could arise not from theoretical texts but from literary ones (even Barthes and Foucault begin and end with literature in their essays). That the questions that form the basis of my thesis are explored in

---

<sup>74</sup> Michelle Smith, ‘The “death” of J. K. Rowling: Why it doesn’t matter what she has to say about Harry Potter’ <<http://theconversation.com/the-death-of-j-k-rowling-why-it-doesnt-matter-what-she-has-to-say-about-harry-potter-35762>> [accessed 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017].

<sup>75</sup> Burke, *Authorship*, x.

critical theory is not to be denied. How they arise elsewhere, and how poststructuralist theory is only a recent manifestation of such questions, are the concerns of this research. It is these questions the following chapters address: questions of authority, of the author as creator, of the idea of genius; how life relates to work, how authors can be written, the relevance of personality; the reader as arbiter of meaning, the joining of reading and writing, the effects of rereading and rewriting; the text as many texts, as open and infinite, for playing rather than solving; and the co-existence of open text, active reader, and author.

## Chapter Two

### Reading Joyce I: Early Criticism

Joycean critics have long written about Joycean criticism. Such self-reflexive tendencies are apparent in the number of published meta-critical studies, including Janet Egleson Dunleavy's edited volume *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 1991; Geert Lernout and Alan Roughley's round-ups of theory in Joyce criticism, published 1990 and 1991 respectively; Michael Patrick and Paula F. Gillespie's 2000 *Recent Criticism of James Joyce's 'Ulysses': An Analytical Review*; and Joseph Brooker's *Joyce's Critics*, published 2004.<sup>1</sup> One good reason for such surveys is the volume of existing critical works on Joyce's texts, disproving this note in a 1965 issue of the *James Joyce Quarterly*: 'There was some concern expressed two years ago when the *JJQ* was started that after a year or two there would be a dearth of manuscripts of publishable quality dealing with Joyce.'<sup>2</sup> Since then, as Brooker highlights, the size and growth of the field has been repeatedly complained about and thus increased: 'the already "excessive" quantity of writing on Joyce has been exceeding itself'.<sup>3</sup> Studies of studies help readers navigate an intimidating mass of criticism, but can also serve critical purposes: arguing for the re-canonisation of an overlooked work, reappraising established ideas, evaluating a particular mode or modes of criticism, or outlining patterns in previous critical thought. In this vein, the aim of this chapter and its partner, chapter four, is to analyse the ways in which the field of Joyce studies has engaged with questions of authorship, readership, and textuality.

This chapter looks back at a selection of early works of *Ulysses* criticism, Joyce's involvement in critical exegeses, and the resultant habits that form in critical works that predate or preclude Joyce studies' engagement with literary theory from the 1970s and 1980s onwards; chapter four will investigate the Joycean response to theory. The division of scope for each chapter cannot be strictly chronological: I have qualified 'predate' with 'or preclude' to indicate the blurry overlapping of 'pre'- and 'post'-theory within the Joycean critical sphere. In this chapter I will explore the reception of critical works from Stuart Gilbert's Joyce-authorized study *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*, published in 1930, up to and including Hugh Kenner's 1980 study *'Ulysses'*. I am arranging my discussion of studies by Gilbert, Harry Levin, Richard M. Kain, A. Walton Litz, David Hayman, and Kenner around three focal

---

<sup>1</sup> *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991); Geert Lernout, *The French Joyce* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990); Alan Roughley, *James Joyce and Critical Theory: An Introduction* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991); Michael Patrick Gillespie and Paula F. Gillespie, *Recent Criticism of James Joyce's 'Ulysses': An Analytical Review* (Rochester: Camden House, 2000); and Joseph Brooker, *Joyce's Critics: Transitions in Reading and Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> Thomas F. Staley, 'Notes and Comments', *JJQ*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Fall, 1965), 1-2 (1).

<sup>3</sup> Brooker, 3.

points: how critics responded to the emphasis Gilbert placed on the Homeric schema, the critical conflation and separation of Stephen Dedalus and Joyce, and the ways in which these early critical works prefigure later theoretical approaches. Hovering in the background of all three is Joyce's role in Gilbert's study, an involved authorial presence found also in the schema given to Carlo Linati, in Frank Budgen's 1934 work *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses'*, and in 1929's *Our Exagmination Round his Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*.

How to read the author in Joyce studies is not often asked by Joycean critics; two exceptions are Patrick A. McCarthy, whose article in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism* I refer to below; and Hugh Kenner. Both do so while discussing Gilbert and other early critics:

The trouble Joyce took to get *Ulysses* explicated while making the explications seem to come from other men resembles Dedalus' trouble over his wings: a contrivance to negate the side-effects of an over-successful contrivance. It is behind Val[é]ry Larbaud and Stuart Gilbert and Frank Budgen that the artist disappears, nail-file in hand. It was they, at his behest, who equipped the great affirmation of meaninglessness with meaning. We have been carrying on their work ever since [...] And Joyce, despite the most diligent biographical effort, has meanwhile ascended on unexpected wings into the air and out of sight. (*J'sV*, 62-3)<sup>4</sup>

Kenner's reading of the author has not been picked up and developed, nor is the link he playfully makes between the author who meddles in criticism, who meddles with reading, and the author described by Stephen in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Joyce sticks his oar in there too: in Budgen's *The Making of 'Ulysses'* readers are admonished by Joyce's complaint that "Some people who read my book, *A Portrait of the Artist* forget that it is called *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*", emphasising 'as a young man'.<sup>5</sup> Budgen's study defends the importance of Bloom, not Stephen, in *Ulysses*, and does so with the author's stamp of approval. The presence within early Joyce studies of authorially-approved readings of *Ulysses* leaves subtle traces, and this is a key reason for returning to Gilbert in this chapter, and Budgen in chapter six, where I will discuss biography in Joyce criticism. Joyce's involvement complicates the roles of critics, and muddies the question of how we should read *Ulysses* – a text which so completely refutes the idea of there being any one 'right' reading. These authorial traces are preserved, and, as I will discuss in chapter four, Joyce studies overwhelmingly turns away from examining them. From the early works which form the foundations of the field, to the continuing boom of new critical texts, every piece of Ulyssean criticism involves an implicit decision of how to read the relationship between the author and the text of *Ulysses*. Reading *Ulysses* informs, and is informed by, these decisions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Katherine Mullin, in *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity*, describes this 'affirmation of meaninglessness with meaning' as a protest by Joyce, Gilbert, Larbaud and Pound against the legal battles *Ulysses* faced – battles with censorship she argues Joyce 'anticipated, provoked and, eventually, profited from' (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 203.

<sup>5</sup> Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and The Making of 'Ulysses'* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 60.

### 1. 'Critical propaganda'

In 'Ulysses, Order, and Myth', published in *The Dial* in November 1923, T. S. Eliot cites two earlier critical responses to *Ulysses* as preludes to a defence of Joyce's 'mythical method'.<sup>6</sup> Pointedly retorting, Eliot's essay lauds Valéry Larbaud and derides Richard Aldington; Larbaud's 1921 lecture is a 'valuable paper', while Aldington's review is just 'pathetic solicitude for the half-witted' (Eliot, 175 and 176). First given as a lecture in Paris, December 1921, then published in the *Nouvelle Revue Française* in April 1922 and in an English translation by Eliot in *The Criterion* that October, Larbaud's Joyce-authorized reading identifies the 'key' of *Ulysses* as 'on the cover', its titular relationship to the *Odyssey*.<sup>7</sup> Richard Aldington's review of *Ulysses*, 'The Influence of James Joyce', published in *The English Review* in April 1921, calls Joyce 'a prophet of chaos', ignores 'the parallel to the *Odyssey*' and as a result 'seems to [...] fail by this oversight' in Eliot's view (Eliot, 175). Aldington's 'oversight' is matched, and furthered, in the better-known opinions of Ezra Pound: viewing Joyce's Homeric 'correspondences' as 'chiefly his own affair, a scaffold, a means of construction, justified by the result, and justifiable by it only'.<sup>8</sup> Aligning himself with Larbaud and positioned against Pound and his kind, Eliot refuses the idea that the mythical parallel is 'an amusing dodge, or scaffolding erected by the author for the purpose of disposing his realistic tale, of no interest in the completed structure' (Eliot, 175). He defends and promotes the 'mythical method' as 'simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history' (Eliot, 177). However, Eliot's article and its arguments that this method is 'a step toward making the modern world possible for art' could not halt less-positive reactions to *Ulysses* (Eliot, 178). In the chapter 'An Analysis of the Mind of James Joyce' in Wyndham Lewis' 1927 work *Time and Western Man*, Lewis eloquently accuses *Ulysses*: 'It is a suffocating mœtic expanse of objects, all of them lifeless, the sewage of a Past twenty years old, all neatly arranged in a meticulous sequence.'<sup>9</sup> The importance of the *Odyssey* is dismissed, and the matter in Joyce's composition luridly described:

So rich was its delivery, its pent-up outpouring so vehement, that it will remain, eternally cathartic, a monument like a record diarrhoea [...] he collected like a cistern in his youth the last stagnant pumpings of Victorian Anglo-Irish life [...] then when he was ripe, as it were, he discharged it, in a dense mass, to his eternal glory.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> T. S. Eliot, 'Ulysses, Order, and Myth', in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber, 1975), 175-8 (178). All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>7</sup> Valéry Larbaud, 'James Joyce', in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Robert H. Deming, 2 vols. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), 252-62 (260).

<sup>8</sup> Ezra Pound, 'Paris Letter, *Ulysses*', May 1922, in *Early Writings: Poems and Prose*, ed. Ira B. Nadel (London: Penguin, 2005), 334-41 (338). Appeared in the *Dial*, June 1922.

<sup>9</sup> Wyndham Lewis, *Time and Western Man* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1927), 108.

<sup>10</sup> Lewis, 109.

Corrective methods were needed, both to cement the importance of the *Odyssey* to *Ulysses* and improve the novel's reputation. In 1930 Stuart Gilbert wrote *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* with the encouragement and assistance of Joyce himself: the study 'contains nothing', Gilbert prefatorily insists, 'to which he did not give his full approbation; indeed there are several passages which I owe directly to him'.<sup>11</sup> Sharing with the public a schema of correspondences, including a list of Homeric episode titles, Gilbert also turns to Joyce's named precursor Victor Bérard in his detailing of Joyce's methods and his attempts to establish that 'James Joyce is, in fact, in the great tradition which begins with Homer' (Gilbert, 43). Patrick A. McCarthy reads Gilbert's *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* as 'intended to be an essay in critical propaganda, with an elaborate exegetical apparatus whose main purpose was to demonstrate the rationality, and therefore the respectability, of *Ulysses'*'.<sup>12</sup> Joyce's involvement has been later characterised as a manipulation rather than collaboration: from the idea that Joyce 'talked his friend Stuart Gilbert into writing the study', to viewing Joyce's suggestions – including the significance of Bérard – as 'elaborate practical jokes'.<sup>13</sup> Michael Seidel sums up the extreme: 'Gilbert is seen as a dummy who moves his lips in synchronization with his master's trickster voice.'<sup>14</sup>

As McCarthy comments, Gilbert's study was a continuation of Eliot's arguments for the 'mythical method' and his 'detailed analysis of that method was a step toward making *Ulysses* possible for much of its audience'.<sup>15</sup> In the first half of *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* Gilbert addresses many general aspects to the experiences of reading *Ulysses*, but most specifically the 'fragments of a theme or allusion' which 'have to be assimilated in the reader's mind to arrive at complete understanding' (Gilbert, 36). He looks at themes such as metamorphosis, return, and paternity, and draws attention to Bérard and Giambattista Vico – attempting to align Joyce's writing methods with those of the writer of the *Odyssey*. Translating Bérard, he suggests we can think of Joyce, like Homer, as 'a skilled arranger' (Gilbert, 87). Going into more depth than Larbaud, Eliot, or any other early defender of the Homeric in *Ulysses*, Gilbert endeavours to establish the link between the *Odyssey* and Joyce's novel as so strong, and so important, that it can no longer be overlooked by critics or readers. His firmly positive study (unsurprisingly complimentary, given who peered over his shoulder) shifts in its second half to read *Ulysses* episode by episode, quoting it extensively and so giving access to a text that

---

<sup>11</sup> Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (London: Faber, 1960), 12. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>12</sup> Patrick A. McCarthy, 'Stuart Gilbert's Guide to the Perplexed', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 23-35 (25).

<sup>13</sup> R. Brandon Kershner, 'Intertextuality', in *The Cambridge Companion to 'Ulysses'*, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 171-83 (174), and William Schutte, *Joyce and Shakespeare: A Study in the Meaning of 'Ulysses'* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957) quoted in McCarthy, 30.

<sup>14</sup> Michael Seidel, *Epic Geography: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Princeton and Guilford: Princeton University Press, 1976), xvi.

<sup>15</sup> McCarthy, 25.

was, in 1930, quite hard to come by – though this access came at the price of wading through what McCarthy reads as a ‘pedantic tone’ and ‘the humourless reverence’ of Biblical exegesis.<sup>16</sup> The significance of Gilbert’s study lies not only in its successful dissemination of the schema, with its correspondences assigning organs, arts, colours, symbols, technics, characters and a Homeric title to each episode. I see its relevance also in the critical tendencies it provoked – in both opposition and agreement – and in the openly author-authorized status of the schema. As McCarthy comments, the tone of Gilbert’s explications ‘made him an easy target for critics who regarded with suspicion Gilbert’s willingness to accept at face value whatever lead Joyce offered him’.<sup>17</sup>

One critical tendency provoked by Gilbert – though he inherited it himself from Eliot – is the urge to overturn previous critical conclusions; a corrective attitude which searches for the ‘right’ reading. The trend for correcting or moving away from Gilbert’s arguments begins most notably and influentially with 1941’s *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* by Harry Levin, who roundly rejects the prioritisation of the mythical in *Ulysses*. Though written and published after Joyce’s death, the study was written by Levin at Joyce’s suggestion.<sup>18</sup> It notably places Joyce’s texts within a literary context, attempting to ease the difficulties of *A Portrait*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake* by relating them to larger ideas and trends within the writings of others: ‘The more we study him, the less unique he seems; and the more he seems to have in common with other significant writers of the past and of the present.’<sup>19</sup> Levin specifically seeks authorial intentions in *James Joyce*, pondering for example whether Joyce might wish ‘to impose a private pattern upon the chaos of his experience’ yet arguing against the importance of the once private, now public, pattern of the schema (Levin, 20). He identifies two ‘keys’ with which to read *Ulysses*: ‘the map’ and ‘the myth’ (Levin, 66). The latter is thoroughly discounted. ‘The closeness of the correspondences between his Irish characters and their Hellenic prototypes is a point that can be, and has been, heavily laboured’, he begins, before making his best-known conclusion of the correspondences: ‘They are not there for us, but for Joyce’ (Levin, 72 and 75). He continues: ‘They are not evidence of esoteric philosophy, but of intricate technique. Utterly unshackled from the usual conventions, Joyce hedged himself in with far more complicated conditions and far more rigorous restrictions than any school of criticism would ever dare to exact’ (Levin, 75). Levin does temper these conclusions somewhat, acknowledging of the Homeric scheme that ‘No serious reader can afford to neglect it, but he need not take it quite so seriously as Gilbert takes Joyce’ (Levin, viii). As I

---

<sup>16</sup> McCarthy, 29-30.

<sup>17</sup> McCarthy, 30.

<sup>18</sup> Harry Levin, ‘Preface to the Revised Edition’, in *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk: New Directions, 1960), vi-xx.

<sup>19</sup> Levin, *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk: New Directions, 1941), viii. Unless otherwise stated, all references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

will discuss later in this chapter, Levin's pointed turn away from what can be read as a published authorial intention – the importance of the schema – and suggestions to not take Joyce too seriously sit oddly with the otherwise explicitly author and intention-focused aims of *James Joyce*. In terms of the development of *Ulysses* criticism, the significance of Levin's study lies predominantly in how later critics read the directive of 'not there for us' – querying whether a reader can, in fact, neglect the mythic framework of the novel. Levin's suspicious treatment of the Homeric scheme diminishes the authority of Gilbert's study, leading to works that look elsewhere for explanation. Two that specifically cite Levin are Richard M. Kain's *Fabulous Voyager*, which looks at a variety of predominantly non-literary printed paraphernalia such as newspapers; and A. Walton Litz's *The Art of James Joyce*, which digs into Joyce's worksheets for answers, birthing a strong genetic critical presence in the arena of Joycean criticism.

In 1947's *Fabulous Voyager* Kain investigates the factual texts woven into *Ulysses* and implicitly questions the boundaries of fiction within the novel. Naming Joyce 'the most bitterly attacked and grossly misunderstood of modern writers', he states his purpose to evaluate Gilbert's exegesis, presumably viewed as one of the gross misunderstandings.<sup>20</sup> This questioning of Gilbert's approach and the correspondences is apparent even at a structural level of Kain's study. Rather than moving through the text episode by episode or huge theme by huge theme (cf. Gilbert and Levin), he works through crucial pieces of novelistic concern: such as facts discernible without the schema, from time, date, weather; to local events, news, races, bets; pamphlets, theatre performances, even schooners; and does so using maps, newspapers, and directories to aid his reading. His disagreement with Gilbert is incrementally detailed: he summarises the Homeric correspondences in ten lines, labelling some of the associations 'arbitrary'; on 'the symbolic interpretation of *Ulysses*' he concludes 'Joyce appears to grow increasingly independent of his classical source as the story goes on'; and listed correspondences are 'never' limited to one episode (Kain, 40, 46, and 42). Developing this last objection, Kain argues that some of the correspondences of the schema are pointless – targeting the schematically-assigned colour of 'Calypso': 'The colour of orange is not even mentioned' (Kain, 42). The Blooms' 'orangekeyed chamberpot' sits unnoticed by Kain in the Eccles Street bedroom, beside a sprawled book, waiting for Bloom to stub his toe (*U*, 61). The overall impression of Kain's study, however, is not as an attack on Gilbert or the 'mythical method'. In its detailed re-enactment of a reading without recourse to the schemata, *Fabulous Voyager* does confirm the possibility of finding information such as the date and time in the text itself; but it also establishes the relevance to *Ulysses* and its readers of other texts beyond

---

<sup>20</sup> Richard M. Kain, *Fabulous Voyager: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), 5. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

the *Odyssey* and the schema: the *Freeman's Journal* and *Evening Telegraph*, maps of Dublin, and Thom's *Dublin Directory*. Kain's enthusiasm for this new mode of reading the novel runs through his study, as he investigates how 'Upon four pages of newsprint Joyce has erected the foundations of his fictional world!' (Kain, 61) As Bernard Benstock comments, '*Ulysses* criticism has never been quite the same since.'<sup>21</sup> Kain's study prompted decades of investigation into newspapers, maps, and directories, a method which expands understandings of the novel's relationship with texts beyond the realm of 'highbrow' literature, and the games it plays with the fictive/factual divide. The influence and significance of *Fabulous Voyager* leads Hugh Kenner to call Kain, quite simply, 'an innovator' (*D'sJ*, xi).

Similarly turning to external texts in a movement away from the Odyssean correspondences advocated by Gilbert, in *The Art of James Joyce* (1961) Litz instead reads Joyce's notes and manuscripts. Though also explicitly aligned with Levin and the 'not there for us' approach, there is a crucial difference between Litz and Kain's methods: both in many ways look at how *Ulysses* was formed, but while Kain's focus is on the resultant way in which we read the novel, Litz is interested predominantly in the writing, not the reading, of *Ulysses*. His recourse to Joyce's worksheets to overturn the authorially-authorized importance of the Homeric schema constitutes a return to the author himself, in order to prove him wrong. Litz focuses particularly on the revisions and additions of Joyce's writing process, with extended reference to unused notes in the worksheets. Thus he finds evidence to argue that 'Invaluable to Joyce [...] the correspondences with the *Odyssey* do not provide a major level of meaning in the completed work. Ezra Pound was right'.<sup>22</sup> Litz details the prevalence of Homeric references in the worksheets and the deletions that occurred before the text was published, illustrating Joyce's removal of certain explicit referents. His focus on the revision process does some work to undermine what McCarthy outlines as a difficulty of Gilbert's presentation of the schema: 'the implication that the plan predated the novel'. 'The impression', McCarthy argues, 'that the Homeric correspondences were incorporated into the text fairly early is the one that Joyce wanted to encourage, however, for it made the parallels seem an integral part of the book's texture rather than an extraneous overlay of symbolism.'<sup>23</sup> By detailing the additions and removals of the drafting processes of *Ulysses*, Litz argues that exhibiting the 'mechanical nature' of Joyce's compositional process emphasises 'the mechanical nature of those ordering principles which give *Ulysses* its superficial unity, and which sometimes obscure the deeper unity of the novel' (Litz, 27). Clarifying his conclusion, Litz states: 'The

---

<sup>21</sup> Bernard Benstock, 'The Fabulous Voyaging of Richard M. Kain', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 8-22 (10).

<sup>22</sup> A. Walton Litz, *The Art of James Joyce: Method and Design in 'Ulysses' and 'Finnegans Wake'* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 21. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>23</sup> McCarthy, 30.

artistic effects [Joyce] sought to achieve while reworking the early episodes and writing the later ones do not depend on our conscious recognition of the analogies he was strengthening' (Litz, 52). Using a new methodology, Litz re-evidences the opinion of the Homeric as 'an amusing dodge': 'Joyce, in revising *Ulysses*, ran the danger of placing disproportionate emphasis on the schema of the novel' (Litz, 52). Litz's study is a fairly negative critique, peppered with unfavourable opinions of Joyce's abilities, however his reading of the 'neutral patterns, arbitrary scaffolds' that 'tend to exist for their own sake, *imposing* order rather than reflecting it', is one of the earliest instances of manuscript or archival work in Joyce studies (Litz, 123). It is intriguing that here this mode of analysis forms Litz's reaction to what could be described as an authorised worksheet, the schema.

Gilbert's study and the Homeric elements of *Ulysses* have, however, been reclaimed. In his Joycean texts written between the 1950s and 1980s Hugh Kenner seeks an influential reappraisal of Gilbert and the mythical method.<sup>24</sup> *Dublin's Joyce*, published 1956, marks the return of Ulyssean criticism to the Homeric. From the eleventh chapter onwards of this far-ranging study Kenner explores how 'the Homeric situation – Homer's world – is *in Joyce's text*, because Joyce found it in Dublin' (*D'sJ*, 180), how the Homeric correspondences in *Ulysses* are both comic and serious, and how the universal nature of the *Odyssey* is appropriate for *Ulysses* and has the effect of establishing it within a tradition. Kenner makes the relationship between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* less eccentric and less intimidating in a variety of ways (for example emphasising the intricate relationship between *Ulysses*, the *Odyssey*, and *Hamlet*), and exhibits how it can aid rather than stymie reading the text – a critical first. He sees value in Gilbert's schema, but points out that the lists of correspondences cannot be expected to 'explain' all – plotting a middle ground between Gilbert and Levin (*D'sJ*, 225). Kenner's treatment of Gilbert might best be characterised as affectionately mocking: on Joyce and his critics, he suggests Joyce 'also appears to have taken revenge in the most elaborate legpull of his career: he permitted [...] Stuart Gilbert, to believe that his useful book was the authorized expression of *Ulysses*' (*D'sJ*, 361). Kenner enjoys 'Mr Stuart Gilbert's timid acknowledgement that Bloom "is no servile replica of his Homeric prototype, for he has a cat instead of a dog, and a daughter instead of a son" (Joyce playfully altering a few trifles in the interests of variety)', while affirming that the variations from the Homeric are 'neither capricious nor mechanical' (*D'sJ*, 182). Amongst extended exploration of the Homeric parallels, he argues that 'the fundamental correspondence is not between incident and incident,

---

<sup>24</sup> It has been suggested that the post-war criticism of *Ulysses* can be split into two paths, one following Budgen and the other Gilbert, with Kenner and Ellmann representative of each. The importance of the Homeric – and therefore the reappraisal of Gilbert – in Kenner's readings of *Ulysses* are of equal value to Kenner's Budgen-ordained focus on Bloom, and thus suggest this division might not quite work. See Brooker, 97-100, and Jeri Johnson's introduction to *Ulysses* (*U*, xviii), both cf. Litz, 'Pound and Eliot on *Ulysses*: The Critical Tradition', in '*Ulysses*': *Fifty Years*, ed. Staley (1972; repr. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974), 5-18.

but between situation and situation,’ and that this ‘has never gotten into the critical tradition’ (*D’sJ*, 181). Kenner ultimately marries the arguments of his predecessors:

the reader should reflect that the object of reading the book is not to reconstruct the schema [...] it is not a set of answers to a puzzle [...] it was, while the book was a-writing, *affair de cuisine*; its usefulness to the reader who happens to have access to it now that the book is completed should consist in helping him focus his apprehension. (*D’sJ*, 225)

Kenner’s reclamation of the Homeric is developed throughout his later work on Joyce and, as McCarthy notes, is taken up by critics including Michael Seidel and Fritz Senn; particularly his way of viewing the Homeric parallels ‘ironically’.<sup>25</sup> A Kenner-esque mid-way point is plotted, for example, in Seidel’s comment in 1976’s *Epic Geography* that ‘A scaffold is a dispensable structure once the building is built. But if the process of building is as important as the result, the scaffold never disappears.’<sup>26</sup> An about-turn, the very act of critical reappraisal, is one legacy of Gilbert’s *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’*. ‘The principle of return,’ suggests McCarthy, ‘so crucial to Gilbert’s reading of *Ulysses*, is also a major factor in Joyce criticism, where once-popular modes of interpretation fall out of favour and then return, like Odysseus, in disguise.’<sup>27</sup>

The reception of Gilbert’s study and his advocacy of the Homeric schema has resulted in a variety of tendencies within Joyce studies. As McCarthy observes in 1991, ‘The pervasiveness of Gilbert’s influence [can] be seen in the way some of his working assumptions, and even specific observations, have come to be regarded as common property and are often repeated without attribution to their original source’<sup>28</sup> – something which can in part be explained by the way criticism, for a time, turned so absolutely away from Gilbert’s study. Given what we know of Joyce’s involvement, there is an added significance to how we understand that ‘original source’. Elements of Gilbert’s authorially-authorized study persist in *Ulysses* criticism, and continue to be either unattributed or unexamined – as I will pick up in my fourth chapter. Joyce’s ‘critical propaganda’ did not establish how to read *Ulysses*; it secured instead that ‘how’ as a central, ongoing question of Joyce studies. The idea of the Homeric in *Ulysses*, as argued for by Gilbert and the schemata, was ‘either haggled over in detail, or brushed aside as a nuisance’ (*D’sJ*, 181). Joyce’s role in this has been largely ignored, and this early phase of Joyce criticism has not been included in discussions of the relationship between the author and criticism.<sup>29</sup> Gilbert, Levin, Kain, Litz, and Kenner explore questions of authorship: in terms of the author, the author’s intentions, the author’s worksheets, or the author’s jokes, what matters to the critic or reader? In the wake of Gilbert’s

---

<sup>25</sup> McCarthy, 31.

<sup>26</sup> Seidel, xv.

<sup>27</sup> McCarthy, 32.

<sup>28</sup> McCarthy, 24.

<sup>29</sup> This is, again, something I will further explore in chapter four, as I am referring to critical studies written ‘post-theory’.

study there emerged a focus on how to read Joyce's texts, a corrective impulse within Joycean criticism formed in part by a movement away from the author's suggestions. In trying to decide how best to read Joyce's texts, however, some critics turned to a Joyce within the text: Stephen Dedalus.

## 2. 'The mind that informs *Ulysses*'

Gilbert's treatment in *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* of the relationship between Stephen and Joyce is complicated and contradictory. 'Stephen Dedalus', he argues, 'represents only one side of the author of *Ulysses*, the juvenile, self-assertive side, unmodified by mature wisdom'. Gilbert finds it easier to believe a Bloom could create a Stephen than the other way around, and criticises a 'polemist' for using Stephen as a model for Joyce's personality (Gilbert, 105-7). Despite this, Gilbert quotes Stephen's words from *Portrait* – 'The personality of the artist... passes into the narration itself, flowing round and round the persons and actions like a vital sea', and 'Old father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead' (*P*, 214 and 253) – in a way which implicitly assigns Stephen's words with an explanatory authority in discussions of *Ulysses* (Gilbert, 23 and 101). Gilbert stops short of referencing the rest of Stephen's musings on the 'personality of the artist'; the first quotation is taken from the passage that culminates in his Flaubertian theory of impersonal authorship. Levin, however, refers explicitly to Stephen's ideas – continuing and developing a method of using Stephen's words in discussions of the aesthetics of *Ulysses* or of Joyce.

Gilbert's warnings go unnoticed. Levin's greater endeavour is to read Joyce's intention, expressed in the preface of the study:

With writers, there is always what Henry James called "the figure in the carpet," a pattern woven into the warp of historical necessity by the woof of artistic intention, which it is the task of criticism to discover and set forth. With Joyce, this figure has been obscured by a luxuriant profusion of language and detail but it is nonetheless implicit in everything he wrote. (Levin, viii)

In his attempt to read authorial intention, Levin conflates Stephen and Joyce. This is first revealed in a turn of phrase, stating that Joyce 'confessed' in an unpublished part of an early *Portrait* draft.<sup>30</sup> Levin then justifies his use of Stephen's words by reading *Portrait* as 'Based on a literal transcript of the first twenty years of Joyce's life. If anything, it is more candid than other autobiographies' (Levin, 45). He therefore allows himself to read Stephen's theory of authorship as Joyce's: 'The artist, like the God of creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, paring his fingernails' (*P*,

---

<sup>30</sup> 'A tendency toward abstraction reminds us, again and again, that Joyce came to esthetics by way of theology [...] In one of the unpublished parts of the *Portrait of the Artist*, he confessed that his thought was scholastic in everything but the premises.' Levin, 25. It is unclear if this is a reference to a part of *Stephen Hero*.

215, q. Levin, 45). Levin's reading of Joyce in 'The Artist' section of his study relies on a romantic approach to authorship, seeking explanation for the complexities of text in the personality of the writer – and reading earlier work as a direct record of the writer's aesthetic views. Stephen's late-romantic impersonal author conveniently serves Levin's purposes.<sup>31</sup>

As Morton P. Levitt comments of Levin's study, it 'is needlessly limiting' to read Joyce as autobiographical.<sup>32</sup> Levitt argues that Levin's creation of a 'biographical myth' is 'directly at odds' with his arguments against the schematic scaffolding; arguments which allow us to see 'a Joyce beyond his own myth'.<sup>33</sup> In a statement which reveals his own attitude to the life-art relationship in Joyce's work, Levitt suggests that 'Given time and greater distance, any reader of Joyce can learn to note and then bypass the artist's often trivial life and go on to the real life, his art'.<sup>34</sup> I will explore Joyce studies' treatment of the life-art relationship and its uses of (auto)biography in chapter six; what is pertinent here is not the use of Stephen's life as Joyce's life as a key to the text, but the use of Stephen's aesthetic views as Joyce's aesthetic views as a key to the text. Levin is one of many; as Kenner notes in *Dublin's Joyce*, 'Most critics [...] have reached in the *Portrait* for a clue' (*D'sJ*, 167).<sup>35</sup> Levin does, however, attempt to justify his reading of Stephen as a direct mouthpiece for Joyce; other critics use his words without comment. Kain, for example, uses words from *Portrait* to detail Joyce's biography in an early section of *Fabulous Voyager* (Kain, 11-6) – later in the study, however, he queries 'But is Stephen the author of *Ulysses*?'. His brief argument is based on a reading of personalities: 'The identification of Joyce with Stephen has often been made, but the creator of Bloom is far more tolerant than Stephen.' Kain also references, without naming Budgen, Joyce's reminder 'that the *Portrait* was entitled the portrait of the artist as a *young man*' (Kain, 210-1). It is Kenner, however, who is credited with finally separating the two: a significant development in Joyce studies, but also an elaboration of Gilbert's warnings.

Looking back, in his 1987 preface to the Morningside edition of *Dublin's Joyce*, Kenner claims he had to separate Stephen and Joyce: that Stephen's limitations were 'sufficient to make it implausible that an extrapolated Stephen had managed to write them' (*D'sJ*, xii). Where Levin and others read candidness in the *Portrait*, Kenner reads pastiche, parody, and irony. He, like Levin, refers to an earlier version – here *Stephen Hero* – but argues that 'by the time he came to rewrite the *Portrait* Joyce had decided to make its central figure

---

<sup>31</sup> In the later edition of *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction*, however, Levin adjusts some of his readings of *Portrait*, toning down his treatment of the novel as straightforward autobiography. Morton P. Levitt, 'Harry Levin's James Joyce and the Modernist Age: A Personal Reading', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 90-105 (95-6).

<sup>32</sup> Levitt, 96.

<sup>33</sup> Levitt, 98.

<sup>34</sup> Levitt, 96.

<sup>35</sup> Kenner becomes guilty of this towards the end of his discussion of Joyce in *The Stoic Comedians* when he argues the importance for 'Joyce' of *consonantia* and *integritas*. Stephen explores these ideas of Thomas Aquinas in *A Portrait*. (*Stoic*, 60-6).

a futile *alter ego* rather than a self-image'. Kenner moves on to '*Ulysses*, which neither Stephen nor any extrapolation of Stephen could have written' (*D'sJ*, 137). In the chapter 'Baker Street to Eccles Street' Kenner compares Bloom with the narrating Watson and Stephen with the narrated Sherlock Holmes, confirming his view of Stephen as created, not creator, within the domain of *Ulysses* (*D'sJ*, 161-78). He pushes this even further by the chapter's end, arguing that 'Bloom, immersed in this sensate world [of *Ulysses*], is the father of Stephen exactly as the Watsonian Conan Doyle is the father of Sherlock Holmes' (*D'sJ*, 170). In the intervening analytical steps, Kenner begins to explore a narrating, pseudo-authorial presence in *Ulysses* that is related to Bloom rather than Stephen. He begins by arguing it is 'essential' to see *Ulysses* as 'a huge and intricate machine clanking and whirring for eighteen hours' (*D'sJ*, 166). Kenner finds a 'thinking machine [...] mechanical and craftsmanlike and unreflective' behind the novel – if one were looking for an 'auctorial personality' (*D'sJ*, 167). 'Joyce', he argues, 'has been at great pains to build up this persona behind his book. [...] it is behind *that*, rather than behind the obvious façade of the work, that the author stands indifferent, paring his fingernails' (*D'sJ*, 167). Unusually didactic once more, Kenner demands 'It is essential to the total effect of *Ulysses* that it should seem to be the artefact of a mind essentially like Bloom's, only less easily defeated; a mind that loses nothing, penetrates nothing, and has a category for everything' – though Bloom, he adds carefully, is not a 'disguise of the author' but a 'low-powered variant on the mode of consciousness that imparts substantial form to the book' (*D'sJ*, 167). Having linked this machine to the mind of Bloom rather than Stephen, Kenner refers his readings back to the conclusions of Wyndham Lewis: 'One of the prime exhibits of that book is an analysis of the mind that informs *Ulysses*, which Lewis unfortunately mistook for the mind of James Joyce' (*D'sJ*, 168).

*Dublin's Joyce* is attacked in S. L. Goldberg's 1961 work *The Classical Temper* for Kenner's 'remarkably boring' reading of a machine-like presence beneath the narrative of the novel.<sup>36</sup> His argument that 'One of Joyce's greatest creations is the character of this sardonic impersonal recorder, that constantly glints its photoelectric eyes from behind the chronicle of Bloomsday' holds no water with Goldberg, who spends twenty pages of his study disagreeing with Kenner (*D'sJ*, 167-8). *The Classical Temper* further (if indirectly) opposes *Dublin's Joyce* by extending Levin's 'there for Joyce'. Goldberg claims that, though the Dublin setting, details of physicality, and Homeric and symbolic catalogues 'all have their function; yet they seem to have mattered to Joyce far more than their function warrants': that their treatment is 'projected from some unease in the author himself' and 'his tendency to rely on purely verbal

---

<sup>36</sup> S. L. Goldberg, *The Classical Temper: A Study of James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), 107.

arrangements of his material, which so weakens his encyclopaedic scheme that it often remains little more than an arbitrary and empty ordering gesture'.<sup>37</sup> Given his use of the anti-Homeric buzzword 'arbitrary', it is unsurprising that Goldberg goes on to echo Litz by increasingly detailing Joyce's limitations as a writer towards the end of *The Classical Temper*. His closing remarks demand that 'it is to the active, the dramatic, that we should look, rather than the passive, the ingenious, and the purely verbal'.<sup>38</sup> To further establish the differences between Goldberg and Kenner's approaches, we need only look at Kenner's later work and his continuing emphasis on the crucial impossibility of separating form from content, explored in all its multiplicities. Kenner does not lose sight of the distance between Stephen and 'The omniscient showman-narrator in *Ulysses*, "paring his fingernails"' (*D'sJ*, 45-6):<sup>39</sup> in *Joyce's Voices* he reads in *Ulysses* a narrative voice which 'flaunts skills such as Stephen covets' (*J'sV*, 72). Kenner's continued focus on the uncanny mind, persona, or machine that informs *Ulysses*, or sits between its author and its narrative, is sustained by his belief in 'the showman-narrator' as 'one of the most extraordinary masks in literature' (*D'sJ*, 46).

Kenner's strategy of reading narrative and structure in search of what controls the text of *Ulysses* prioritises language, character and enjoyment in the text. The Arranger, Kenner's text-based solution to a search for a pseudo-author in the text, is a narrative device that forms a climax to his developing readings of *Ulysses*. It is also, however, a device first named by David Hayman (and neither Hayman nor Kenner notice that the term 'arranger' is first used by Gilbert). But we can trace the evolution of the Arranger in Kenner's work from the separation of Stephen and Joyce, through Kenner's focus – following Budgen – instead on Bloom as the central figure, his insistence that there can be no separating of form and content in *Ulysses*, and the critical attention he pays to the significance of the physicality of the novel as a printed and bound book. *Flaubert, Joyce and Beckett: The Stoic Comedians* and *Joyce's Voices* were published in 1962 and 1978 respectively, forming vital pieces of critical housekeeping in Kenner's development of what was to become the Arranger. In *The Stoic Comedians* Kenner reads *Ulysses* as the dramatic rewriting of the *Odyssey* from an oral epic to a printed book, focusing therefore on the importance of the book-form to the novel. Kenner explores the simultaneously finite and permanent nature of a printed and bound text, and how an awareness and exploitation of this nature can be read in the text.<sup>40</sup> A careful caveat can be found early in the preface of the study when Kenner outlines his scope to be Flaubert, Joyce,

---

<sup>37</sup> Goldberg, 300.

<sup>38</sup> Goldberg, 312.

<sup>39</sup> Some confusion here: Kenner sees the author hiding, paring his fingernails, behind a machine-like glinting narrative presence – which is also paring its fingernails.

<sup>40</sup> Kenner has great fun exploring the possibilities opened up by structures of printed discourse, such as footnotes. In a mid-sentence footnote to his own diatribe on footnotes, Kenner comments: 'Some footnotes of course seem totally unrelated to the point in the text at which they are appended. They suggest an art form like the refrains in Yeats' late poems'. A footnote not much later reads 'Please pay attention' (*Stoic*, 40 and 41).

Beckett, ‘and the books they contrive, or have their contrivances contrive’ (*Stoic*, xix). Echoing the machine lurking beneath the narrative in *Dublin’s Joyce*, this also reaches forwards to Kenner’s identification of a conniving contrivance in the form of the Arranger. *Joyce’s Voices*, which further reaches forward to Kenner’s Arranger, was in fact published eight years after David Hayman’s naming of the ‘arranger’ in his 1970 monograph ‘*Ulysses*’: *The Mechanics of Meaning*.<sup>41</sup> Curiously then, the term does not appear in *Joyce’s Voices*, though it is an in-depth unravelling of narrative voice in Joyce’s novel. The study is most often cited for its development of ‘the Uncle Charles Principle’: a way of reading confusions in narrative voice, allowing the narrative idioms of a character to infiltrate the third person narration (*J’sV*, 17-18).

Continuing to focus on the importance of the book as a physical object, and establishing within his argument that nothing in the novel is anything but ‘purely verbal’, Kenner’s reading in *Joyce’s Voices* is once more affected by the Homeric. He discusses two narrators of *Ulysses*, linking his analysis back to a Homeric invocation of the Muse, and the multi-narrator form of the *Odyssey*. Arguing that Joyce ‘commences *Ulysses* [...] as a sort of duet for two narrators, or perhaps a conspiracy between them’, Kenner describes ‘one voice perhaps better informed about stage-management, the other a more accomplished lyrical technician’ (*J’sV*, 67). He continues, detailing how ‘Fulfilling one office of the Muse in periodically elevating the style, this second narrator has served an apprenticeship on *A Portrait* [...] and become a virtuoso of the Uncle Charles Principle’ (*J’sV*, 71). While the first voice ‘attends to [...] housekeeping’, the second’s ‘responsibility is to the sensation reported rather than to the locked and cherished phrase’ (*J’sV*, 71 and 72). Kenner harks back to his suggestion in *The Stoic Comedians* – that the physical book resting in the hands of the reader is of concern to the reading – in a comment that, in ‘Aeolus’, ‘The narrator is letting us know that he is there, and that he will not necessarily remain content to serve the narrative [...] No, he is *reading* that narrative, and reserves the privilege of letting us know what he thinks of it’ (*J’sV*, 75). Kenner continues: ‘He is an ironic, malicious figure, this second narrator [...] arranging the strategic presence of banana peels or helping weave the network of coincidence [...] He has written a great many books before this, he will have us know, and arranged a great many pantomimes’ (*J’sV*, 75). One narrator ‘gets on with the business of the book’, while the other increasingly ‘snatches the pen’ (*J’sV*, 77 and 78). In his later study ‘*Ulysses*’, Kenner credits Hayman with coining the phrase ‘arranger’. It is puzzling then, that in this earlier examination of an arranging, weaving narrative presence, neither the term nor Hayman’s study is cited.

---

<sup>41</sup> On typographical confusions: Hayman’s term in 1970 is “‘the arranger’”. I will follow Kenner in using ‘the Arranger.’

In *The Mechanics of Meaning*, Hayman identifies a need for order ‘in the narrational strategy and evolution of a nameless creative persona or “arranger”’, using ‘the term “arranger” to designate a figure or presence that can be identified neither with the author nor with his narrator, but that exercises an increasing degree of control over increasingly challenging materials’.<sup>42</sup> He continues: ‘it is in small effects that this presence is first felt, in stylistic tricks or rather rhetorical gestures’ (Hayman, 88-9). ‘Gradually and with calculated stealth this invisible but consistently locatable speaker will be metamorphosed into the artist-God as cosmic joker,’ Hayman details, positing that ‘By the book’s second half he will have become a creature of many faces but a single impulse’ (Hayman, 92-3). Hayman’s Arranger ‘calls attention to his ingenuity’, and though it is not to be identified with the author it has some manner of tangential link to authorial authority (Hayman, 100). He references the Stephen-mused ‘artist-God’, but changes it into a cosmic joker – a move not dissimilar from Kenner’s fingernail-paring ‘showman-narrator’. Hayman revisits the Arranger in the 1982 edition of *The Mechanics of Meaning*, in which he assesses the fate of the Arranger in the hands of other critics – with particular focus on Kenner.

Published in 1980, Kenner’s *Ulysses* emphasises the fun of the Homeric and the usefulness of difficulties of reading, building its arguments in tandem with the changing episodes of the novel. Outlining principles of narration – of how the parallax narrative structures in *Ulysses* are tied to how the narration is affected by the characters it presents – Kenner works through the novel reading and offering explanations for unnarrated gaps. He links unwritten scenes to Bloom and exhibits how what is not narrated develops Bloom’s character as much as, if not more than, what is. He reaches the Arranger in ‘Sirens’, marking the Arranger’s explicit presence in the phrase ‘As said before’, which reaches back to the opening line of the ‘Calypso’ episode.<sup>43</sup> Arguing that ‘Some mind, it is clear, keeps track of the details of this printed cosmos’, of the events ‘mimed in words arranged on pages in space’, a mind which ‘seems to enjoy a seemingly total recall for exact forms of words used hundreds of pages earlier, a recall which implies not an operation of memory but access such as ours to a printed book, in which pages can be turned to and fro’, Kenner credits Hayman with the naming of the Arranger, despite the clear debt of Kenner’s construct to his earlier work in *The Stoic Comedians* on the myriad ways in which *Ulysses* is aware of its physical form (*‘U’*, 64-5). Reaching back too to the ‘craftsmanlike’ machine of *Dublin’s Joyce*, and showing clear links to *Joyce’s Voices*, Kenner’s Arranger is arguably the fruition of his own explorations of what lies between the narrative of *Ulysses* and its author, coinciding with rather than

---

<sup>42</sup> David Hayman, *Ulysses’: The Mechanics of Meaning*, Revised and Extended Edition (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982), 84. All references are to this text and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

<sup>43</sup> Though Kenner does not acknowledge it, the phrase is previously noted by Charles Peake in *James Joyce: The Citizen and the Artist*. Peake suggests the ‘clumsy formula’ is used to show ‘the author’s intention’ – to emphasise the text as a ‘verbal representation’ (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 230.

developing Hayman's construction. We have again the two narrators of *Joyce's Voices*, one Muse, one 'housekeeper'. Kenner tacitly encourages such a link in phrases lifted directly from his previous study, describing the Arranger as 'snatching the pen from his anonymous colleague' – as the second narrator from *Joyce's Voices* 'snatches the pen' – and 'just this side of malicious' – as the second narrator is an 'ironic, malicious figure' ('*U*', 67). His Arranger, increasingly busying himself as the novel moves through Bloomsday, is a continuation of Kenner's critical thought more than a response to Hayman's construct.

In 'Ten Years After Thoughts', added to the 1982 edition of *The Mechanics of Meaning*, Hayman argues that Kenner makes too much of the role of the Arranger: he suggests that 'Perhaps it would be best to see the arranger as a significant, felt absence in the text, an unstated but inescapable source of control.' Hayman worries over Kenner's use of the Arranger, seeing Kenner's construct as a designed narrative voice, which therefore diminishes its innovation (Hayman, 122-3). Hayman also dislikes a broader application of the idea of the Arranger across the novel; on the narrative voices that record behaviour and scenes and objects, Hayman comments 'Clearly, both of these help reassure the reader adrift in this strange new medium, this unpredictable narrative space. Both fade with the coming of the late-afternoon and evening hours; neither need be attributed to a capricious arranging presence'. He continues, arguing that 'the attempt to generalize further the arranged component of the text weakens the concept of arranger. The latter becomes the sum of the narrative process rather than a component of it: the distinction between narrator and arranger is virtually eliminated'. Hayman declares that 'Instead of going that far, we should probably think of the arranging presence as subtly penetrating the fabric of the narrative at a variety of points and in a variety of ways' (Hayman, 124). There is a marked difference between each critic's construct: where Kenner implies a link between the increased activities of the Arranger and Bloom, Hayman does no such thing. Kenner's Arranger is a continuation of his reading style, linking formal oddities and the minds of the characters: on the increasing presence of the Arranger perceived in the elaborate styles of the later episodes, Kenner comments:

And now we are in a position to understand that Joyce has not forgotten his former criterion of fidelity to the rhythm of his characters' thoughts for, if the book seems for some hours temporarily adrift, that reflects Bloom's state, adrift, too, putting in time, neither free to go home nor sure how long to stay away. ('*U*', 101)

Kenner continues, observing that 'The new stylistic complications, too, which tend rather to screen than to clarify the chain of events, correspond to a span of time he won't want to discuss with Molly' ('*U*', 101). As something greater than a 'component', more active, and in more control throughout *Ulysses* than Hayman would allow, Kenner's Arranger plays a far greater role than Hayman's.

Despite the occasional didacticism of *Joyce's Voices*, Kenner's critical mode does not claim to have solved anything once and for all. As Michael Patrick Gillespie comments, 'in

presenting his own view of *Ulysses*, Kenner at the same time legitimizes a range of alternative readings'.<sup>44</sup> Kenner maintains both playfulness and openness in his Joycean studies, and encourages a reader to do the same. Gillespie argues that Kenner does not hide 'the problems facing anyone seeking to form an intelligent response to any of the works, but at the same time he offers readers the stimulus to develop their own reactions in directions that he himself has not chosen to pursue'.<sup>45</sup> On Kenner's work on the *Portrait in Dublin's Joyce*, perhaps referring in part to his separation of Stephen and Joyce, Gillespie's assessment reflects not only Kenner's style but also its legacy: 'Kenner's argument does not simply serve to advance his own view about Joyce's writings; rather it makes us more aware of our own.'<sup>46</sup> A thread runs from Kenner's reading of an ironised Stephen to his proposed Arranger. Clear links back to Stephen are seen also in Kenner and Hayman's use of the words of Stephen's authorial theory (a nail-file bearing God-like artist) to refer to a narrating presence rather than to the author. These are further established by Kenner's continued, if complicated, emphasis on the relationship between the Arranger and Bloom – with its roots in his turn from Stephen. Kenner's view of Stephen did not close the topic: critics continue to find themselves prompted by Kenner to discover their own view, and not everyone views Stephen as ironically as Kenner does. As I will touch on again in chapter six, this is in part due to a continuously varied response to the autobiographical in Joyce's texts. Given its anecdotal style, this will be where I discuss Budgen's *The Making of 'Ulysses'* – though it is here worth marking two of Joyce's assertions via Budgen. We are reminded to note the youth of Stephen (and thus the distance between Stephen and Joyce), and to focus on Bloom (suggesting difficulties will be answered by paying attention to Leopold). Kenner's Arranger is complicated by the relevance of Budgen's study to Kenner's Bloom-centric approach, and his elaboration of Gilbert's warnings against simple Stephen-Joyce links and readings of Bloom as more capable of creating Stephen than vice versa.<sup>47</sup> The theory of the Arranger is indebted to approaches recommended by two authorially-authorized studies.

### 3. 'The half-erased writing of our predecessors'

The Arranger and the Uncle Charles Principle are readings of narrative informed by character: as I have explored above, the roots of the Arranger lie partly in a shift of focus from Stephen to Bloom. The Uncle Charles Principle, meanwhile, suggests that confusing moments of

---

<sup>44</sup> Michael Patrick Gillespie, 'Kenner on Joyce', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 142-54 (150-1).

<sup>45</sup> Gillespie, 144.

<sup>46</sup> Gillespie, 149.

<sup>47</sup> Kenner clarifies his debt to Budgen in his study *'Ulysses'*, in which he thanks him for his pioneering of 'the centrality of Bloom' (*'U'*, 5).

narration are in fact characterised, an elaboration of free indirect discourse.<sup>48</sup> Using characters to explain a stylistic choice or difficulty is one more critical mode owed to Gilbert, who defends the hyper-referential style of the novel by pointing at the saturation of Stephen and Bloom's minds with 'literary sources' and 'literary habits' (Gilbert, 82). These are examples of finding solutions or explanations within the text itself, a well-established habit of Joycean criticism that endures despite demands to search for help beyond the pages of the novel. In this last section, I will bring together earlier threads of discussion to look at the other trends, habits, and shifts we can see in early *Ulysses* criticism which implicitly or explicitly convey attitudes to the author, the reader, and the text – and to the relationships between all three. First, however, I wish to highlight some curious instances of phrasing in these critical texts which are hard to ignore from a playful, perhaps insolent, post-Barthesian vantage point. Kenner echoes Gilbert's reading and declares in *Dublin's Joyce* that 'As Bloom's mind is a compost of objects, so is Stephen's a fabric of quotations', within his discussion of Stephen as a parody of a writer (*D'sJ*, 174). Kain, meanwhile, briefly looking at *Finnegans Wake*, explores an idea of history and its writings as layered: 'The pages of history rapidly pass from view, and each generation, in turn, writes its records. But the pages are palimpsests on which we can barely trace the half-erased writing of our predecessors' (Kain, 213). This layering shifts: 'In *Ulysses* thoughts, characters, events, hopes, fears and memories are woven into an intricate strand, constantly changing colour with the changing moods of the principal figures' (Kain, 226). His phrasing is oddly evocative of Barthes' ideas from some years later, of texts formed of mixed writings and tissues of quotations. The text as woven, as fabric, is not new with Barthes; as he himself points out, its etymological roots are clear. With Barthes this idea of a text being 'woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages' forms an argument against origins, against 'the myth of filiation' ('DA', 146 and 'FWT', 160). Though without its later connotations, Kenner and Kain highlight the 'text-ness' of *Ulysses*.

There is a discernible shift in the aims of early Ulysean criticism that we can characterise as either a move towards a more realistic outcome or a sea change in notions of what literary criticism should try to achieve. This, again, is revealed in turns of phrase. Gilbert indicates what a reader must do in order 'to arrive at complete understanding' (Gilbert, 36). Kain notes an aspect of the text 'has never been fully interpreted' (Kain, 21). The motif of a 'key' or of 'keys' is used by both Larbaud and Levin – the implication being that a text can be unlocked, even solved. An attendant concern is that of intention, as we can see in Levin's desire to fully comprehend authorial intent and belief in the possibility of such an endeavour. Litz shares such faith, arguing that 'The action of the book is immediately accessible, and this

---

<sup>48</sup> And in the next chapter I will explore the extent to which *Ulysses* plays with links between character and narrative.

provides the reader with an incentive for the careful study necessary to comprehend Joyce's full intent' (Litz, 215). Full, total, complete understanding aided by the discovery of a distinct, concrete intent gives way to more attainable aims of pluralism. As the number of studies increases, and with them the unavoidable coexistence of multiple readings, the way in which Joyce's texts resist 'complete understanding' – their polysemy – becomes itself a focus of criticism. This is exemplified in what Gillespie reads in Kenner's critical style: allowing for alternative readings rather than proclaiming 'the' interpretation. To further quote Gillespie, Kenner 'repeatedly asserts the multiplicity inherent [...] by articulating an overtly idiosyncratic response'.<sup>49</sup>

Acknowledging or focusing on the wealth of possible readings of *Ulysses* also prioritises the reader. These early studies pay increasing attention to the reader rather than the author; we can even see this by identifying a contradiction in *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction*. Despite his stated aim to grasp the author's intention, Levin bases his movement away from an authorially authorised 'key' – the schema – on the argument that it is 'not there for us, but for Joyce'. What is 'for us', the reader, is more important than that which is 'for Joyce'; Levin's study does not explain how or why what can be read as a statement of intent (the schema), or a doubling of that statement (Gilbert's study) are discounted in the search for 'the figure in the carpet'. His approach undermines his own stated aims, by arguing that what is relevant to the author is irrelevant to the reader. Kain's *Fabulous Voyager* also focuses on the reader: its re-enactment of how she might search for and find information in *Ulysses* displays an interest in that very activity: though not explicitly stated in his study, his efforts begin to show how *Ulysses* can make us aware of our own reading. Coupled with the work of Kenner, Kain's approach suggests that reading is itself relevant to *Ulysses*. Kenner is explicit in his focus on reading, on reading being a concern: his theories of Ulyssean narrative, emphasis on the physicality of the text, and use of the text to fill in its gaps all explore the question of *how* we read *Ulysses* – even his study '*Ulysses*' is structured in such a way that his arguments develop as his discussion moves through the episodes of the novel, mimicking the growing adeptness we feel in reading and rereading as we work our way from 'Telemachus' to 'Penelope'. The Arranger and the Uncle Charles Principle are as much about reading as they are writing; they offer the reader strategies to navigate *Ulysses* and encourage playful, suspicious, even disrespectful readings.

An increased need to recognise and consider a wealth of possible readings and the relevance of the actual reading experience develops in these early years, and as it does so a contradictory corrective urge is established in Joyce studies. As I explored earlier in this chapter, Gilbert's study's *raison d'être* was to correct some of the first critics of *Ulysses*.

---

<sup>49</sup> Gillespie, 144.

Gilbert confirms this: ‘we who admired *Ulysses* for its structural, enduring qualities and not for the occasional presence in it of words and descriptive passages which shocked our elders, were on the defensive, and the pedant’s cloak is often a convenient protection against the cold blasts of propriety’ (Gilbert, 12). *Ulysses* had to be rescued from Aldington and Lewis by Eliot and Gilbert. Gilbert responds to and even pre-empts negative criticism of the novel, in general evasions,

Some critics of *Ulysses*, while accepting the work as a whole, accuse defects in this passage or that, in the technique of one episode or another, and blame the author for leading us around unnecessary detours; it is often [...] precisely in the offending passages that the text is at its most significant. For no passage, no phrase in *Ulysses* is irrelevant [...]. (Gilbert, 59)

and more specific suggestions: ‘It will be observed that there is no corresponding ‘Organ of the Body’ for the first three episodes. The explanation of this is probably that these episodes deal exclusively with [...] Dedalus’ (Gilbert, 42). The literary mind of Stephen silences complaints that the novel is too referential, accusers who see an uncontrolled outpouring are shown the regimented schema, and gaps in the schema are there for good reason. This aspect of Gilbert’s critical legacy is established by his critical opponents: enter Levin’s own correcting approach. Righting critical wrongs is entrenched: Levin tut-tuts over the emphasis Gilbert places on the schema, Litz backs up this correction by delving into worksheets and notes, and Kain not only disagrees with Gilbert but also laments previous criticism more generally: ‘Just as Shakespeare has often been ruined for schoolboys, so Joyce’s brilliant insights into the dilemmas of modern civilisation are too often smothered under a moraine of footnotes’, a useful claim repeated by critics preceding and following (Kain, 4).

Kenner’s salvaging of Gilbert, and the re-instatement of the Homeric in Joycean critical thought continued by Kenner, Ellmann, Seidel, Senn, and many others, is itself corrective. Kenner’s reclamation of the mythic in *Ulysses* comes with careful adjustments: he is not repeating Gilbert, but reassessing. He does, however, replicate Gilbert’s corrective mode: both generally in his Homeric work and more specifically in his references to Wyndham Lewis. Kenner pointedly corrects Lewis at least twice in his Joycean studies, and these corrections form the basis of his innovative readings of narrative. Kenner amends Lewis’ misreading of ‘the mind that informs *Ulysses*’ and revises the way in which previous critics read Stephen as Joyce, developing – as I have argued – both rectifications in his theory of the Arranger. Similarly, in *Joyce’s Voices* Kenner frames the Uncle Charles Principle as a direct response to another of Lewis’ misreadings: ‘Scanning *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* fifty years ago, the eye of Wyndham Lewis was caught by what seemed an inadvertency of diction in a book not quite, as he thought, “swept and tidied”’. What Lewis spots is the word ‘repaired’: ‘Uncle Charles repaired to his outhouse but not before he had greased and brushed scrupulously his back hair and brushed and put on his tall hat’ (*P*, 60, q. *J’sV*, 16-17).

Lewis thought that in catching Joyce writing “repaired” he had caught him off guard. “People,” he said, “*repair* to places in works of fiction of the humblest order.” He was characterizing Joyce as a humble scrivener who kept himself from dropping into cliché by not wholly incessant vigilance. But the normal Joycean vigilance has not faltered here. (*J’sV*, 17)

Combining this with other readings, Kenner establishes his argument of ‘invisible quotation marks’ in the narration: ‘something new in fiction, the normally neutral narrative vocabulary pervaded by a little cloud of idioms which a character might use if he were managing the narrative’ (*J’sV*, 17). Where other critics find error, Kenner finds innovation. He further uses the principle to explain the opening naturalism of the novel, reading it as linked to both the presence of the characters Buck Mulligan and Stephen, and the expectations of the reader opening and beginning to read the book; a correction continued by Karen Lawrence in her 1981 study *The Odyssey of Style in ‘Ulysses’*, in which she reads the early naturalising style through the changing modes of the second half of the novel to reveal and explore ‘the arbitrariness of all styles’.<sup>50</sup>

A gentler description of this critical tendency would be ‘collaborative’; as Kenner describes, looking back at *Dublin’s Joyce* in 1987,

We draw on a kind of collective and evolving awareness of the text, something I’ve watched develop among Joyceans over forty years. Joyceans are readers of Joyce who keep in touch, by article or book or letter, and each Joycean helps form the conscience the rest rely on. So we none of us now read the same *Ulysses* Stuart Gilbert read in 1930; nor, for that matter, do I read the same *Ulysses* I was reading in 1950. (*D’sJ*, xiii)

But characterising these early critical endeavours as ‘corrective’ usefully highlights their preservation of a belief in a ‘right’ reading of *Ulysses*, which itself connotes a prospect of ‘complete understanding’. Even if we tone down this view and perhaps argue that these corrective early critical studies are not offered ‘instead of’ what precedes them but as ‘better than’, we still come up against an implicit hierarchical attitude to readings which undermines polysemy. Though these inherent paradoxes were not explored at the time, the developmental mode of Joyce criticism formed by layers of remedial critical studies established a self-reflexive tendency. At its origins, criticism of *Ulysses* had to respond to previous criticism; and this became more and more of a focus. This places an increased emphasis on the activity of reading *Ulysses*, as an analysis of criticism is an analysis of other readings. The polysemantic text of *Ulysses* provokes myriad readings, and criticism becomes a space in which *how* we read *Ulysses* assumes increasing importance.

In these early critical works much of the expressed or suggested attitudes to the relationships between authors, readers, and texts – and to the role of the critic – revolve around questions of intention. McCarthy wonders whether Gilbert’s ‘status as an authorized interpretation seems less important to a generation that has come to be suspicious about

---

<sup>50</sup> Karen Lawrence, *The Odyssey of Style in ‘Ulysses’* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 9.

author's statements regarding their intentions' – a query that tells us as much about McCarthy's 1991 context as it does about critical attitudes earlier in the twentieth century.<sup>51</sup> 'Intention' is not a dirty word to many of the critics discussed above, and its discovery is often expressed, for example by Levin in 1941 and Litz in 1961, as the aim of their work. As I have begun to explore, the oddity of Levin is the coincidence of his pro-intention stance and his refusal of 'an authorized interpretation'. Litz, meanwhile, relies in *The Art of James Joyce* on the authority of worksheets in his search for intention – but complicates this in a confession in his preface:

I have long since relinquished the comforting belief that access to an author's workshop provides insights of greater authority than those produced by other kinds of criticism [...] Indeed it now seems to me that the controlling design – the 'figure in the carpet' – lies always in plain view, not in the dark corners explored by the genetic or biographical critic. (Litz, v)

Litz contradicts the authority of biographical or genetic and archival criticism (little affecting the growing popularity of genetic methods in the decades that followed) but retains the aim he shares with Levin to seek the artist's design. Kain, meanwhile, moves away from this in his 1947 study. We see this in his focus on the reader and the reader's activity, but it is also suggested in a choice of phrase: discussing certain aspects of 'Calypso' Kain notes that 'Gilbert would have us believe [these] are not accidental' (Kain, 41). He refutes what Gilbert presents as intentional – either due to a distrust of Gilbert, a disinterest in the author's intentions, or a treatment of those intentions with the 'suspicion' McCarthy finds in later critical responses. Kenner does not shy away from discussing intention either, though it is occasional and not an overriding critical aim. In *Dublin's Joyce* Kenner reads the Homeric correspondences 'inflected with a pathetic divergence of intention' (*D'sJ*, 186). He develops this in '*Ulysses*', not by suggesting more knowledge of that intention but by defending the impossibility of knowing it. 'In giving the *Odyssey* priority, the title does not tell us how the *Odyssey* is present: retrieving its marks is our doing', he argues, before confirming that

It is this compliance with our collaboration, this symbiosis of observer with observed, that marks the radiant novelty of *Ulysses*. Whatever tasks we may set ourselves with its aid, we are oddly liberated from an anxious sense of the living in the great Taskmaster's eye, confined by the intentions of the author. He kept his intention, in so far as he could, out of sight, suppressing even the Homeric episode-titles, and much, he saw to it, must emerge that he did not intend. ('*U*', 155)

Kenner presents *Ulysses* as a text in which there is no need for reader or critic to concern themselves with the author's intention, as we have our own important role to play; a text to be read without the guarantee of the father, to use Barthes' words. This is described by Kenner, however, in terms of what Joyce 'did' ('so far as he could'). The result is a paradoxical assertion that we cannot read the author's intention in *Ulysses* because the author did not

---

<sup>51</sup> McCarthy, 32.

intend that to be possible – and that furthermore the author intended (or ‘saw to’) the potential for unintended effects.

In the reappraisal that I have referenced several times in this chapter Gillespie throws many labels at Kenner: successfully showing how Kenner’s work resists such categories while revealing the concerns of a Joycean in the early 1990s. ‘[I]nterpretive responses that go beyond specific illumination to the creation of an ethos for reading that serves as a useful guide to any scholar, whatever his or her particular theoretical predilections’, he argues,

long before writers like Jacques Derrida called into question traditional linear critical responses, Kenner had been deconstructing Joyce’s works. Yet in doing so, he has resolutely avoided the linguistic accoutrements adopted by many of the most outspoken proponents of poststructuralism [...] none of the elements making up Kenner’s critical personality seem to fit with the easy categorization we enjoy applying to leading figures in our field, yet he relentlessly engages our interest and our concern.<sup>52</sup>

Applying some linguistic accoutrements and a ‘New Critic’ label, Gillespie suggests that

Even when he most overtly exercises his New Critical tendencies, it would be a mistake to dismiss Kenner’s methodology or his findings anachronistic. Like the best of the recent critical approaches, Kenner’s methods remind one of the power inherent in words and of the power inherent in the reader’s signification.<sup>53</sup>

Finally, he reaches out to two more theoretical modes: ‘Such an openness demonstrates implicit affinities with contemporary theories of reader response and with current gestures toward a methodology of phenomenological interpretation.’<sup>54</sup> In 1987 Kenner observes, looking back at the early critical works of Gilbert, Budgen, Levin, and Kain – as well as Gorman’s biography – ‘That the key to the books is the man and what he lived through was a post-Romantic dogma then seldom questioned. We’ve since swung all the way clear to deconstructible text – an excessive correction’ (*D’sJ*, xi). Joyce is often very present in Kenner’s work: he cannot be described as an anti-authorial critic. Furthermore, despite the clear similarities between aspects of his work and the poststructuralist ideas of writers like Barthes, Kenner places himself in opposition to those ideas. In ‘*Ulysses*’, he clearly restates his belief that ‘On nothing is *Ulysses* more insistent than on the fact that there is no Bloom there, no Stephen there, no Molly there, no Dublin there, simply language’. The reader and author are ‘co-creators’, he continues, but tries to clarify: ‘This is not to say, with Barthes in *S/Z*, that our reading of any book is essentially our doing. Words are prior to us, communal, entangled in human experience, registered in other books and in dictionaries’ (a final point Barthes might, however, agree with) (*U*, 156). Kenner’s critical work resists the labels and standpoints of critical theory. His analytical concerns, and those expressed by the early critics

---

<sup>52</sup> Gillespie, 143. Gillespie repeats an earlier comment that ‘Hugh Kenner betrayed signs of proto/crypto poststructuralism in *Dublin’s Joyce*.’ *Reading the Book of Himself: Narrative Strategies in the Works of James Joyce* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 3.

<sup>53</sup> Gillespie, 148.

<sup>54</sup> Gillespie, 149.

of *Ulysses*, nevertheless share common ground with the concerns of literary theorists and their followers from the 1970s onwards. These early critics engage, if indirectly, with the issue of what literary criticism should aim for – critiquing the mode of criticism itself, one aim we can see in literary theory’s reforming streak. They also engage – again, not always explicitly – with questions pertinent to analyses of literary origins, of the role of the reader, the nature of text, and the relationships between all three: the questions grappled with in the authorial theorising of the writers explored in the previous chapter. The shift from ‘what was the author trying to do?’ to ‘how do we read this?’ is prompted by *Ulysses* criticism and *Ulysses* itself.

These early works of criticism display the impact of Gilbert’s *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’*, of a study authorially authorised by Joyce. Gilbert’s legacy of corrective criticism emphasises a trait of all literary criticism: to reassess, find something new, position one’s reading in relation to others. This inherent characteristic begins to be writ large in early Joyce studies because the rudimentary question of *how* one should or can read *Ulysses* continues to require attention. Joyce’s interventions, however we read them – dependant on how much intention-mining we can stomach – did not clarify how to read *Ulysses* but ensured the ongoing provocation to answer the question. This focus, and the attendant self-reflexivity of Joycean criticism, are also the results of the text itself. The difficulty of *Ulysses* and its demands to be reread provoke critics to query how the text is to be read – but also become topics for criticism themselves. Joseph Frank in 1945 argues that ‘Joyce cannot be read – he can only be re-read’, and that despite the ‘burdens place on the reader’ he ‘proceeded in the assumption that a unified spatial apprehension of his work would ultimately be possible’.<sup>55</sup> Edmund Wilson, five years later, compares the book’s difficulty and our need to ‘revisit it’ to ‘a city, where we come more and more to recognize faces, to understand personalities, to grasp relations, currents, and interests’.<sup>56</sup> The impossibility of discussing *Ulysses* without discussing the activity of reading informs Joyce studies from its earliest years. And as touched upon in Frank’s response, the question of *how to read the author* is caught up in that of *how to read the text*. Looking for help, some critics turn to the text’s composition – and as Seidel mentions in his defence of the schema, ‘if the process of building is as important as the result, the scaffold never disappears’. Joyce guaranteed the importance of process when he turned to Gilbert. Traces of the ongoing entanglement of Joyce’s involvement in the conclusions and practices of early critics were present in studies written thirty years after his death, as is the implicit question of *how to read*

---

<sup>55</sup> Joseph Frank, ‘Spatial Form in Modern Literature’, in *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*, ed. Michael J. Hoffman and Patrick D. Murphy, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005) 61-73 (64). Frank is also quoted by Litz, 56.

<sup>56</sup> Edmund Wilson, *Axel’s Castle* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1950), 210. Also quoted by Litz, 58.

*the author*. Meanwhile, a tiny minority of Joyceans began to respond to new theoretical approaches to literary texts.

French theory started to appear in Joyce studies in the 1970s, most notably in Hélène Cixous' *L'Exile de James Joyce ou l'Art des remplacements*, a 1972 study translated into English in 1976, and Margot Norris' 1976 *The Decentred Universe of Finnegans Wake: A Structuralist Analysis*. Cixous and Norris explored psychoanalytic and poststructuralist approaches, and were part of a small group which grew in number and impact as Joyce studies moved into and through the 1980s – a development I will discuss in chapter four. The work of Hayman and Kenner exists concurrently to these developments: both refer to these shifts in later editions of their work, but go no further than brief prefatory mentions. Much of Joyce studies carried on regardless, critical heads not turned by new methods or ideas. These non-theoretical, or 'pre'-theoretical studies proliferated beyond and in spite of the arrival of theory in Joycean criticism: Clive Hart and Hayman's edited volume of episode-by-episode essays *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Casebook*, in 1974; Marilyn French's *The Book as World: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* in 1976; Charles Peake's *James Joyce, the Citizen and the Artist* in 1977; and Richard Ellmann's *'Ulysses' on the Liffey* in 1979 among many others. While Kenner's concerns in particular overlap with those of various literary theoretical approaches, the other works I have discussed also confirm that many of the issues occupying the theorists and theoretical critics of the 1970s and 1980s were already present in Joyce studies: issues such as the role of criticism, the polysemy of text, the activity of reading, the relevance of intention, playfulness, intertextuality, the potential within language, and who or what lies behind the text. The early critical works I have discussed in this chapter reached differing conclusions riddled with contradictions, and rarely discussed these issues explicitly – but they were being attended to.

The *Odyssey* is one text of the many that we address when reading *Ulysses*, joined by countless other works of literature, and the factual texts explored by Kain and those that followed him. Whether engaged in critical analysis or reading only for pleasure we are also obliged to address the text of the schema, appended to nearly every edition of the novel, and the texts of annotations or footnotes. We note the existence of other *Ulysseses* when we check errata in the backs of our copies, or turn to other editions. Reading further – closer, yet wider – we must address yet more texts to assist our endeavour: those which have been referred to as 'satellites', guide books.<sup>57</sup> If we open a work of criticism, we encounter a layered history of readings, a palimpsest attesting to the novel's resistance to being pinned down. We can trace key characteristics of Joyce studies – self-conscious corrective criticism, a focus on

---

<sup>57</sup> McCarthy, 25. He quotes Judge Woolsey, who ruled *Ulysses* was not obscene in the 1933 trial *United States v. One Book Called 'Ulysses'*.

reading itself, and a strange and complex relationship to the author – back to the early question of how to read the *Odyssey* in *Ulysses*.

### Chapter Three

#### Reading Homer: 'Eumaeus' and the Homeric Question

Written texts and pieces of paper clutter Dublin on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June, 1904. In transit, a 'crumpled throwaway' moves along the current of the Liffey (*U*, 218, 230, and 239); Deasy's letter is repurposed as scribbling-paper for Stephen's poetic composition, later found by Bloom (*U*, 47-8 and 363); letters are received, written, and dwelled-upon; an advertisement is placed, galleys are proofed, and Bloom 'watch[es] a typesetter neatly distributing type' (*U*, 116-8); a library book requires renewal (*U*, 62), but remains out of date (*U*, 606); and Bloom picks up *Sweets of Sin*, a novel which remains both in his pocket and on his mind. In 'Eumaeus', the sixteenth episode of *Ulysses* and first part of the final 'Nostos', there is something a little wrong with anything on paper or card. The sailor 'W. B. Murphy, A. B. S' – regaling Leopold Bloom, Stephen Dedalus, and others with sea-faring stories in a cabman's shelter late at night – presents 'a not very cleanlooking document' as his discharge papers (*U*, 580), quickly followed by a postcard 'A friend of mine sent me' contradictorily addressed to a 'Señor A. Boudin' (*U*, 581).<sup>1</sup> The *Evening Telegraph* write-up of Patrick Dignam's funeral, read by Bloom, is peppered with errors of omission and inclusion (*U*, 602); mistakes foretold by the pun 'tell a graphic lie' (*U*, 601). Even a photograph of Molly Bloom shown by her husband to Stephen is not just 'faded' but 'slightly soiled': 'an added charm' (*U*, 606-7). Something is a little wrong too with 'Eumaeus' itself: though the text of the episode looks on the page like the straightforward third person narrative a reader might yearn for after the riot of 'Circe', it swiftly becomes clear that the narrative of Bloom and Stephen making their way from the brothels of Nighttown to Bloom's home on Eccles Street will not be straightforward at all. In a confusion of posturing and slip-ups, populated by characters with mistaken, false, and mislaid identities, suspicion coils through 'Eumaeus' – and faced with such an intriguing and evasive narrative, we are provoked to read suspiciously. As survivors (of sorts) of the games of previous episodes, of the geographically-hopping omniscience of 'Wandering Rocks' or the melodic repetitions of 'Sirens', by the time we reach 'Eumaeus' we have some experience of reading the narratives of the novel with suspicion and of filling in narrative unknowns. But this mode of reading becomes especially pertinent in 'Eumaeus'; as is made clear by an analysis of its exploration of disguises and storytelling, and – in particular – the Homeric roots for such explorations.

Several key concerns which run throughout *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* are arguably at their most explicit in 'Eumaeus'. The themes of disguise, role-playing, and identity which are

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Gabler *Ulysses* this is 'D. B.'. Joyce, *Ulysses*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (London: The Bodley Head, 2008), 17. 511.

explored in the episode are present all through the novel and the *Odyssey*, and furthermore are constant in *Ulysses*' position as a rewriting in which intertextual roles shift and change across a disguised source text. In the *Odyssey* hidden identities are linked to the telling of stories, to lies and revelations. The same occurs in *Ulysses*, especially where Bloom is concerned, who in his extra-marital letters goes by 'Henry Flower'. This too is perhaps most explicitly realised in 'Eumaeus', by the spurious narratives within the episode and the curious narrative by which they are communicated to the reader, and by the confused and stolen identities of the episode's characters – bodied forms of lies and storytelling. Critics tend to focus on two confused identities in 'Eumaeus' – the keeper of the cabman's shelter who resembles the getaway driver of the nationalist Invincibles, and Murphy the storytelling sailor – and their schematically-assigned roles Eumaeus the swineherd and 'Ulysses Pseudangelos'. In this chapter I will instead reassess the strange relationship between Bloom and the narrative, treating the very act of questioning the narrative as a significant playful interaction of *Ulysses* with its Homeric precursor. This will enable me to not only argue for a reconsideration of how *Ulysses* rewrites the *Odyssey* – but also suggest a new reading of how it rewrites Homeric scholarship.

In chapter two I discussed the lengths to which Joyce went to establish the Homeric precursor of *Ulysses*, and the impact that questions of the role of the *Odyssey* had on early critical responses to the novel, touching upon the suggestion that one function of Stuart Gilbert's 'critical propaganda' was to establish the 'respectability' of *Ulysses* by emphasising the Homeric.<sup>2</sup> This reading of Gilbert is briefly addressed in more recent criticism by Katherine Mullin and Leah Culligan Flack: in *Modernism and Homer* (2015) Flack reads a pointed use of the 'cultural currency' of Homer by the authors she discusses.<sup>3</sup> Referencing Mullin's 2003 study *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity*, Flack characterises the Joyce-authorized works of Linati, Eliot, Larbaud, and Gilbert as 'a targeted public relations campaign to pre-emptively dismantle charges of formless incoherence and obscenity'.<sup>4</sup> Joyce, Pound, and Eliot's 'promotional' use of Homer's 'cultural currency [...] intentionally obscured the complex, changing engagements with Homer that fuelled their literary and socio-political projects'.<sup>5</sup> Flack demands a reappraisal, joining a long line of Joycean readers who query the way the Homeric in *Ulysses* was characterised by Gilbert et al. Michael Seidel positions himself similarly, but with quite a different emphasis. In his preface to *Epic Geography*, published in 1976, he raises the unpopular opinion that Gilbert, 'the bag man for Joyce's esoterica', rather than overblowing the Homeric correspondences 'did not take Joyce's

<sup>2</sup> Patrick A. McCarthy, 'Stuart Gilbert's Guide to the Perplexed', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleston Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 23-35 (25).

<sup>3</sup> Leah Culligan Flack, *Modernism and Homer: The Odysseys of H.D., James Joyce, Osip Mandelstam, and Ezra Pound* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 4.

<sup>4</sup> Flack, 6. Referencing Katherine Mullin, *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 203.

<sup>5</sup> Flack, 4.

schemes far enough to reveal the extent to which some of them informed the narrative design of the novel'.<sup>6</sup> The sense that there is more work to be done, a need to reread the relationship between the *Odyssey* and *Ulysses*, is rarely more apparent than in Hugh Kenner's writing. In each of the studies I discussed in the previous chapter, a number of articles, and his 1971 tome *The Pound Era*, Kenner continues to add depth and complexity to his reading of the Odyssean elements of *Ulysses*. In *The Pound Era* he emphasises the instability of Homer, and of the *Odyssey*, noting the existence of several 'invented Homers'. He finds many in *Ulysses*, 'a museum of Homers', suggesting that the different Homers conceptualised by classical scholarship are rewritten in the pages of the novel (*Pound*, 49-50). Seidel also focuses on previous scholarly readings of Homer in his analysis of Joyce's use of Victor Bérard, and Flack argues that Joyce, along with Pound and H.D., 'drew upon two main lines of Homeric scholarship active at the end of the nineteenth century: the first emphasized the ritualistic, mythological, archaic qualities of the Homeric epics, and the second viewed the ancient world as essentially modern'.<sup>7</sup> These critics highlight the complexity of 'rewriting Homer', of rewriting that which is unfixd. Fritz Senn, as part of a continued fascination with the Homeric in Joyce's texts, takes steps beyond his own rereadings of the *Odyssey* in *Ulysses*. In 'Remodelling Homer' Senn decides 'not to find out, once again, how Joyce adapted [Homer's metamorphoses] for himself, but to figure out (or to feign) how Joyce influenced *them*, the classics. Such retrospection may unearth old chestnuts, or make tiresome rediscoveries, or it may resurrect dormant ghosts'.<sup>8</sup> 'Remodelling Homer' is a close reading of the *Odyssey* and several translations of the poem through 'post-Ulysean lenses'.<sup>9</sup> Senn reads for 'techniques that we may call Joycean' in the *Odyssey*; but it is his actual mode of reading, however, that I might call Joycean.<sup>10</sup>

The central inquiries of this chapter revolve around the textual provocations within 'Eumaeus' to look beyond the narrative, beyond *Ulysses* to its precursory text the *Odyssey*, and beyond the *Odyssey* to the Homeric Question. This chapter explores how 'Eumaeus' causes us to re-enact questions of authorship, and how through its rewriting of the *Odyssey* *Ulysses* thus provokes a questioning of the activities of authors and readers. Reading *Ulysses* closely, and tracing the ambiguous inferences of our readings, engenders these questions of authorship. My inquiries lead me to discuss a wide range of texts, but these emerge from 'Eumaeus': something of the episode points at its origins. This strategy relates back to the methodology I described in the introduction to this thesis, and it is important to emphasise

---

<sup>6</sup> Michael Seidel, *Epic Geography: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), xvi.

<sup>7</sup> Flack, 11.

<sup>8</sup> Fritz Senn, 'Remodelling Homer', in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 111-32 (112).

<sup>9</sup> Senn, 'Remodelling', 119.

<sup>10</sup> Senn, 'Remodelling', 130.

again the difference between reading *Ulysses* closely through questions of authorship, and asking such questions as arise out of close readings of *Ulysses*. It is the latter, along with its implications, that I endeavour to undertake in the thesis as a whole, and here in particular. Beginning with the language of the Eumaeian narrative style, I shall explore how suspicions of ‘who’ narrates the episode shift to ‘what’, as the concept of an individualised narrator becomes impossibly simplistic. Through an interrogation of the episode’s treatment and awareness of printed texts, papers, or cards, I will argue for a development of previous readings of how the *Odyssey* is rewritten in *Ulysses* – and particularly contend that we can in *Ulysses* find traces of the Homeric poem’s orality, of its shift from oral to written text, and of its unidentifiable authorship. Led thus to investigate the questions of authorship – subsumed under the umbrella term ‘the Homeric Question’ – which are central to certain approaches to the Homeric texts, I will posit parallels between the narrative effects of ‘Eumaeus’, the unknown denoted by the name ‘Homer’, and the activities of authorially-focused Homeric scholars, as well as suggest further resonances with theoretical approaches to the roles of authors and readers generally. I will then introduce two further texts, prompted by these parallels. First, I will turn to the suggestively creative authorial scholarship of Samuel Butler’s 1897 *The Authoress of the ‘Odyssey’*. Butler’s response to the *Odyssey* plays with uncertainties of authorship; filtering its suggestion of a Homeric authoress through a further author-persona. Though it has been critically discussed as an intertext through which *Ulysses* reads the *Odyssey*, significant elements of how this relationship has an impact on the narrative of ‘Eumaeus’ have been overlooked. The comfort with which these explorations sit within the thematic concerns of ‘Eumaeus’, its corresponding section of the *Odyssey*, and the *Odyssey* as a whole, is of great importance to my approach. I will therefore turn finally to Zachary Mason’s more recent Homeric short stories: *The Lost Books of the ‘Odyssey’* (2010), which reach back to the Homeric poems and their scholarship and refigure both with the trope of self-conscious metafiction. *The Lost Books* provides a model for the fictive capacity of the Homeric Question, and aids my suggestions that *Ulysses* engages in a similar activity of rewriting the concerns of Homeric scholarship – in which we as readers are complicit, our manner of reading providing a further crucial link back. Though the discussions that follow will travel far from the strange pages of ‘Eumaeus’, it is those pages that impel the venture.

1. *‘My Experiences, let us say, in a Cabman’s Shelter’ (U, 601)*

The peculiarities of narrative in ‘Eumaeus’ may appear subtle after the dramatic script-like form of the preceding episode, ‘Circe’, but instead point to a complicated and unsettling upset of narrative norms. Cumbersome phrasing and too many clauses, asides, and qualifying

statements result in a style which many readers and critics find boring or tired.<sup>11</sup> The opening sentence has the narrative detail we might expect, but presented in an oddly list-like yet elaborated style. The result is one too many ‘ands’ and an oddly described mode of ‘bucking up’: ‘Preparatory to anything else Mr Bloom brushed off the greater bulk of the shavings and handed Stephen the hat and ashplant and bucked him up generally in orthodox Samaritan fashion, which he very badly needed’ (*U*, 569). In ‘Eumaeus’ things are hit-upon or taken a shot at, sentences go on for too long or read like notes (‘Funny, very’ (*U*, 584)), and it is often unclear to whom pronouns refer. Subjects are buried by extra pieces of information and attempts at style, as a lack of logic pushes syntax to the brink of nonsense:

But, as he confidently anticipated, there was not a sign of a Jehu plying for hire anywhere to be seen except a fourwheeler, probably engaged by some fellows inside on the spree, outside the North Star Hotel and there was no symptom of its budging a quarter of an inch when Mr Bloom, who was anything but a professional whistler, endeavoured to hail it by emitting a kind of whistle, holding his arms arched over his head, twice. (*U*, 569)

The narrative is not to be satisfied with anything as simple as ‘he whistled twice’ – though ten pages later ‘Pom, he shouted twice’ (*U*, 579) is deemed more appropriate than ‘Pom pom’ – as events are over-narrated in an elaborate style. These seemingly harmless details of bad writing, clumsy narration, and over-reaching style obscure the limited events of the episode, with the cumulative effect of causing a reader to ask of the narrator, ‘But who?’ (*U*, 582).<sup>12</sup>

Though others find it boring or tired, the narrative is as comic as it is intriguing: we can find great humour in the way in which, as Senn describes, the episode ‘abounds in contradictions, terminological, logical, etymological, and metaphorical’.<sup>13</sup> The pretensions of the narrative are revealed in the abundance of italicised imported words – *au fait*, *soiree*, *entre nous*, *coup d’œil*, *tête-à-tête*, *apropos*, *protégé*, *voglio*, *hoi polloi*, and *sangfroid* – unevenly littered through ‘Eumaeus’, as if the narrative only occasionally remembers to appear cosmopolitan. But its tendency to use clichéd phrases, a poor attempt at sophistication, often backfires: ‘The horse, having reached the end of his tether, so to speak, halted’ (*U*, 618). Bloom (‘anything but a professional whistler’, and whose button, we are told, ‘had gone the way of all buttons’ (*U*, 570)) and Stephen (‘not in any over sober state himself’ (*U*, 572)) are

---

<sup>11</sup> For example, Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and The Making of ‘Ulysses’* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 249; S. L. Goldberg, *The Classical Temper: A Study of James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), 140; Richard Ellmann, *‘Ulysses’ on the Liffey* (London: Faber, 1972), 151; and, more recently, David Pierce, *Reading Joyce* (Harlow: Pearson, 2008), 190.

<sup>12</sup> There are more occurrences of the word ‘who’ in ‘Eumaeus’ than in any other episode of *Ulysses* (79 at my count – though I have not separated the interrogative ‘who’ from the relative pronoun). Pleasingly, in second place is ‘Cyclops’, an episode with a nameless narrator (62); third is ‘Circe’, the longest episode of the novel, teeming with roles and voices (53); in fourth is the many chronologically-advancing narrative styles of ‘Oxen of the Sun’ (42). Neatly, with regards to the suggestions of this current chapter, the episode with the fifth highest occurrences of ‘who’ is ‘Scylla and Charybdis’ (30), in which Stephen theorises a strong link between Shakespeare’s life and his work – though little biographically is known of the author.

<sup>13</sup> Fritz Senn, ‘Dogmed or Dubliboused?’, in *Joyce’s Dislocations: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 96-118 (98).

‘our two noctambules’ (*U*, 577) – though Bloom is later upgraded to ‘our hero’ (*U*, 612) – and the sailor Murphy receives the epithet ‘the communicative tarpaulin’ (*U*, 581). The tics are so pronounced as to hint almost at a personality, a characterised narrative; as Dermot Kelly argues in *Narrative Strategies in Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’*, ‘the style of “Eumaeus” suggests some indeterminate border area between the interior monologue and the parodied voices of “Cyclops,” “Nausicaa” and “Oxen of the Sun”’.<sup>14</sup> In her 1993 notes to the Oxford World’s Classics edition, *Ulysses: The 1922 Text*, Jeri Johnson observes in ‘Eumaeus’ ‘an indirect discourse so free as to be virtually unattributable’ (*U*, 945). However, several cues in the episode’s narrative games suggest attribution might be possible, tempting the reader of the words of ‘Eumaeus’ to attempt to discover ‘who precisely wrote them’ (*U*, 589).

A story told twice offers a clue for the suspicious reader of ‘Eumaeus’. In the right newspaper office (though unsure now of which one it was) at the right time, Bloom once had a brief interaction with Charles Stuart Parnell, then leader of the Irish nationalist movement: Parnell thanked him for returning his knocked-off hat. This tale first appears as Bloom’s recollection, within a passage of interior monologue: ‘He saw him once on the auspicious occasion when they broke up the type in the *Insuppressible* or was it *United Ireland*, a privilege he keenly appreciated, and, in point of fact, handed him his silk hat when it was knocked off and he said *Thank you*’ (*U*, 604). This story is transformed a few pages later, narrated into over thirty lines of sentences each at least as long as the original recollected anecdote, peppered with ‘*fracas*’ and ‘*aplomb*’, and resulting in such a confusion of detail that not only is an attempt to amplify Parnell’s *Thank you* into ‘*Thank you, sir*’ smothered but even the following clarification is necessary: ‘His hat (Parnell’s)’ (*U*, 608-9). As Kelly comments, ‘The anecdote is colossally overdone and in its exaggerated dimensions we can see the operative mechanism of the episode’s incompetent narrative.’<sup>15</sup> Something of the transition from Bloom’s thoughts to a narrative performance echoes the form of the episode, and suggests a culprit. Kenner observes in ‘*Ulysses*’ that Bloom is the only character who in ‘Eumaeus’ speaks in the same idiom as the narrative (*U*, 130). This is particularly clear when Bloom’s speech is juxtaposed with that of other characters:

– You, as a good catholic, he observed, talking of body and soul, believe in the soul. Or do you mean the intelligence, the brainpower as such, as distinct from any outside object, the table, let us say, that cup? I believe in that myself because it has been explained by competent men as the convolutions of the grey matter. Otherwise we would never have such inventions as X rays, for instance. Do you?

Thus cornered, Stephen had to make a superhuman effort of memory to try and concentrate and remember before he could say.

– They tell me on the best authority it is a simple substance and therefore incorruptible. It would be immortal, I understand, but for the possibility of its annihilation by its First Cause, Who, from all I can hear, is quite capable of adding that to the number of His

<sup>14</sup> Dermot Kelly, *Narrative Strategies in ‘Ulysses’* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988), 73.

<sup>15</sup> Kelly, 78.

other practical jokes, corruption per se and corruption per accidens both being excluded by court etiquette. (*U*, 588)

The awkward and syntax-muddling asides of Bloom – which are not incorrect, but difficult to read – are all the more apparent when compared to the natural interruptions Stephen makes; his ‘I understand’ and ‘from all I can hear’ do not sacrifice the sense or logic of his point, while Bloom’s asides sit uncomfortably within his sentences, excessive explanation leaving ‘Do you?’ hanging oddly. His question to Stephen is rendered nonsensical, in the same manner as his Parnell story is rendered dull – or, like the narrative, ‘boring’ (and we might also think of Bloom’s inability in ‘Hades’ to properly tell the anecdote about Reuben J. Dodd (*U*, 91)). We are encouraged to make further tentative links between Bloom’s mind and the narrative of ‘Eumaeus’ as Bloom thinks back to a story read in *Titbits* magazine that morning: ‘Suppose he were to pen something out of the common groove (as he fully intended doing) at the rate of one guinea per column, *My Experiences*, let us say, *in a Cabman’s Shelter*’ (*U*, 601).<sup>16</sup> Bloom’s daydream of a hypothetical entrepreneurial endeavour is consistent with the meanderings of his thought elsewhere in *Ulysses*, particularly in the following episode ‘Ithaca’. However, rather than pondering a scheme for increasing Dublin tourism (‘Ithaca’, *U*, 671), Bloom here imagines writing the episode in which he himself is written.

This impulse to imply that Bloom is a part of the formation of the narrative, but not its sole perpetrator, is most explicitly explored by Kenner as an extension of free indirect speech. The appearance of the word ‘literally’ in *Dubliners* is crucial to Kenner’s development in *Joyce’s Voices* of the Uncle Charles Principle. In defence of ‘Lily, the caretaker’s daughter’ who in ‘The Dead’ is ‘literally rushed off her feet’ and the ‘repairing’ Uncle Charles, the Principle allows that in Joyce’s works ‘*the narrative idiom need not be the narrator’s*’ (*J’sV*, 18). In Kenner’s reading ‘repaired’ is a word Uncle Charles would use, just as Lily might claim to be ‘literally rushed off her feet’, a ‘speck of his characterizing vocabulary’ affecting the third person narration (*J’sV*, 17). ‘Literally’ is dotted about in ‘Eumaeus’, fulfilling its role as a pointer of narrative interpolation: though ‘the civilised world’ is taken ‘by storm, figuratively speaking’ there is also music capable of ‘literally knocking everything else into a cocked hat’, and Bloom can be ‘Literally astounded’ (*U*, 585, 614, and 606). Kenner’s reading of ‘Eumaeus’ elaborates this concept of ‘writing about someone much as that someone would choose to be written about’ (*J’sV*, 21). ‘Eumaeus’ is ‘the Uncle Charles Principle *in excelsis*’: Bloom is ‘treated to an episode written as he would have written it’, and furthermore ‘it is so

---

<sup>16</sup> ‘Asquat on the cuckstool’ at the end of the fourth episode ‘Calypso’ Bloom reads *Matcham’s Masterstroke* by Mr Philip Beaufoy, a story in three and a half columns in *Titbits*: ‘Quietly he read, restraining himself, the first column and, yielding but resisting, began the second. Midway, his last resistance yielding, he allowed his bowels to ease themselves quietly as he read, reading still patiently that slight constipation of yesterday quite gone’ (‘Calypso’, *U*, 66). As the output of Mr Philip Beaufoy is aligned with the output of Bloom’s bowels, it is fun to note that Richard Ellmann has argued *Matcham’s Masterstroke* ‘jocularly’ refers to a story written by a young Joyce for *Titbits*. *James Joyce: New and Revised Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 50.

much Bloom's episode he even daydreams of writing it' (*J'sV*, 38, 35, and 37). Several other critics suggest a relationship between Bloom and the narrative of 'Eumaeus', with a consistent carefulness of phrasing in order to avoid anything so simple as 'Bloom narrates/writes the episode'.<sup>17</sup> Senn, for example, argues that 'According to how some of us read "Eumaeus" [...] the episode can be read as an imaginary product of what Bloom might have written.'<sup>18</sup> He clarifies, calling Bloom, 'in one sense', only 'an oblique co-author'; and the episode 'the sort of thing to which Bloom would like to rise, circumstances permitting'.<sup>19</sup>

Though stranger and more subtle than free indirect speech, the Uncle Charles Principle similarly implies a collaborative narrative. If the narrative is in some manner disguised in Bloom's idiom, playing the role of Bloom-as-author, then the reader is still left with questions. What does the disguise conceal, and who, or what, is playing the role? The Uncle Charles Principle in 'Eumaeus' does not solve an impulse for identification caused by the narrative style: it causes an inherent function of narrative to be writ large. In this episode we find a complex teasing version of the effects of any narrative – to ask what lies behind it. Narratives beg questions. As Vladimir Nabokov points out in *Lectures on Literature*, 'Eumaeus' is full of a 'variety of synonyms for "he said"' – though to Nabokov these are just evidence of an 'elegant journalese' style.<sup>20</sup> '[H]e said'; 'he mentioned'; 'he commented'; 'he very sensibly maintained'; 'he added with a half laugh'; 'he informed', 'he remarked'; 'he observed'; 'he ventured to say'; 'he subjoined pensively'; 'he appetisingly added'; 'says he'; 'repeated he'; 'he resumed'; 'he proceeded'; 'he continued'; 'he declared'; 'he stated'; 'he softly imparted'; 'he muttered'; 'he managed to remark'; and 'he intimated' – these are also repeated markers of the narrative act, exaggerated by their style and variation. In his 1953 work *Writing Degree Zero* Roland Barthes discusses the preterite tense of narrative: the 's/he said' function of third person narration. He argues that 'The preterite *signifies* a creation', and that 'it is a lie made manifest, it delineates an area of plausibility which reveals the possible in the very act of unmasking it as false' (*Zero*, 46-7). Reading narrative as 'a lie made manifest' allows a reader to see the sailor Murphy's untruthful storytelling as an exaggeration of the inherent fiction of any narration. Barthes claims that 'Behind the preterite there always lurks a demiurge, a God, or a reciter' (*Zero*, 46). There is someone or something weaving the lie of narrative and simultaneously using it to conceal them or its self; as Barthes explains, 'this is what writing does in the novel. Its task is to put the mask in place and at the same time

<sup>17</sup> See, for instance, John Paul Riquelme, *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 217, and Brook Thomas, *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Book of Many Happy Returns* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 134.

<sup>18</sup> Senn, "'All kinds of words changing colour": Lexical Clashes in "Eumaeus"', in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 156-75 (173).

<sup>19</sup> Senn, 'Eumaeus Titbits – As someone somewhere sings', in *Inductive Scrutinies*, 176-96 (176 and 177).

<sup>20</sup> Vladimir Nabokov, *Lectures on Literature*, ed. Fredson Bowes with an introduction by John Updike (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), 355.

point it out' (*Zero*, 48). Narrative can be read therefore as a disguise, as a concealed identity. Furthermore, we can read it as a form of role-playing: Gérard Genette, in *Narrative Discourse* (1980), describes narrating as 'an *act* like any other'.<sup>21</sup> In 'Eumaeus' this '*act*' draws attention to itself by performing the act badly, causing us to suppose that, as I have explored above, the narrative in some manner is playing the role of Bloom on the page, while Bloom plays the role of narrator in his mind.

The narrative of 'Eumaeus' is where these two collide, in a confusion of mistaken and concealed identities, adopted roles, and disguises. The narrative maintains the thematic games of the episode, in which a man spuriously named Lord John Corley mistakes Bloom for a friend of Boylan's (*U*, 574); the keeper of the cabman's shelter is 'said to be the once famous Skin-the-Goat, Fitzharris, the invincible' (*U*, 577); someone bears 'a distant resemblance to Henry Campbell, the townclerk (*U*, 586); Simon Dedalus is transformed by Murphy into a circus performer, and, when asked, Stephen Dedalus claims only to have 'heard of him' (*U*, 578-9). Of course, the search for what or who is behind the narrative is in no way limited to the 'Eumaeus' episode of *Ulysses*, or even to those episodes of the novel in which a characterised narrative implies some sort of collaborative narrative effort. This search prompts Kenner, for example, to find an arranging figure at work in *Ulysses*, a presence which is neither the narrator nor the author. Kenner's Arranger, as I discussed in chapter two, reveals itself in the musical episode 'Sirens' with the words 'As said before' placed before a repetition of the opening of 'Calypso' – 'he ate with relish the inner organs, nutty gizzards, fried cods' roes' (*U*, 258) ('*U*' 64). Kenner's Arranger 'keeps track of the details of this printed cosmos', and has 'access such as ours to a printed book, in which pages can be turned to and fro' ('*U*', 64-5). Across much of his Joycean criticism Kenner explores links between the ways in which *Ulysses* plays with its own printed form and questions of who or what informs the narrative of Joyce's texts. In the close readings that follow, I will suggest that the tensions between a self-conscious printed text and a disguised narrator or narrative are at their peak in 'Eumaeus', found in tiny mistakes and oddities which reveal a troublesome interaction between speech and writing. Though linking much of this back to Kenner, I am not attempting to find further evidence for an Arranger. Rather, digging into these textual details enables me to argue that in 'Eumaeus' the relationship between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* reaches a particularly self-aware pitch of intensity.

---

<sup>21</sup> Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 234.

2. A ‘printed matter’ (U, 581)

*The mourners included: Patk. Dignam (son), Bernard Corrigan (brother-in-law), John Henry Menton, solr., Martin Cunningham, John Power eatondph 1/8 ador dorador douradora (must be where he called Monks the dayfather about Keyes’s ad.) Thomas Kernan, Simon Dedalus, Stephen Dedalus, B. A., Edward J. Lambert, Cornelius Kelleher, Joseph MC. Hynes, L. Boom, C. P. M’Coy – M’Intosh, and several others. (U, 602)*<sup>22</sup>

Two instances of terrible transcription lurk in the quoted extract of a printed text in ‘Eumaeus’. The *Evening Telegraph* write-up of Patrick Dignam’s funeral – attended by Bloom in the episode ‘Hades’ – includes M’Intosh, an embodied mishearing. A mistaken identity who wanders through the pages of *Ulysses*, the pseudonymous M’Intosh is named for his overcoat:

- And tell us, Hynes said, do you know that fellow in the, fellow was over there in the...
- He looked around.
- Macintosh. Yes I saw him, Mr Bloom said. Where is he now?
- M’Intosh, Hynes said, scribbling. I don’t know who he is. Is that his name?
- He moved away, looking about him.
- No, Mr Bloom began, turning and stopping. I say, Hynes!
- Didn’t hear. What? Where has he disappeared to? Not a sign. (U, 107-8)

M’Intosh, having found his way into print, is joined by ‘a line of bitched type’: ‘*eatondph 1/8 ador dorador douradora* (must be where he called Monks the dayfather about Keye’s ad.)’, a disaster of interpolation. In his 1987 study *The Mechanical Muse*, Kenner posits ‘that “eatondph” is the grope of James Joyce’s memory toward “etaoin”’.<sup>23</sup> Typing jumbled letters – ‘etaoin’ – after a mistype was a method of compositors using Linotype machines, to enable the whole line to be removed later: so we might assume that this ‘line of bitched type’ is either the compositor’s incorrect (and perhaps therefore ignored) effort to do so, or follow Kenner and read it as Joyce’s incorrect effort to imitate.<sup>24</sup> Bloom’s thought – ‘that must be where he called Monks the dayfather about Keyes’s ad’ – refers the reader back to ‘Aeolus’, in which Bloom visits the newspaper offices and its printing machines which clank and ‘sllt’ (U, 117). Making an adjustment to an advert for ‘Alexander Keyes, tea, wine and spirit merchant’, Bloom witnesses Monks, the dayfather, being called for by the foreman on an unrelated matter (U, 117). On his way out Bloom passes Monks, and a typesetter working: ‘Reads it backwards first. Quickly he does it. Must require some practice that. mangiD. kcirtaP’ (U, 118). A reader

<sup>22</sup> I have corrected this passage following Jeri Johnson’s listed errata (U, 755). In the 1922 text Stephen Dedalus is left out, Simon Dedalus gains a B. A., and Bloom’s name is correct. The publication history of *Ulysses* itself exhibits the lasting effects of printed errors.

<sup>23</sup> Kenner, *The Mechanical Muse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 8.

<sup>24</sup> John Simpson details the history and technicalities of Linotype printing in his note ‘Eatonph and Douradora’ at Harald Beck and Simpson’s online resource *James Joyce Online Notes*. He explains that ‘etaoin’ was a nonsense word made by running one’s left hand down the keys of the composing machine, and that occasionally compositors would forget to remove these lines of ‘bitched type’ – which then ended up in newsprint. <<http://www.jjon.org/joyce-s-words/eatondhp>> [accessed 13<sup>th</sup> December 2017].

might presume that Bloom is seeing ‘Patrick Dignam’ being typeset at that very moment. However, it is just as likely that, having just left Dignam’s funeral and spoken to Hynes about the write-up, Bloom is imagining ‘mangiD. kcirtaP’, pretending to read the name backwards as a typesetter would. Either way, it is not clear that Bloom interrupted Monks himself, though the interruption is tied to Keyes in his memory; he is only tangentially linked to that typographical error, unlike the misprinted character he inadvertently christened ‘M’Intosh’. And as the characters M’Intosh, Stephen Dedalus, and C. P. M’Coy are incorrectly included in the write-up, another character is excluded: the ‘L’ in Bloom’s name is missing, as if in a fit of typographical revenge against the originator of the erroneous M’Intosh. Despite the galleys-checking and ‘proof fever’ in ‘Aeolus’ (*U*, 117), the snippet of newsprint is full of mistakes, at least one of which exposes the dangers of transferring the spoken (‘macintosh’) to the written and printed (‘M’Intosh’).

This is not the only time that the registers of speech and writing collide. Not long after reading the *Evening Telegraph* Bloom hands Stephen a slightly grubby photograph of Molly. He ‘looked away thoughtfully with the intention of not further increasing the other’s possible embarrassment while gauging her symmetry of heaving *embonpoint*’ (*U*, 607).<sup>25</sup> A parenthetical anomaly in the narrative that follows suggests to a suspicious reader that ‘Eumaeus’ is aware of itself as a written and printed text; and therefore just as susceptible to errors caused by the interaction of the spoken and the written.

In fact, the slight soiling was only an added charm, like the case of linen slightly soiled, good as new, much better, in fact, with the starch out. Suppose she was gone when he?... I looked for the lamp which she told me came into his mind but merely as a passing fancy of his because he then recollected the morning littered bed etcetera and the book about Ruby with met him pike hoses (*sic*) in it which must have fallen down sufficiently appropriately beside the domestic chamberpot with apologies to Lindley Murray. (*U*, 607)

The third person narrative reports – or mediates – Bloom’s thoughts as they turn to Molly, and as he recalls ‘I looked for the lamp which she told me’, a line from Thomas Moore’s ‘The Song of O’Ruark, Prince of Breffni’. Bloom’s mind and the narrative wander back to the morning and Molly’s misreading of ‘metempsychosis’ in her book, present in *Ulysses* as ‘met him pike hoses’ only in Bloom’s repeated recollections.<sup>26</sup> This four-word translation is accompanied by the italicised, bracketed ‘*sic*’. *Sic erat scriptum*. Thus it was written. Thus it was however in no way written in *Ruby: the Pride of the Ring*, as Bloom read that morning ‘near her polished thumbnail’ (*U*, 62): thus, rather, it was spoken by Molly. These four words

---

<sup>25</sup> Molly merges in Bloom’s mind and idiom with ‘the beautiful woman’ of *Sweets of Sin*, who ‘threw off her sabletrimmed wrap, displaying her queenly shoulders and heaving *embonpoint*’. Just moments before finding *Sweets of Sin*, Bloom surveys the ‘Crooked botched print’ of a copy of Aristotle’s *Masterpiece*, in a foreshadowing of Eumaeian errors (‘Wandering Rocks’, *U*, 227).

<sup>26</sup> It is partially revealed as ‘Met him what?’ in ‘Calypso’, before being recalled in full in ‘Lestrygonians’. In the 1922 facsimile referenced it is erroneously ‘met him pikehoses’ (*U*, 147). It is later rewritten by Molly as ‘that word met something with hoses in it’ (*U*, 705).

were not written in Bloom's world, but in ours. The text is referring to itself: as in 'Sirens', where the text pronounces 'As said before'. Both 'as said before' and '(sic)' are all the more noticeable for being placed where they are least needed: 'Mr Leopold Bloom ate with relish' is one of the most memorable formulations of *Ulysses*, and the error of 'met him pike hoses' is pretty well established earlier in the text. Furthermore, this shorthand for *thus it was written* is a solely typographical convention: it is not only not used to denote incorrect speech, it is not used within speech, or thought, or in any medium other than writing. Whatever narrates 'Eumaeus' inadvertently calls attention to its own medium of writing in an enthusiastic misapplication of a convention to efface a writer from blame, to assert that an error is not their own. The twice-repeated appearance in 'Eumaeus' of '£. s. d.', a purely typographical stand-in for 'pounds, shillings, pence', forms another narrative choice which highlights the very printed nature of the text (*U*, 571 and 597). There is a disjunction in the episode between spoken and printed words, and between oral and written narratives. The long winding sentences formed of qualifying clause upon qualifying clause appear in this light to be amended as the action is narrated, as if composed aloud, stutteringly self-corrected. There is a disguised perpetrating presence in a further fictional layer of the text, who, like Kenner's Arranger, has access to a printed text – but who, or perhaps which, acts in 'Eumaeus' as an incompetent scribe. Yet the inherent risks of translating the spoken to the written occur elsewhere in *Ulysses*: there is, for example, something of the reverse of '*thus it was written*' in Bloom's world when his 'I was just going to throw it away' is heard as 'Throwaway', the horse whose name is printed in the newspaper Bloom is to discard (and who eventually wins the Ascot Gold Cup, a detail taken by Joyce from the real newsprint of the 16<sup>th</sup> of June, 1904) (*U*, 82).<sup>27</sup> In our world as readers, meanwhile, we face the Blooms' cat's transliterated meows in 'Calypso': 'Mkgnao!', 'Mrkgnao!', 'Mrkrnao!' (*U*, 53-4).

In his application of the Uncle Charles Principle to 'Eumaeus' Kenner fends off those who might point out the differences between the narrative style of the episode and Bloom's thought and speech earlier in *Ulysses*: he argues that 'no man writes as he speaks or thinks, but more formally, and generally in longer sentences, with elegant variations' (*U*, 130-1). The mis-attempt to write in a formal style of long, elegantly-varied sentences is itself a signal of the transition of spoken to written, in the Eumaeian version of Kenner's principle. Kenner touches upon the importance and effects of shifts from oral to printed texts in his Joyce chapter of the 1962 study *The Stoic Comedians*, which explores the ways in which *Ulysses* is self-

---

<sup>27</sup> And another potential transformation from speech to print is greeted with suspicion: Stephen seems less than impressed by the idea of his own 'sayings' being collected by Haines, unless he might 'make money by it' (*U*, 16). He does, however, later try to sell his theorising in 'Scylla and Charybdis': 'For a guinea, Stephen said, you can publish this interview' (*U*, 205).

aware as a text printed on bound pages. Introducing his argument, he makes the following claim:

the most profound of all Joyce's Homeric transformations is this, that the text of *Ulysses* is not organized in memory and unfolded in time, but both organized and unfolded in what we may call *technological space*: on printed pages for which it was designed from the very beginning. The reader explores its discontinuous surface at whatever pace he likes; he makes marginal notes; he turns back whenever he chooses to an earlier page, without destroying the continuity of something which does not press on, but will await until he resumes. He is manoeuvred, in fact, precisely into the role of the scholiasts whose marginalia encumbered the Alexandrian manuscripts of Homer's texts; only here is a text designed, as Homer's was not, precisely for this sort of study. (*Stoic*, 35)

Kenner reads the cat's meows and other instances where 'something living has been imperfectly synthesized out of those twenty-six interchangeable parts' as 'taut, arbitrary and grotesque' in their imperfection; part of Joyce 'playing in every possible way with the spatial organization of printed marks' (*Stoic*, 47).<sup>28</sup> Developing his reading of *Ulysses* as the *Odyssey* composed in print, Kenner highlights that 'Nothing more completely separates typographic from oral narrative than the fact that, as we turn the pages, we can literally see the end coming' (*Stoic*, 49). It follows, then, that at the opening of the end of the novel, as the weight of pages-read are in the reader's left hand and the end is in sight – at the sixteenth episode 'Eumaeus' – such games are played with the differences between oral and printed narratives. Walter Benjamin elaborates an effect of the printed and finite pages of a novel in 'One-way Street': 'As the life-clock ticking away the seconds like mad, the characters in a novel have, hanging over them, the page number. What reader has never once fleetingly, anxiously, glanced up at it?'<sup>29</sup> This threat of print to characters is suggested also by John Paul Riquelme in his analysis of 'Eumaeus': 'Through the printing of texts, characters, both typographical and fictional, are made to appear or disappear.'<sup>30</sup> The character 'L', as previously noted, is absent in the newsprint of the *Evening Telegraph*; an insult to Bloom which is gamely continued by the narrative. The narrative, however, cannot keep track of its characters. In the references to Bloom following his re-christening by the *Telegraph* the joke slips up:

L. Boom pointed it out to his companion B. A.,  
 [...]
 – Is it really, Mr Bloom said  
 [...]
 While the other was reading it on page two Boom (to give him for the nonce his new misnomer)  
 [...]
 – There was every indication they would arrive at that, Mr Bloom said.  
 [...]
 All the same Bloom (properly so dubbed) was rather surprised [...]. (*U*, 602-3)

<sup>28</sup> Though I do think 'sllt', a noise occurring as pages are printed, is pretty perfect (*U*, 117).

<sup>29</sup> Walter Benjamin, *One-way Street and Other Writings*, trans. J. A. Underwood (London: Penguin, 2009), 83.

<sup>30</sup> Riquelme, 221.

Forgetting that it has already given Bloom ‘for the nonce his new misnomer’, and then slipping back to ‘Mr Bloom’ before marking his returned ‘L’ – ‘properly so dubbed’ – the narrative errs in such a way as to suggest a lack of attention; or, to form a comment on the powers of print over characters.<sup>31</sup>

For the characters of ‘Eumaeus’, of *Ulysses*, are themselves the rewritings of oral creations into printed compositions: they are unaware of their Homeric roles, of their previous incarnations. As the narrative of ‘Eumaeus’ is a transformed, disguised version of the narrative of the corresponding section of the *Odyssey*, so are the characters altered and disguised versions of their Odyssean counterparts. The characters are unaware of their imposed roles, just as M’Intosh is unaware of his own misnomer, and therefore that misnomer’s appearance in newsprint – were he to see the article, he would have no way of knowing ‘M’Intosh’ referred to him (whoever he is). ‘Eumaeus’ weaves together themes of disguise, concealment, and mistaken identities; enticements to search behind the narrative, behind the storytelling; and explorations of the episode’s own ‘printedness’. This combination allows us to suspect that a concern of ‘Eumaeus’ is the rewriting of the *Odyssey* as *Ulysses*.

### 3. ‘Assuming he was he’ (U, 595)

Odysseus finally reaches Ithaca from Scheria, home to the Phaeacians. He has kept his identity concealed from Alcinous, the King of Phaeacia, and his people, revealing it only after requesting that Demodocus sings of the wooden horse at Troy. The tale of Odysseus’ cunning stratagem, a wooden disguise, moves Odysseus to tears, causing the King to question his identity. Once revealed, Odysseus moves into the position of narrator and tells of his exploits across the seas. The Phaeacians then aid the final stretch of his journey to Ithaca, and once there Athena disguises Odysseus as an old beggar, ‘such-like that no man shall know thee’.<sup>32</sup> ‘His fair flesh she withered on his subtle limbs, and made waste his yellow hair from off his head, and over all his limbs she cast the skin of an old man, and dimmed his eyes, erewhile so fair’ (*O*, 221). So changed, Odysseus first visits the swineherd Eumaeus, who fails to recognise him, and declares to ‘tell thee all most plainly’ how he reached Ithaca (*O*, 228). Spinning a

<sup>31</sup> ‘New misnomer’ implies that ‘Bloom’ is his ‘old’ misnomer – a reference presumably to Virag, his father’s original surname, obliquely referenced in ‘Eumaeus’: ‘Yes, our name was changed too’ (*U*, 578). Bloom, furthermore, is hereafter in the novel only ever ‘Bloom’: either he has forfeited his ‘Mr’ during this bout of name-calling, or we simply know him well enough. It must be significant that his title is lost here, though, surrounded in this episode by similarly unfixated names.

<sup>32</sup> S. H. Butcher and A. Lang, *The ‘Odyssey’ of Homer Done into English Prose* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 220. All references are to this edition, and will be given in parentheses with the abbreviation *O*. I am referring to the Butcher and Lang edition partly because Joyce ‘relied [...] on its mannered translation’, but mostly because I feel a ‘mannered’ version of the *Odyssey* sits well with the put-on style of ‘Eumaeus’. Brian Arkins, ‘Greek and Roman themes’, in *James Joyce in Context*, ed. John McCourt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 239-49 (240).

fictitious tale, Odysseus invents himself as a tricked Cretan forced into beggars' clothes (*O*, 228-33).

Disguises, transformations, and stories define this section of the *Odyssey*, but these themes are present throughout the poem. Odysseus narrates whole swathes of the epic, providing a model for Genette's 'intradiegetic homodiegetic' narrative: a 'narrator in the second degree who tells his own story'.<sup>33</sup> He is concealed variously by his own methods and Athena's, and his unveiling becomes the turning point of his violent homecoming. The Uncle Charles Principle in 'Eumaeus' can thus be read as a translation of Odysseus' narrating tendencies, his control over sections of the narrative in the *Odyssey*. The narrative style of the episode is formed in the idiom of Bloom, the rewritten Odysseus of *Ulysses* – as Kenner suggests, 'Eumaeus' is 'in some ways the book's most profound tribute to Ulysses, first among Homer's word-men' (*J'sV*, 38). In *Epic Geography* Seidel focuses much of his attention on the sailor Murphy, the pseudo-Odyssean storyteller of 'Eumaeus'.<sup>34</sup> He comments on the power of lies, observing that Odysseus only hears Eumaeus confess his secret past after 'he constructs an enormous lie'.<sup>35</sup> Turning to Bloom, he notes that 'Odysseus will invent stories in the *Nostos* of the *Odyssey*. Bloom is not beyond telling a lie or two to suit his own immediate ends'.<sup>36</sup> Focusing on Murphy, Seidel's reading of 'Eumaeus' overlooks the parallels between the narrative games of the episode and the narrative of the *Odyssey*, an epic tale constructed of many 'he said's in which the identity of the narrator is often masked, veiled by role-playing, a 'lie made manifest'. Narrative as a mask or an act, following Barthes and Genette, is of great relevance to the *Odyssey*, while the prompted desire to unveil what lies beneath or behind a narrative echoes *Ulysses*' rewriting of the Greek epic. Furthermore, this enticement to identify a perpetrator, a creator, forms a palimpsestial echo of the Homeric Question, a centuries-old need to identify the authorship of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* – to which I will now turn. The errors and slip-ups of 'Eumaeus' shadow the history of Homeric scholarship's understandings of the poems attributed to Homer: crafting thus a further layer of rewriting.

The Homeric scholar J. V. Luce cautions that 'If one is to begin to write about Homer, one must make assumptions'.<sup>37</sup> Understandings of 'Homer' have been and continue to be so contentiously varied that the use of Homer as a proper noun, an identifier for an individual, must itself be clarified as an assumption. Theories of single or multiple authorships, of differing authorship for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and of modes of composition have been developed and debated for centuries. A key figure in modern readings of Homeric authorship is F. A. Wolf, whose 1795 *Prolegomena ad Homerum* 'argued', as Kostas Myrsiades describes

---

<sup>33</sup> Genette, 248.

<sup>34</sup> Seidel, 229-31.

<sup>35</sup> Seidel, 229.

<sup>36</sup> Seidel, 231.

<sup>37</sup> J. V. Luce, *Homer and the Heroic Age* (London: Futura, 1979), 116-7.

in *Reading Homer: Film and Text*, ‘that Homer, or rather many Homers, orally composed and left behind a number of short lays, which were then stitched together at a later period when writing came into being’.<sup>38</sup> This notion of ‘many Homers’ included the suggestion that the poems were not completely the work of ‘Homer’. Wolf’s ideas, however, were not new: as the translators of the 1985 English edition of the *Prolegomena* describe – repeating Wolf’s own admission – ‘Classicists knew long before Wolf that Homer’s text had been composed and transmitted in unusual ways. Ancients of high authority, Josephus and Cicero, suggested that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had been composed without writing and only put into coherent, written form by Pisistratus some centuries later’.<sup>39</sup> In their translators’ introduction to the *Prolegomena* Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and James E. G. Zetzel also detail the similarities between Wolf’s arguments and those of his nearer contemporaries, including his teacher Christian Gottlieb Heyne and J. B. G. d’Ansse de Villoison, the scholar who published in 1788 ‘the vast corpus of Venice scholia on the *Iliad*, still the richest single source for our knowledge of the working methods of ancient Homeric scholars’.<sup>40</sup> Both assert that the Homeric texts shifted from song to written form, pieced together later with adjustments and additions. These ideas are in the work of Giambattista Vico too: as James I. Porter outlines in ‘Homer: The History of an Idea’, in 1730’s *Scienza nuova seconda* Vico reads Homer as an idea ‘created by the Greeks’ rather than as a person, presenting a hypothesis that Homer did not exist and that the ‘Homeric poems were the final product of a long tradition of oral composition and compilation’.<sup>41</sup> Porter compares Vico’s logic to that of ‘the MacGuffin (an impossible, non-existent and empty object the effects of which are nonetheless real)’, and argues that it anticipates Wolf and the analytic approach Wolf inspired (Porter, 330).

In his eleventh chapter of the *Prolegomena*, Wolf complicates the aims of some Homeric scholarship:

But what if the suspicion of some scholars is probable – that these and the other poems of those times were not consigned to writing, but were first made by poets in their memories and made public in song, then made more widely available by the singing of the rhapsodes, whose peculiar art it was to learn them? And if, because of this, many changes were necessarily made in them, by accident or design, before they were fixed, so to speak, in written form? And if for this very reason, as soon as they began to be written out, they had many differences, and soon acquired new ones from the rash conjectures of those who rivaled one another in their efforts to polish them up, and to correct them by the best laws of the art of poetry and their own usage? And if, finally, it can be shown by probable arguments and reasons that this entire connected series of the two continuous poems is owed less to the genius of him to whom we have normally

<sup>38</sup> Kostas Myrsiades, ‘Introduction’, in *Reading Homer: Film and Text*, ed. Kostas Myrsiades (Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 2009), 7-18 (7-8).

<sup>39</sup> Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and James E. G. Zetzel, ‘Introduction’, in F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena to Homer*, trans. Grafton, Most, and Zetzel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 3-35 (5).

<sup>40</sup> Grafton, Most, and Zetzel, 7.

<sup>41</sup> James I. Porter, ‘Homer: The History of an Idea’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Robert Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 324-43 (329-30). All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

attributed it, than to the zeal of a more polite age and the collective efforts of many, and that therefore the very songs from which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were assembled do not all have one common author. If, I say, one must accept a view different from the common one about all these things – what, then, will it mean to restore these poems to their original luster and genuine beauty?<sup>42</sup>

In his exploration of these difficulties, questions, and theories, Wolf finds evidence for the orality of the Homeric texts within the poems themselves. In Chapter XX he points out the absence in the texts of any references to writing, finding ‘no evidence of even the faintest beginnings of true writing’.<sup>43</sup>

The word *book* is nowhere, *writing* is nowhere, *reading* is nowhere, *letters* are nowhere; nothing in so many thousands of verses is arranged for reading, everything for hearing; there are no pacts or treaties except face to face; there is no source of report for old times except memory and rumor and monuments without writing; from that comes the diligent and, in the *Iliad*, strenuously repeated invocation of the Muses, the goddesses of memory; there is no inscription on the pillars and tombs that are sometimes mentioned; there is no other inscription of any kind; there is no coin or fabricated money; there is no use of writing in domestic matters or trade; there are no maps; finally there are no letter carriers and no letters.<sup>44</sup>

Wolf avoids firm conclusions, as Grafton et al observe: ‘Wolf took great care not to write his exact results into the book. Wherever possible he stated his meaning by negation or approximation. [...] And above all he refused to give definitive answers to the main Homeric questions, even though he liked at times to pretend he had them.’<sup>45</sup> Porter picks up the flipside of this pretence, reading hesitations and ‘indecision [...] only some of which was rhetorically staged’ (Porter, 335). For Wolf, Porter argues, ‘Homer [...] must have been a simple and illiterate bard, but in the end he remains an unknowable cipher’ (Porter, 335). In the century that followed, Homeric scholarship divided over questions of multiple and single authorship – often characterised as Analysts and Unitarians<sup>46</sup> – and later, in the 1930s, Milman Parry investigated more fully and coherently the ‘oral formulaic composition’ of the poems (Porter, 340).<sup>47</sup> Though lacking in solid arguments, Wolf’s *Prolegomena* did establish Homer as uncertain and illiterate.

In her 2002 study *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic* Barbara Graziosi discusses how ancient audiences responded to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, exploring facets of the Homeric Question prefigured much earlier. She outlines two different traditions of etymological analysis: one which works to link Homer to a place and a biographical story, and an opposing ‘important tradition [...] which etymologises the name ‘Homer’ so as to show that it does not refer to an individual at all, but rather speaks of the composition of the poems

---

<sup>42</sup> (*sic*)! Wolf, 69-70.

<sup>43</sup> Wolf, 100.

<sup>44</sup> Wolf, 101. As Grafton, Most, and Zetzel note, this argument was also made by Wolf’s friend J. B. Merian (31).

<sup>45</sup> Grafton, Most, and Zetzel, 33.

<sup>46</sup> See Robert Fowler, ‘The Homeric Question’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, 220-32 (220-1).

<sup>47</sup> Porter uses the word ‘discovery’.

as a collective effort'.<sup>48</sup> Graziosi focuses on F. G. Welker's nineteenth century translation of 'Homer' as '*zusammenfüger*': 'compiler' (Graziosi, 52).<sup>49</sup> More recently updated by Gregory Nagy as 'he who fits the story together', such translation opposes ideas of a single, creative author (Graziosi, 52).<sup>50</sup> Graziosi argues that even in antiquity the name was not understood simply, and that 'the two options, that Homer was originally a proper name, or that it was a symbolic one, are both possible, but neither can be proved right to the exclusion of the other' (Graziosi, 53). The questions that have been, or continue to be, relevant to some fields of Homeric scholarship – whether an individual Homer lived and composed, or if there were instead 'many Homers'; whether the same person or persons composed the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; and the question of later interpolations – have authorial implications. In his 1869 inaugural lecture Friedrich Nietzsche queries whether 'in Homer "has a person been made out of a concept [*Begriff*] or a concept out of a person?"' (Porter, 329) A concept, a compiler, one of many, non-existent, a genius; Homer the author is unfixed. As Thomas de Quincey quips in 'Homer and his Homeridae' in 1841, 'Some say, "there never was such a person as Homer." "No such person as Homer! On the contrary," say others, "there were scores."' (Porter, 330)

We can read De Quincey's 'scores' of Homers as referring both to notions of multiple authorship, and to the reception of the poems: to the host of different ideated Homers formed by Homeric scholars. Graziosi concludes *Inventing Homer* by arguing that multiple imagined Homers existed for ancient audiences too, though with different implications:

In the modern world, the authority of Homer is linked with keen attempts at recovering a credible image of that poet and at establishing exactly what he composed. In the archaic and classical periods, Homer's authority seems to have worked differently. As we have seen, ancient audiences did not try to discover, once and for all, who the real author of the Homeric poems was, but rather tailored new images of the poet to suit particular contexts, or, alternatively, collected and listed several contradictory views without adjudicating between them. At the same time, the authority of this imaginary and multiform figure was real enough: rhapsodes were expected to perform his work, rather than improvise freely on a well-known story, and countless intellectuals appealed to the authority of Homer in order to establish their own. (Graziosi, 250)

The ancient audiences Graziosi explores form their own Homers without seeking a definitive author, yet we can see that modern scholarship has also created its own Homers for its own contexts.<sup>51</sup> For example, M. H. Abrams details romantic readings of Homer from Coleridge's

---

<sup>48</sup> Barbara Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 81 and 52. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>49</sup> F. G. Welker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, 2 vols., 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Bonn: 1865-82), vol. 1, 121.

<sup>50</sup> Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 297-300.

<sup>51</sup> It is worth nothing here that the Homeric Question does not only ponder the composition of the poems or identity of their author(s). Such scholarship can also be concerned with the audiences of Homer: for example, Douglas Frame argues that the Homeric audience is figured within the *Odyssey* by the Phaeacians, who listen to Odysseus and return him home. Frame, 'New Light on the Homeric Question: The Phaeacians Unmasked', included in 'A virtual birthday gift presented to Gregory Nagy on turning seventy by his students, colleagues, and friends', The Centre for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University <<https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4453>> [accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017].

‘objective’ poet to John Keble’s highly-knowable author: ‘Keble was not in the least deterred [...] by the knowledge that a number of contemporary investigators affirmed that Homer was not a person at all, but a composite myth’, comments Abrams.<sup>52</sup> Keble’s application of romantic ideas of a ‘visibly invisible’ author-God to Homer results in, as Abrams describes, ‘a poet made patently after his own image, or at least after his own ideals. The Homer who emerges from Keble’s pages is a Tory, a backward-looking romantic, and a sentimental, all-but-Christian gentleman’.<sup>53</sup> Keble’s Homer is a genius poet, markedly different from the Homers of Wolf or Welker: his Homer responds to Keble’s context and serves his purposes. As I touched upon earlier, Kenner finds many Homers in *Ulysses* itself – a ‘museum,’ even, ‘of Homers’:

The Homer of Joyce’s own time, a Homer of molecular activities, is as pervasive as the air [...] The next most recent Homer, the one of comparative mythology, is easier to see, though not being very distant he presents very large outlines [...] Behind him we find Wolf’s Homer of multiple authorship, who corresponds to the fact that *Ulysses* would seem on stylistic grounds to have a number of different authors, one of them a woman. The Homer of Stoic exegesis moreover has obviously been at work, strewing the pages with systematized lore [...]. The way they are worked into Joyce’s text has been called arbitrary, but it corresponds to the way exegetes once got them out of Homer’s. (*Pound*, 49-50)

As Stephen Minta argues in ‘Homer and Joyce: The Case of Nausicaa’, ‘to place Joyce alongside Homer is not simply – perhaps not even primarily – to ask how Joyce read the *Odyssey*, but to recall how the *Odyssey* was read’.<sup>54</sup> Minta’s essay explores how sexual undertones present when Odysseus meets Nausicaa in the original Greek of the *Odyssey* were suppressed by many translators, and yet found their way back into the corresponding episode of *Ulysses*. With little ancient Greek and a reliance on translations, such a return by Joyce forms a puzzle.<sup>55</sup> Yet Minta’s focus emphasises the impossibility of discussing the *Odyssey*, particularly through translation, without engaging with the history of its reading. How the *Odyssey* was read is of great importance to how we read the *Odyssey* in ‘Eumaeus’. Minta’s conclusions also have a sense of the uncanny, suggesting literary relations that undermine somewhat the importance of the biographical author, Joyce, in the interests of making links between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey*. Senn’s aforementioned ‘Remodelling Homer’ creates similarly free readings of the *Odyssey*, and ends with his concession:

The above readings are all modelled on techniques that we may call Joycean. Joyce, at any rate, helped to teach them to us. As might be shown in much more ample detail, some of these techniques were already Homeric, and may have been overlooked. But, inevitably, I have offered not only interpretations, but also metachronic figments, or

<sup>52</sup> M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 256-7.

<sup>53</sup> Abrams, 261.

<sup>54</sup> Stephen Minta, ‘Homer and Joyce: The Case of Nausicaa’, in *Homer in the Twentieth Century: Between World Literature and the Western Canon*, ed. Barbara Graziosi and Emily Greenwood (London: Oxford University Press, 2007), 92-119 (93-4).

<sup>55</sup> Minta, 102-3.

feints – for that is what fiction means: Latin  *fingere* , ‘feign’ or figure (all cognates of English ‘dough’) go back to a root meaning to kneed, mold, form, or what in German could be expressed by  *modeln* .<sup>56</sup>

And, as shifts from oral to written narratives are acted out before us in ‘Eumaeus’, held up in newsprint and signalled by lapses in narrative cohesion, we can read an echo of the translation of spoken to printed epic, and a rewriting of a significant change in perceptions of the Homeric. ‘As said before’ becomes ‘Thus it was written’: the self-conscious asides of  *Ulysses*  enact the transition from voice to print, echoing the early suggestions of Vico or Wolf. To furthermore suggest Joyce pre-empts Parry’s development of understandings of Homeric oral composition might seem an uncannily metachronic interpretation, though not nonsensical if one views the reader as the ahistorical site of intertextuality or follows Kenner’s lead: ‘Perhaps Joyce’s sense of things was not as far from the oral-formulaic as chronology might have led us to suppose’ ( *J’sV* , 67). Parry’s work, however, theorised the mechanisms of oral composition; pre-Parry, the  *idea*  of Homeric orality would have been fully available to Joyce. Traces in ‘Eumaeus’ of transformations from oral to printed text are an important reference back to the Homeric Question, and more broadly raise questions of how texts originate. We can also read the Arranger as a ‘compiler’, as ‘he who fits the story together’, controlling the many voices and styles of  *Ulysses* , and see something of a compilation in the overwhelming intertextuality of  *Ulysses* , a re-versioning and stitching together of previous texts. Such a reading suggests a strange alliance between Welker and Nagy’s genius-author-effacing translations of ‘Homer’, and Barthes’ definitions of a writer as one who ‘can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original’ and of a text as ‘a tissue of quotations’ (‘DA’, 146). This reading of  *Ulysses*  accordingly suggests that questions of what we mean by an ‘author’ or a ‘text’ manifest both in Homeric scholarship and twentieth century literary theory.

Further evidence pointing towards a Homeric foreshadowing of poststructuralist theories of authorship is also apparent in Graziosi’s  *Inventing Homer* . In her explorations of the myriad interpretations of ‘Homer’ Graziosi plots the appearances of and transitions between  *aoidos*  (bard),  *rhapsodos*  (rhapsode), and  *poietes*  (poet, ‘maker’: the closest to ‘author’) (Graziosi, 19-20). Graziosi identifies Homer as a bard and a poet, but not a rhapsode (Graziosi, 48). She details that as ‘the maker and the performer can coincide in the figure of the  *aoidos*  [...] [t]he verb  *poieo*  and its cognate  *poietes*  become relevant when the performer, or the reader, evokes the absent author’ (Graziosi, 42). In relation to Homer, the word closest to author becomes important when the distinction needs to be made between the performer and the composer; when a gesture is required to signal an absent other has authored the poem performed. As Graziosi continues, ‘The difference is one of perspective: the word  *aiodos*  belongs to the distant world described in epic poetry, the word  *poietes*  points towards the

---

<sup>56</sup> Senn, ‘Remodelling’, 130.

relationship between maker and performer as well as to what was made by the poet once and for all'. She concludes that 'by the time the name Homer first appears in our sources the distinction between author and performer is already in place. Homer emerges when the performer evokes the absent author' (Graziosi, 48). Homer can thus be understood as metonymic from its very roots of an unknown, absent author. Graziosi's investigations lead her to give her own definition of 'the author Homer' as 'the place where you establish your own special connotation and interpretation' (Graziosi, 89). Graziosi's delineation of Homer is reminiscent, as she briefly notes, of Michel Foucault's exploration in 'What is an Author?' of the 'author-function': 'the name of an author is not precisely a proper name among others' but rather 'points to the existence of certain groups of discourse and refers to the status of this discourse within a society and culture'.<sup>57</sup> The 'absent author' furthermore reaches forward again to Barthes: 'To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing' ('DA', 147). If Homer is 'the place where you establish your own special connotation and interpretation' then the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can be read as texts without origin, limitless, authorless texts which allow a creativity of reading. Paradoxically, areas of Homeric scholarship use such freedoms of reading precisely to locate an author. The absent author who provokes the Homeric Question conversely allows for a method of reading strikingly similar to that advocated by Barthes – a 'birth of the reader' ('DA', 148), but in the service of locating an author. Acts of conjecture define authorially-seeking Homeric scholarship: the author or authorship of the Homeric poems is a gap to be filled, an inference writ large. Forming an author through conjecture fulfils a potential of unlimited, creative, authoritative reading.

4. 'give us a squint at that literature' (U, 612)

Nearing the end of *Inventing Homer* Graziosi suggests that the authorial hunting of Homeric scholarship supports a broader observation: 'The analogy God/author vs world/work has greatly influenced modern literary criticism: the good reader of the work, or the world, hopes to gain some insight into the will of the Creator' (Graziosi, 245-6). She raises a similar point to, for example, Abrams and Barthes, but extends this by noting the attention paid more recently to 'the parallels between Wolf's *Prolegomena ad Homer* and Biblical exegesis' (Graziosi, 246). As she continues: 'scholars have displayed a great interest in recovering the original contribution of a great individual named Homer' (Graziosi, 247). In some respects, the way such scholars engage with the Homeric Question is by hungrily seeking an author,

---

<sup>57</sup> Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard and trans. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 113-38 (122 and 123). Porter invokes Foucault too when discussing Wolf, 336.

with little more than the texts and previous readings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to aid their investigation. In doing so certain classicists theorise an author by reading a text – an intriguingly creative act of reading. We can read Samuel Butler’s *The Authoress of the ‘Odyssey’* as a response to such Victorian scholarship; to make things even more Eumaeuan, the seriousness of this 1897 text remains unknown. The result of his conjecture (whether tongue-in-cheek or not) is the creation of an authoress, which suggests a potential for fiction within the Homeric Question. In what follows, I will explore this potential by looking both at Butler’s study and at several of the interlinked short stories in *The Lost Books of the ‘Odyssey’*. The twisting games of Mason’s stories enable me to highlight how fictions in which authors and readers are figured have Homeric precedence, and how creative scholarship such as *The Authoress of the ‘Odyssey’* is rewritten by ‘Eumaeus’. In their readings of the *Odyssey* and their engagement with Homeric scholarship, Butler and Mason’s texts shed yet more light on the narrative of ‘Eumaeus’, encourage further consideration of theoretical questions of authorship, and suggest how such questions can be wrought in fiction.

In a 2003 introduction to Butler’s *The Authoress of the ‘Odyssey’*, Tim Whitmarsh discusses the context in which this strange work emerged. He quotes Butler’s ‘A Lecture on the Humour of Homer’, given in Cambridge, 1892: ‘It would seem as though Minerva had shed the same thick darkness over both the poems as she shed over Ulysses, so that they might go in and out of the dons of Oxford and Cambridge from generation to generation, and none should see them’.<sup>58</sup> Whitmarsh sees Butler’s reading of the *Odyssey* (along with his translation) as a response to the elitism of classical scholarship, ‘to challenge the academic establishment’s monopoly on the Homeric poems’ (Whitmarsh, xiv). Victorian Homeric scholarship was perhaps not for everyone, but it became well known: as Porter comments, ‘by the end of the century the “analysed” Homer was such a commonplace that it had percolated into popular consciousness’ (Porter, 336). Another Homer emerged at this time too, one formed by the archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann; Kenner and Edith Hall remark that it is this Homer whom (or which) Butler reacts to, or riffs on. ‘The most reputable scholars are still divided on the question of whether Butler believed his own arguments, or was writing a parody of the earnest, archeologically informed Homer of hypothesis that had been such a feature of nineteenth-century scholarship’, claims Hall, highlighting the unanswered question of intent at the heart of attempts to explain Butler’s *Authoress*.<sup>59</sup> Whitmarsh reads *The Authoress* as part of Butler’s lifelong resistance to authority. ‘Classics,’ he argues, ‘along with the Church,

---

<sup>58</sup> Tim Whitmarsh, ‘Introduction’, in Samuel Butler, *The Authoress of the ‘Odyssey’: Where and when she wrote, who she was, the use she made of the ‘Iliad’, and how the poem grew under her hand* (Bristol: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2003), vii-xxv (viii), quoting Butler, ‘A Lecture on the Humour of Homer’ (Cambridge, 1892) 35-6. All references are to the introduction of this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name – referenced separately from Butler’s text for the sake of clarity.

<sup>59</sup> Edith Hall, *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer’s ‘Odyssey’* (London: I. B. Tauris and Co, 2008), 116.

represented for Butler the brutally absurd snobbery of Victorian society at its most intense' (Whitmarsh, x). He argues that '*The Authoress* is the culmination of this disestablishmentarianism' (Whitmarsh, xii). Whitmarsh's conclusions are tempered by his opening admission that *The Authoress* remains 'one of the great mysteries of Victorian scholarship. Even to categorise it as "scholarship" begs the question' (Whitmarsh, vii). Porter describes the text as Butler's 'curious, half-satirical and half-whimsically serious study aimed at the late-Victorian public' (Porter, 336). The 'whimsically serious' study is a challenge for recent commentators, who can easily find serious and worthy reasons for the parody – such as Butler's belief that more should have access to the Homeric poems – yet must struggle with Butler's sillier arguments. Such difficulties were not had by contemporary reviewers and academics, who 'took it very much as a joke', as Whitmarsh describes (though Butler's translation of the *Odyssey* was met with some outrage) (Whitmarsh, ix). Someone who did not, in Kenner's estimation, was Joyce a decade or so later. Kenner critiques Butler for having had too much fun at the expense of established scholars, and as a result 'put himself forever beyond their serious consideration': 'He could have been a Bentley or a Wolf, inventor of the Homer of his age. Instead he chose to be the man with the silly bee in his bonnet about a poetess, and that his most serious reader should have been James Joyce was perhaps more than he deserved to expect' (*Pound*, 49).<sup>60</sup>

Yet Kenner, as a result, takes Butler rather seriously, reading two approaches to Homer and the *Odyssey* in his work as crucial for Joyce. The first is 'the archaeologists' Homer', who Kenner identifies as the Homer of Joyce's age. Kenner links the second to the first: 'During [Joyce's] young manhood archaeology had been turning Homer into just such an organizer of information as the novelist had also become' (*Pound*, 44). Kenner expands his arguments, positing that of the Homeric poems 'The *Odyssey* is the novelist's book of the two, and Joyce [...] saw a novel in its workings: a grip on detailed actuality'. As he notes, at the time 'The Achaeans were turning very domestic in men's imagination, and it is not surprising that domesticity is the note of Joyce's equivalents' (*Pound*, 45). Butler's study, and his translation of the *Odyssey*, emphasised for Joyce this aspect of the Homeric poem: as Seidel summarises, citing Kenner's speculations, 'as a novelist working on the *Odyssey* in novelistic ways, Butler provides a model for Joyce's epic translation'.<sup>61</sup> Though Seidel spends some time in *Epic Geography* on what he calls 'the most apocryphal, although witty, piece of blarney in the Homeric tradition', his study primarily explores the work of another 'eccentric scholar': reading Victor Bérard's unusual geography of the *Odyssey* as a precursor to Joyce's translation

---

<sup>60</sup> Kenner uses the same phrase to describe self-styled outsider-scholar John Kidd (who I will discuss in chapter four).

<sup>61</sup> Seidel, x.

of the epic poem onto the spaces of Dublin.<sup>62</sup> Seidel takes this precursor named by Stuart Gilbert, written off by some as a joke, and argues that Bérard's idiosyncratic *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee* work of 1902-3 was essential to Joyce's rewriting of the *Odyssey*. Bérard and Butler sit between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey*, both exhibiting creative responses to questions prompted by the latter. Both suggest their own geography for the *Odyssey*; it is, however, Butler's construction of author-figures that is of the most pertinence to my Eumaeon investigations.

Whitmarsh argues that 'For Butler the simplicity of his method was the medium as well as the message. Academic scholarship, he claimed, was blinded by its over elaborate theoretical edifices and self-serving obscurantism' (Whitmarsh, vii). Butler applied similar logic to his prose translation of the *Odyssey*, which Whitmarsh reads as 'fundamentally opposed' to 'the *faux*-biblicisms and cod-Shakespeareanisms' of Butcher and Lang's 1879 translation (Whitmarsh, xvii). Yet it is perhaps Butler's 'simplicity of method' that makes *The Authoress* all the more outrageous. Taking a Homeric tradition of close-reading-in-search-of-an-author to its extreme, Butler defends a single authorship of the wanderings of Odysseus. 'That the finest poem of the world was created out of the contributions of a multitude of poets revolts all our literary instincts', he insists, explaining that, when reading the original Greek of the poem, 'The more I reflected upon the words, so luminous and so transparent, the more I felt a darkness behind them that I must pierce before I could see the heart of the writer – and this was what I wanted; for art is only interesting in so far as it reveals an artist'.<sup>63</sup> He agrees with theories that the authors of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were separated by 'some generations,' but his application of what he calls 'common sense' takes him far from other popular responses to the Homeric Question (Butler, 5). *The Authoress* argues that the writer of the *Odyssey* was female and from Sicily, based her geography on her knowledge of her home Trapani, and 'introduced herself into her work under the name of Nausicaa' (Butler, 8). In a chapter entitled 'Further indications that the writer is a young, headstrong, and unmarried woman', Butler invokes questionable logic to argue that only a young woman would dare to undertake the writing of the *Odyssey*, and that parts of the poem are 'too prettily done for a man' (Butler, 145); in a later chapter, 'Who was the writer?' he uses close reading of a shift in tense and descriptive detail to locate the authoress in the household of King Alcinous.

The excellently-titled chapters 'That the *Iliad* which the writer of the *Odyssey* knew was the same as what we now have', and 'The *Odyssey* in its relation to the other poems of the Trojan cycle, and its development in the hands of the authoress', develop Butler's opening

---

<sup>62</sup> Seidel, 183 and xiv.

<sup>63</sup> Samuel Butler, 'The Importance of the Enquiry', *Spectator*, 2<sup>nd</sup> of January 1892, included in *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey'*, 2 and 6. All references are to this edition of *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey'* and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

claim that the authoress not only had an in-depth knowledge of the *Iliad*, but a much-read manuscript in her possession (Butler, 232). Butler presents an *Odyssey* that is a written text, by a single author, with a relationship to the *Iliad* explained by Butler in an uncannily Harold Bloomian manner. Similar or borrowed lines are due to the authoress' 'saturation' with the previous text – an 'unconscious cerebration' – 'the spontaneous outcome of the fullness of the writer's knowledge of the *Iliad*'; while the lack of references to Iliadic events in the *Odyssey* proves the authoress guilty by omission (Butler, 230 and 246).<sup>64</sup> As Butler's quoted publisher friend remarks: "let me tell you that it is our almost unvaried experience that when a writer mentions a number of other books, and omits one which he has evidently borrowed from, the omitted book is the one which has most largely suggested his own" (Butler, 251). Butler provides his own alternative reasons for the absence in the *Odyssey* of direct Iliadic reference, varying from accusations of jealousy to the supposition that the authoress perhaps knew something of Homer that we do not – for instance the poet might have beaten his wife, or run off with someone else's (Butler, 247 and 251). By identifying oddities in the *Odyssey* Butler creates a personality for his authoress, with which he then constructs authorial intentions to authorise his own conclusions. For example, he argues that at the close of the poem his authoress had to either have Odysseus kill Penelope along with the suitors, or maintain throughout that Penelope 'had been pure as new fallen snow. She chose the second alternative, as she would be sure to do, and brazened it out with her audience as best she could' (Butler, 254). As Whitmarsh argues, *The Authoress* 'confronted the prejudices that lay at the core of the masculinist view of literary authorship' (Whitmarsh, xvi). Hall echoes this opinion, suggesting that Butler 'was irreverently debunking both Victorian scholarship and the patriarchal values it embodied'.<sup>65</sup> Butler is prompted by perceived inconsistencies in the *Odyssey* to create a characterised author-figure through which to read the poem; nonsensical gender stereotyping aside, *The Authoress* thus prefigures the effects of textual peculiarities in 'Eumaeus'.

Butler mocks 'masculinist' literary and Homeric scholarship through his authoress, but also through the construction of another author-figure: the 'Butler' to whom I have referred in the last two paragraphs. This ironised figure is solemn yet flippant, angry at the methods of previous scholars yet using only 'common sense' for his own methodology. 'Though repeatedly pressed,' Whitmarsh reports, 'Butler never claimed that the book was anything other than a serious contribution to scholarship' (Whitmarsh, ix). Whitmarsh writes of 'self fashioning,' of a Butler who 'liked to refer to himself as an *enfant terrible*, even when his

---

<sup>64</sup> See Harold Bloom's reasons for excluding Shakespeare from his study of influence – 'the largest instance in the language of a phenomenon that stands outside the concern of this book: the absolute absorption of the precursor.' 'A Meditation upon Priority, and a Synopsis', in *Authorship: from Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, ed. Seán Burke (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), 131-9 (135).

<sup>65</sup> Hall, 116.

*enfance* was several decades behind him'. He sees *The Authoress* as 'consciously playful', and part of a broader self-conscious endeavour by Butler to create a persona (Whitmarsh, viii). Butler edited his own notebooks and letters and has been accused of incessant 'self portraiture' in writing; as Whitmarsh explains, 'the story of Butler's progressive social and intellectual marginalisation is, ultimately, his own invention, and designed to buttress a particular role he created and acted out' (Whitmarsh, xii-xiii). Despite this carefully cultivated persona within and without *The Authoress*, Whitmarsh refuses to write off the study as 'late Victorian whimsy' (Whitmarsh, xvii). In his introduction he argues nothing less than that *The Authoress* helped to undermine the fundamental academic beliefs of Butler's classicist and literary contemporaries: those of the 'great poet' Homer or 'great author' in literature (Whitmarsh, xviii). Its similarities in method to straight-faced readings of Homer lead Porter to describe Butler's text as 'at the very least an extreme symptom of the age' (Porter, 337). For the 'Butler' of *The Authoress* (and Butler's other Homer-related writing) sees the author as the focus of literary scholarship: 'art is only interesting in so far as it reveals an artist' intimates that this persona at least believes a 'good reader' will be rewarded with a glimpse of the author (or an intimate knowledge and surety of her actions). It is this attitude that we find rewritten into 'Eumaeus', and in our searching reading we echo the activity and focus of *The Authoress*.

There is thus more of Butler in 'Eumaeus' than only the treatment of the *Odyssey* in 'novelistic ways'. Seidel compares Butler's theories to those of Stephen Dedalus, and, reminiscent of Stephen's Shakespearean arguments, claims that it does not matter whether Butler believes in his authoress or not.<sup>66</sup> Kenner, meanwhile, argues that Butler and Joyce saw an *Odyssey* both domestic and epic, and links his readings back to Homeric scholarship:

Wolf had believed in a number of bards, making things up; there were inconsistencies because they didn't check one another's work. Butler, in the age of the novel, worked from a different psychology of creation: the poet using knowledge of an immediate and experienced world, and making errors when he got beyond that knowledge and had to guess. (*Pound*, 47)

While I agree with this positioning of Butler as an exceptionally important interpreter of Homer for Joyce, I believe it goes further. We are encouraged in 'Eumaeus' to think that if we read well enough we will be rewarded and pierce the narrative of the episode to find the narrator, unmask the demiurge behind the preterite tense, remove the storyteller's disguise – just as many readers have believed thorough reading of *Ulysses* can identify M'Intosh, the character named after what disguises him. As I have previously discussed, Kenner posits that through the transformation of the orally-composed *Odyssey* to the printed pages of *Ulysses* the reader is 'manoeuvred [...] into the role of scholiasts whose marginalia encumbered the Alexandrian manuscripts of Homer's texts'. In our search through reading for an author-

---

<sup>66</sup> Seidel, 84-5.

narrator of ‘Eumaeus’, some combination of Bloom playing the narrator in his mind and the narrative playing Bloom on the printed page dotted with oddities, we are manoeuvred rather into the role of Butler’s overreaching Victorian Homeric scholar, attempting to characterise a controlling figure using the strangeness of the text. Scholars form Homers in reaction to the greatness of the Homeric poems; the reader of ‘Eumaeus’ is prompted instead by the clumsy oddness of the text. We are trapped by the narrative hide-and-seek into a constant search for a narrative presence, which is ever beyond our reach. Yet in the absolute refusal of ‘Eumaeus’ to allow such a discovery our stymied readings become creative: theoretically any narrator could be argued for (de Quincey’s ‘scores,’ even). A confusion of the authority of the reader and the author seeps into the episode, consistent with the Odyssean fun and games of mistaken identities, storytelling sailors, and a lying beggar-king.

Butler’s construction of an authoress involves a creative effort in the service of a scholarly endeavour. The potential for fictive creation prompted by the figure of Odysseus as hero, narrator, and subject of the gods intermingles in Zachary Mason’s *The Lost Books of the ‘Odyssey’* with tropes and themes from within and without the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; interlinked short stories draw as much from the activities of Homeric scholarship as they do from literature which self-consciously addresses questions of authorship. Often sinister, Mason’s dark retellings echo the meta-theatrical confusion of Pirandello’s 1921 play *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, which ends tragically with the deaths of two unfinished characters; or the claustrophobic, anxious worlds of Jorge Luis Borges’ short fictions. *The Lost Books* contains, the preface informs us, ‘forty-four concise variations on Odysseus’ story’, evidence of how ‘the Homeric material was formless, fluid, its elements shuffled into new narratives like cards in a deck’.<sup>67</sup> Games of fiction, scholarship, and the authority of an author start with the preface, as an authorial voice informs us that these ‘variations’ are a ‘translation’ of ‘a pre-Ptolemaic papyrus excavated from the desiccated rubbish mounds of Oxyrhynchus’ (Mason, vii). Described by Charlotte Higgins as ‘Thinly posing as a literary hoax’, this preface can be seen also as a foreshadowing of what follows.<sup>68</sup> In *The Lost Books* the relationships and boundaries between authors and readers are treated as irreverently as the stories of the Homeric poems and the centuries of their scholarship.

In ‘Record of a Game’ the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* become ‘largely atrophied’ chess primers, much altered over the years until they ‘assumed an essentially literary character’ (Mason, 209-10). The *Odyssey* is particularly corrupted and interpolated – perhaps even ‘apocryphal’ – reimagined as ‘a treatise on tactics to be used after the game has ended [...]’

---

<sup>67</sup> Zachary Mason, *The Lost Books of the ‘Odyssey’* (London: Vintage, 2011), vii. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

<sup>68</sup> Charlotte Higgins, ‘The Lost Books of the Odyssey’, *The Guardian*, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2010 <<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/may/15/lost-books-odyssey-zachary-mason>> [accessed 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017].

the pieces left finally to their own devices and to entropy' (Mason, 210-11). A combination of theories of a different authorship for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and arguments of interpolation and a patchwork composition, this story plays both with the – certainly entropic – movements of Odysseus and his men and with the 'speculations' of Homeric scholars. By treating the literary substance and scholarly history of the Homeric poems as equally viable material for fiction, Mason presents an exaggeration that is only a step further than Butler's construction of a Sicilian authoress. In 'Fugitive', Mason allows correspondences to develop between the question of Homeric authorship and the character of Odysseus, complicating the divine control wrought over Odysseus, his frequent role as narrator, and his characterisation as silver-tongued liar – weaving authorial control and the role of the reader into the fabric of the Homeric poems. An Odysseus finds a book called the *Iliad*, the introduction of which claims that 'the epics attributed to Homer were in fact written by the gods before the Trojan war – these divine books are the archetypes of that war rather than its history'. We are told that the Trojan war keeps recurring, in an 'attempt at bringing the terror of battle into line with the lucidity of the authorial intent' (Mason, 51). Authorial intent and control is thus transposed onto the gods of the Homeric scene, and romantic author-god confluences dramatized. The unknown authorship of the epics is figured into this construction as an echo of Graziosi's link between the authorial hunting of Homeric scholarship and the broader attitudes of literary studies. Divine authorial authority in 'Fugitive' doubles as we learn that even when the poems, 'through authorial and managerial oversights,' have been seen by 'their protagonists [...] this has had no impact on the action or the outcome' (Mason, 51-52). As 'Fugitive' continues, Odysseus, the helpless reader, finds his story repeats: trapped by the narrative of the gods, by the intentions of his author(s). He is written as an ensnared, controlled reader in stories which explore the enticements of Homeric scholarship to identify an author, and theoretical questions of authorial control: these divine authors place what Barthes would describe as a 'limit' on Odysseus' life – inescapably a text ('DA', 147).

A joke on Odysseus the liar, storyteller, and oftentimes narrator becomes in 'A Fragment' the answer to the Homeric Question: 'Odysseus, finding that his reputation for trickery preceded him, started inventing histories for himself', and, eventually, 'one of his lies became, with minor variations, the *Odyssey* of Homer' (Mason, 71). The *Odyssey* is rewritten as the fruits of its protagonist's wily labour: narrator becomes author and lies become composition. This fanciful theory of authorship can be read as prefigured by the application of the Uncle Charles Principle in 'Eumaeus', where Bloom-Odysseus wields obscure, indirect, and unknown control over the narrative, imagining himself to even author the episode.<sup>69</sup> In

---

<sup>69</sup> This has precedence: *Ulysses Homer; or, a Discovery of the True Author of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey'* by Constantine Koliades is an 1829 argument that the King of Ithaca himself wrote the texts of Homer (Whitfish: Kessinger, 2010).

Mason's 'Guest Friend', narrative acts and authorial control are again twisted together, combining the mask of the preterite and Odysseus' knack for disguise and tale-telling. At a crucial moment, to save his own life, Odysseus is revealed as the narrator of the piece: 'he said' shifts to 'I tell this story' (Mason, 22). Authors are written into *The Lost Books*, in a confusion of textual norms which draws as much from the intrusions of a work such as 'Borges and I' as from Odysseus' narrative capability and the authority of storytelling; the importance of lies, disguises, and stories in the final stretches of Odysseus' journey home; the godly control over characters' lives in the *Odyssey*; and the creative authorial-seeking of Homeric scholars exhibited by Butler's *The Authoress*. Borges' 'I do not know which of us has written this page' in 'Borges and I' separates the 'I' on the page from the author, a fictionalisation of a disconnection between the author and their work, or of a questioning of how the author functions within the text.<sup>70</sup> In his constructions of paradox Mason is able to render theoretical questions of the roles of authors and readers as fiction, and thus explore the ways in which such questions materialise in the *Odyssey* and the history of its scholarship. Writing authors and readers into texts allows for subtler and less didactic wanderings through issues of authorship and readership. Genette labels such traversing of narrative boundaries 'metalepses', and explains that the effect of placing readers within a narrative is a sensation of ourselves being part of the narrative.<sup>71</sup> We are encouraged to question our own roles as readers, and how we approach the author, through these metaleptic fictions, and such questioning is relevant to both the content and form of the *Odyssey* and to the history of its scholarship. In its engagement with unknowns of narration, authorship, transcription, and truth, 'Eumaeus' also explores authorial and reader roles. By provoking the reader into a Butler-esque disguise, and constructing an authorial, out-of-reach narrative presence, 'Eumaeus' engages with questions inherent to any act of literature.

Discussing translations of Homer, Porter suggests that 'At issue, in a most basic sense, is how we can communicate with the past' (Porter, 341-2). If a preoccupation of Homeric scholarship rewritten in 'Eumaeus' is that of how we communicate with our literary past, then, once more, a concern of the episode is how literature communicates with its predecessors: how texts can be formed of readings of previous texts. As the opening of the third and final section of *Ulysses*, the 'Nostos', or 'return', this is particularly apt: we return to both the *Odyssey* and the centuries of readings that lie between it and *Ulysses*. The clichés that dot the pages of 'Eumaeus' are a similar reminder of repetitions, pre-existing texts, words that have been said before or have been written by another. Placing Butler between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey*

---

<sup>70</sup> Jorge Luis Borges, 'Borges and I', trans. James E. Irby, in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. Donald A. Yates and Irby (London: Penguin, 2000), 283.

<sup>71</sup> Genette, 236.

emphasises the presence within *Ulysses* of not only previous readings, but unusual readings. As Flack notes, Joyce was not only ‘interested in the major channels of transmission and translation of the literary tradition,’ he was ‘also attentive to the back roads, fragments, silences, and blank spots in literary history’.<sup>72</sup> As one such back road or blind spot, Butler’s *The Authoress* is strange not only in its findings, but in its style. The Butler persona’s pseudo-serious voice and elusive position continues to confuse readers, but is perhaps not so different from the ‘staged indecision’ of Wolf in his *Prolegomena*. Butler and Wolf engage in authorial role-playing, withholding something of what we expect from the authors of academic texts – from the first person voice of scholarship. In Butler, the excessiveness of this becomes almost narrative: a novelist’s character spouting theories of authorship. Such narrative role-playing is a further link to ‘Eumaeus’, as we struggle to pinpoint the creator of a puffed up, overcomplicated, over-written text: *The Authoress* and ‘Eumaeus’ can be said to have a similar narrative structure. Narrative masks are at play in the Uncle Charles Principle too, in its borrowings of characters’ words, and of course in Barthes’ reading of the preterite tense, ‘a lie made manifest’ behind which ‘always lurks a demiurge, a God, or a reciter’. It is this distance between creator and voice that is exploited in a literary hoax: where an authorial persona is a fiction and a narrative persona treated as fact. Mason plays with the notion of literary hoax; his pretence that the ‘lost tales’ are real excavated documents is part of the fiction itself. ‘Real’ literary hoaxes, when exposed, disturb our perception of authorial authenticity and authority.<sup>73</sup> The boundaries between fiction and reality are crossed: a lie of authorship is a disruptive activity.

A literary hoax, authorial persona, narrative voice, or preterite tense points elsewhere: all are at one, hard to quantify, remove from the author. There is something of this in the *Odyssey* when a disguised Odysseus tells Penelope he has met Odysseus, doubling down in his role-playing by teetering dangerously close to the truth. It creates a gap in its evasions, a potent space. In this context, Porter’s reference to ‘the MacGuffin’ when discussing Homeric scholarship takes on a particular pertinence: the Macguffin is a blank, a space, but the fiction of it has real effects within a text. We sense a gap of sorts from the very first sentence of ‘Eumaeus’: we confront our struggle to identify clauses and scan the words for meaning. We can still make sense of it – Bloom brushes down Stephen and returns to him his hat and stick – but something is not quite right, the sentence itself needs brushing down and bucking up. Even if we decide on how it is wrong, we are left to question why, and we increasingly

---

<sup>72</sup> Flack, 11.

<sup>73</sup> The reactions to contemporary literary hoaxers JT LeRoy and James Frey evidence this. Each hoax was exposed with vast, emotional media attention. See Steve Rose, ‘JT LeRoy unmasked: the extraordinary story of a modern literary hoax’, *Guardian*, 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016 <<https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/jul/20/jt-leroy-story-modern-literary-hoax>> and Evgenia Peretz, ‘James Frey’s Morning After’, *Vanity Fair*, June 2008 <<https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2008/06/frey200806>> [both accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017].

experience the effects of this fecund unknown, mimicking the suspicious listeners in the cabman's shelter. '(sic)' also points elsewhere, conventionally at another writer of another text: in 'Eumaeus' its misuse points instead at the fictionally incompetent author-persona of the episode's narrative (and at the unnarrated moment of Molly's misreading). The 'elsewhere' to which 'met him pike hoses (sic)' directs us, however, is worth further unpicking. The real novel *Ruby. A Novel. Founded on the Life of a Circus Girl* by Amye Reade, does not contain the word 'metempsychosis'.<sup>74</sup> Believing that its fictional counterpart *Ruby: the Pride of the Ring* does contain such a word requires a bit of a leap of faith. But it is this word that Molly misreads, or mispronounces, and her unnarrated attempt in 'Calypso' that Bloom recalls in 'Eumaeus': 'met him pike hoses'. The third person narrative of the episode – formed by the author-persona with whom Bloom has a bizarre, unquantifiable link – reports this recollection with the caveat '(sic)', seemingly overlooking the fact the words appear (eventually) in *Ulysses*, not *Ruby*. This narrative muddle is controlled – perhaps – by the Arranger, and ultimately by Joyce. In its reference to Molly and *Ruby*, 'met him pike hoses (sic)' also refers to the relationship between *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* – as it is an invocation of a prior text, transformed – and to Homeric scholarship – by prompting us to find who or what is responsible for this slip up. Within these five words are traces of Molly, Bloom, whatever narrates 'Eumaeus', the Arranger, and Joyce – and with these voices are rereadings or rewritings of earlier pages of *Ulysses*, two *Rubys* (one real, one fictional), 'major channels' and 'blank spots' of Homeric scholarship, and the *Odyssey*. 'Met him pike hoses (sic)' is a palimpsest of fictional and real reader and author voices, a coexistence of texts and their readings – as is 'Eumaeus', and all of *Ulysses*. Ultimately, '(sic)' gestures towards an absent author-figure, who remains unknown, but whose effects we feel and towards whom we strive. When we hold this idea together with Graziosi's argument that 'Homer emerges when the performer evokes the absent author', we find a sense of the performative in '(sic)' and in 'Eumaeus' that links the episode and its oddities again back to understandings of Homer. The narrative of the episode is a performance, and refers to a blank but potent elsewhere in the way a rhapsode's performance of the *Odyssey* might. Narrative performance is in the *Odyssey* itself when Demodocus sings, when Odysseus lies, and even when Penelope weaves. It is in the Uncle Charles Principle, and the preterite tense, gesturing elsewhere, an amalgamation of character, author, unknown; of inauthenticity, hoax, fiction, and authority. It seeps into a performance of authorship, a show put on by Butler, Wolf, and the narrator of 'Eumaeus'.

---

<sup>74</sup> Mary Power, 'The Discovery of "Ruby"'. Power notes however that 'it well could have, for it provides a description of the whole thematic process of the novel.' To make matters even more fun, Power is not able to conclusively say who 'Amye Reade' was the penname of. *JJQ*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Winter, 1981), 115-21 (121). Power's essay is mentioned in Johnson's annotations to *Ulysses*, 795.

Rewriting the Homeric texts involves a rewriting of Homeric scholarship, which allows for a fictionalisation of crucial questions of authorship. The underlying presence of such questions in Homeric scholarship, and their explicit existence in fictions such as Borges' short stories, signals their constant, intrinsic relevance to literature and literary studies. We can even read the formulation of the unknown 'Homer', the name and all it connotes as the birth of the 'author', the inception of the set of questions signalled by the term. In tracing such questions, the thematic fabric of the *Odyssey* remains undisturbed: these concerns are consistent with the act of narrative, the functions of disguise, the wit and power of language, the overarching control of the gods, and the weaving of lies. Nor do these questions jar with the games of 'Eumaeus', of the search for who tells the story or for who creates printed texts, of speech altered in writing, of pseudonyms, identities, and lies. Printed pages of curious origin are waved before the characters – the *Evening Telegraph*, the postcard, the photograph – and before us. 'Eumaeus' focuses our attention on our desire to unveil the narrative presence, to prick the bubble of performed authorship, and thus self-consciously gestures towards the previous Homeric text through which centuries of scholars have roamed to find an author. The concern of rewriting is woven through the episode, an explicit reference to a curious origin of the pages of *Ulysses*. As we read for the creator of the narrative of 'Eumaeus' we enact the entrapment of some Homeric scholars, a freedom of limitless reading conversely in the service of locating an author. This forms an important middle-ground exploited by Mason, and familiar to a reader of *Ulysses*. We enjoy an activity of reading in *Ulysses* in which we must to some extent create the text ourselves, unravelling the mass to string together occasional moments of possible, unstable, and incomplete clarity. We might even feel in control, aware of our own writing of the text in our reading, yet all the while conscious of the author that such a complicated intertextual novel constantly points to in its intricacies. In our stilted readings of *Ulysses*, we are complicit in the creation of an echo.

## Part Two

### Chapter Four

#### Reading Joyce II: Late Criticism

That's folk, he said very earnestly, for your book, Haines.  
Five lines of text and ten pages of notes.

(U, 13)

Several of the critical traits I explored in chapter two endure in the Joycean criticism of the last four decades; for example, the tendency of critics to reference Joyce's extra-literary words: his notes, drafts, letters, and anecdotes. Arthur Power's *Conversations with James Joyce* was published in 1974, providing critics with a new source of anecdotal authorial opinions. Their references to the words of Power's Joyce follow an earlier model, and prevail beyond the Joycean encounter with anti-authorial poststructuralist literary theory. It is to this encounter that I turn in this chapter. My aims are two-fold: to give an overview of the Joycean reception of, and relationship to, literary theory from the 1970s onwards, and to look at the questions of authorship raised explicitly and implicitly by Ulyssean criticism in that time. The resistance of swathes of Joyce studies to French theory has itself key ramifications for understandings of how Joyce criticism views and has viewed the author-figure and the role of the reader. Furthermore, the impact and reception of these theoretical shifts exaggerate the pre-existing self-conscious and self-corrective nature of *Ulysses* criticism, a discipline much concerned with the 'right' way to read *Ulysses*. Joycean criticism's constant assessment of its own activity predates the challenges of theoretical shifts in the wider academy.

Though following a loose chronology, this will not be an historicising reading of Joyce studies. Nor is it in any way aiming to be comprehensive: the so-called boom of Joyce studies very much coincided with the arrival of theory, and though this chapter looks at many more works of criticism than chapter two it by no means looks at every major work of Joyce criticism in the last forty years. Questions of how to read a text, its author, and our own readings are the concerns of both literary theory and Joyce studies, making the Joycean resistance to theoretical approaches particularly relevant to this thesis. Though I am interested in the general impact of 'theory' or 'literary theory' (here referring to the mostly European theories that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s) poststructuralist literary theory and criticism will be a principal focus, in part due to a necessary limiting of scope but also due to the shared concerns of poststructuralists and some readers of *Ulysses*. Within this I will also pay attention to deconstruction, as its relationship to Joyce caused more controversy – more arguing over how we *should* read Joyce – than other alignments of Joyce with theory. Jacques Derrida's

Joycean work, exploring how we read both Joyce's texts and Joyce, sparked responses which in their disagreement with Derrida and his admirers also discussed how we read Joyce and his texts. Though it is not my aim to argue that deconstruction is Joycean, the problems Derrida addresses in his work on Joyce also play out across the activities of Joyce studies.

Chris Baldick defines deconstructive theory and criticism as a way 'by which it can be shown that a text's meanings will resist final incorporation into an interpretative frame. It acts as a warning against critical ambitions to control texts, and against critical self-belief in general'.<sup>1</sup> Derek Attridge attests to this, describing in 1984 how 'familiar' Joycean criticism is viewed as a 'contribution to the growing body of increasingly accurate information, coming ever closer to the truth as errors are corrected and new insights added', and how 'we confirm the belief in an accessible truth independent of our commentary, which is our goal to approximate as closely and fully as possible'.<sup>2</sup> He evidences the strength of this belief by observing that theoretical approaches are also used 'to provide "improved readings"', including 'deconstruction – or something bearing its name' (9<sup>th</sup>, 83). Attridge argues against this misuse of the approach, hoping instead that

Deconstructive criticism would weave itself through the text being read, and weave that text through itself, and thread other texts through both, in a patient and careful movement of displacement and dissemination, at once exposing and destabilizing, however momentarily, the boundaries and perceived hierarchies that have enabled the text to be pinned into (and to serve into reinforcement of) an ideology or a metaphysic that denies it its specificity, its inexhaustibility, its unrecuperable otherness. (9<sup>th</sup>, 83)

What Attridge wants to move away from is an attitude where any criticism is judged by one framework: judged 'as if the interest of, and justification for, a careful reading, deconstructive or otherwise, lay solely in the nugget of truth it added to the pile' (9<sup>th</sup>, 84).

One strand of inquiry in my somewhat developmental exploration of the Joycean reception of theory is how such a belief in critical 'truth' is denied or affirmed by Joyce critics and by the activities of Joyce studies as a field, and how this relates to critical authority. My interest in how critics continue to read Stephen Dedalus' words as Joyce's is also related to authority, particularly when the words referenced express theories of authorship. Critics link Stephen's ideas to both anti-authorialism or anti-intentionalism and to the enduring control of the author – yet another contradiction within the field in terms of how the author is viewed. I will be noting readings of Stephen, and for similar reasons uses of Joyce's extra-textual comments, in Joycean studies of the author and/or authority as part of this next stage of my exploration into how Joyce studies approaches questions of authorship. As I remarked in

---

<sup>1</sup> Chris Baldick, *Criticism and Literary Theory from 1890 to the Present* (London: Longman, 1996), 174.

<sup>2</sup> Derek Attridge, 'Criticism's Wake', in *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth, Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium, Frankfurt 1984*, ed. Bernard Benstock (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988), 80-7 (82). All references are to this edition, and will be given in parentheses with the abbreviation 9<sup>th</sup>.

chapter two, every piece of Ulyssean criticism involves an implicit decision of how to read the relationship between the author and the text of *Ulysses*, whether this decision is then explicitly explored in that critical act or not. These attitudes form, and are formed by, readings of *Ulysses*, be it an individual's reading or the inherited readings of a critical or theoretical school.

Picking up where chapter two ended, and bearing in mind what was discovered in chapter three, I will begin by looking at some of the first works of Joycean criticism which proclaimed their allegiances to the new literary theories. I will then explore how theoretical ideas and their relationship to Joyce's texts were expressed and received at the 1984 International James Joyce Symposium and in the work of both theorists and critics. While I will continue to track the resonances of this, and how or if it affected Joycean attitudes to their own practice, I will also note another area which raises questions of authorship and authority: that of editing, here in the work of Hans Walter Gabler and Danis Rose. A paradoxical contention amongst Joyce critics post-theory is that the reading methods of theoretically- (particularly deconstructive-) inclined critics are not markedly different from those of Joyce scholars who openly eschew theory. In the interests of adding to this debate, I will compare the approaches of Fritz Senn and Derek Attridge, before returning to more recent developments in the field. As an investigation of how Joycean critics read Joyce and Joyce's texts, and of how such readings are authorised, this chapter will form a backdrop to chapter five: 'Reading *Ulysses*'.

### 1. The forerunners

Colin MacCabe's critical writing on Joyce and work with Stephen Heath in the film journal *Screen* are often credited with importing French theory to Britain and Anglophone academia. His 1979 monograph *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* puts its allegiances to new approaches up front, opening with 'Theoretical Preliminaries' which range from Lacanian psychoanalysis to political conclusions via Freud, Saussure, Derrida, Marx, and Brecht.<sup>3</sup> The complex theoretical framework used by MacCabe somewhat overwhelms the texts in question, however, and some of the study's arguments and methods contradict its proclaimed critical positioning of the author-figure. MacCabe situates his study as a movement away from the author as a root of meaning: 'The author does not create the meanings which are then conveyed by the text' (MacCabe, 54). He repeats this refrain further into the study, affirming that 'Writing menaces any simple notion of origin – any simple notion of author' (MacCabe, 79).

---

<sup>3</sup> Colin MacCabe, *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* (London: Macmillan, 1979), 1-12. All references are to this edition, and will be given in parentheses with the author's name.

But despite explicitly stating that his approach ‘will not be to study the work as a product of the life’ and his references to Derrida’s ‘turn [...] away from meaning as founded in a [...] presence’, MacCabe looks specifically and directly at the author (MacCabe, 12 and 76). He increasingly refers to Joyce’s letters (constituting a turn to the author even when refuting their comments), and uses Arthur Power’s 1974 memoir *Conversations with James Joyce* as authoritative proof of Joyce’s socialism (MacCabe, 159-65). He interprets both Joyce’s letters and his reported conversations in order to prove a personal politics of the author, with which he then reads Joyce’s texts. In his efforts to argue that ‘Joyce’s writing produces a change in the relations between reader and text, a change which has profound revolutionary implications’, MacCabe presents a confusion of theoretical attitudes towards the author – and uses authorising methodologies not dissimilar from critics who predate or avoid the literary theories he applies (MacCabe, 1).

MacCabe’s monograph, however, accentuated a need for what some Joyce scholars were beginning to view as unavoidable and essential: a critical engagement with theory. Karen Lawrence’s 1981 study *The Odyssey of Style in ‘Ulysses’*, though theory-literate, neither draws on MacCabe’s work nor follows his approach. One of the earliest pieces of Joycean criticism to refer to Roland Barthes, Lawrence’s discussions of narrative and style in *Ulysses* respond predominantly to the work of other Joyceans – perhaps most notably Hugh Kenner – but bring in ideas expressed by Derrida, Wolfgang Iser, and Edward Said. Though her Barthesian references are to *Writing Degree Zero*, *Mythologies*, and other texts predating *S/Z* or ‘The Death of the Author,’ she touches upon questions of authorship and textuality. She labels *Ulysses* ‘antirevelatory’, with no ‘single truth’; argues Joyce’s ‘rhetorical masks’ in the novel ‘allowed the writing to be both the “me” and the “not me” of the writer’; and ponders (as I noted in my introduction) whether ‘The artist “paring his fingernails” is no longer an adequate image for the process of artistic creation’.<sup>4</sup> These are but small parts of her study, yet markedly different from how Brook Thomas views their contemporaries in his 1982 study *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’: A Book of Many Happy Returns*. Citing MacCabe’s impact specifically, Thomas pits theoretically-informed recent Ulyssean criticism against critics such as Richard Ellmann, Marilyn French, and S. L. Goldberg in his opening pages, quoting MacCabe’s opinion of Ellmann’s 1979 *‘Ulysses’ on the Liffey* as a reading of the novel as ‘a fixed source of fixed meanings’. He extends his criticism to French’s 1976 *The Book as World* and Goldberg’s 1961 *The Classical Temper* (repeating Fritz Senn’s opinion of the latter as ‘the best book against Joyce’), which he argues reductively ‘posit a subject matter and then judge the book by that

---

<sup>4</sup> Karen Lawrence, *The Odyssey of Style in ‘Ulysses’* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 7, 9, and 63.

subject matter'.<sup>5</sup> French makes her critical views clear in terms of the author, asserting that 'Beyond or behind the narrational point of view lies the authorial point of view, which must be distinguished before there can be any assurance as to what kind of statement is made in the novel'.<sup>6</sup> This stance is questioned by Thomas, by John Paul Riquelme in 1983's *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives*, and by Christopher Butler in a 1982 article, 'Joyce and the Displaced Author'. All three draw on contemporary literary theory, and sit on one side of a developing rupture in Joyce studies.

While Philippe Sollers' avantgarde journal *Tel Quel* – described by Jennifer Levine as 'one of the major vehicles for French post-structuralism' – had been publishing articles on Joyce since 1960, the *James Joyce Quarterly* only attempted to keep up with new approaches in its 1979 'Structuralist/Reader-Response' issue.<sup>7</sup> As Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer point out of that issue, 'the collocation in the title itself is revealing'.<sup>8</sup> Much of Anglo-American Joyce studies appears to have been cut off from evolving literary critical attitudes in the broader field; a very different situation from that described by Jonathan Culler in his preface to 1983's *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*: 'To write about critical theory at the beginning of the 1980s is no longer to introduce unfamiliar questions, methods, and principles, but to intervene in a lively and confusing debate.'<sup>9</sup> Attridge and Ferrer addressed a growing frustration with Joyce studies' neglect of French poststructuralist approaches by publishing *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French* in 1984. Most notable for its contributions of translated essays from thinkers including Derrida, Hélène Cixous, Jacques Aubert, and André Topia (some originally from *Tel Quel*), the volume stressed the specific importance of poststructuralist approaches to the discipline. Attridge and Ferrer argue in their introduction that 'the realization that texts are unmasterable, and will return new answers as long as there are new questions, or new contexts in which to ask questions, and that Joyce's texts display this characteristic more openly than most, is a thread that is barely visible in Joyce scholarship and criticism' (*PSJ*, 8). Irritated at the 'remarkable absence of substantial change' in Anglophone Joyce studies, Attridge and Ferrer note the few exceptions in Britain and America – including MacCabe, Heath, Margot Norris, and Maud Ellmann (*PSJ*, 7-9). Their irritation rests on their opinion that 'the affinity between Joyce and

<sup>5</sup> MacCabe, 'Uneasiness in Culture', *Cambridge Review* 93, no. 2208 (2<sup>nd</sup> June 1972), 174-7 (176). Brook Thomas, *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Book of Many Happy Returns* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 13 and 3.

<sup>6</sup> Marilyn French, *The Book as World: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1976), 2.

<sup>7</sup> Jennifer Levine, 'Rejoicings in "Tel Quel"', *JJQ*, vol. 16, no. 1/2, 'Structuralist/Reader Response Issue' (Fall, 1978 - Winter, 1979), 17-26 (17).

<sup>8</sup> *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, ed. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 8. All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the abbreviation *PSJ* – this includes references to Derrida's 'Two Words for Joyce', 145-58.

<sup>9</sup> Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), 7.

the theory of the Text and the subject being elaborated in Paris is so close'; in their introduction they endeavour to establish an irrefutable link between the two, arguing that the concerns of theory – such as 'unreadability', 'mechanisms of infinite productivity', the 'perpetual flight of the subject and its ultimate disappearance', and 'strategies that attempt a deconstruction of representation' – closely echo the concerns of the texts and readers of Joyce (*PSJ*, 10).

Derrida, his 'Two Words for Joyce', and his alignment of Joyce with deconstruction feature prominently in the introduction to *Post-Structuralist Joyce*. Originally given in 1982 as a talk at the Centre Georges Pompidou, 'Deux mots pour Joyce' is a very close reading of the words 'he war' in *Finnegans Wake*, and of Derrida's relationship to Joyce and his works. 'How many languages,' he asks, 'can be lodged in two words by Joyce, lodged or inscribed, kept or burned, celebrated or violated?' (*PSJ*, 145). He describes a 'madness of writing by which whoever writes effaces himself, leaving, only to abandon it, the archive of his own effacement', then adjusts this reading to suggest an 'act of writing by which whoever writes pretends to efface himself, leaving us caught in his archive as in a spider's web'.<sup>10</sup> Though Derrida speaks of authorship, the idea of Joyce as an author – discussing 'the singular *event* of his work (I prefer to talk here of an event rather than a work or subject or author)', for example – 'Two Words for Joyce' is known best for its approach to readership (*PSJ*, 146).

But I'm not sure that one can say 'reading Joyce' as I just have. Of course, one can do nothing but that, whether one knows it or not. But the utterances 'I am reading Joyce', 'read Joyce', 'have you read Joyce?' produce an irresistible effect of naivety, irresistibly comical. What exactly do you mean by 'read Joyce'? Who can pride himself on having 'read' Joyce?

[...]

you stay on the edge of reading Joyce [...].

[...]

Is this true to the same extent of all works? In any case, I have the feeling that I haven't yet begun to read Joyce, and this 'not having begun to read' is sometimes the most singular and active relationship I have with this work. That is why I never dared to write *on* Joyce.

He confesses that, despite not previously writing *on* Joyce, 'every time I write, and even in the most academic pieces of work, Joyce's ghost is always coming on board'. He claims his work is 'haunted by Joyce'; a 'haunting' which 'invades' (*PSJ*, 149-50).

Attridge and Ferrer report a comment made during the presentation of 'Two Words for Joyce' at the Pompidou: 'a leading Joyce scholar' claimed, as he 'listened carefully', Derrida's reading of 'he war' to be the same activity of any reading of the *Wake* (*PSJ*, 1). In her *James Joyce Quarterly* review of *Post-Structuralist Joyce* Margot Norris makes an educated guess ('I would bet a fin') that this scholar is Fritz Senn. Senn confirms this in a 'Letter to the Editor', though he denies 'listening carefully'. He does graciously acknowledge,

---

<sup>10</sup> Like Kenner suggesting Joyce's intention is for us to ignore intention, or others that his intention was to pretend to efface himself; this is not the last we will hear of this.

however, that the ‘Decanians and Larridians’ ‘should have *their* say’.<sup>11</sup> The comparison paradoxically gives strength to both sides of the argument over the validity of poststructuralist, and specifically deconstructive, theory in Joyce studies. If a deconstructive reading is no different from how Joyce critics already read the *Wake*, then such new approaches are irrelevant or unnecessary, a pointless novelty in methodology. Conversely, if the similarities are so great, then deconstruction is a pertinently Joycean activity, clearly developed as Derrida would have it from the ways in which the *Wake* causes one to read and be aware of one’s reading. Joyceans remained, and remain, divided over whether the standard practice of reading the *Wake* is a deconstructive practice. These opposing views, extended as they were and are to all theoretical modes of Joycean criticism, were played out in the Joyce Symposia of the 1970s and 1980s, and came to a head in the same year as the publication of *Post-Structuralist Joyce*.

## 2. Two readings of *Ulysses*: 1984

1984 saw two major events occur within the Joyce world, both of which had the potential to provoke crucial questions of the activity of reading Joyce’s texts and the position held by their author. In June, the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium took place in Frankfurt: a departure from the usually Joyce-related locations of the Symposia (Paris, Dublin, Trieste, and Zurich). The keynote speakers were Derrida and Julia Kristeva, and panels were presented with deconstructive, feminist, Marxist, and psychoanalytic critical approaches. At the Symposium the first copies of Hans Walter Gabler’s new edition of *Ulysses*, a ‘three-volume allegedly authentic edition’ entitled *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, were presented to Joyce’s grandson Stephen.<sup>12</sup> This edition pushed the role of ‘editor’ to new extremes, and forced an appraisal of how the use of manuscripts and editorial judgement to correct the mistakes of the 1922 text affects critics and readers. The following year a conference took place in Monaco with the aim ‘to achieve a collaborative assessment’ of Gabler’s edition of Joyce’s text, and in 1988 John Kidd, in ‘The Scandal of *Ulysses*’ in *The New York Review of Books*, accused the text of being more Gabler’s than Joyce’s. In the papers of the Symposium panel entitled ‘Deconstructive Criticism of Joyce’, the discussion with Derrida during the panel, and in Derrida’s address ‘Ulysses Gramophone: Ouï-dire de Joyce’, the importance of Joyce’s texts in the development, or birth, of deconstructive criticism was explicitly reasserted. For these scholars ‘Joyce’ referred to the texts themselves, and to what unites them, rather than to Joyce-

---

<sup>11</sup> Margot Norris, *JJQ*, vol. 23, no. 3 (Spring, 1986), 365-70 (370), and Senn, ‘Letter to the Editor’, *JJQ*, vol. 24, no. 1 (Fall, 1986), 115-6.

<sup>12</sup> Anthony Burgess, ‘Foreword’, in *Assessing the 1984 ‘Ulysses’*, ed. C. George Sandulescu and Clive Hart (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1986), ix-xii (xi).

the-man or even Joyce-the-author. Meanwhile Gabler and his team's search for the version of *Ulysses* intended by its author suggests a more romantic approach shared with critics like French, seeking a definable 'authorial point of view' that supposedly lurks just under the surface of the words if one can only find the right way to read.<sup>13</sup> In the continued disagreements over the validity of deconstruction's claiming of Joyce's texts at its roots, and the development of the work by Gabler et al into an influential and prominent strand of Joyce scholarship – genetic criticism – the year 1984 is of great importance in the history of criticism of the Joyce canon.

At the Frankfurt Symposium Derrida reportedly stated, in an unusually direct style, that 'Deconstruction could not have been possible without Joyce' (9<sup>th</sup>, 77). The force with which this was argued contributed to the sense that, as Bernard Benstock describes in his introduction to *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth, Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium*, 'a confrontation of sorts' took place in Frankfurt (9<sup>th</sup>, 4). Benstock's contextualising concurs with Attridge and Ferrer, as he summarises the Symposium as 'marked by the dominance of new critical approaches to Joyce's texts in an area where more conventional readings had long dominated' (9<sup>th</sup>, 4). Benstock refers back to the 1975 Fifth Symposium in Paris to detail the tension between the supporters of these approaches, commenting that 'the "revolution" in Frankfurt had its roots in Paris', where 'the two groups' – 'assembled traditionalists' and 'avant-gardists' – 'ignored each other' (9<sup>th</sup>, 5-6).<sup>14</sup> Maintaining a balanced overview in his introduction, Benstock notes both that the language divide between these groups played an important part, particularly in Paris, and that at the Seventh Symposium in Zurich 'participants were pressing certain issues allied to what we generally now term "post-structuralism"' (9<sup>th</sup>, 8 (fn. 4, 24)). But at the Ninth, for the first time, self-defined poststructuralist approaches dominated the proceedings, and have dominated the Joyce world's perspective of the Symposium, best known now to some for Derrida's extraordinary, extended, and dense opening address, 'Ulysses Gramophone'. Derrida was also the focal point of the panel 'Deconstructive Criticism of Joyce', both for those presenting (Attridge, Christine van Boheemen-Saaf, and Jean-Michel Rabaté, with Ellen Carole Jones chairing) and those asking questions. Derrida's assertion in the panel discussion that 'Joyce is one of the most powerful preconditions of deconstruction, and that's why there is a privileged circulation between those two types of discourses';<sup>15</sup> papers such as Attridge's 'Criticism's Wake', an unpicking of the 'double genitive' in the panel title 'Deconstructive Criticism of Joyce', and Bonnie Kime Scott's 'Character, Joyce, and Feminist Critical Approaches'; and

---

<sup>13</sup> French, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Benstock defines these two groups as 'for the most part, English-speaking' and 'French-speaking' respectively, refusing to name names (9<sup>th</sup>, 6).

<sup>15</sup> Derrida, quoted by Ellen Carole Jones, (9<sup>th</sup>, 78).

panels titled ‘Character and Contemporary Theory’, ‘James Joyce/Jacques Lacan’, and ‘Joyce’s Marxism’, promised a change in Joyce studies – or at least a broadening of its horizons.<sup>16</sup>

Opening with the untranslatable ‘Oui, oui, vous m’entendez bien, ce sont des mots français’ and abruptly ending at ‘I decided to stop there because I almost had an accident just as I was jotting down this last sentence, when, on leaving the airport, I was driving home after the trip to Tokyo’, ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ plots an appropriately parallax path through its arguments.<sup>17</sup> Derrida spoke in French for two and a half hours, pausing roughly every half an hour to allow a translator the unenviable task of giving the non-French speakers of the audience some sense of what was being said.<sup>18</sup> ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ performs a circular close reading of the word ‘yes’, moving from textual specifics to the specifics of Derrida’s own context, of time running out and where he was when writing his presentation. Self-disparagement is part of his argument: ‘Incompetence, as they [Joyce critics] are aware, is the profound truth of my relationship to this work which I know after all only directly, through hearsay, through rumours, through what people say, second-hand exegeses, readings which are always partial’ (a description of a reader who knows no complete reading, who reads the text both directly and through the readings of others – this cannot only sound familiar to this reader of *Ulysses*) (*Acts*, 280). I am referring to the translation of this talk given in the 1992 collection of Derrida’s work, *Acts of Literature*, which its editor, Attridge, describes as ‘editorially modified in the light of the published French text’ (from the translation by Tina Kendall, revised by Shari Benstock, in *The Augmented Ninth*) (*Acts*, 256). However, in the 1987 French publication *Ulysse Gramophone: Deux mots pour Joyce* the word ‘directly’ is in fact wrought as ‘*indirectement*’, and in every other English translation (including the first, in *The Augmented Ninth*) one finds ‘indirectly’. Whether an ‘editorial modification’ unrelated to the French, or a misunderstanding corrected elsewhere, I have retained this oddity as I enjoy the concept of knowing *Ulysses* both directly and incompetently. It is for this mistake that I use this particular translation in this chapter. Derrida develops an idea he explores in ‘Two Words for Joyce’ – of being ‘read in advance by *Finnegans Wake*’ (*PSJ*, 149) – ‘Everything we can say about *Ulysses*’, he argues, ‘has already been anticipated [...] Yes, everything has already happened to us with *Ulysses* and been signed in advance by Joyce’ (*Acts*, 281). This forms part of his reading of the ‘double laughter’ in *Ulysses*: one controlling and one opening the text.<sup>19</sup> Derrida’s ‘reading and [...] re-writing of Joyce’ takes in bookshops, tourism, phone

<sup>16</sup> Details of panels and papers appear in *The Augmented Ninth*.

<sup>17</sup> Derrida, ‘Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce’, in *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 253-309 (‘Ulysses’ is not italicised). Unless otherwise stated, all references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the abbreviated title *Acts*.

<sup>18</sup> Attridge, ‘Signature/Countersignature: Derrida’s Response to *Ulysses*’, in *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Andrew J. Mitchell and Sam Slote (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), 265-80 (270).

<sup>19</sup> Attridge’s phrase, in ‘Signature/Countersignature’, 277.

calls, aeroplanes, and even ‘the Joyce international, the cosmopolitan, but very American James Joyce Foundation’; his circling development of his arguments proves difficult reading – let alone, we must imagine, listening (*Acts*, 292 and 284). As Attridge points out, however, few people left as Derrida spoke: ‘perhaps there was a shared awareness that this was, however incomprehensible, a landmark event in twentieth-century literary studies’.<sup>20</sup> Despite this ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ has remained, as its publishing history shows, in a primarily Derridean context, and its contribution to the scholarship of *Ulysses* is thus somewhat smothered.<sup>21</sup> Attridge’s comments are perhaps heavily laced with hindsight, as for many Joyceans the ‘landmark event’ in Joyce studies that year was the arrival of Gabler’s *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*.

Anthony Burgess closes his foreword to *Assessing the 1984 ‘Ulysses’*, published in 1986, on an ominous note: ‘certain scholars fear that, while something is gained much is lost’.<sup>22</sup> The conference, on the topic ‘A *Finnegans Wake* Approach to *Ulysses*’, addressed this fear in papers on the new roles created by the edition’s layout of ‘synoptic’ text on the left hand page and ‘corrected’ on the right hand, on intention within an editorial sphere, and on deconstruction in relation to Gabler’s *Ulysses*. The conference ‘arose out of a deep sense of frustration [...] experienced at the 1984 symposium’ by C. George Sandulescu, who organised the event at the Princess Grace Library in Monaco.<sup>23</sup> Sandulescu describes in his introduction the ‘indifference’ towards the Gabler edition in Frankfurt which prompted him to gather Joyce scholars to assess the publication.<sup>24</sup> His conference could not escape John Kidd’s well-publicised opposition to the text, and Sandulescu refers to ‘the strange operations of Dr John Kidd’, ‘the Kidd-Gabler New York duel’, and ‘the *Washington Post* splash article’.<sup>25</sup> That first article of 1985 was followed by the eventual ‘The Scandal of *Ulysses*’, published in *The New York Review of Books* in 1988. In this article and elsewhere Kidd identifies ‘literally thousands of unfortunate features of *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*’, variously accusing Gabler and his team of simply doing a bad job, and of aiding ‘the hopes of the Joyce estate [...] for a new copyright to run seventy-five years from 1984’.<sup>26</sup> Previous editions of *Ulysses* were reissued following the Kidd-Gabler controversy, and the ‘corrected’ ‘corrected text’ was printed in

---

<sup>20</sup> Attridge, ‘Signature/Countersignature’, 269.

<sup>21</sup> *Ulysse Gramophone: Deux mots pour Joyce*, published in French in 1987, has never been translated to English in this form; ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ appeared in translation only as part of the Ninth proceedings in 1988, in *Acts of Literature* edited by Derek Attridge in 1992, and then over twenty years later in Sam Slote and Andrew J. Mitchell’s *Derrida and Joyce* in 2013.

<sup>22</sup> *Assessing*, xi.

<sup>23</sup> *Assessing*, xix.

<sup>24</sup> *Assessing*, xx.

<sup>25</sup> *Assessing*, xxii.

<sup>26</sup> John Kidd, ‘The Scandal of *Ulysses*’, *The New York Review of Books*, 30<sup>th</sup> June 1988 <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1988/06/30/the-scandal-of-ulysses-2/>> [accessed 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017].

1993 as ‘The Gabler Edition’.<sup>27</sup> Kidd’s response exposes within Joyce studies an extra current of concern over authenticity and correctivity. The sensationalism of the *Washington Post* aside, his worries are revelatory:

“I’d say 4,000 of Gabler’s changes are unnecessary,” Kidd said the other day at his spare, one-bedroom apartment near the medical school. “They do nothing to restore Joyce’s intentions for the work.

“I think what I have to say is going to blow the whole Joyce establishment wide open. I have no desire to hurt [Gabler] or to impugn his honesty, but it was a project that got out of hand and was rushed. They rushed like mad to get it ready for the Frankfurt conference on Joyce last June.”<sup>28</sup>

Perhaps another instance of Senn’s oft repeated tip for readers of Joyce, that of Joyce one can only be definite that there are no definites, *The Corrected Text* provoked an explicit moment of self-assessment for the Joyce world – and one in which no outsiders had a hand. As Morris Beja and Shari Benstock comment in their introduction to the proceedings of the Tenth Symposium in 1986, ‘The Joyce “industry” is caught in a moment of self-evaluation’.<sup>29</sup>

### 3. Joyce and theory

Monographs engaging with, or influenced by, poststructuralist theory proliferated in the late 1980s and early 1990s,<sup>30</sup> swiftly followed by two retrospective studies responding to a need for an evaluation of the field’s interaction with French theory. Alan Roughley’s *James Joyce and Critical Theory*, published in 1991, gives an overview of structuralist, semiotic, Anglo-American feminist, French feminist, psychoanalytical, Marxist, and poststructuralist encounters within Joyce studies. It has a clear pro-theory, and specifically pro-Derridean deconstruction, bias, prefiguring the interests of his 1999 *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce*. Roughley points out a ‘mistaken notion’, ‘that the more traditional methods of literary studies are free of the rhetorical encumbrances which come between the text and readers who use more obviously theoretical methods for reading’; he suggests that such ‘traditional methods’ are also ‘theoretical’.<sup>31</sup> His focus, as he admits, is less on Joyce studies and more ‘the

<sup>27</sup> For adeptly summarised details – editorial, textual, and historical – of this altercation, see for example Sam Slote, ‘*Ulysses* in the Plural: The Variable Editions of Joyce’s Novel’, *The National Library of Joyce Studies* 5 (Dublin: 2004), 26-32.

<sup>28</sup> David Remnick, ‘The War Over *Ulysses*’, *Washington Post*, 2<sup>nd</sup> April 1985 <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1985/04/02/the-war-over-ulysses/5bc5964b-0486-4005-beb7-1e56e36590d2/?utm\\_term=.0245708ccace](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1985/04/02/the-war-over-ulysses/5bc5964b-0486-4005-beb7-1e56e36590d2/?utm_term=.0245708ccace)> [accessed 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017]. The article is hilarious, if a bit on the nose: ‘Like biblical scholars who continue to haggle over versions of the New Testament, Joyceans see nothing arcane or funny about wars waged over punctuation and other linguistic nits.’

<sup>29</sup> *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium*, ed. Morris Beja and Shari Benstock (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), xv.

<sup>30</sup> For example: Michael Patrick Gillespie, *Reading the Book of Himself* (1989) Suzette Henke, *James Joyce and the Politics of Desire* (1990); Cixous, *Readings: The Poetics of Blanchot, Joyce, Kafka, Kleist, Lispector, and Tsvetayeva*, Sheldon Brivic, *The Veil of Signs: Joyce, Lacan, and Perception*, and Bernard Benstock, *Narrative Con/Texts in Joyce* (all 1991).

<sup>31</sup> Alan Roughley, *James Joyce and Critical Theory: An Introduction* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), ix.

intriguing relationships which exist between Joyce's fiction and a variety of critical theories'.<sup>32</sup> Roughley's certitude in this relationship, and his positive overview of deconstructive Joyce, finds its alternative in Geert Lernout's *The French Joyce*, published in 1990.

Lernout's resoundingly negative critique of theoretical Joycean criticism particularly singles out deconstruction, at once homogenising all deconstructive criticism and attacking it for lacking a unified approach. His 'disagreement with the theory and practice of poststructuralism' more generally is in part due to his belief that poststructuralists see theirs as 'not just another methodology but the only way in which texts can meaningfully be read'.<sup>33</sup> Lernout looks back at Symposia: 'In the proceedings of the Paris Joyce Symposium, I read between the lines that there was a genuine willingness on the part of American Joyceans to find out what the French were so excited about and an equally genuine unwillingness on the part of the French to offer that explanation' (Lernout, p 13). His view of the 1988 Venice Symposium is no less damning, as he declares self-interest lay at the heart of young scholars who adopted new approaches: 'poststructuralism and feminism sell well' (Lernout, 17). After identifying misquotations of Joyce by Derrida, *The French Joyce* eventually advocates readings informed by historical context, arguing that 'to a large extent the discussion about the death of the author is irrelevant in French criticism' by pointing out that 'for Cixous, Sollers, and Derrida, there seems to be no difference between an artist's work and his life' (Lernout, 209). Lernout revealingly promotes a 'view of the producer of literature that comes closer to Joyce's self-understanding': he describes 'Joyce's view of himself as a highly self-conscious demiurge, the godlike creator of an oeuvre that is a challenge to the divine creation' (Lernout, 212). Lernout's claim is made without citation, or evidence – suggesting he views this Stephen-ism as a relevant, unquestionable truth.

Despite the criticisms of Lernout and others, work increased to affirm Derrida's place in literary studies in general, and Joyce studies in particular. In 1992 Attridge and Derrida collaborated to publish for the first time a collection of Derrida's writings on literature. *Acts of Literature* asserts the continued relevance of Derrida's work in 1992 – as well as how unknown it still was to many – and also includes the first English translation of 'Ulysses Gramophone' since *The Augmented Ninth*. In his introduction, Attridge refuses the separation of philosophy and literature, positing Derrida as a literary theorist and a writer of both literature and exemplary literary criticism. He argues for similarities between the texts Derrida responds to, the texts he writes in response, and how we as readers react in turn: 'As verbal acts which "belong" both to literature and philosophy the only responsible answer to the demands they make is another act of the reader's part, an invention, a risk, at once singular

---

<sup>32</sup> Roughley, *Critical Theory*, xi.

<sup>33</sup> Geert Lernout, *The French Joyce* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 15 and 10. All references are to this edition, and will be given in parentheses with the author's name.

and general, which will countersign them and so make them happen again, for the first time' (*Acts*, 27).<sup>34</sup> Since the publication of *Acts of Literature*, the field of Derridean Joyce studies has resulted in numerous works.<sup>35</sup> Predominantly focused on *Finnegans Wake*, these studies established a continued interaction of Derridean thought and Joycean texts despite, as Roughley details, the attempts of Joyce criticism to move past Derrida and Joyce 'by closing off or ignoring the conceptual ruptures and textual spaces opened up in the writings of both'.<sup>36</sup> Roughley pinpoints the continuing activity of reading Joyce and Derrida together as due to 'the impossibility of ever fully comprehending all of the polysemous meanings and complex textual operations of either of the writers'.<sup>37</sup>

This continued activity is also, however, due to a complex manoeuvring of critical and authorial authority. Derrida's deconstruction is, to some extent, authorised by its invocation of Joyce; and Joycean critics' use of Derrida's work is authorised by both that proclaimed link and by the authority of Derrida himself. Derrida was not alone in placing Joycean texts at the root of his approaches to reading. To name just two others: Joyce's work is included in Kristeva's writings on intertextuality as an example of the 'polyphonic' novel, and plays a significant role in Wolfgang Iser's formation of reader-response criticism.<sup>38</sup> Several critics make similar arguments, often but not always reiterating or citing those of the theorists. An early example is in Phillip F. Herring's 1987 study *Joyce's Uncertainty Principle*: just a single footnote suggesting without qualification or development that 'Why, pray, sign anything as long as every word, letter, penstroke, paperspace is a perfect signature of its own?' in *Finnegans Wake* anticipates Barthes's 'The Death of the Author,' Foucault's 'What is an Author?', and Derrida's 'Signature Event Context'.<sup>39</sup> As referenced in the introduction to this thesis, in 1988's *Reauthorizing Joyce* Vicki Mahaffey claims 'I learnt from Joyce what others were learning from contemporary theory, that a reading guided by the desire to uncover the author's meaning relies upon the same assumptions about authority – here authorship – that support monotheistic religions and centralized governments'.<sup>40</sup> More

<sup>34</sup> 'Introduction: Derrida and the Questioning of Literature', 1-29.

<sup>35</sup> These include Claudette Sartillot, *Citation and Modernity: Derrida, Joyce, and Brecht* (1993); Murray McArthur, 'The Example of Joyce: Derrida Reading Joyce', a *JJQ* article from 1995; the aforementioned *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce* by Alan Roughley; Christine van Boheemen-Saaf, *Joyce, Derrida, Lacan, and the Trauma of History* (1999); Peter Mahon, *Imagining Joyce and Derrida: Between Finnegans Wake and Glas* (2007); and more recently Mitchell and Slotte's *Derrida and Joyce*.

<sup>36</sup> Roughley, *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999), xii.

<sup>37</sup> Roughley, *Reading Derrida*, xvi.

<sup>38</sup> Julia Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel', in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 64-91 (71). Wolfgang Iser, 'Ulysses and the Reader: Wolfgang Iser Discusses the Importance of Ulysses in the Development of "Reader Response" Criticism', *James Joyce Broadsheet*, no. 9 (October 1982), 1-2.

<sup>39</sup> Phillip F. Herring, *Joyce's Uncertainty Principle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 197. (*FW* 115:07-09).

<sup>40</sup> Vicki Mahaffey, *Reauthorizing Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

recently and more comprehensively, Scarlett Baron's *'Strandentwining Cable': Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality* (2012) asserts 'that the ever more radical nature of Joyce's intertextuality paved the way for the emergence of intertextual theory in the 1960s'.<sup>41</sup> Such opinions are occasionally framed as part of a more general view of poststructuralism as a development of essentially modernist ideas – evidenced by Tim Conley's reference to 'challenges (inspired by modernist thought and by authors like Joyce) to the foundations of the idea of authorship, such as those of Heidegger, Barthes, Foucault, and so on'<sup>42</sup> – but links between Joyce and literary theory continue also to be queried.

In his 2002 article 'The Fidelity of Theory: James Joyce and the Rhetoric of Belatedness' Joseph Brooker derides a process he terms 'the naturalization of the relation between theory and Joyce' in a specifically British context, an argument repeated in his 2004 monograph *Joyce's Critics* – in which he also aligns himself with Lernout's views of theory.<sup>43</sup> Brooker uses an historical analysis to pull at the 'central dialectic' of 'British post-structuralism': that it was 'propelled at its very origin' by Joyce's 'textual politics'. He sidesteps an engagement with either Joyce's texts or the theory in question, but argues that placing Joyce at the roots of theory 'allows theory to be "applied" to Joyce on the grounds that it is not really being applied, because it has been, so to speak, secreted by the text as its own self-understanding'.<sup>44</sup> Laurent Milesi shifts the emphasis of this debate in his introduction to *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*, also published in 2004:

What the multi-faceted resilience of Joyce's fabrications has made possible – and why his novels have long been privileged testing ground for new theoretical agendas and thus themselves stood the test of time – is his readers' (self-)empowerment through the very medium and fabric of his works, beyond the mere academic mapping of different theoretical grids onto his fiction.<sup>45</sup>

His notion of a reader's self-empowerment did not, however, convince reviewer Paul K. Saint-Amour, who pointedly cites Brooker's work on 'belatedness' in his reading of Milesi's argument. Saint-Amour names efforts to suggest Joyce pre-empted theory 'a self-authorizing move within Joyce studies'.<sup>46</sup> The debate over whether *Ulysses* or *Finnegans Wake* anticipate all readings or readers themselves, and therefore specific literary theories – and whether arguments in favour are self-authorised, authorised by theorists, authorised by Joyce or a

---

<sup>41</sup> Scarlett Baron, *'Strandentwining Cable': Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 19.

<sup>42</sup> Tim Conley, *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 10.

<sup>43</sup> An allegiance is suggested in the claim that it 'need not be rehearsed here.' Brooker, *Joyce's Critics: Transitions in Reading and Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 149.

<sup>44</sup> In *Joyce's Audiences*, ed. John Nash, *European Joyce Studies* 14 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), 201-21 (202, 210, and 219).

<sup>45</sup> Laurent Milesi, 'Introduction: language(s) with a difference', *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*, ed. Milesi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-27 (10).

<sup>46</sup> Paul K. Saint-Amour, 'Review: *James Joyce and the Difference of Language* by Laurent Milesi', *South Atlantic Review*, vol. 70, no. 1 (Winter, 2005), 189-93 (192).

product of the reader's empowerment – has not addressed at length the activities of 'pre-theory' criticism. As I discussed in chapter two the behaviour and focuses of early, pre- or non-'theory' Joyce studies share qualities with the work of theoretical Joyceans and theoretical texts themselves. Ideas are pre-empted, as is the debate itself: the self-reflexivity of early Joyce studies, for instance, means that the question of how best to read a literary text – and how such readings are authorised – has been a prominent feature of the field since the 1920s. The role of the author only became an explicit query in Joyce studies after the advent of literary theory, which makes the extent to which theory is indebted to Joyce a relevant issue. That a questioning of the relationship between author, reader, and text was implicitly present in works of Ulyssean criticism which predate Joyce studies' engagement with theory complicates the debate, undermining accusations of 'self-authorisation'.

#### 4. The author in Joyce studies

The author became a site for critical investigation in the early 1980s work of Brook Thomas, Christopher Butler and John Paul Riquelme, and in 1984 Jean-Michel Rabaté published in French a study of authority and the author (also presenting aspects of the work at the Frankfurt symposium). By the time the English translation arrived, *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* in 1991, several more works had appeared which explored Joyce and authorship: Mahaffey's 1988 *ReAuthorizing Joyce*, Leo Bersani's 1988 article 'Against *Ulysses*', 1989's *Reading the Book of Himself* by Gillespie, Susan Stanford Friedman's 'Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author', in Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein's *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, 1991; and Steven Connor's 'Authorship, Authority, and Self-Reference in Joyce and Beckett' in Phyllis Carey and Ed Jewinski's 1992 volume *Re:Joyce'n Beckett*. The majority of these texts reference or directly confront the author-related arguments of literary theory, and argue in some way for a return to the author – a curiosity in retrospect, as it is not apparent that the author was ever abandoned in Joyce studies.

In his 1982 study *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Book of Many Happy Returns* Thomas notes that 'a line of influence can be drawn from Joyce to one of the leading proponents of the reflexivity of language, Jacques Derrida', and sets out his own 'critical bind':

A writer self-conscious about language seems to be an author in control of his language. Advocates of literary reflexivity, however, usually assert the opposite: rather than consciousness having priority over language, language has priority over consciousness; hence an author is not "in control" as we usually think of it. It seems that a critic cannot have it both ways. He must take a stance on this issue.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Thomas, 3 and 4-5.

Thomas sees risks on either side, and after exploring a wide-ranging ‘obituary on the defunct author’ asks how the author might ‘return to his text’.<sup>48</sup> His study is firmly embedded within the theoretical debates of the time, though he does rely also on some of the more traditional methods of Joyce criticism: referencing, for example, Joyce’s words as reported by Arthur Power. Among his many arguments is the idea that ‘what the name Joyce attached to the text means is not so much a person as a way of reading language’.<sup>49</sup> Christopher Butler advocates a return to the author too in ‘Joyce and the Displaced Author’ in 1982, focusing more on *A Portrait* in his discussion of the death of the author, parody, and Stephen Dedalus. Butler contends that a removal of the author for a freedom of reading ‘is doomed to failure’, in part because we cannot identify parody ‘without some notion of the author’; he views texts ‘as areas of competing authority which lead back to the author as origin, and our notions of him’.<sup>50</sup> Susan Stanford Friedman also turns to Stephen in her arguments for a return to the author in notions of intertextuality. Her article directly addresses the death of the author, Kristeva’s use of Joyce, the American reception of French theory, and the role of feminist literary theory in discussions of intertextuality. Friedman focuses on Nancy K. Miller’s ‘gynocriticism’:

This method is a deliberate blending of Barthesian notions of the text as “textile” or “web” with a clashing American feminist insistence on the importance of the author. But where Barthes’s text is an infinite web seemingly spinning itself, Miller insists on reintroducing the spider – as author, as subject, as agent, as gendered body, as producer of the text.<sup>51</sup>

She aims to extend Miller’s arguments, and her ‘refus[al] to accept the concept of anonymity that Barthes, Foucault, and Kristeva promote in their versions of intertextuality’, from women’s writing to writing of all authors and backgrounds.<sup>52</sup> After a discussion involving *A Portrait*, Kristeva, Joyce, and psychoanalysis, she closes:

At its “birth,” intertextuality by its self-definition denied its origins in the discourse of influence. But as the term spread intertextually, the author whose death it had proclaimed insistently returned, particularly as intertextuality was transposed into American critical discourse. We have come full circle, back to the fabric of the text, this time an intertextual web of critical discourses that are endlessly woven and re-woven. Central to this (intertextual) reweaving of the critical discourses of intertextuality is the reinsertion of the author, along with some of the biographical and historical methodologies of influence studies, back into the pattern of the fabric.<sup>53</sup>

Friedman queries boundaries between intertextuality and influence, arguing that the author returns in the reception and use of intertextuality theory. Stephen Connor, meanwhile, also

---

<sup>48</sup> Thomas, 5.

<sup>49</sup> Thomas, 142.

<sup>50</sup> Christopher Butler, ‘Joyce and the Displaced Author’, in *James Joyce and Modern Literature*, ed. W. J. McCormack and Alistair Stead (London: Routledge 1982), 56-76 (70).

<sup>51</sup> Susan Stanford Friedman, ‘Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author’, in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 146-80 (158).

<sup>52</sup> Friedman, 158-9.

<sup>53</sup> Friedman, 173.

turns to *A Portrait*; his discussion of authority in the works of Joyce and Beckett is informed by a reading of Stephen's theories of authorship as Joyce's – without querying the implications of such a decision in terms of authority or authorship.<sup>54</sup> He does, however, unusually touch upon the authorial-roles of Joyce both within and without the text – 'there is an extraordinary contradiction between Joyce's withdrawal from the surface of the text and the energy that he devoted to his texts as literary commodities in writing to patrons, arguing with printers, and supervising critical work' – a comment harking back to Kenner's readings of Joyce hiding behind Larbaud, Gilbert, and Budgen.<sup>55</sup>

John Paul Riquelme's 1983 work *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction* is dedicated to Wolfgang Iser, among others; it also opens with quotes from W. B. Yeats, William Faulkner, and Barthes' *S/Z*. Riquelme upsets usual conventions by starting his discussion in *Finnegans Wake*, before moving from *A Portrait* to *Dubliners* and *Stephen Hero*, and finally to *Ulysses*. He identifies a 'teller' in Joyce's work: a narrator figure that 'can be no more absolutely distinguished from author than from tale'.<sup>56</sup> 'In all fiction,' he argues, 'the language indicates at once the author's previous, ineluctable presence during the writing and his necessary absence during the reading. We designate that presence and that absence by a single term: *narrator*.'<sup>57</sup> Though he claims in the 'Brief Argument' with which he opens *Teller and Tale* that 'The very being of writing (the meaning of the labor that constitutes it) is to keep the question *Who is speaking?* from ever being answered', Riquelme does not reference Foucault's 'What is an Author?'; nor refer to Barthes' 'The Death of the Author'.<sup>58</sup> His arguments are not dissimilar from the Flaubertian ideas of Stephen Dedalus, which he references: his 'teller' is hidden and powerful, though less so than the Flaubertian author-god.<sup>59</sup> Riquelme keeps discussions which are otherwise authorial firmly located in narrative; a move somewhat mirrored by Gillespie in *Reading the Book of Himself*. Gillespie's focus is the reader of narrative, however. His 1989 study, following the same model as Thomas, Riquelme, and MacCabe, opens by setting up its theoretical allegiances. Referencing Barthes, Derrida, Iser, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Stanley Fish throughout, Gillespie defends 'theoretical diversity' in his introduction:

As readers have become more self-consciously aware of the viability of multiple perspectives informing the interpretation of any piece of literature, any notion of broad intellectual certitude has come to carry less and less significance, seeming more likely to lead to oversimplification than to enlightenment. These impressions have prompted many to move increasingly further from methods whose theoretical biases most overtly

---

<sup>54</sup> Stephen Connor, 'Authorship, Authority, and Self-Reflection in Joyce and Beckett', in *Re:Joyce'n Beckett*, ed. Phyllis Carey and Ed Jewinski (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992), 147-59 (152).

<sup>55</sup> Connor, 157.

<sup>56</sup> John Paul Riquelme, *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 246.

<sup>57</sup> Riquelme, 132.

<sup>58</sup> Riquelme, xv.

<sup>59</sup> Riquelme, 132-3.

aim at the derivations of a single, hegemonic interpretation. Instead, these readers have come to concentrate with growing attention on methodologies overtly opposed to the quest for definitive meaning.<sup>60</sup>

Gillespie outlines his own approach, refusing notions of either a single correct meaning or unlimited meanings: his ‘examination presumes that certain amorphous but finite limitations, outlined by the work itself, circumscribe one’s possible responses to a piece of literature’ (Gillespie, 4). How the author relates to such a set-up, and the author’s relationship to the text, is found by Gillespie in Stephen’s ideas of authorship. In a cake-and-eat-it argument, Gillespie proclaims that ‘While the discourse [of *A Portrait*] invites the reader to discern a great deal of irony in those lines, one can also derive from them an understanding of the delicate balance that must exist in the relationship between author and reader’ (Gillespie, 5). His reader ‘takes on all creative control’ but is ‘arbiter’ of only ‘provisional meaning’ (Gillespie, 6). Gillespie pits himself against authorial intention, while stating that ‘as Stephen implies, after the completion of the writing process the artist’s influence over the meaning(s) that one can derive from a work does not disappear’ (Gillespie, 6). Ultimately, Gillespie’s argument is for balance:

a both/and condition that does not assign either to the author or to the reader the position of sole arbiter of meaning [...] No reader, no matter how pliant, can hope to recover completely the author’s aims (nor for that matter could the author), yet no reader, no matter how independent, can fully escape the shaping influence of the author’s consciousness. (Gillespie, 4)

He later links *A Portrait* to the anti-intentionalism he finds in the work of Barthes and Foucault, and references Barthes to back up an idea of a limitless text (‘To give a text an Author...’) (Gillespie, 98 and 91). In *Ulysses*, Gillespie argues, the reader is even more in control, though with boundaries: ‘I intend to propose an approach that acknowledges *Ulysses* as a work that limits the range of valid idiosyncratic experiences but that does not oppose all readings that deviate from a single privileged interpretation’ (Gillespie, 164). However, Gillespie closes the chapter in which he proposes this approach with a quotation from Power’s Joyce, to authorise his arguments: ‘that was what Joyce aimed to do’ (Gillespie, 172). Gillespie criticises ‘Iser’s response’ to Joyce’s work as it ‘implies a reliance on a determination of intentionality’, yet he himself determines intention from Joyce’s words in Power’s memoir (Gillespie, 195). He wishes to allow readings which ‘deviate’ from ‘privileged interpretation’, yet in referring to Joyce himself – via Power, via an un-ironised reading of Stephen – he maintains basic author-reader power structures. Gillespie’s arguments for a balance of interpretative power between author and reader are based on the texts and informed by theoretical notions of an active reader; yet they are authorised by the author, and this reliance on authorial authority goes unnoticed.

---

<sup>60</sup> Gillespie, *Reading the Book of Himself: Narrative Strategies in the Works of James Joyce* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 3. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

Mahaffey and Rabaté take up questions of authority in *ReAuthorizing Joyce* and *James Joyce, Authorized Reader*. Mahaffey's study of monological authority in Joyce's texts notes the split in Joyce studies at the time; she argues that *Ulysses* could be 'a model' for 'a bridge' between 'mainstream' criticism and poststructuralist criticism (Mahaffey, 2). Among her arguments are a comparison of Stephen and Molly as readers ('patriarchal' 'biographical' authority represented by Stephen, and 'collective' and 'post-structuralist' authority by Molly) (Mahaffey, 7-9), a delineation of 'individual' and 'communal' authority in Joyce's works, and a discussion of the relationship between authority and 'interconnection' in terms of woven text (Mahaffey, 13 and 201). Her study is markedly different from those of her contemporary Joyceans working on authorship and/or authority, as it brings in the work of feminist literary theorists and critics – prefiguring Freidman's slightly later article 'Weavings'. Mahaffey also makes a welcome observation:

Joyce, like Shakespeare, chose to play all the parts. However, to aggrandize Joyce by celebrating his comprehensiveness is partial in both senses of the word: it sets him up as a mastermind, a model of authority who invites and defies imitation, thus dividing him from his admirers. The author who is everybody is the authority who no one can be. (Mahaffey, 5)

Mahaffey does not develop this welcome note of how criticism affects views of the authorship or authority in *ReAuthorizing Joyce*, nor is her study free of definitive statements of what Joyce's 'view' is (Mahaffey, 190). Rabaté's study links authority and criticism, particularly in its last chapter: 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Bogyman', a version of which first appeared in *The Augmented Ninth*. In the years between its French and English publications, Rabaté's critical approach changed – he declares in his introduction to have since 'systematically situated' himself in genetic criticism as opposed to the 'Lacanian and Derridean' approach of *Authorized Reader*.<sup>61</sup> This distance, particularly given the context of opposing critical allegiances, does bring to mind Stephen's lack of belief in his own reading of Shakespearean authorship. Stephen's Shakespeare theories are there in *Authorized Reader*, along with his views on authorship from *A Portrait*, read by Rabaté as Joyce's: 'Joyce, it is true, does not say that the author has died, preoccupied as he is with dead mothers and dying fathers, but states that he has been "refined out of existence"' (Rabaté, 3).<sup>62</sup> These sit alongside a direct engagement, and some disagreement, with Barthes' 'The Death of the Author', as Rabaté discusses a return of the author, after death, as a 'bogyman' (Rabaté, 153). Rabaté ultimately defines the author as Stephen does, which he reads as Joyce's own view, and thus rather than addressing in his discussion of authority and criticism the sort of pitfalls seen in Gillespie's

---

<sup>61</sup> Jean-Michel Rabaté, *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), xiii. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>62</sup> This is despite later pointing out that 'it would be wrong to take Stephen Dedalus for the author of *Ulysses* and call him "Stephen Joyce," as most commentators seem to imply' (12). I think any argument that Rabaté is referring to Joyce as 'an event' or as text unravels at his use of 'states' (presumably not a translation issue, as Rabaté translated the study himself (xi)).

work, he repeats them. Rabaté invokes the authority not only of Stephen-as-Joyce, Joyce's letters, and Joyce to Power, but also to the schemata (Rabaté, 155-6). He addresses the use of Joyce's own words, ironically by discussing a critical reader's ability to disbelieve Joyce's denial of believing the theories of Vico: 'magically repeating Stephen's denegation. Beyond the ambiguities of such a reference to a biography exploited and quarried for many false leads, Joyce shows that the constitutive division of the author's enunciation does not prevent the reader's divinization' (Rabaté, 183). This is not, however extended to the authority of the schemata, or the critical history of their dissemination. Though the discussion of *Authorized Reader* is firmly rooted in the relationship between critics and authority, Rabaté does not explore the ramifications of using the authorially-approved schemata, nor how suggestions formed by a reading of Joyce's texts may be relevant to understandings of authority and authorship in more general discussions of literature.

Leo Bersani's 'Against *Ulysses*' first appeared in *Raritan* in 1988. Bersani is better known for his non-Joycean work, and it is perhaps this edge of an outsider-status that enables his provocative thoughts on Joyce and *Ulysses*: that, for example, it is 'possible that Joyce wastes no time in encouraging us to find the novel more complicated, more devious, than it actually is [...]?'; on 'the extraordinarily preposterous Joyce industry'; and that contemporary 'chic' critics are 'immune' to story.<sup>63</sup> He explores how we read *Ulysses*, the narrative voices of the novel, how *Ulysses* teaches us to read *Ulysses*, and the effects and implications of intertextuality, yet marks his discussions apart from these usual Joycean topics by arguing that *Ulysses* works against interpretation, and is in fact for deciphering, not reading.<sup>64</sup> As for the author, Bersani suggests that 'Where *Ulysses* really leads us is to Joyce's mind; it illuminates his cultural consciousness', but that the text 'also includes, or at least alludes to, the anxiety from which we escape in our exegetical relocation of the work itself within the masterful authorial consciousness at its origin'.<sup>65</sup> *Ulysses* becomes, in Bersani's reading (or deciphering), nothing less than 'modernism's most impressive tribute to the West's long and varied tribute to the authority of the Father'.<sup>66</sup> His arguments imply the whole of *Ulysses* points to its creator: a statement which, though positioned within a fairly confrontational article, is not dissimilar to the arguments of Joyceans themselves.<sup>67</sup> Many of these critics suggest and advocate a 'return' of the author, pre-empting Seán Burke's 1992 work *The Death and Return of the Author*. Furthermore, it is unclear that the author ever left Joyce studies: the engagement

---

<sup>63</sup> Leo Bersani, 'Against *Ulysses*', in *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Casebook*, ed. Attridge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 201-29 (202-3).

<sup>64</sup> Bersani, 224.

<sup>65</sup> Bersani, 225.

<sup>66</sup> Bersani, 228.

<sup>67</sup> Bersani's article was brought into the fold when included in Attridge's *A Casebook*.

of Joycean critics with poststructuralist anti-authorialism is partial, selective, and loyal to more traditional methods.

By the mid-1990s new interpretations read the self-reflexivity in Joyce's texts as examples of postmodernism – attempting to query Joyce's 'high modernist' status. Though noting self-reflexivity was not new in Joyce studies – Lawrence and Thomas, for example, discuss the way Joyce's texts refer to themselves (particularly in terms of language) or are about writing – relating this to postmodernism was less common, despite Jean-François Lyotard's 1979 declaration in 'What is Postmodernism?' that Marcel Proust is 'modern' where Joyce is 'postmodern'.<sup>68</sup> In 1995 Cixous' 'At Circe's, or, The Self-Opener' was included in Paul A. Bové's *Early Postmodernism: Foundational Essays*, continuing the norm (excepting Lyotard) for discussions of Joyce and postmodernism by appearing outside the main arena of Joyce criticism – as exemplified also by Connor's discussion of authority and postmodernism in Joyce and Beckett. With the exception of one or two articles, such as Ihab Hassan's '( ): Finnegans Wake and the Postmodern Imagination' which appeared in *Light Rays: James Joyce and Modernism* in 1984, the topic of Joyce and postmodernism remained within articles and chapters in non-Joycean journals and edited volumes until the mid-1990s, as hinted at by the title of the first full-length monograph on the topic: Kevin J. H. Dettmar's *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain*. Dettmar's 1996 Lyotard-informed study is prefaced by the claim that 'read [...] through postmodern glasses' Joyce can appear as a 'considerably less godlike' writer.<sup>69</sup> Stating that 'the approach here is postmodern' and that he is 'less interested in philosophical consistency than in discovery and delight', Dettmar's readings of *Dubliners*, *A Portrait*, and *Ulysses* (he pointedly leaves out the *Wake*) argue for an increasing lightness in Joyce's works.<sup>70</sup> However, as Daniel Morris argues, Dettmar's 'anecdotes' about Joyce and the composition of his texts undermine his approach:

In spite of Dettmar's allegiance to pronouncements concerning the death of the author, as well as to the free play of the sign as a statement that language writes the author in a way that disfigures presence, such anecdotes, in which the composition of the text coincides with the author's lived experience while composing it, suggest a continuity between the quirky person, the gifted artist, and the novel he produced.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Jean-François Lyotard, 'Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism?', trans. Régis Durand, in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 71-82 (80-1). Gillespie briefly suggests, without referencing Lyotard, that *Ulysses* marks a shift from modernist to postmodernism – reading postmodernism as 'questioning any authority, even that situated within the self' (Gillespie, 173). Lyotard reiterated his point in a discussion of *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey* in his keynote lecture at the Eleventh International James Joyce Symposium in Venice, 1988. 'Return upon the Return', in *The Lyotard Reader and Guide*, ed. Keith Crome and James Williams (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 133-47.

<sup>69</sup> Kevin J. H. Dettmar, *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), xii.

<sup>70</sup> Dettmar, xii.

<sup>71</sup> Daniel Morris, *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 43, no. 4 (Winter 1997), 1030-3 (1033).

Maintaining traditional critical habits, Dettmar exposes the strength of the pull in Joyce studies towards the figure of the author.

How to relate extra-textual Joyce, the Joyce of manuscript notes and compositional anecdotes; letters and reported conversations; and guided critical works or schemata to new discussions of authority, authorship, self-reflexivity and the agency of the reader forms an implicit problem for Joyce criticism at this time. Theoretical approaches become undermined from within by tendencies inherent in the tradition of Joycean criticism, an effortless win for the anti-theorists. In 1997 the Joyce of manuscripts, letters, notes, and a reader's own construction became a focal point of scholars: however, as in 1984, this was due to the work of an editor rather than a critic. Danis Rose's *Ulysses: The Reader's Edition* pushed the role of editor to its limits and beyond, resulting in a trial four years later in which the James Joyce Estate charged Rose both with 'copyright infringement and "passing off" (which meant that the *Reader's Edition* was charged with having so altered the text of *Ulysses* that it could not be justifiably be called an edition of Joyce's novel)' as Sam Slote details in 'Ulysses in the Plural'.<sup>72</sup> John Kidd describes this charge in yet another article, 'Making the Wrong Joyce' in *The New York Review of Books*, written shortly after the appearance of Rose's edition: 'Their position is that 10,000 changes, including perhaps 7,000 that do not appear in any existing manuscript or edition, are so anti-Joycean that the author is Danis Rose, not James Joyce.'<sup>73</sup> Rose changed spelling, inserted hyphens, amended perceived 'errors', and punctuated the unpunctuated, prompting critics to respond with alacrity.

Reviews from Gabler, Senn, Gillespie, and Lawrence Rainey somewhat changed the focus of the *James Joyce Quarterly* Summer 1997 special *Finnegans Wake* issue.<sup>74</sup> A newer version of the corrective nature of early Joycean criticism, errors in Rose's reading are pointed out in these reviews and undermined by literary critics, using a combination of manuscripts, previous readings, and their own judgement – methods remarkably similar to Rose's. Senn, however, remains stolidly self-aware, commenting on his own critique:

(Of course, the tables could be turned on me. Maybe the emendations show that people like me are the wrong-minded ones, victims of habit or indoctrination, in search of subtleties where none are intended. Potentially, I could have been misguidedly reading my own projections: the emperor might be wearing different clothes from those I imagined.)<sup>75</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Slote, 'Ulysses in the Plural', 35.

<sup>73</sup> Kidd, 'Making the Wrong Joyce', *The New York Review of Books*, 25<sup>th</sup> September 1997 <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1997/09/25/making-the-wrong-joyce/>> [accessed 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017].

<sup>74</sup> There is an appropriate treat for those who access *JSTOR*'s online archived *JJQ* for Summer 1997, which is listed as a 'Finnegan's Wake' issue – as if a vengeful re-punctuator had hacked *JSTOR* (Rose's *Ulysses* was infamous for its inserted apostrophes in 'Penelope').

<sup>75</sup> Senn, 'Review: Prodding Nodding Joyce: The "Reader's Edition" of "Ulysses"', Edited by Danis Rose: Some First Impressions', *JJQ*, vol. 34, no. 4 (Summer, 1997), 573-83 (581).

In ‘A Defense of Danis Rose’ Joseph Kelley’s argument – that the disagreements between Rose and others are actually about a difference in belief in how much meaning was ‘intended’ in *Ulysses* – pulls at and develops the same suggestions Senn makes in this emperor’s clothes comment, and posits that critics use a belief in Joyce’s genius to authorise their own interpretations.<sup>76</sup> As Conley explores in a chapter of *Joyces Mistakes*, heavily referencing a 1991 article by Mahaffey on the same topic, editorial work also has a complicated relationship with authorial intention.<sup>77</sup> The authority of critics and of copyright laws succeeded: *A New Reader’s Edition* appeared in 2004, after the Joyce Estate’s success in court put a stop to the distribution of *A Reader’s Edition* – winning over copyright but not on the ‘passing off’ charges.<sup>78</sup> Concurrently a different practice of manuscript analysis grew in popularity in the Anglo-American Joyce world: genetic criticism. As I explained in the introduction to this thesis, I will not be discussing this field at length; I will note here, however, that a collection of genetic criticism appeared in 1995 as part of the *European Joyce Studies* series, edited by Slote and David Hayman. This collection of essays foresaw the continuing swell in numbers of publications by scholars working in or informed by genetic criticism, suggestive of an ongoing interest in the origins of Joyce’s texts. As a result, ‘authorship’ in Joyce studies today could more readily refer to the craft of writing, the ways in which the texts evolved – how they were edited, which parts were elaborated, what notes were used and where. Genetic criticism as a practice is not always carried out in the service of literary interpretation (the European mode, at least in the mid-nineties, appears to have taken this approach).<sup>79</sup> Where it is, however, it raises the spectre of ‘explanations’ – could one’s reading be ‘proved wrong’ by a scholar with access to certain notesheets? I shall briefly look at how genetic criticism can authorise arguments in the next chapter; for now, however, it is interesting to observe that in ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ Derrida argues that this practice is also ‘anticipated’ by Joyce: ‘Rather than giving himself up by accident and posthumously to the “genetic criticism” industry, one could say that he constructed the concept and programmed the routes and dead ends’ (*Acts*, 307; fn. 27).

##### 5. Two readers of *Ulysses*: Senn and Attridge

The combined work of two critics offers assistance to contemporary readers arriving at Joyce long after the impact of theory: Fritz Senn, at once the best known ‘amateur’ of Joyce studies

---

<sup>76</sup> ‘A Defense of Danis Rose’, *JJQ*, vol. 35/36, vol. 35, no. 4 - vol. 36, no. 1 (Summer-Fall, 1998), 811-24.

<sup>77</sup> Conley, 59-80. Quoting Mahaffey, ‘Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce’s *Ulysses*’, in *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 171-91.

<sup>78</sup> Slote, ‘*Ulysses* in the Plural’, 35.

<sup>79</sup> See Jörn Barger, ‘Review: *Probes: Genetic Studies in Joyce*. *European Joyce Studies* 5 by David Hayman, Sam Slote’, *JJQ*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Spring, 1997), 389-93 (392).

and one of the most established and respected commentators in the field, and Derek Attridge, a pioneer of theoretical criticism of Joyce, who since *Post-Structuralist Joyce* has kept up with changing approaches to texts and shifts in attitudes to differing theories. One obstinately sticking to preferred methods and the other open about his ‘history of changing responses to Joyce’, these two critics differ widely in how they approached Joyce post-theory.<sup>80</sup>

*Joyce’s Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation* is the first collection of Senn’s articles in English. Published the year Derrida gave his ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ address, it contains one of Senn’s many proclamations of non-theory: ‘Any resemblance to theories, especially currently relevant ones, is likely to be accidental: I have read few and understand none.’<sup>81</sup> In his ‘Author’s Preface’ Senn details his focus: ‘what *happens*’ in the text, ‘or what seems to happen in that interaction with our minds that we call, without knowing what it is, reading’.<sup>82</sup> Senn is ‘sceptical’ of statements such as ‘*Ulysses* is’, preferring ‘*Ulysses* does... acts... performs’, and accordingly his interests are in ‘reading, translating, righting, turning, weaving, processing, knowing (and *not* knowing), and doubting’.<sup>83</sup> Senn has been a part of the Joyce world since before the first Symposium in 1967 – but not as an academic. Often repeating that ‘One of my disadvantages is that I never took a Joyce course. One of my advantages is that I never took a Joyce course’, he illustrates his unusual straddling of the divide between academic and amateur.<sup>84</sup> He is known for his close readings, his extensive knowledge of Joyce’s texts, his work on language and on the Homeric (as discussed in chapter three), and his reading of Joyce as a ‘verb’. Senn gave his talk ‘Joyce the Verb’ at the 1988 Symposium in Copenhagen; it was later included in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, a 1995 collection of essays. His argument, that ‘It is equally true to say “Joyce has been dead for forty-five years”, as to claim “Joyce is alive.” “Joyce” does not equal “Joyce”’, exists apparently in a critical world without theory.<sup>85</sup> Senn’s position as non-academic – despite being a central figure of Joyce studies – enables him to consequently side-step the developments of theory, and the suggestions made by other Joyceans of a contradiction within his denial of the theoretical.

Riquelme, as editor of *Joyce’s Dislocutions*, comments that ‘Despite Senn’s justified suspicion of method and theory, many of the attitudes he expresses in his commentaries of the past three decades tend to cohere as a critical stance. That stance involves what can broadly

---

<sup>80</sup> Attridge, *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), xiv. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the abbreviation *JE*.

<sup>81</sup> Senn, *Joyce’s Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), x.

<sup>82</sup> *Dislocutions*, ix.

<sup>83</sup> *Dislocutions*, x.

<sup>84</sup> For example, in an interview for *New Dublin Press* by Lara May O’Muirthe, 15<sup>th</sup> June 2014 <<http://newdublinpress-old.squarespace.com/updates/fritz-senn>> [accessed 16<sup>th</sup> December 2017].

<sup>85</sup> Senn, ‘Joyce the Verb’, in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O’Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 7-34 (7). All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the abbreviation *IS*.

be described as a method, and it raises, though often indirectly, theoretical questions'.<sup>86</sup> And as Christine O'Neill, the editor of *Inductive Scrutinies* suggests, for many Joycean critics Riquelme does not go far enough:

Senn is one of those rare scholars who do not need to keep citing theorists [...] yet many Joyceans feel that Senn's ideas are in tune with some of the most important theoretical writing of the last few decades, especially Derrida's [...]. Some Joyceans think him unwilling to acknowledge, others unwilling to see, how much his approach to literature shares with the best examples of post-structuralism [...]. (*IS*, xi)

Senn consistently pushes aside theory, however, claiming in the 1988 interview included in *Inductive Scrutinies* that he 'never got the hang of the pioneering novelties' (this comment comes straight after a mention of the first 'primeval feminist panel' at a Joyce Symposium, which suggests that Senn is more aware of changes in Joyce studies than he admits, and that his light-hearted dismissal of theoretical approaches casts a worryingly wide net) (*IS*, xvi). Repeating in his preface 'The Creed of Naiveté' his lack of understanding of deconstruction or 'Theory', he ponders whether 'Perhaps it is an insult to expect something as commonplace as results from on high' (*IS*, 1 and 3). Confirming his view that theory is pointless (though perhaps one can discount this view, as Senn confesses to not understanding it), he states that 'most literary theories [...] increase human misery' (*IS*, 5).

In his discussion, and cheering on, of deconstructive criticism at the 1984 Ninth Symposium, Attridge notes that by 'Joyce' he means a 'name to stand in for the group of texts bearing that signature' (9<sup>th</sup>, 85). His talk, as published in *The Augmented Ninth* as 'Criticism's Wake' (though apparently titled 'Of' at the Symposium),<sup>87</sup> explored the relationship between Joyce and deconstruction in a variety of ways – including whether Joyce's texts were singularly fit for such a relationship or the absolute opposite. Attridge develops these ideas further in *Peculiar Language*, claiming that '*Finnegans Wake*, although usually banished to the very edges of the literary canon as an unassimilable freak, can also, it appears, function as the canonical instance of the "literary" itself'.<sup>88</sup> In 'Reading Joyce', in *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* (1990), Attridge includes in a footnote a list of 'many of the most influential literary theorists of the past twenty years [...] [who] have testified to the importance of reading Joyce in the development of their ideas': Derrida, Cixous, Kristeva, Lacan, Frye, Iser, Eco, Jameson, Heath, Williams, and McCabe – and those, such as Jung and Lukács, who despite not being enamoured of Joyce's work 'have recognised his importance'.<sup>89</sup> Six years after the defensive attitude necessary in *Post-Structuralist Joyce* and at the Ninth Symposium, the inclusion of this list reflects the established, respected, or at least all-pervasive position of

---

<sup>86</sup> *Dislocations*, xv.

<sup>87</sup> Attridge, 'Signature/Countersignature', 269.

<sup>88</sup> Attridge, *Peculiar Language: Literature as Difference from the Renaissance to James Joyce* (London: Methuen, 1988), 10.

<sup>89</sup> Attridge, 'Reading Joyce', in *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*, ed. Attridge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1-30 (24 and 30).

theory by 1990. Attridge's essay introduces the experience of reading Joyce, of enjoyment and 'pleasures' which 'rely on qualities of inexplicability, unpredictability, inexhaustibility'.<sup>90</sup> He comments on the way one can 'enjoy the prospect of an endlessly repeated failure' to 'end' reading, and how Joyce's writing 'exposes and plays with the very processes of sense-making that underlies all experiences of fiction, so that the world in which we are invited to participate and find pleasure when we read Joyce includes the world of our acts of reading and comprehension', before warning readers to mistrust 'Any critical text which claims to tell you (at last) what a work of Joyce's is about, or what its structure, or its moral position, or its symbolic force, "is" [...] because it is making a claim that, taken literally, would exclude all other ways of reading the work'.<sup>91</sup> Attridge states that Joyce's 'texts themselves teach us how to read them', a comment that in the light of Attridge's changing approaches could suggest that the lesson gleaned from Joyce's texts is of flexible, open reading.<sup>92</sup>

Ten years after editing *The Cambridge Companion* Attridge published both *Joyce Effects*, a collection of his essays, and *Semicolonial Joyce*, edited with Marjorie Howes. In the introduction to *Joyce Effects*, split into 'Mainly Autobiographical' and 'Mainly Theoretical' (with a telling overlap between the two), he details his changing attitudes to theory and reading. He describes the opinion shared by the 'Deconstructive Criticism of Joyce' panel at the Ninth Symposium: 'Literature, for us, was not the merely passive object of theorizing, but a discourse pre-empting and exceeding all theories' (*JE*, 8). The effects of hindsight show in his comment that by the Ninth the 'dominant approach' was French theory, contradicting the intimations from *Post-Structuralist Joyce* and *The Augmented Ninth* that while French theory was popular elsewhere in literary studies it was far from 'dominant' in the Anglo-American-centred world of Joyce studies (*JE*, 8). Attridge goes on in his introduction to list the shifting approaches since the mid-1980s, from the popularity of 'historical contextualisation' to the focus on cultural studies in the 1990s, through 'gay and lesbian studies' and finally 'colonial and postcolonial' – popular in 2000 with Attridge himself (*JE*, 10-12). Since 2000 Attridge has edited '*Ulysses*': A Casebook and published *How to Read Joyce* (both 2007), co-edited *Theory After 'Theory'* with Jane Elliott, and produced *Reading and Responsibility: Deconstruction's Traces* (2010). His own critical record speaks of what he calls 'fast changing new approaches' – enabling him to respond to critical tendencies which deride the shifts of theoretical criticism from each new novelty to the next (*JE*, 13):

Those who complain most loudly [...] usually imply that obscured by the frenetic musical chairs of critical fashion is some solid, abiding, dependable approach to literature [...]. The problem with this position is that the approach it favours is

---

<sup>90</sup> Attridge, 'Reading', 2.

<sup>91</sup> Attridge, 'Reading', 3.

<sup>92</sup> Attridge, 'Reading', 24. This observation is also made by Bersani and Gillespie.

necessarily itself historical, the product of specific social, economic, and cultural forces.  
(*JE*, 13)

Where this leads Attridge is curiously Senn-like, considering Senn's oft-expressed negative views on new or once-new literary theories: 'It is important to recognize that there is no intrinsic limit to what can be said about a text [...] What we chose to say or write about a given text cannot be determined by any concept of "*inherent importance*"' (*JE*, 17). Senn appears to battle in his work against a perceived hierarchy of 'important' readings promoted by theoretical approaches, with a new 'important' reading with each new theory. Senn resents the finality of critical or theoretical claims: 'Look at how we, commentators or critics, seem often at pains to re-reify all that elusive work in progress, to freeze it into solid theses, symbols, parallels, discourses, or even "puns", things that we can categorize and administer. Joyce might be the antidote' (*IS*, 9). Attridge follows through the very possibility for changing approaches to make the same argument against conclusiveness, against any '*Ulysses* is...' He carries this forward, arguing that 'The publication of *Ulysses* not only brought about a revolution in modes of reading and interpretation, but also initiated a consideration of what a responsible or accurate reading may be' (*JE*, 21).

The ways of reading caused by Joyce's texts for Attridge explain changing, self-conscious, theoretical approaches, whilst for Senn explain a stable, open, non-prioritising approach. As when Derrida's approach was compared in a whisper (by Senn himself) to any reading of the *Wake*, this contradiction can be used to argue for either side. Comparisons made between Senn's approach and those of theoretical, particularly deconstructive, critics similarly add weight to either pro- or anti-theorists' arguments. The similarities between the readings of those for and against theory have been pointed out repeatedly by both sides of the divide in Joyce studies. Senn's advocacy of enjoying the unknown, of chance and coincidence, of the power of language and association, of how we use the word 'Joyce' to refer to the texts not the man, or of avoiding definite conclusions at all costs does have something in common with poststructuralist theory and the work of its followers. 'Joyce the Verb' is one example: 'Reading Joyce (you see, we use the name but don't mean the person)', he remarks, exploring how naming and knowing are not etymologically linked. Continuing, Senn observes that 'in identifying we are *doing* something [...] At one extreme the word [Joyce] does duty for a life lived in various cities in the course of almost sixty years; at the other possible ends of the scales it suggests writing, thinking, creating, developing, intending – you name it, and you name it appropriately by verbs'. Not one to be accused of a lack of self-awareness, he acknowledges the likelihood 'that someone has already put this into a system of trendy abstractions' (*IS*, 9). Arguably, someone has: Foucault's 'What is an Author?' explores remarkably similar ground. Elsewhere, in the short text 'Authorial Awareness' Senn discusses intention under the term 'authorial attention', and decides that 'It is all right to casually dismiss

naïve questions about “what the author really put in”, as against what we for whatever reasons get out of a text, but sometimes the consciousness of the artist, if it could be determined, would have reverberations’.<sup>93</sup> He is not interested in how the concept of intention has occupied literary theorists for several decades, finding his musings prompted rather by Joyce’s texts: the same argument made by several of those theorists. His responses to Joyce’s texts give a great deal of time to the reader and the reader’s creativity – his metachronic readings through ‘post-Ulysean lenses’, for instance – and his approach continues to be playful, even disrespectful. Whether we agree or not on the similarities between Senn’s work and theoretical approaches, or on what that means, comparing the fixed approach of Senn and the changeability of Attridge and their resultant similarities suggests that for all the varieties of approaches common ground remains – and that therefore perhaps any approach is valid save for the one which announces itself the ‘only’ approach.

## 6. How to read Joyce

Linking the specifics of Joyce’s texts and questions of the activity of reading continues to be a focus of Joyce studies, and several scholars addressed Joyce’s readers in the early 2000s. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli’s ‘The Reader as Detective: Sherlockholmsing Joyce’s Texts’ in *The Benstock Library as Mirror of Joyce*, 2002, posits ‘a way of approaching Joyce’s text as a crime scene’. Echoing both Kenner and Senn, Bollettieri Bosinelli argues that

under the magnifying lens of the reader-detective the word as a clue will speak new tales and lead to the solution of the mystery; if not to the apprehension of the perpetrator of the crime. But while we may think we have Joyce, his word, or the word made flesh, the body of the crime in fact, can never be fully apprehended or even found, and here lies the greatness of Joyce.<sup>94</sup>

In the same year John Nash’s edited volume of essays *Joyce’s Audiences* also investigated the specific Joycean relationship between readers and the texts: ‘Joyce’s work [...] anticipates the interpretative dilemma which all readers encounter. An “audience” is thus partially imagined by the text itself. Readers both shape the text and are shaped by it.’<sup>95</sup> A year later in 2003 *James Joyce and the Difference of Language* includes explorations of how Joyce’s language aids critical readings: as Milesi comments in his introduction, ‘Joyce’s verbalizations are performative acts prompting his readers to promote his coinages into critical tools offering an intrinsically more suitable leverage on the writer’s prose’.<sup>96</sup> Offering a different approach, 2003’s *Who Reads ‘Ulysses’? The Rhetoric of the Joyce Wars and the Common Reader* by

<sup>93</sup> Senn, ‘Authorial Awareness’, in *Ulysean Close-ups* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2007), 95-107 (96).

<sup>94</sup> In *The Benstock Library as Mirror of Joyce*, ed. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Franca Ruggieri, Joyce Studies in Italy 7 (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2002), 167-75 (174-5). A gentler version of Bersani’s ‘paranoid’ reader.

<sup>95</sup> John Nash, ‘Introduction’, in *Joyce’s Audiences*, 3-8 (5).

<sup>96</sup> Milesi, 20.

Julie Sloan Brannon addresses the differences between scholarly and ordinary readers and the controversies of Gabler and Rose.

In its ongoing interest in how we read Joyce, the field has also continued since 2000 to produce monographs, edited collections, and articles linking Joyce and literary theory.<sup>97</sup> The author as a site for discussion forms parts of several different – and mostly theory-influenced – approaches in the last two decades: cropping up in studies of intertextuality, errors, copyright, celebrity, and irony. In *'Strandentwining Cable': Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality*, Scarlett Baron discusses Stephen Dedalus' notions of authorship in terms of the textual relationship between Joyce and Flaubert. Her 2012 study of intertextuality echoes the problems set out by Lucia Boldrini in 2001's *Joyce, Dante, and the Poetics of Literary Relations: Language and Meaning in 'Finnegans Wake'* and discussed by Lawrence and Friedman: how to situate Joyce's intertextual practices within existing theoretical frameworks of influence and intertextuality. When exploring the literary relationship between Joyce and an earlier author, critics must decide what sort of agency to attribute to Joyce – who in such studies is both Joyce-the-author and Joyce-the-reader. Is the relationship one of passive influence, active reference, or one where textual boundaries dissolve? Are such categories useful? In more recent work on Joyce and Georges Perec, Baron approaches Joyce's intertextuality through the lens of the later writer; how Perec reads 'Joyce's intertextual vision', plays his own intertextual games, and forms his own complex view of an author's role.<sup>98</sup> The authorial connotations of literary relations come back often to questions of intention, an issue explored explicitly by Tim Conley in his 2003 monograph *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation*. In keeping with his provocatively unpunctuated title, in a discussion of authorial intention he quotes Power's Joyce discussing authorial intention, and argues that it is the author's intention that we do not place much emphasis on authorial intention when reading.<sup>99</sup> Conley cites Mahaffey and a similar comment of Kenneth Booker's, that 'in a writer like Joyce one has to deal with the paradoxical fact that often his authorial intention is apparently that one should not grant interpretive authority to authorial intention', an idea also expressed – though not referenced by Conley – by Hugh Kenner and Brook Thomas (Thomas also quotes Power).<sup>100</sup> Within Conley's propositions is

---

<sup>97</sup> This includes Luke Thurston's 2002 *Reinventing the Symptom: Essays on the Final Lacan*; various articles and encyclopaedic entries by Rabaté; Brooker's *Joyce's Critics* (2004); Gregory Castle's 'James Joyce: *Ulysses*', in the *Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory* (2007); articles in William D. Melaney's *After Ontology: Literary Theory and Modernist Poetics* (2001), and Maeve Tynan, Maria Beville, and Marita Ryan's *Passages: Movements and Moments in Text and Theory* (2009); Sean Latham's *James Joyce*, which includes Christine van Boheemen-Saaf's 'Joyce in Theory/Theory in Joyce'; and David Vichnar's *Joyce Against Theory: James Joyce After Deconstruction* (both 2010).

<sup>98</sup> Scarlett Baron, 'Hoaxville: Reading Perec Reading Joyce', *JJQ*, 'Joycean Avant-Gardes', guest ed. Catherine Flynn and Richard Brown, vol. 52, no. 2 (Winter 2015), 367-412 (395).

<sup>99</sup> Couldn't resist.

<sup>100</sup> M. Keith Booker, *Joyce, Bakhtin and the Literary Tradition: Toward a Comparative Cultural Poetics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 219. Quoted by Conley 57. (Thomas quotes Power, 165.)

another return of the author, partly as errors cannot exist without one. In his explorations he touches on ideas of a reader's intention, editing Joyce, how we read the *Wake*, and the concept of 'multiple' Joyces.

This last is also a feature of Paul K. Saint-Amour's 2003 study *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Intellectual Imagination*, which I discussed in chapter one. *The Copywrights* includes an extended discussion of Joyce as an example of how an awareness of copyright was brought into literary texts by authors as 'metadiscourse'.<sup>101</sup> In a chapter on the 'Oxen of the Sun' episode of *Ulysses*, Saint-Amour notes the tensions in Joyce between collective authorship and the single genius; between intertextuality and originality (Saint-Amour, 160). His Joyce is aware, and (in 'Oxen' and beyond) responding to, an idea of authorship informed by copyright law: from the link between copyright and an author's life, to the notion of 'fair use and infringement' (Saint-Amour, 166-8 and 170). Saint-Amour identifies Joyce's use of anthologies when writing the stylistic parodies in 'Oxen' – and how those anthologies were limited by copyright laws (Saint-Amour, 179-82). His analysis of the episode develops into complicated readings of how copyright enshrines a form/content dichotomy (as it does not protect ideas), and how this is explored and exploded in 'Oxen'; he closes by imagining what *Ulysses* would have to include if published under today's strict laws of copyright: copyright statements up front, a defence that it is 'a work of fiction', and twenty-five pages acknowledging material reprinted within (Saint-Amour, 188-9 and 193-8). Saint-Amour reads in Joyce an understanding of authorship informed by legal frameworks and restrictions, and in suggestively placing this in parallel to the Joyce Estate heir Stephen Joyce's capricious interpretations of 'fair use,' makes a broader argument about the impact of legal changes on intertextual artworks (Saint-Amour, 156-8). Self-conscious authorship is refigured in the relatively new field of celebrity studies, as is modernism – which Aaron Jaffe, in 2005's *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*, links to anti-authorialism. An example of a recent engagement with Barthes' 'The Death of the Author' and Foucault's 'What is an Author?', Jaffe's study (in its Joyce section) is firmly focused on Stephen Dedalus in *A Portrait*. His interest is in Joyce's notion of authorship, which he reads as Stephen's; unlike many other critics however, Jaffe analyses his own reading. He argues that both readings of Stephen – as ironised or not – depend on different readings of Joyce's authority, and involve questions of how intelligent we view Joyce.<sup>102</sup> In *Modernist Star Maps: Celebrity, Modernity, Culture*, edited in 2010 with Jonathan Goldman, Jaffe's general view is repeated: 'Celebrity is [...]

---

<sup>101</sup> Saint-Amour, *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003), 160. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>102</sup> Aaron Jaffe, *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 34-5.

authorial/literary self-fashioning *in extremis*.<sup>103</sup> The approach gives great agency to authors, while also focusing on a mode of reception: their ‘Afterlife’ – the title of Goldman’s essay in the 2014 *Cambridge Companion to ‘Ulysses’*, in which he explores the ‘authorial branding’ of and in Joyce.<sup>104</sup> Finally, discussing authorship but without reference to Barthes or Foucault, Brian Cosgrove’s 2007 study *James Joyce’s Negations: Irony, Indeterminacy and Nihilism in ‘Ulysses’ and Other Writings* reads the indeterminacy of text alongside a strong authorial control in a discussion of irony and parody – thus pulling on the same thread as Conley, and Christopher Butler before him.

James Joyce and authorship is not an area of discussion limited to the field of Joyce studies: examples include Max Saunders’ placement of Joyce and Stephen Dedalus within the context of life-writing in 2010’s *Self-Impression: Life-Writing, Autobiography, and the Forms of Modern Literature*; and Ian Lancaster’s *Forgetful Muses: Reading the Author in the Text*, also published in 2010, which looks at *A Portrait* and many other texts in its arguments for a return to intentionalism under the banner of ‘authorial attribution’.<sup>105</sup> The question of authorship in Joyce has though become less and less popular, and where present at all it is increasingly only a facet, rather than the focus, of Joycean monographs. Continued efforts, however, are made to decipher how one reads Joyce’s texts. These include comparative studies such as Patricia Novillo-Corvalán’s *Borges and Joyce: An Infinite Conversation*, published 2011, which looks at Borges as a reader of Joyce and plays with the ties between authors, their precursors, and their texts; Margot Norris’s 2011 study *Virgin and Veteran Readers of ‘Ulysses’*, in which Norris finds ways of addressing different modes of reading with narratology influenced by possible-worlds theory; and *Joyce Against Theory: James Joyce After Deconstruction*, David Vichnar’s 2010 return to and propounding of ‘the belief [...] that Joyce’s writing is itself theoretical through and through’.<sup>106</sup> Vichnar situates his study in relation to his obvious precursors, Alan Roughley and Geert Lernout. Citing Roughley’s ‘form and content’, he adds to his prior explorations by addressing ‘the Lacanian psychoanalytical approach, cultural studies of Joyce, studies of Joyce’s (post)modernism, and textual genetics’.<sup>107</sup> Vichnar also positions his study in opposition to Joseph Brooker’s historical analysis of the impact of theory within Joyce studies, which forms a chapter of 2004’s *Joyce’s Critics*. He disagrees particularly with an aside of Brooker’s: ‘(Strictly, the Derridean claim refers to the operation of Joyce’s writing, not the man himself: but this makes little practical

---

<sup>103</sup> *Modernist Star Maps: Celebrity, Modernity, Culture*, ed. Jaffe and Jonathan Goldman (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), 9.

<sup>104</sup> Goldman, ‘Afterlife’, in *The Cambridge Companion to ‘Ulysses’*, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 33–48 (35).

<sup>105</sup> Ian Lancaster, *Forgetful Muses: Reading the Author in the Text* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 3.

<sup>106</sup> David Vichnar, *Joyce Against Theory: James Joyce After Deconstruction* (Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2010), 1.

<sup>107</sup> Vichnar, 4.

difference.)' As Vichnar points out, 'the distinction between Joyce-the-man and Joyce-the-writer matters a good deal'.<sup>108</sup> Brooker's study argues that 'the reading of Joyce has invoked and involved place and nation', and closes with a focus on historical and political approaches;<sup>109</sup> reviewer Emer Nolan notes that 'the fact that Brooker concludes the book with an account of the work of his own London-based colleagues does rather tend to give the impression that he thinks that the writings of his own friends represent the culmination of Joyce criticism so far'.<sup>110</sup> Vichnar links the primacy of such critical focuses back to Lernout's *The French Joyce*, which he describes as 'a study whose critical objections to its subject matter were conterminous with, and to some extent also catalysed, the early 1990s turn from (particularly French) critical theory in search of different paradigms'.<sup>111</sup>

Despite deconstruction-influenced Joyce criticism continuing to appear through the 1990s and 2000s, Vichnar's comment highlights the increasingly popular historical and political approaches which simultaneously developed, heavily influenced by postcolonial theory and cultural studies, and echoing Lernout's advocacy for a return to historical reading methods. This focus informs a multitude of studies: as Len Platt observes in his 2011 introductory work *James Joyce: Texts and Contexts*, 'over relatively recent years the focus on historicizing the Joyce text has moved to the centre and now informs reading of *Ulysses* almost as a matter of course'.<sup>112</sup> Meanwhile, the canonical status of Derrida within Joyce studies remains uncertain – as the publication of Andrew J. Mitchell and Sam Slote's edited volume *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts* in 2013 suggests. This collection of essays by Derrida and by academics on Derrida and Joyce to some extent echoes *Post-Structuralist Joyce* in its defence, expressed through its focus and form, of the importance of continuing to pay attention to the relationship between Joyce and the most famous deconstructionist theorist. Attridge himself contributes an essay, 'Signature/countersignature: Derrida's response to *Ulysses*'. Just shy of thirty years after Derrida delivered 'Ulysses Gramophone' at the 1984 Symposium in Frankfurt, Attridge emphasises not the importance of that moment, but the importance of 'Ulysses Gramophone' as a text, as a critical reading of *Ulysses* – a novel statement. In their introduction Mitchell and Slote affirm the continued relevance and fecundity of the literary and philosophical relationship between Joyce and Derrida; their volume confirms both an audience for whom the relationship is still of interest, and the need to still defend the position of a theorist within Joyce studies. Historical and political approaches tap also into a rich seam

---

<sup>108</sup> Vichnar, 5. Brooker, *Critics*, 166.

<sup>109</sup> Brooker, *Critics*, 6.

<sup>110</sup> Emer Nolan, "'Who's he when he's at home?': Re-reading Joyce and Modernism', Review of three texts. *Modernism/modernity*, vol. 12, no. 3 (2005), 505-9 (507). Mark Osteen makes a very similar comment in his review of Roughley's *Critical Theory*: he remarks that the chapter structure makes sure 'Derrida gets the last word' and that 'Derridean poststructuralism is presented as the top of a ladder of progress'. *JJQ*, vol. 30/31 (Summer – Fall, 1993), 909-12 (910 and 911).

<sup>111</sup> Vichnar, 5.

<sup>112</sup> Len Platt, *James Joyce: Texts and Contexts* (London: Continuum, 2011), 81.

of Joyce's texts, and in the continued abundance of research the question of criticism's relationship to or view of the author has been lost. Newer Joycean monographs authorise their arguments with Joyce's biography, notebooks, or manuscripts as standard. In, for example, her 2014 study *Modernism and Cosmology: Absurd Lights*, Katherine Ebury reads 'the new physics' in Joyce's texts. She bases her detailed arguments on both his published literary texts and on proof in Joyce's notes that he read certain scientific works: her authority as reader is in part provided by an evidenced chain of influence.<sup>113</sup>

The works of Levin, Kain, Litz, and Kenner – prompted of course by Gilbert's Joyce-authorized work – laid the foundations of Ulysean criticism's tendency to advocate a certain mode of reading whilst affirming the validity of all modes of reading. But how does this tendency relate to the author? Traces of Gilbert's authorially-tinged study are only one instance of how Joyce's authority functions within the criticism of his texts (many of the above critics repeat his suggestions and ideas, including Iser, Lawrence, Senn, and Rabaté). As we can see in the efforts of critics to read Stephen Dedalus' opinions of art as Joyce's, something of the text of *Ulysses* prompts a search for authority, for help, for something to pin down. This reveals not only an effect of *Ulysses*, but a more pervasive critical attitude: Joyce studies is not alone in seeking authorised exegesis. The autobiographical elements of the novel do not justify the use of Joyce's letters to 'explain' an episode's style, nor Stephen's words (as Joyce's) to find an overarching theory of art to unravel what the novel is trying to achieve. As Barthes describes, an awareness of the polysemia of texts, the active role of the reader, and language as the source of meaning precludes a turn to the authority of the author. Yet, as we can see in Attridge's warnings against critical texts which give definites, or Senn's advice to not claim '*Ulysses* is' or '*Ulysses* does', in Joyce studies the threat of a closure of possible readings is rarely located at the author.

The theory-informed studies of authorship I have discussed in this chapter argue for a return to the author, or rather for an author who never left. Anti-authorial notions of poststructuralism do not seem to have put a dent in Joyce's authority, and it is hard to find a critic who tried openly to read *Ulysses* or *Finnegans Wake* without their author. Questions of how to read the author become side-lined in Joyce studies, though questions of how to read Joyce's texts continue to garner attention. The link between these two areas of inquiry is everywhere, yet goes largely unexplored. Joyce studies is a collection of readings each formed by attitudes towards the author-reader-text relationship. It is a history of self-conscious shifts in reading, an argument in itself for the limitless ways in which one can read a literary text.

---

<sup>113</sup> Katherine Ebury, *Modernism and Cosmology: Absurd Lights* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 66-71.

Yet the author is woven throughout, glinting in the background behind episode titles, nudging Gilbert, chased by genetic critics, contextualised, politicised, and deified. Joyce studies confirms that authorial authority can coexist with a freedom of reading, but it has stopped asking how. This will be the task of the next chapter, in a return to *Ulysses*.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Reading *Ulysses*: ‘Calypso’, ‘Wandering Rocks’, and the Role of the Reader**

As Molly takes over the final narration of ‘Penelope’, a barely-punctuated meandering in eight sentences and forty-odd pages, we can read in her narrative an intertextual relationship between her role and a Barthesian understanding of textuality and reading. Loose with syntax, grammar and, seemingly, logic, the episode presents itself as simultaneously a prose falling apart and a prose of astonishing density. Molly provides some of the most self-referential lines of the novel – ‘I dont like books with Molly in them’, ‘O Jamesy let me up out of this’, and ‘they all write about some woman in their poetry’ – and this, along with her misreading of ‘metempsychosis’, gives Molly an arguably metatextual position in the novel: as one who responds to texts (*U*, 707, 719, 725, and 62). The evocation of the Homeric Penelope, implicit in the character of Molly throughout *Ulysses*, becomes explicit in the the final tangled episode – and the correspondence between Molly and Penelope’s nighttime roles is particularly clear. Having promised her suitors to choose one to marry once she has woven a shroud for her father-in-law Laertes, she weaves by day and unravels by night to buy herself much-needed time. While Penelope’s deception can be read in terms of female writing (along with the weaving of other mythical mortals such as Arachne and Philomena), we can also view her activity as an intertextual link between Molly Bloom (née, nicely, Tweedy) and the reader of *Ulysses*. Understanding ‘text’ as a metaphor for a ‘network’, as ‘etymologically [...] a tissue, a woven fabric,’ lends a satisfying significance to the presence of Penelope (‘FWT’, 159). The roots of ‘text’ are emphasised by Roland Barthes in ‘From Work to Text’, arguing that the nature of text ‘asks of the reader a practical collaboration’ (‘FWT’, 163). This develops, as I have discussed before, ‘The Death of the Author’: ‘everything is to be *disentangled*, nothing *deciphered*; the structure can be followed, “run” (like the thread of a stocking) at every point and at every level’ (‘DA’, 147). As readers of *Ulysses* we are given license to unravel and weave the text anew, forming and undoing our readings.

While this chapter will refer to and complicate ideas expressed in both ‘The Death of the Author’ and ‘From Work to Text’, it responds more specifically to two essays from *The Rustle of Language*, a collection of Barthes’ essays written between 1967 and 1980. 1970’s ‘Writing Reading’ discusses *S/Z*, and develops Barthes’ approach to both the author and the reader. The latter is detailed further in ‘On Reading’, an idea from which echoes a focus of this chapter:

In the field of reading [...] there is not only no pertinence of *levels*, there is no possibility of describing *levels* of reading, because there is no possibility of closing the list of these levels. [...] we do not know where to halt the depth and the dispersion of reading: at the apprehension of a meaning? Which meaning? Denoted? Connoted? [...] I can decide

that in the depths of every text, however readable its conception, there is, there remains a certain measure of the unreadable. ('OR', 35)

Barthes' arguments read like the lessons learnt by readers of *Ulysses* or *Finnegans Wake*; out of context, these could be the words of several Joyce critics. This chapter will begin by exploring these ideas of limitless yet incomplete reading, before addressing how such a reading affects, and is affected by, our attitudes towards authorship. The question of authority will run through the chapter, as I discuss how our readings are authorised by the way we understand the figure of the author.

My argument is that the manner in which we read *Ulysses* provokes attitudes towards the author which are seemingly incompatible: that the ways we learn to read *Ulysses* re-enact a Barthesian concept of 'authorless' reading, while the same textual intricacies that prompt such ways of reading simultaneously affirm the activity and control of an author. After the previous chapter on 'post-theory' Joycean criticism, I wish to make it clear that it is not only the recent decades of the discipline that affirm the pertinence to Joyce studies of questions of authorship, but also the text itself. I want to track how the form and content of *Ulysses* demands we move through and beyond the text. This chapter is also in some ways a response to and querying of one focus of that previous chapter: the relationship between Joyce's texts and poststructuralist theory. The paradox of reading that I argue for and query in here reaches back to both my discussions of 'Eumaeus' in chapter three, and to what I hope chapters one, two, and four established: a sense of extremes of opinion, co-existing clashing approaches, and the dual presence in Joyce studies of a corrective urge and a faith in a multiplicity of readings. By continuing my discussion of narrative in *Ulysses* from chapter three I will be able to look at the concept of *Ulysses* as 'difficult': this will enable me to link this conversation back to critical and popular notions of Joyce as author. The overall aim of this chapter is to explore the ramifications of how reading *Ulysses* prompts us to become aware of our own activity of reading, and to slot those explorations into my wider analysis of the looping relationships between author, reader, critic, and text.

In order to discuss reading *Ulysses* I have chosen a scope and focus both specific and general: my starting points will be one sentence from 'Calypso', and 'Wandering Rocks' as a whole episode – enabling me to discuss reading in the requisite detail, engage with the way one sentence is woven into the rest of the text, and extend my readings to the text in full. My choices may need a little clarification. 'Wandering Rocks' engenders discussions of narrative and difficulty through its form, or rather through how we react to its form. I think its stylistic effects offer an experience of stymied reading that is hard to read our way out of. This then links to 'Eumaeus': unanswerable questions that inevitably lead us to look further. The single sentence of 'Calypso', however, is tougher to justify. I chose 'The sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea' by chance, as an experiment – it was chosen because it seemed

innocuous and understated, but noticed because it is intriguing and striking. The more I have read it the less like ‘chance’ this choice seems, and the less coincidental my selection of a sentence of such fecundity (though coincidences of reading, and coincidences in *Ulysses*, are relevant here). An important part of my argument is that it could be any sentence, that we can read any part of this novel with such intensity. However, my interest in the less-usual modes by which *Ulysses* narrates Bloom’s thoughts, and in all the unsaids of ‘Calypso’ – both explored in chapter three – perhaps made my selection predictable. A final clarification: for the purposes of my discussion, I have decided not to take into account the differences between milk and cream (this could be an error – there may be subtleties at play in *Ulysses* that I am overlooking).<sup>1</sup>

This chapter will open with a close reading of ‘The sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea’. I will read and reread the sentence, tracing associations, resonances, and echoes throughout the text. I hope to illustrate how far this can be pushed, how elaborate the reading of an innocuous sentence can be, and analyse my own reading of the sentence, an interrupted, far-ranging, active, and creative reading. With Barthes’ help I will argue that this exaggeration of reading is not dissimilar from any reading – it is rather making apparent what is inherent to any act of reading. Arguing thus that the manner in which we are encouraged by *Ulysses* to read *Ulysses* is similar to the reading described by Barthes’ in his anti-authorial work (and in this linking back to and developing the arguments of chapter three), I will begin to unpick the alternative and make it as clear as I can how entwined are these opposing views of the author for the reader. This mightily plotted, intricately mapped novel drags our focus to its creator. ‘Wandering Rocks’, mapped and plotted both more and less than we might want, will aid my discussion of this aspect of reading *Ulysses* – and pick up an analysis of the difficulties we face as readers. Looking at how narrative functions in ‘Wandering Rocks’ – or rather, how ‘Wandering Rocks’ make us question the purposes and functions of narration – will lead to an analysis of how the episode changes our perceptions of how significance is attributed via narration, setting us up to perceive the significance of the unnarrated, and how our complicated, far-reaching readings allow us to ‘read’ these ‘unwritten’ parts of the text.

From ‘Wandering Rocks’ I want to hone in on two linked ideas. These are the idea of difficulty and the idea that a reading which is difficult can lead us somewhere affecting, a moment or moments of pathos, development of character, for example – and that in this way intricate ‘plotting’ takes on further meaning. Following a textual echo, unravelling a network of intra or intertextual references, or piecing together something that is unnarrated can lead us to the human warmth of the novel. In this way our creative, ‘limitless’ reading follows paths that are in all senses ‘written’: an experience which emphasises the activity of the author. This

---

<sup>1</sup> In my defence, milk can behave like the cream described in ‘Calypso’ – when added after tea.

informs my argument that the activity of the author is highlighted via our activity of reading, and leads into an investigation of how this difficult text can form a deifying approach to the author. Discussing ‘genius’ or ‘god-like’ Joyce, and reaching back to the ‘double laughter’ of Derrida’s ‘Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce’, the final parts of this chapter link back to my earlier analysis of the author in and beyond Joyce studies. Noting the similarities of how a ‘genius’ author can authorise a critic’s readings and how a ‘dead’ author allows for the same authority of reading, I hope to show that the back-and-forth of reader and author prompted by *Ulysses* prefigures the debates of anti-authorial and author-centric theory and criticism that I investigated in earlier chapters. Finally, I will return to our opening sentence from ‘Calypso’ and Barthes’ ‘levels of reading’ to test out my own critical and readerly authority.

1. ‘Thumbed pages. Read and read’ (U, 233)

‘The sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea’ (U, 62)

‘Sluggish’ is a word that immediately seems to refer to more than the cream. It reaches out to Molly, rising late, lazily reclining in bed; associations which perhaps echo Bloom’s own thoughts as he brings her breakfast. Bloom’s mind too, however, is sluggish this morning in the ‘gelid light and air’ of the kitchen (U, 53). He strains to define metempsychosis for Molly, burns his breakfast kidney, forgets what he did with his hat, and fails to get his latchkey from his other trousers. Of course, Molly’s own mind is sluggish as well – she forgets the word she wishes to understand, the word we know from Bloom’s later recollections she sounds out as ‘met him pike hoses’. ‘Sluggish’ becomes a description, then, of the characters and the time of day. As for the cream (aside from its endowment with slightly too much of an adjective) it could lead us back to the mewling ‘pussens’ given ‘warmbubbled milk’ already that morning – back to the confusions of the pronoun ‘she’ that Bloom uses interchangeably for his wife and the cat, and back to that affectionate interaction between Bloom and an other (U, 52-4). In ‘wound’ there are traces of a manipulation, a trapping even, in its suggestion of a gradual surrounding, wrapping, tying. ‘Curdling’ adds to this, with its connotations of forcibly changing a state, of metamorphosis – not necessarily for the better. It adds a sour taste to the sentence, a taste of something going wrong.<sup>2</sup> ‘Spirals’ disorient, twisting and confusing, and a journey of cream through tea gains the weight of a more mystical descent: these winding curdling spirals of cream describe a forced and disorienting change, and thus bring us back to Molly’s unknown word. This startling parallel of making tea with the transmigration of souls

---

<sup>2</sup> To briefly separate milk and cream again: cream in tea is already a little wrong.

brings into this sentence the associations of metempsychosis in the episode: of Patrick Dignam's funeral happening later that morning, but also of Molly's book in which she finds the word and Bloom's first offered definition of it – 'It's Greek' (*U*, 62).<sup>3</sup> We might be forgiven for seeing a feminine, winding entrapment, a change in form, and another text with Greek words in it as an invocation of the *Odyssey's* Calypso and Circe. Dragging ourselves back to the tea, it is of course very much 'her tea' – it is linked to Molly in the first description earlier in this episode of her sitting up in bed, 'The warmth of her couched body rose on the air, mingling with the fragrance of the tea she poured' (*U*, 61). This tea punctuates the narrative of 'Calypso' at various points, creating occasional little pauses of detail. Perhaps 'the sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea' is a pause in conversation as well as the text, a moment for Bloom to think before going on to give another definition of metempsychosis. We could then read this sentence as a description of Bloom's pause for thought, the words coloured by his current preoccupation, by a mind full of reincarnation.

Quickly we find ourselves following traces beyond 'Calypso'. Bloom has just told Molly of the forgetfulness inherent to this concept of rebirth, 'frowning' as he himself forgets (*U*, 62). He does not mention the river Lethe and the role drinking its waters plays in such mythic renewal – erasing past lives for the reborn – but while Molly drinks her tea an informed reader might find themselves looking forward to the 'waters of oblivion' in the next episode 'Lotus Eaters', and the corresponding amnesiac properties of lotus in the *Odyssey* (*U*, 78).<sup>4</sup> If not distracted by a descent into Greek myth, we might be similarly brought out of 'Calypso' by a recollection of that other breakfast in *Ulysses*: tea is had by Stephen Dedalus, Buck Mulligan, and the Englishman Haines three episodes earlier at the same time of day (a trinity to match that of Bloom, Molly, and Boylan?). The arrival in 'Telemachus' of the milkwoman providing the necessary companion for their cups is imbued with a particular sense of importance:

Old and secret she had entered from a morning world, maybe a messenger. She praised the goodness of the milk, pouring it out. Crouching by a patient cow at daybreak in the lush field, a witch on her toadstool, her wrinkled fingers quick at the squirting dugs. They lowed about her whom they knew, dewsilky cattle. Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in old times. A wandering crone, lowly form of an immortal serving her conqueror and her gay betrayer, their common cucquean, a messenger from the secret morning. To serve or to upbraid, whether he could not tell : but scorned to beg her favour. (*U*, 14)

When Stephen and Bloom are together in the early hours of the next morning, several hundreds of pages later, the narrative again imposes a strange weight and ritual to their consumption of hot drinks, and Molly's cream reappears as Bloom makes cocoa:

---

<sup>3</sup> Hugh Kenner names Bloom's definition 'the book's first internal clue to the meaning of its own title' (*'U'*, 29).

<sup>4</sup> The river Lethe is mentioned just once, in 'Oxen of the Sun' (*U*, 394).

Relinquishing his symposiarchal right to the moustache cup of Crown Derby presented to him by his only daughter, Millicent (Milly), he substituted a cup identical with that of his guest and served extraordinarily to his guest and, in reduced measure, to himself, the viscous cream ordinarily reserved for the breakfast of his wife Marion (Molly). (*U*, 629)

The pomposity of the three young men (along with Stephen's idea of Mother Ireland) tints the description of the milkwoman, while the ridiculous tone of Bloom's cocoa-making is typical of 'Ithaca'. But without our description of Molly adding cream to her tea might we notice this coincidence of ceremony, the importance of dairy, permeating these book-ending cups of tea and cocoa? This odd significance neatly prefigures the importance ascribed by critics to the third, unwritten breakfast made the next day at 7 Eccles Street – clung to by some as an indicator of the future of the Blooms' marriage.<sup>5</sup>

Associations come and go in our paused reading of this pause in conversation. The Blooms' cat is here not only with the cream but with the 'purr' heard in 'curdling' (though she of course does not purr, making instead a variety of 'Mkgnao!' noises (*U*, 53-4). Purring is reserved, later in *Ulysses*, for a librarian, a drum, and two lawnmowers).<sup>6</sup> A recollection of the 'sluggish bile' of Stephen's mother is less pleasant, but forges another link between 'Telemachus' and 'Calypso' as the only two instances of the word 'sluggish' appear at the same time of day in different parts of Dublin (*U*, 6). The 'cream' has still more disparate connections: 'Two sheets cream vellum paper' in 'Sirens', the 'cream of a joke' in 'Eumaeus', Molly's memory in 'Penelope' of Bloom saying 'it was sweet and thicker than cows then he wanted to milk me into the tea well hes beyond everything', and Lenehan's claim in 'Wandering Rocks' that sitting next to Molly he was 'lost, so to speak, in the milky way' (*U*, 253, 573, 705, and 225). The tea lingers in Bloom's thoughts as he views the 'Bath of the Nymph' print on the wall of their bedroom a few lines later in 'Calypso' as being perhaps the colours of 'Tea before you put milk in it', and tea and its warmth stay in his thoughts in 'Lotus Eaters' (*U*, 63). The tea could even be read as infusing the text beyond Bloom – the schematically assigned colour of 'Lotus Eaters' is 'dark brown' (think again of tea before you put milk in it).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Austin Briggs details critical readings of breakfast on the 17<sup>th</sup> June in 'Breakfast at 7 Eccles Street: *Oufs Sacher-Masoch?*', in the proceedings of the Eighteenth Symposium *Joyce in Trieste: An Album of Risky Readings*, ed. Sebastian D. G. Knowles, Geert Lernout, and John McCourt (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007), 195-209.

<sup>6</sup> 'the quaker librarian purred' in 'Scylla and Charybdis', 'The drum turns purring in low hesitation waltz' in 'Circe', and the lawnmowers of Siamese twin Oxford dons Philip Drunk and Philip Sober in the same episode 'purring with a rigadoon of grasshalms' (*U*, 17, 534, and 488).

<sup>7</sup> According to Petr Skrabanek, the Liffey is 'described by Joyce as having the colour of tea without milk. "Tea" in slang means both "whiskey" and "urine". *Le thé* in French is "tea". But the Lethe is also the river of forgetting, the river of death.' Skrabanek, 'Finnegans Wake – Night Joyce of a Thousand Tiers', in *The Artist and the Labyrinth*, ed. Augustine Martin (London: Ryan, 1990), 229-40 (232). On that note: 'When I makes tea I makes tea, as old mother Grogan said. And when I makes water I makes water. [...] *So I do, Mrs Cahill*, says she. *Be 'gob, ma'am*, says Mrs Cahill, *God send you don't make them in the one pot*' (*U*, 12-3).

As previously noted, in 'Calypso' the warmth of Molly's body is perceived by Bloom as 'mingling with the fragrance of the tea she poured', and perfumes continue to connote Molly's warm physicality for Bloom throughout *Ulysses*. The question asked in his letter from Martha Clifford in 'Lotus Eaters', 'do tell me what perfume does your wife use', is repeated in full and in part throughout the novel (*U*, 75). In 'Lestrygonians', a couple of hours after reading the letter, the question continues to repeat in Bloom's mind and is followed shortly by a hinted-at memory: 'A warm human plumpness settled down on his brain. His brain yielded. Perfume of embraces all him assailed. With hungered flesh obscurely, he mutely craved to adore' (*U*, 160). Within three lines this develops into many mingled experiences: 'Perfumed bodies, warm, full. All kissed, yielded: in deep summer fields, tangled pressed grass, in trickling hallways of tenements, along sofas, creaking beds' (*U*, 161). A few pages later the key memory is identified: Bloom and a 'warmfolded' Molly lying on Howth Head, in each other's arms and surrounded by rhododendrons (*U*, 167-8). The importance of this memory to the Blooms and the novel is confirmed by Molly in 'Penelope'. She remembers 'the day we were lying among the rhododendrons on Howth head in the grey tweed suit and his straw hat the day I got him to propose to me yes' (*U*, 731). Molly closes the text by recalling 'and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes' (*U*, 732).

As ever in *Ulysses*, humour both cruel and affectionate is close at hand. Beyond the mingling of Molly's warmth and the tea's fragrance Bloom picks up the 'foul flowerwater' of old incense in their bedroom. I would surely not be the only reader drawn backwards and forwards to two other close-by references to 'flower water', which when brought together form an illuminating comparison of the preoccupations of Stephen and Bloom (*U*, 61). A description of the sea moving amongst low rocks, coloured by Stephen's thoughts and ways of thinking, occurs towards the end of 'Proteus': 'It flows furling, widely flowing, floating foam, flower unfurling' (*U*, 49). Meanwhile 'Lotus Eaters' describes at its close Bloom foreseeing himself in the bath: 'He saw his trunk and limbs riprippled over and sustained, buoyed slightly upward, lemonyellow : his navel, bud of flesh : and saw the dark tangled curls of his bush floating, floating hair of the stream around the limp father of thousands, a languid floating flower' (*U*, 83). Juxtaposing Stephen's literary pretensions (seen in the narrative's habit in 'Proteus' of echoing Stephen as he tries out words) with Bloom's mental image of his own 'limp father of thousands' results in a slight but not unkind mocking of both men. This in turn reveals the more serious and essential concerns of each character: Stephen's anxieties over his own talents and aspirations, and Bloom's worries over his roles of man, father, and

sexual being.<sup>8</sup> And, with much less humour, part of the cause of Bloom's disquiet perhaps hovers amongst 'The sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea'. That sour note of 'curdling' is unpleasant, connoting a splitting or going too far. Just a page earlier as Bloom carries Molly's breakfast into the bedroom they briefly discuss the letter she has received, now badly hidden under the 'dimpled pillow'. 'O, Boylan' wrote the letter to 'Mrs Marion' to arrange their meeting later that day (*U*, 61). As eventually becomes clear, Molly and Boylan are meeting at four o'clock to begin an affair; the thought of another man having sex with his wife is on Bloom's mind, curdling the marital domesticity of the morning. In 'Ithaca' he even finds 'soured adulterated milk' in the kitchen dresser just before he notices Boylan's betting slips close by, and shortly before he gives Molly's cream away to his guest Stephen (*U*, 628). He is preoccupied enough in 'Calypso' to directly cause another unpleasant sensation just a few lines later: the smell of burnt kidney from the kitchen downstairs (*U*, 63).<sup>9</sup>

Following the traces of this sentence we read widely, this focus affecting our other readings and bringing together disparate moments of text. The satisfying results of such excessive reading encourage us to push further: if one description of adding milk to tea draws out the ever-circled memory of Howth Head then where else might it take us? Placing limits feels inappropriate, dealing as we are not just with the far-reaching possibilities of our own minds but with those of the characters. As I mentioned, the narrative's brief focus on Molly's transforming tea can be read as a description of a character's pause for thought. Such a reading provides an explanation for how fertile this seemingly-innocuous sentence is. If it describes Bloom thinking, then to discover traces of his thoughts within it is no surprise.<sup>10</sup> The presentation of human thought in *Ulysses* is complex and unorthodoxly mimetic, a scattered web of fragments served both by form and content that the reader must draw together in reading the novel. In this one sentence a Ulyssean mimesis can be seen. On the pages of another novel we might read 'while she added cream to her tea Bloom/I thought of metempsychosis, his/my mind wandering to the day ahead'. Instead we have a curiously finely-wrought yet economic description of the cream's journey through the tea, catching our

---

<sup>8</sup> There is a similarity rumbling away under this comparison, however: Stephen's dreams of writing and Bloom's self-contemplation reveal a common preoccupation with creation, legacy, making a mark. They need not have worried about permanence.

<sup>9</sup> We could even argue for an alternative reading, that it is Molly's mind that tinges this sentence – Molly who 'poured more tea into her cup, watching its flow sideways' (*U*, 62). It could be Molly who observes the spirals curdling through her tea, pondering both her husband's description of reincarnation and her imminent first act of adultery. Such a reading would be a radical departure from the standard reading that Molly's interior world is kept from the reader until 'Penelope', and could be refuted by the use of 'her' in the context of the surrounding text – such as the words that follow, 'Better remind her of the word : metempsychosis', which are surely Bloom's.

<sup>10</sup> In the BBC's 1988 documentary 'James Joyce's *Ulysses*', the first episode of the series 'The Modern World: Ten Great Writers', several sections of *Ulysses* are dramatised. One such is Bloom and Molly's conversation in 'Calypso', including a zoomed-in shot of white cream, poured slowly via the back of a spoon, spiralling into Molly's dark tea as Bloom explains reincarnation. In an otherwise fairly straight-forward dramatisation of the scene, the swirling cream stands out visually – as does the immediately preceding illustration from Paul de Kock's book *Ruby*. Molly's sexuality and the meaning of metempsychosis – Bloom's thoughts – are visually layered over the image of the tea. Dir. Nigel Wattis (*BBC*, 10<sup>th</sup> January 1988).

attention by being slightly too much yet not enough. This encourages us to pause with Bloom, to return, to read-over or ‘overread’. In doing so we mimic the possible cognitions of Bloom at that moment and at later moments in the day, unable to fix the links we find and so allowing them to shift and change. We work hard to create something which can be seen as a mapping of Bloom’s thought, as we do from start to finish in *Ulysses* reading back and forth, skipping and repeating. Layered over this, of course, are our own associations that function beyond Bloom – such as the breakfast of ‘Telemachus’, which he does not know about – our readings being constantly altered or adjusted by further reading. How satisfying it is that both a moment of contemplation colouring one’s other thoughts and opinions, and a new or developed reading adjusting one’s previous and later readings, could also be compared to how tea is changed by adding milk.

Mimicry of the movements and functions of human thought causes much of the active reading we perform in *Ulysses*, flicking back and forth through the book as we bring together threads of the characters’ internal lives. Form and content work in harmony, and result in a gradually increased understanding of the characters and the day we move through with them – further mirroring how we ‘know’ or ‘comprehend’ people and events in our own lives; ‘a secondary mimetic technique’, as Leo Bersani notes in ‘Against *Ulysses*’.<sup>11</sup> This encourages us to enter into a mode of reading which contributes to perceptions of *Ulysses* as ‘difficult’ (as I will discuss further below), in which to catch up with a character’s thoughts we must make connections between repetitions and gestures separated by tens or hundreds of pages, relying on our own notes and folded page corners. This mode of reading itself encourages a liberated, active, creative reading in which finding resonances can become our primary activity. We can have great fun testing the limits of how much significance can be assigned to such traces and relationships, and reading with our ears metaphorically pricked up can predictably affect our reading beyond *Ulysses*. What am I to do when, reading as *Ulysses* prompts, I find tea and curdling, spiralling cream in other texts? I read it in this unsuspecting description of adding milk to tea in Stella Gibbons’ 1932 novel *Cold Comfort Farm*: ‘The opaque curve purred softly down into the teak depths of the cup.’<sup>12</sup> It begs to be noticed in these words, said by Valentine in Tom Stoppard’s 1993 play *Arcadia*: ‘The ordinary-sized stuff which is our lives, the things people write poetry about – clouds – daffodils – waterfalls – and what happens in a cup of coffee when the cream goes in – these things are full of mystery, as mysterious to us as the heavens were to the Greeks.’<sup>13</sup> If I were to use these intertextual links to form a critical reading of any of the three texts in question I would be

---

<sup>11</sup> Leo Bersani, ‘Against *Ulysses*’, in *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’: A Casebook*, ed. Attridge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 201-29 (205). All references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name. A similar point is made by Kenner in ‘*Ulysses*’, the results of ‘Joyce’s aesthetics of delay’ (81).

<sup>12</sup> Stella Gibbons, *Cold Comfort Farm* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949), 82.

<sup>13</sup> Tom Stoppard, *Arcadia* (London: Faber, 1993), 48.

relying only on the authority of my own reading; would this constitute a valid argument? Is the similarity of form and a thread between ‘purred’ and ‘curdling’ enough to argue for the presence of *Ulysses* in *Cold Comfort Farm* or for any effect of such presence? How would I compose an argument that ‘what happens in a cup of coffee when the cream goes in’ is a reference to *Ulysses*, or what that reference could mean in either *Arcadia* or *Ulysses*? I am goaded by the way in which I read *Ulysses* to question what my reading authorises, and what authorises my reading.

This performance of close reading could be seen as ‘overreading’, as an excessively extensive if not absurd or indulgent act typical of and specific to *Ulysses*.<sup>14</sup> This mode of reading is specific to *Ulysses*, and yet simultaneously not. Barthes opens ‘Writing Reading’ with the following question: ‘Has it never happened, while you were reading a book, that you kept stopping as you read, not because you weren’t interested, but because you were: because of a flow of ideas, stimuli, associations? In a word, haven’t you ever happened to *read while looking up from your book?*’ (‘WR’, 29)<sup>15</sup> He continues, defending *S/Z*: ‘It is such a reading, at once insolent in that it interrupts the text, and smitten in that it keeps returning to it and feeding on it, which I tried to describe’ (‘WR’, 29). Following this approach, we can see our physical back-and-forth page-turning and note-making as an enactment of any reading in which one’s mind wanders yet remains in the text – which is in turn a conscious active re-enactment of reading itself. As Barthes continues: ‘composition *channels*; reading, on the contrary (that text we write in ourselves when we read), *disperses*, disseminates’ (‘WR’, 30). This concept of writing a text in ourselves as we read, a familiar Barthesian marriage of reading and writing as a ‘single signifying practice’, rings true with the way we read *Ulysses*, constructing a text as we manoeuvre our way through the parallax narrative. The so-called difficulties we face in *Ulysses* – the presentation of the characters’ minds, the differing styles, the echoes of and references to other texts – cause us as readers to make apparent that which is inherent in any act of reading: a dispersion of ‘ideas, stimuli, associations’. As we read one sentence of the novel and follow its threads within and without the text of *Ulysses* we find that its traces in turn affect other readings – it infuses throughout, colouring the places where it leads. The reading of an episode, sentence, word, winds curdling spirals through one’s reading of the entire text, and beyond. The intertextuality of the novel feeds into this along with the intratextuality: part of the dispersion, the dissemination, of our reading is structurally,

---

<sup>14</sup> Nancy K. Miller uses the term ‘overreading’ very differently in her essay ‘Arachnologies: The Woman, The Text, and the Critic’. Miller’s concept opposes Barthes’ authorless reading; she defines ‘The goal of overreading, of reading for the signature’ in her reading of Arachne as ‘to put one’s finger – figuratively – on the place of production that marks the spinner’s attachment to her web.’ I am here using the term ‘overreading’ without Miller’s connotations of reaching for the writing subject, but rather as an exaggeration of the reader’s role. In *The Poetics of Gender*, ed. Nancy K. Miller (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 270-95 (288).

<sup>15</sup> Not to keep going on about it, but this is Fritz Senn: ‘or what seems to happen in that interaction with our minds that we call, without knowing what it is, reading.’ *Joyce’s Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), ix.

thematically, and linguistically woven into the text of *Ulysses* through its references to other texts, and as Bersani notes it is our intratextual wanderings that teach us to leave the text in order to keep reading (Bersani, 212). Openly and obliquely, *Ulysses* is referential from its title to its core, and one way of understanding what we might call an ‘exaggeration’ of reading could be to appreciate again the novel as an ‘exaggeration’ of what constitutes a text. *Ulysses* makes explicit that which Barthes argues is implicit to all texts: the text is ‘a tissue of quotations’, ‘a network’ asking ‘of the reader a practical collaboration’. Most pertinently:

a text is made up of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said the author. The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text’s unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. (‘DA’, 148)

Again, this leads to Barthes’ declaration that an author limits text: closes reading (‘DA’, 147). My interrupted, far-ranging, active, and creative reading is not dissimilar from any reading – it, again, is rather making explicit what is implicit to all acts of reading. As my exaggerated mode of reading an exaggerated text suggests a form of writing, and a limitlessness and creativity which proscribe an author, it implies the same of any reading of any text.

## 2. ‘Very large and wonderful and keeps famous time’ (U, 232)

The process of reading described above results also in a more tangible form of writing: annotation. Our copies of *Ulysses* become overwritten with notes, the margins crammed with questions and reminders, page numbers listed as a record of echoes tracked, the names of authors and works visited marked down next to circled words. Though active and engaged, there is an element of catching up at play in this mode – and I am again reminded of Hugh Kenner’s alignment of the reader of *Ulysses* with the scholiasts of Alexandria.<sup>16</sup> This sensation of catching up is particularly clear for the reader faced with ‘Wandering Rocks’, the tenth and central episode of the novel. Divided into eighteen sections with a final coda, ‘Wandering Rocks’ follows to some extent the structure of *Ulysses*. Its central scene focuses on Bloom, though he is only one of roughly fifty characters who move around Dublin between three and four in the afternoon in the episode. A directory’s-worth of street and building names pinpoint the movements of these characters across the nineteen scenes, which are often interrupted by unmarked interpolations: snatches of observation from some other place, some other scene in the episode occurring at the same time. Identifying these inferences of simultaneity is much easier for those with an in-depth knowledge of Dublin’s geography, and readers without this

---

<sup>16</sup> Bersani stretches the word ‘simply’ when noting that ‘The exegetical work is enormous, but in a sense it has already been done by the author, and we simply have to catch up with him’, but then so does Barthes in claiming we are ‘simply’ holding together all traces of a text (Bersani, 225).

knowledge may find themselves plotting the movements of the characters on a map of the city. We can only understand why, in the first scene of the episode, Father Conmee greets and is greeted by all whom he meets apart from Mr Denis J. Maginni, if we know that Mountjoy Square East, where Father Conmee ‘smiled and nodded and smiled and walked’, is roughly ten minutes’ walk away from Mr Maginni at ‘the corner of Dignam’s court’: Conmee and Maginni are near to each other in the text, not in Dublin (*U*, 210-1). Figuring out this first interpolation encourages us to believe that mapping the characters across the city may reveal something of importance. With either glosses and critical annotations or our own scrawled-on map (or some time spent on Google Maps) we can be assured that the movements of and encounters between the characters have been perfectly worked out and timed – but our endeavours reveal little beyond the exactitude of the plotting.

In his 1974 chapter on the episode, Clive Hart notes that it ‘is [also] in fact full of verbal echoes and thematic connections which are, so to speak, potential interpolations made by the reader [her/]himself’.<sup>17</sup> We can understand this concept of ‘potential interpolations’ as describing the sort of reading discussed above; the text on the page is interpolated by our wandering minds, by our reading as we look up from the page. Two passages of ‘Wandering Rocks’ even interpolate ‘Calypso’ in our tracing of milk and cream. As mentioned before, walking along Wellington Quay Lenehan tells his friend M’Coy a story of sitting next to Molly Bloom and her ‘fine pair’ in a ‘bumping’ carriage, joking with ‘hands mould[ing] ample curves of air’, that while ‘Bloom was pointing out all the stars and the comets in the heavens [...] I was lost, so to speak, in the milky way’ (*U*, 225). Very close by in the Dublin Bread Company tearooms (‘We call it D. B. C because they have damn bad cakes’) a panama and ‘primrose waistcoat’ clad Buck Mulligan and the Englishman Haines have coffee and scones while Charles Stewart Parnell’s brother plays chess near a window (*U*, 238-9). Discussing Stephen Dedalus’ plan ‘to write something in ten years’, Haines tastes his creamy *mélange* coffee: ‘– This is real Irish cream I take it, he said with forbearance. I don’t want to be imposed on’ (*U*, 239). With a pomposity that reaches back to Buck that morning and forward to the cocoa of ‘Ithaca’ that night, colonial tourist Haines demands to be sure he has an authentic Irish experience while in the coda of the episode the British rule imposed on Ireland is displayed in the procession of the Viceregal Cavalcade through the streets of Dublin. Either Haines or Lenehan could interrupt our reading of tea in ‘Calypso’. The interpolations that take us across the city in ‘Wandering Rocks’, however, are directed wanderings, plotted for us, and though we can make arguments for the effect or meaning of individual interpolations, their

---

<sup>17</sup> Clive Hart, ‘Wandering Rocks’, in *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’: Critical Essays*, ed. Hart and David Hayman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 181-216 (193).

significance *en masse* seems only to be their precision.<sup>18</sup> Hart's definition of 'potential interpolations' as being 'made by the reader themselves' implies that the explicit interpolations of the 'Wandering Rocks' narrative are instead authorial. They raise awareness of the author's activity, and we are rewarded for our efforts with a reminder of how skilfully and intricately plotted the text is.

Tracking the interpolations and the movements of the characters does not, however, offer us a greater understanding of the strangeness of 'Wandering Rocks'. Such strangeness is caused by a series of structural, stylistic, linguistic and narrative oddities. In her annotations to *Ulysses*, Jeri Johnson dubs these 'disorienting effects', a turn of phrase which gestures towards a reader's sense of being lost in this episode despite being able to pinpoint each of its events on a map (*U*, 866). Interpolations are examples of these bizarre ticks in the episode, all of which also interrupt and confuse our reading in some way. Repetitions, moments of wordplay, and a continued thwarting of narrative momentum cause us to question the focus of the narrative. As discussed above, repetitions are a standard characteristic of *Ulysses*; in 'Wandering Rocks', however, we find repetitions which occur confusingly close together and with unusual similarity. We are used to repetitions having significance in the novel, but this stutters when we are told twice within seven lines that Father Conmee 'stepped on to an outward bound tram' and 'stepped into an outward bound tram' (*U*, 213) or that Almidano Artifoni 'trotted on stout trousers after the Dalkey tram. In vain he trotted, signalling in vain' (*U*, 220). Searching for some logic behind these repetitive moments, we can at times find echoes of the effects of 'Sirens' or Stephen's wordplay in 'Proteus'. The latter makes some sense and suggests significance in scenes where Stephen is present, such as during his conversation with Artifoni: his linguistic touch seems to reach 'the pigeons roococooed', 'swaying his ashplant in slow swingswong', and the quick repetition of the word 'frankly' (*U*, 219). We can also see Stephen's language experimentation affecting the opening of his scene with Dilly Dedalus, with three different attempts to describe dust, each more elaborate than the last:

Stephen Dedalus watched through the webbed window the lapidary's fingers prove a timedulled chain. Dust webbed the window and the showtrays. Dust darkened the toiling fingers with their vulture nails. Dust slept on dull coils of bronze and silver, lozenges of cinnabar, on rubies, leprous and winedark stones. (*U*, 231-2)

Why then, does the narrative use a similarly alliterative style in its central scene, describing the shopman showing books to Bloom? 'Onions of his breath came across the counter out of his ruined mouth. He bent to make a bundle of the other books, hugged them against his unbuttoned waistcoat and bore them off behind the dingy curtain' (*U*, 226). And why are we

---

<sup>18</sup> Hart attempts to find reasons for each of the interpolations, his findings recorded in a table at the end of his chapter on the episode. The reasons given for three interpolations are listed as just '?'. Hart, 207, 212, and 214.

told that Cashel Boyle O'Connor Fitzmaurice Tisdall Farrell has his 'stickumbrelladustcoat dangling' twice in two short paragraphs (*U*, 240)? The cumulative effect is narrative inattention or forgetfulness. This is heightened by the repetition of 'a one-legged sailor', an example used by both Hart and Karen Lawrence in their analyses of 'Wandering Rocks'. Giving the impression that the narrative has either forgotten that it and we have encountered the sailor already or that the narrative does not recognise its own previous narration of the sailor, the repetition of 'a one-legged sailor' disrupts our reading. Lawrence argues that 'The narrative inability to progress from the indefinite to the definite article illustrates a strange failing in the "narrative memory."' A critical component of the development of narrative is precisely this ability to synthesize knowledge while accumulating it'.<sup>19</sup> We expect to be told of 'the one-legged sailor' once we have read of 'a one-legged sailor': for that encounter to cause a change in article. Eventually he is wrought as 'the sailor' and 'the one-legged sailor', and the definite article does appear comfortably elsewhere – such as when 'A constable on his beat' becomes 'the constable' (*U*, 212). With consistency, we could argue for some rule or stylistic choice. The inconsistency emphasises Lawrence's argument for a 'strange failing': the effect is of something not working, of something having gone wrong (curdled?). The one-legged sailor seems unworthy of the narrative's attention, divided as it is between nineteen scenes.

Non-human objects, however, seem to catch the narrative focus at random. Just as when the language seems to take on Stephen's mode of playing and trying out ways of expression in scenes which focus on him, something akin to the Uncle Charles Principle occurs elsewhere in the episode. Characteristics and emotions seep into inanimate objects, and an apparently random selection of items find themselves curiously detailed. Innocent peaches become 'shamefaced' and later 'blushing' in the company of Blazes Boylan, as if when painting Boylan guilty (on his way to meet Molly) the narrative's brushstrokes catch the fruit, 'fat pears' 'bedded' with the peaches in a basket (*U*, 218-9); Kenner dubs these 'Boylan-verbs' and 'Boylan-epithets' (*J'sV*, 27).<sup>20</sup> In the coda, the excitement of the cavalcade reaches tens of characters and 'a bag in which eleven cockles rolled to view with wonder the lord mayor and lady mayoress'; even 'the salute of Almidano Artifoni's sturdy trousers' is acknowledged (*U*, 244). And while Father Conmee greets and is greeted on his walk he also passes 'cabbages, curtseying to him with ample underleaves' (*U*, 213). We could argue that the result of this particular disorienting effect is that Boylan's flirting, the cavalcade's impact, or Conmee's ego are emphasized. However, when Conmee sees an old woman stepping off the tram, and sees 'the conductor help her and net and basket down', why are woman and objects placed

<sup>19</sup> Karen Lawrence, *The Odyssey of Style in 'Ulysses'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 84-5.

<sup>20</sup> Kenner notes also the later repetition of 'bedded' and description of a 'disrobed' bottle at the end of that day; I would add the 'soured adulterated milk' Bloom also finds at home.

oddly on an equal footing by the absence of possessive pronouns (*U*, 213)? And if this narrative is capable of a complex trope in which objects are swept up in emotional tides in order to emphasise the self-importance of Boylan, Conmee, and the Viceroy, then why is it incapable of recalling what or who it has already narrated? As much as we can try to argue for some significance in the amazed cockles, embarrassed peaches, and curtseying cabbages, the overwhelming impression is of an illogical narrative focus. Furthermore, the briefness of each scene cuts short any effect these characterised objects might impart, as the attention of the narrative shifts thoughtlessly. This also halts much of the momentum of pathos in the episode: Stephen's perception of his younger sister as 'drowning' at home and Dignam's son's grief are cut cruelly short, as the interior life of a character appears insufficient to keep the narrative interested. Johnson argues that 'the reader's problem' is 'how to contend with the seeming capriciousness of the narrative'. She continues, 'Is there some underlying significance here? Just as a plot-line appears to be gaining momentum an interpolation intrudes. These interruptions force the fact of narrative simultaneity to the reader's consciousness, but how do we make sense of the juxtaposition?' (*U*, 866)

'Wandering Rocks' is uncomfortable because much of what we expect as readers, even as readers of *Ulysses*, is thwarted. We expect a narrative to keep track of its characters, of some of their inner lives, of its own narration, language, decisions – even as far in as 'Eumaeus' we expect the narrative to keep track of its own jokes too, such as Bloom's L-less misnomer (in fact, we expect an unusually high level of this. As Kenner argues, 'Novelists don't normally know where characters' hats are' (*U*, 46)). We expect 'plot' to be more than marks on a map, 'realism' to be more and less than precise timing. We expect important occurrences to garner narration: as Johnson points out, "'Wandering Rocks" teasingly hints that it is the fact of the narrative which bestows significance on narrative events, not vice versa' (*U*, 866). The purpose of the narrative comes into question, and, as when reading 'Eumaeus', the narrative's oddities suggest a personality behind the strangeness. Hart describes the narrator's 'difficult personality [as] the most salient thing about the chapter'.<sup>21</sup> Johnson's use of the word 'capriciousness' responds to the narrative's seemingly forgetful omniscience, while Lawrence responds to the same effects by discussing 'the narrative mind':

Reality is "defamiliarized," to borrow a phrase from the Russian formalists, a process due to the type of narrative mind in the chapter. This narrative mind exhibits what I would call a "lateral" or paratactic imagination: it catalogues facts without synthesizing them. It documents the events that occur but fails to give the causal, logical, or even temporal connections between them.<sup>22</sup>

Again, as in 'Eumaeus', we might find ourselves reading the narrative failures of 'Wandering Rocks' as indicative of a mind, a character. The lack of a consistent central character rules out

---

<sup>21</sup> Hart, 186.

<sup>22</sup> Lawrence, 83.

a similar possible extended version of the Uncle Charles Principle in this episode, but the idea of the narrator as personified overseer may bring us back to Kenner's version of the Arranger: only here the arranger has little idea what it has 'said before'. Kenner argues that 'Wandering Rocks' is indeed 'Joyce's earliest explorations of the Arranger – the captions of "Aeolus" extended his presence retroactively at a late stage of revision – and it is noteworthy that in "Wandering Rocks" the Arranger's difficult personality manifests itself in snares for the reader' (*U*, 65). An inefficient arranger, or personality-laden narrator; we are again seeking some logic, some system behind the oddities of 'Wandering Rocks'. A 'distracted narrator' theory carries some credence: the narrator is sophisticated but attempting too much, and finds its attention easily grabbed by, for example, the gleam of what we infer is Molly's 'generous white arm from a window in Eccles street' which interpolates Corny Kelleher's brief scene (*U*, 216). The idea of an observing, even voyeuristic, narrator, is similarly convincing: looking at all of Dublin and making sure to include mention that 'A flushed young man came from a gap of a hedge and after him came a young woman with wild nodding daisies in her hand. The young man raised his hat abruptly : the young woman abruptly bent and with slow care detached from her light skirt a clinging twig' (*U*, 215).<sup>23</sup> We could even argue for a narrator who is easily influenced by its characters: with an overall episode style that takes on Father Conmee's concerns with noticing, greeting, and recognising others and being noticed, greeted, or recognised in return; Bloom and Boylan's preoccupations with illicit sex; Stephen's linguistic experimentation and play; Master Dignam's attempt to reach truth through language ('Pa is dead. My father is dead' (*U*, 241)); and even the cavalcade's showy procession and display of power through and over all of Dublin.

So, what is the function, or purpose, of a narrative that encourages such theorising? We are desperately seeking a reason not only for why the events of 'Wandering Rocks' are narrated in this manner, but for why they are narrated at all. In chapter three I focused on how the style of 'Eumaeus' drew our attention to the 'act' of narration and its potential perpetrators; here we are faced with confusion over, to refer again to Johnson, the 'fact' of narration: "'Wandering Rocks" teasingly hints that it is the fact of the narrative which bestows significance on narrative events, not vice versa'.<sup>24</sup> As our efforts fail to find reasons for how or why the episode is narrated, it is our efforts that are spot lit. This prompts questions of what is not narrated: if the causality we presumed existed between significance and narration is far less certain, it follows that what is not included in the narrative can be of great relevance and import – that its 'not'ness is as pointed as Molly's holding of a cup 'by nohandle' (*U*, 62).

---

<sup>23</sup> This story is told again in 'Oxen of the Sun' 'And in your ear, my friend, you will not hear who met us as we left the field. Conmee himself!' (*U*, 395).

<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, where significance is not immediately apparent we usually presume that what is included in the narrative will be important at a later point in the text – cf. Chekhov's gun.

This is, of course, something that we have begun to glean from previous episodes – and that we become increasingly aware of throughout *Ulysses*. To return to ‘Calypso’: Molly’s pronunciation of metempsychosis as ‘met him pike hoses’ is not included in the narrative, and neither is the conversation had by Molly and Bloom which reveals the specific time of Molly and Boylan’s meeting – both are narrated only later in retrospect. As we are so aligned with Bloom and Stephen in the novel it is unsurprising that Molly and Boylan’s meeting also goes unnarrated – but it is left to us to figure out why, for example, we are not witness to Bloom’s visit to Patrick Dignam’s widow in between ‘Cyclops’ and ‘Nausicaa’ (and to comprehend in the first place that there was a missed conversation or visit). Kenner gives a lot of attention across his work to these gaps: his explanation of Bloom’s unnarrated visit, for example, is that Bloom does not want to think about it. Kenner develops this reading between *Joyce’s Voices* and ‘*Ulysses*’, labelling the gap ‘an especially eloquent chapter’ and concluding that Bloom’s mental avoidance of it is due to more than a sadness around Dignam’s death: that rather Bloom suspects Cunningham brought him along on the visit for anti-Semitic reasons (that he would be of help with a ‘sticky’ financial situation) (*J’sV*, 91 and 117-8; ‘*U*’, 101-3).<sup>25</sup> In my extended reading of the cream spiralling through Molly’s tea in the first part of this chapter my wanderings suggested that the pause for detail is coloured by Bloom’s thoughts: those thoughts are at once unnarrated and narrated, as we find we still read his preoccupations in the short description of the cup of tea. We might think too of Kenner’s argument that the musical style of ‘Sirens’ plays on Bloom and Molly’s tacit agreement to refer to her meeting with Boylan as a singing rehearsal; the style itself tells us of Bloom’s concerns, it adds to the story of how he is around four o’clock, it narrates his misery as he fails to avoid thinking about what might be happening in his home at that time (‘*U*’, 90-1). As Kenner notes, ‘There is much the Blooms do not say to each other, much also that the book does not offer to say to us’ (‘*U*’, 48). We grow accustomed in *Ulysses* to reading the unnarrated, as we fill in gaps, make associations, tie together disparate threads. If our tracing of the threads of one short sentence about tea can function as an act of narrating the inner life of Bloom, then what we mean by ‘narration’ in this novel is not something contained within the words on the page. Are we, then, reading unwritten text?

Reading ‘unwritten text’ may seem to be the least of our problems when reading *Ulysses*. The fabric of this ‘usylelessly unreadable Blue Book of Eccles’ (*FW*: 179.26), from its language to its intertextuality to its structure, makes for difficult reading. It demands a great deal from the reader in terms of memory, concentration, and further reading (of the novel itself and its many reference points). To borrow Leonard Diepeveen’s definition of difficulty in *The*

---

<sup>25</sup> After what Bloom goes through in ‘Cyclops’ it is perhaps unsurprising that this has such an impact on the structure of the novel’s narrative.

*Difficulties of Modernism*: the reader's expectations, including their desire for comprehension, are thwarted.<sup>26</sup> 'It is customary to note,' with Kenner, 'that Joyce makes very severe demands of his reader' (*Stoic*, 32). The text's difficulty returns us to its transformation from oral epic to printed novel: Joyce's 'demands' work only because we hold the book, and thus 'the whole conception of *Ulysses* depends on the existence of something former writers took for granted as simply the envelope for their wares: a printed book whose pages are numbered' (*Stoic*, 34). Yet it is the aspects of the text that make it difficult that also cause the modes of reading I have been exploring: active, creative readings that seek and form theories; understandings of the text that shift and alter as we read and reread.<sup>27</sup> There is, however, a further effect of the difficulty of *Ulysses*: our attention is drawn through the text to its creator – the writing being who crafted such complexity. As Bersani argues, with reference to the character Odysseus, 'trickery, cunning, and ruse are the novel's first connotations [...] they define an authorial strategy' (Bersani, 202). Senn makes a similar argument: 'Interestingly enough, the two contradictory evaluations of Joyce's ways happen to reflect the two views held of the character of Odysseus – the superbly agile and ingenious hero, or else the artful, deceitful trickster.'<sup>28</sup> The perfectly-timed 'Wandering Rocks' and its confusing, unfulfilling interpolations encourage a great deal of work on the part of an engaged reader; our reward is the ability to grasp how well-wrought the episode is. The 'Bloom' mentioned at one point in 'Wandering Rocks' is revealed, hundreds of pages later, to be a dentist of no relation; a reader who, as encouraged by the text, reads carefully to identify this dentist Bloom gets little in return.<sup>29</sup> Elsewhere, intratextual references make little to no sense at all, such as when a joke of Lenehan's is repeated in Bloom's thoughts though Bloom was absent when the joke was told.<sup>30</sup> These, for want of a far better term, 'false leads', act like spotlights on the complexity of the text. The difficulty of reading that prompts an active and creative reading role also encourages an awareness of the text as 'authored': an awareness of the author.

The author is also brought to our attention when confronting difficulties leads us somewhere: when close reading and effort has a revelatory effect. Trying to find some narrative logic behind our single sentence of 'Calypso' took a convoluted route to an affecting place: the act of making tea coloured by Bloom's preoccupations. Our reading brought us to a moment of understanding, and, though fleeting and suggestive, that moment offered

---

<sup>26</sup> Leonard Diepeveen, *The Difficulties of Modernism* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), x.

<sup>27</sup> The consonance between Molly, Penelope, and text extends to include the relationship between the text's 'ness' of *Ulysses* and its difficulty if we note a modern scholarly approach to Penelope. As described by Tim Whitmarsh, this involves seeing Penelope as 'an embodiment of the Odyssean virtue of self-concealment, as inscrutable to us as she is to Odysseus.' 'Introduction', in Samuel Butler, *The Authoress of the Odyssey* (Bristol: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2003), vii-xxv (xxi).

<sup>28</sup> Senn, 'Book of Many Turns', in *'Ulysses': A Casebook*, 33-54 (50).

<sup>29</sup> 'Mr Bloom's dental windows' (*U*, 240) solved by Kenner (*'U'*, 65).

<sup>30</sup> The boundaries between characters' minds dissolve for the sake of the 'Rose of Castile / rows of cast steel' joke, told first by Lenehan in 'Aeolus' and then again by Bloom in 'Circe' (*U*, 129 and 432) – in the interim, however, the opera is frequently on Bloom's mind in 'Sirens'.

character and narrative development along with a mimetic effect of getting to know Bloom better. The complicated and in-depth reading Kenner applies to ‘Sirens’ unravels narrative and stylistic confusion – answering the challenge of strange style – and arrives again at an affecting understanding of Bloom’s mind. When we fill in the gaps of what goes unnarrated in ‘Calypso’ we have a similar experience, learning more about Bloom as we learn more about how the narrative works. In ‘*Ulysses*’ Kenner reads the unnarrated information of Boylan’s 4 o’clock visit as informing not only the absence of a conversation but the increasing shifts of styles in the later episodes of the novel, arguing much revolves around how Bloom is ‘occupied chiefly with staying away from the house as long as he can, and evading the question how long that had better be’. He gathers the moments of *Ulysses* where Boylan is seen or mentioned – very affecting when all grouped together – and describes Bloom as ‘virtually in shock’. Ultimately, Kenner suggests, ‘Some of the most moving things the book has to say are things never said’ (*U*, 48-51).

Molly holds her cup ‘by nothandle’, hand wrapped around the heat of her tea in the cold morning air; in the ‘not-narrated’ of the novel we likewise grasp its warmth. Our own acts of reading deliver pathos, and complete plot; while plotting the movements of ‘Wandering Rocks’ on a map may feel fruitless, ‘plotting’ is an activity we engage in throughout *Ulysses*. However, just as the concrete gaps in narration – the skipping of events or conversation – are written into the remaining text with oblique and obvious reference, are we not also following trails set up for us when we unpick an episode or a sentence or a moment of confusion? Is our reading written into the text – is it part of the plot? Are we following written paths? Does the remarkableness of finding narrative development at the end of an hour’s close reading make us congratulate ourselves for our reading skills, or marvel at the creator who can guide our reading – even when we leave the text – to a useful place? As Mark A. Wollaeger points out, ‘Readers of Joyce are familiar with the experience of following out an interpretive lead, an allusion, say, or an inter-textual echo, only to discover that one’s ingenuity has all the time been in service of returning to a place where Joyce has long been expecting us.’<sup>31</sup> What we find is as a result of our own reading, but we read in a manner prompted by the text itself. This is the ‘double-laughter’ of Derrida’s ‘Ulysses Gramophone’, which I will return to below. Both exist: our creativity of reading and the author’s ability to pre-empt us. It is Barthes’ ‘limitless’ text, but it does not preclude the author. Rather, our own activity of reading highlights the author’s activity. The text provokes inventive, active reading, and that reading brings us back to the author.

---

<sup>31</sup> Mark A. Wollaeger, ‘Stephen/Joyce, Joyce/Haacke: Modernism and the Social Function of Art’, *ELH*, vol. 62, no. 3 (Fall, 1995), 691-707 (691).

3. 'James Joyce was an artist. He has said so himself'<sup>32</sup>

These difficulties – this filling of gaps and pitching of answers and theorising of solutions – lead to a heightened awareness of our own reading, of our own activity of reading. Reading as understanding, as temporarily fixing meaning (or fixing openness), as 'that text we write in ourselves'; the processes and effects of such reading, of our reading, are drawn to our attention. Our activity becomes part of what we read, pulling not only at the text on the page but also at the unsettled text in our minds and the relationship between the two. This awareness of our reading leads to an awareness of the author, one carefully-crafted step ahead of us, able to write a text which pre-empts all responses without refusing inventive interpretation. Comprehending or identifying difficulty (whether when forming theories of reading *Ulysses* or trying to find out from the novel that the 16<sup>th</sup> of June is a Thursday) leads us not only to the author but perhaps to a certain attitude towards the author. One such attitude, seen in criticism and beyond, results in a deification of sorts; a reading of genius, of exceptionalism. Much of this is light-hearted: in 'Ulysses Gramophone' Derrida, for example, refers to Joyce and other 'finite divinities'.<sup>33</sup> Kenner, meanwhile, occasionally uses biblically-tinged, if tongue-in-cheek, phrasing to describe Joyce's opinion of his own work: 'the author inspecting what he had been writing for seven years, and seeing that it was good' ('*U*', 157). Inherited from Budgen ('he looks on his handiwork when he has done it and finds it good'), this deifying tic perhaps makes a joke of Joyce's sense of self-worth more than it outlines a critical attitude.<sup>34</sup> Such deification can, however, be taken more seriously.

In 'Survivors of Joyce', published in the 1990 volume *James Joyce: The Artist and the Labyrinth*, John Banville remarks on Joyce's legacy:

The greatness, or part of the greatness, of an *Aeneid*, of a *View of Delft*, of a *Don Giovanni*, of a *Ulysses*, rests in the fact that they are, in an essential way, *closed*. By this I do not mean to say that these works of art are difficult, or obscure – what could be more limpid than the light that hovers over Delft? – but that they are *mysterious at their core*. There is something uncanny about such art. It does not seem to have been produced by human hands, but to have created itself out of nothing by some secret, unknowable means.

[...]

He is one of those writers [...] or should I say, *he is a writer* (for he is probably unique) whose work is utterly free of solecisms, of errors of judgement, of mistakes: for such

<sup>32</sup> Flann O'Brien, 'A Bash in the Tunnel', in *Stories and Plays* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), 201.

<sup>33</sup> Jacques Derrida, 'Ulysses Gramophone', trans. François Raffoul, in *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Andrew J. Mitchell and Sam Slote (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), 41-86 (59). I am using this most recent translation in this chapter.

<sup>34</sup> Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and The Making of 'Ulysses'* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 48. In perpetuating the myth of Joyce spending one day writing the aforementioned 'Perfume of embraces' etc., Budgen does much to mythologise the skills of Joyce – but more on this in the next chapter.

things, should they seem to appear, are immediately transformed, by a sort of continuous chain reaction, into *inventions*.<sup>35</sup>

Banville describes himself as ‘split in two’ when thinking of Joyce: ‘To one side there falls the reader, kneeling speechless in filial admiration, and love; to the other side, however, the writer stands, gnawing his knuckles, not a son, but a survivor’ (Banville, 74). His short commentary on the creation of Joyce’s texts is very much from the perspective of a later writer, but reveals how perceived greatness affects views of an author. In defence of his opinions, Banville notes that ‘it will be no good my pointing out that Joyce himself held that the artist should stand disengaged from his art, off in the background somewhere, paring his nails – no one pays much attention any more to *that* piece of piety’: a confusing conflation, familiar to this thesis, of Stephen and Joyce’s words (Banville, 75). Banville’s argument, instead, is that we can only ‘know about’ *Finnegans Wake* or *Ulysses*, rather than ‘understand’ (Banville, 77).<sup>36</sup> He grasps the oddly ‘biblical’ quality given to these texts, claiming that such a quality is ‘conferred’ due to ‘the quality of *closure*’: ‘great art, I am convinced, does not “reveal” itself to us, does not open outwards to our needs; on the contrary, it is great precisely because it is closed against us’ (Banville, 77). Banville almost removes the author in his reading of greatness – calling Joyce ‘the supreme escape-artist, a Houdini of the word, who used every possible rhetorical device in order to bury himself’, and finding an author incapable of mistakes (Banville, 80). This describes our reading of Joyce’s texts more than it describes Joyce; we have a faith in the completeness and perfection of *Ulysses* that *is* biblical – this enables, from Kenner’s perspective, our close readings – and we can see in our own reading and in Joycean criticism a refusal to accept error or failure in Joyce’s texts.<sup>37</sup> From Kenner’s corrections of Wyndham Lewis’s conclusions; to Hart and Lawrence’s reading of ‘a one-legged sailor’; to my own reading of ‘(sic)’: all rely on a particular level of faith in the text – that it is without flaws, as it is meant to be, or even (oh god) as was intended. Our free and interpretive, creative reading relies upon a perfect text (once we have checked the errata!), which itself implies a particular level of faith in the author’s talent (‘Bosh!’), and in the author.

‘The element of performance and exhibition in the writing itself,’ observes Lawrence, ‘is too great to allow the reader to receive all the applause.’<sup>38</sup> Critics including Bersani, Vicki Mahaffey, and Michael Patrick Gillespie note that our reading, and criticism, of *Ulysses* celebrate its author; Bersani goes so far as to claim that ‘Exegesis reveals that *Ulysses* signifies Joyce’s multitudinous stylistic and structural intentions; it demonstrates that the work glorifies

<sup>35</sup> John Banville, ‘Survivors of Joyce’, in *James Joyce: The Artist and the Labyrinth*, 73-81 (74 and 80). All references are to this edition, and will be given in parentheses with the author’s name.

<sup>36</sup> This echoes Bersani’s argument that *Ulysses* is to be deciphered, not read (Bersani, 224).

<sup>37</sup> Kenner explores ‘our sense of the book’s integrity’ explicitly in *The Stoic Comedians* (see 60), but more generally in much of his work on Joyce. Joycean attitudes to errors are carefully explored in Tim Conley’s *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

<sup>38</sup> Lawrence, 8.

its creator just as Christ – concentrating and purifying in His Person a universal human truth – glorifies the Father’ (Bersani, 227-8). This critical viewpoint is perhaps one reason why critics continue to return and give non-ironic credence to Stephen’s idea of an author-god; it also describes an effect of Kenner’s work – for all its tongue-in-cheek references to a godly author. By identifying, across several pieces of criticism, author-foils such as the Arranger Kenner looks away from the author for answers, yet glorifies the author who created such a complicated, slippery, novel piece of narrative trickery; he refers often and significantly to a ‘grand design’.<sup>39</sup> Acts of criticism can confirm, reiterate, and rely on a very high opinion of the author; true even for Bersani, who confesses that ‘Even in writing “against *Ulysses*,” we can only feel a great sadness in leaving it’ (Bersani, 228). And as Jonathan Goldman argues in ‘Afterlife,’ the ‘authorial branding’ of *Ulysses*, Joyce’s fame, and the cultural status of Joyce and his works ‘announce the author’s renown and connote his genius’.<sup>40</sup>

Such attitudes towards the author affect our reading, as they are also affected by our reading. How we read the text and its author is determined within a looping relationship between reader, author, text, and critic, which takes no heed of incompatibilities or contradictions. An active mode of reading presupposes an absent author, yet is prompted by the text’s difficulties. These difficulties in turn draw our attention to the text’s creator – and furthermore to the creator’s skill. This genius author is emphasised too by our faith somehow in the text as perfect, which both deifies and removes the author. Our reading leads us to questions of authorship: as I explored in chapter three, reading the absence of an author behind the name Homer as providing a space for both authorially-seeking scholarship and a freedom of creative reading. The far-reaching – distrustful – mode of reading encouraged by the difficulties of ‘Eumaeus’ develops our attempts to identify an author-figure in the narrative. Reading the ‘genius’ of Joyce, we find again Barthes’ ‘birth of a reader’; here in the service of not just locating, but exalting the author. Retaining our focus on the activity of reading: what practical difference does it make to face a Barthesian ‘dead’ author or a genius? I can read Circe and Calypso, metempsychosis and the river Lethe, the milkwoman of ‘Telemachus’, Ithacan hot cocoa, the Blooms’ pussens, Molly on Howth Head, Stephen’s wordplay, Bloom’s ‘father of thousands’, and his approaching cuckoldry in one short description of adding milk to tea because I, as reader, am where the multiplicity of the text is gathered; because there is no author and therefore no limit to the text, which is open and has no possible ‘final signified’. Or do I find such richness in a stream of milk because Joyce was a genius, because *Ulysses* is infallible – because such wealth of meaning is written into the text by an unfathomable literary mind?

---

<sup>39</sup> Three times in *Joyce’s Voices*.

<sup>40</sup> Jonathan Goldman, ‘Afterlife’, in *The Cambridge Companion to ‘Ulysses’*, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 33-48 (35).

This is not the first reading of *Ulysses* to find itself ‘spinning in milk’: in ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ Derrida laments the Joyce-authorized French translation of the novel, due to its alteration of ‘galaxy of events’ to ‘gerbe des événements’ or ‘sheaf of events’. As he complains, ‘that loses all the milk and thus also the milky tea that constantly irrigate *Ulysses* to precisely make of it a milky way or “galaxy”’.<sup>41</sup> This coincidence is appropriate, given Derrida’s interest in ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ in coincidence as one way in which reading *Ulysses* spills over into our own lives, as a contributing factor to the sensation that everything is contained within the novel.<sup>42</sup> Moving in circles away from the irrigating milk, Derrida presents in ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ his reading of the ‘double laughter’ in *Ulysses*:

nothing can be *invented on the subject* of Joyce. All that can be said of *Ulysses*, for example, is already anticipated, including, as we saw, the scene of the academic competence and the ingenuity of meta-discourse. We are caught in this net. We find all the gestures to take the initiative of a movement announced in a superpotentialized text that will remind you, at a given time, that you are caught in a network of language, writing, knowledge, and *even of narration*. [...] Everything that happened to me, including the narration that I would attempt to make of it, was said in advance, narrated in advance in its dated singularity, prescribed in a sequence of knowledge and narration: within *Ulysses*, to say nothing of *Finnegans Wake*, by this hypermnestic machine capable of storing in a giant epic work, with the memory of the West and virtually all the languages of the world, *the very traces of the future*. Yes, everything has already happened to us with *Ulysses*, and in advance signed by Joyce.<sup>43</sup>

Read in one way, Derrida’s reading of *Ulysses* finds the novel and ‘the event signed Joyce’ as near-mythical, even fantastic.<sup>44</sup> The text is ‘superpotentialized’ and pre-empts not only its reading but also the life of its reader: it and Joyce have ‘caught us in this net’, and contain ‘the very traces of the future’. This is, after all, a text which seeps into our world when it requires 7 Eccles Street’s vacancy on the real 16<sup>th</sup> of June, or keeps a late library book on Bloom’s shelves from ever being returned (In ‘*Ulysses*’ Kenner reports in a footnote that *The Stark-Munro Letters* by Arthur Conan Doyle, listed in ‘Ithaca’ as borrowed from the Capel Street Library and ‘13 days overdue’, was never returned. The discovery that the book was declared ‘missing’ by the library in 1906 was revealed at the Sixth Symposium in 1977 (*U*, 143)). In ‘Signature/Countersignature: Derrida’s Response to *Ulysses*’ Derek Attridge explicates Derrida’s response:

A double laughter, he argued, runs through the text: a sardonic, triumphant laughter that takes pleasure in the work’s totalizing power, and a light, dancing laughter that opens the work to otherness. The former arises from the encyclopedic ambition of the novel, its appearing always to pre-empt any response made by the reader; the latter to its ceaseless undermining of any such ambition, opening fresh spaces for inventiveness, what we might call a deconstructive laughter. The two laughters presuppose one another, ventriloquize one another, put one another at risk, make each other possible; they correspond to two types of criticism, the mechanical analysis of a text and the

---

<sup>41</sup> Derrida, 43.

<sup>42</sup> Yet another similarity between Derrida and Kenner, who notes that ‘*Ulysses* welcomes coincidence’ (*U*, 156).

<sup>43</sup> Derrida, 60.

<sup>44</sup> Derrida, 61.

countersignature of unique affirmation. [...] *Ulysses*, then, is a work of such complexity and richness that it seems to pre-empt all critical manoeuvres, yet that very complexity makes possible unpredictable coincidences, connections, and insights – not just within the work, but, as Derrida’s personal narrative reveals, between the work and the lives of its readers.<sup>45</sup>

As I explored in the fourth chapter of this thesis, the significance of ‘Ulysses Gramophone’ is generally seen as its position within Derrida’s arguments for the importance of Joyce’s texts to deconstruction. The extent to which we can argue that Joyce’s texts prefigure the concerns of poststructuralist theory underpins the discussions of this chapter: arguing that the way we are provoked into reading *Ulysses* is later described by Barthes as, simply, reading; that his definition of ‘text’ is writ large in Joyce’s novel; and how the opposing attitudes to the author that we form in our active reading find an important role in Derrida’s work. This pre-empting, and contradiction, is echoed by Joyce studies itself – as my reliance on Kenner’s modes of reading emphasises. The happy co-existence of incompatible readings that this chapter has detailed can be seen in Joyce studies: an openness to multiplicity, a faith in infinite interpretations, in difference, alongside a need to correct, improve, read better, find the ‘best’ approach, invoke authority. Reading *Ulysses* prefigures the critical-theoretical debates played out in Joyce studies and beyond: we find in our own readings a contradictory response to the author.

#### 4. ‘Victory to the critic’?

The way in which *Ulysses* prompts me to read dares me to test out my own reading authority. What I require to authorise readings has shifted and altered in Joyce studies (reflecting changes within and beyond the field): the personal involvement of Joyce, a fashionable critical focus, an established theoretical framework, access to archival notes and drafts. How would I validate my own readings, were I to follow up on the milk and cream and tea and coffee I find beyond ‘Calypso’, beyond *Ulysses*, in the unwritten links I read with *Cold Comfort Farm* and *Arcadia*? Would my argument be authority enough? Gibbons’ *Cold Comfort Farm* is well-known for parodying other novels, such as those of D.H. Lawrence, in its presentation of the Starkadders. Its response to other literature is perhaps more complex, however, as the books read by the protagonist Flora Poste appear to then inform events beyond her control that drive her story forward. In Stoppard’s *Arcadia*, meanwhile, there is tension between being read as a real person and read as a character – as historical persons appear alongside the fictional counterparts who read them in turn. Perhaps in both texts we can read an interest in being the subject in, or focus of, literature: in the effects of being read, explored through metaleptic

---

<sup>45</sup> Derek Attridge, ‘Signature/Countersignature: Derrida’s Response to *Ulysses*’, in *Derrida and Joyce*, 265-80 (277).

reading characters.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, Bloom and Stephen share flower water-soaked worries of what will be left of them when they are gone, of their legacy – unaware of their permanence as characters in a text. Linking these three texts are the curdling spirals of Molly’s tea, but also perhaps a shared interest in how characters are formed by fiction, and the effects of reading. How would I justify this? Pure coincidence carries some weight – as does its treatment in Derrida’s hands, arguing that *Ulysses* contains within it ‘traces of the future’. This is perhaps the ‘genius’ route: the text of *Ulysses* is so totalizing and adept that any later literary exploration in Western literature of anything similar to its concerns will by definition be pre-written by it. Do I need something more concrete? Stoppard wrote elsewhere on Joyce, turning him into one of his characters (as I will explore in the next chapter). Gibbons, meanwhile, was writing a novel that played with the novel form, ten years after *Ulysses* – can influence, inspiration, or direct response be inferred? Do I need to find a line in drafts or notes of *Cold Comfort Farm* or *Arcadia*, or a statement in letters or interviews with either author to find traces of intentions? The alternative is to be the authority as the reader, to remove the authors so as to authorise my own readings. This extends – perhaps to absurdity – Barthes’ arguments that ‘In the field of reading [...] there is not only no pertinence of *levels*, there is no possibility of describing *levels* of reading, because there is no possibility of closing the list of these levels. [...] we do not know where to halt the depth and the dispersion of reading’ (‘OR’, 35). Do I authorise my readings with the authority of author, reader, or critic? Can they be separated?

Critical acts which invoke the authority of the author rely often on a determination of intention; attempts to do this within Joyce studies have been predictably complicated. As I have discussed before, the idea that Joyce did not intend for his readers to worry about intentions is well-established in Joyce studies. The author’s intention, and authority, is maintained in this movement – we are only allowed to kid ourselves we have interpretative freedom because he planned this all along. Self-effacement, or mock-self-effacement, affirms the Dedalean model of authorship: impersonal, yet ultimately in control. We are trapped in an author’s game; as Jean-Michel Rabaté comments, ‘A writer who pretends to dispossess himself of his traditional prerogatives’ will return ‘like a bogeyman to scare critics and reader’.<sup>47</sup> Attempts to ignore the author are pre-empted, authorially authorised, and thus neutered. The author’s authority functions too, as explored in chapter one, in references to his authorised exegesis, to Gilbert, Budgen, or even *Our Exagmination*; to the schemata, letters, the reported conversations with friends; notesheets and manuscripts. This last is perhaps the most prevalent mode of authorial authorisation in Joyce studies today. In her 2012 study *‘Strandentwining Cable’: Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality*, for example, one way in which

---

<sup>46</sup> I am referring again to Gerard Genette’s notion of ‘metalepsis’ in *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 236.

<sup>47</sup> Jean-Michel Rabaté, *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 153.

Scarlett Baron authorises multifaceted links between the two authors is by citing ‘David Hayman’s momentous discovery of three “Flaubert” jottings in one of the *Finnegans Wake* notebooks. One of these states: “G. F can rest having made me.”’<sup>48</sup> Genetic criticism maintains a high premium on what the author thinks, or means. When we invoke authorial authority, including via Stephen’s theories, we perhaps reach towards something akin to the romantic authorial attitudes explored by M. H. Abrams, of the author being the key to the work.

In the absence of either Gibbons’ or Stoppard’s authorising statements, my alternative is a reader’s authority, Barthes’ anti-authorialism, and particularly models of intertextuality which deny or remove filiation.<sup>49</sup> We might return once more to Lawrence’s argument that in *Ulysses* ‘The artist “paring his fingernails” is no longer an adequate image for the process of artistic creation. The book now seems cut off from the notion of human origin; the metaphors of filiation [...] no longer apply to the writing of *Ulysses*’.<sup>50</sup> The agency of the author is removed in both Barthes and Julia Kristeva’s models of intertextuality – forged in opposition to influence – with the reader taking on the active role. As Baron outlines, ‘Influence is defined by agency and causality [...] Intertextuality, on the other hand, takes a bird’s-eye view of the texts involved, exploding the binary structure that sits at influence’s conceptual heart.’<sup>51</sup> In such conceptions of intertextuality, there is no need to find or prove a link between *Cold Comfort Farm*, *Arcadia*, and *Ulysses* any stronger than the link of my own reading. In various hands, intertextuality has been treated as a mode of reading in which authorial intention is irrelevant. Baron argues,

For few authors do Barthes’ and Kristeva’s descriptions of texts as “mosaics” or “tissues” of quotation ring true as they do for Flaubert and for Joyce. This is not to deny other writers a role in providing the conditions that made possible – and indeed necessary – the emergence of the concept [...] But Joyce and Flaubert are surely the prime movers behind intertextual theory, as well as its paradigm cases.<sup>52</sup>

Yet Susan Stanford Freidman turns to Joyce in her reappraisal of Kristevan and Barthesian intertextuality, arguing that the author returns; and Baron later in her study argues that Joycean intertextuality includes the author. Likewise, critics such as Gillespie link Stephen’s Flaubertian authorial theories in *A Portrait* to a removal of the author, using this to read Joyce’s later texts: ‘In effect the novel consciously shifts the terms of engagement from the subject-centred consciousness to the language-centred discourse described by Roland Barthes and by Michel Foucault.’<sup>53</sup> Yet, as Baron deftly suggests of the same section of *A Portrait*:

---

<sup>48</sup> Scarlett Baron, *‘Strandentwining Cable’: Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 15. Her reference is to Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* notebook, VI.B.8, 42.

<sup>49</sup> Barthes defines the text – which as I have explored above *Ulysses* so embodies – as working against ‘the myth of filiation’. The text ‘reads without the inscription of the Father’. (‘FWT’, 160-1).

<sup>50</sup> Lawrence, 63.

<sup>51</sup> Baron, 9.

<sup>52</sup> Baron, 280.

<sup>53</sup> Michael Patrick Gillespie, *Reading the Book of Himself: Narrative Strategies in the Works of James Joyce* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 98.

‘paradox arises because Stephen’s borrowed declaration consists of a denial of intertextuality as a modus operandi of literary creation. Indeed, no position could stand in starker opposition to the intertextual author of Barthesian “scriptor” than the figure of God at the origin of creation, creating out of nothing’.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, if we seek to authorise our readerly authority of intertextuality by noting Joyce’s importance to Kristeva (or Derrida) do we not maintain the same power structures of ‘agency and causality’ found in ideas of influence? And is that not the same as arguing that Joyce intended we ignore intention?

Critics do pitch middle grounds between readerly and authorial authority; we can see this for example in Gillespie’s argument that there are ‘certain amorphous but finite limitations, outlined by the work itself’.<sup>55</sup> His response to *Ulysses* gives great weight to the reader’s role, but keeps that reader’s movements within a limited frame set by the author. Thus, though seemingly striking a balance between the authority of each, Gillespie’s argument in fact maintains and affirms the author’s authority. His approach outlines the implicit attitude of most Joycean criticism (often despite proclaimed theoretical allegiances), drawing on both authorial and readerly authority but prioritising the former. The construction of a critic’s authority is a complicated manoeuvre, in part as the critic straddles both reader and author roles. In *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* Rabaté notes a similar sort of anxiety to my own, suggesting that ‘when the text keeps referring to its own problematic origins, the reader turned critic has either to invoke another writer or critic as an instance of authority or to produce his own theory of authority’.<sup>56</sup> Rabaté then argues that the text itself authorises our shift from reader to critic: it ‘puts an end to the dichotomy between reader and author by abolishing the opposition between text and commentary, novel and criticism’.<sup>57</sup> He refers here to *Finnegans Wake*, yet as I have explored above *Ulysses* provokes the same questions. In Rabaté’s reading, there is a ‘price to pay for the death of the author’ in Joyce’s texts: that ‘such a birth of the reader-as-writer can only be founded on a philosophy of authority’.<sup>58</sup> His ‘death of the author’, however, is Stephen’s, trapping his discussions in an extra layer of authorial authority that his otherwise complex, comprehensive explorations do not touch upon. But his argument, that in gaining authority the reader becomes critic, is rooted in the texts of Joyce; not dissimilar from Laurent Milesi’s argument that Joyce’s ‘readers’ (self-)empowerment [is made possible] through the very medium and fabric of his works’, referring to critical empowerment as much as readerly.<sup>59</sup> Responses outside Joyce studies to the theories of the death of the author have also debated critical authority: blurrings of reader and critic, for instance, are inferred by Susan

---

<sup>54</sup> Baron, 92.

<sup>55</sup> Gillespie, 4.

<sup>56</sup> Rabaté, 151.

<sup>57</sup> Rabaté, 191.

<sup>58</sup> Rabaté, 152.

<sup>59</sup> Laurent Milesi, ‘Introduction: language(s) with a difference’, *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*, ed. Milesi, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-27 (10).

Sontag's reading of Barthes' 'notions of "text" and "textuality" [which] translate into criticism the modernist ideal of an open-ended, polysemous literature; and thereby make the critic, just like the creators of that literature, the inventor of meaning'.<sup>60</sup> Within this, the roles of critic and author blur too. While Michael Moriarty may argue that of his own study 'All the reader has to bear in mind is that when statements are made here about Barthes's attitudes, priorities, and values, "Barthes" is a kind of theoretical fiction, a device of exposition',<sup>61</sup> Adrian Wilson declares that not even anti-authorial theory can escape the invocation of authorial authority, let alone critical responses to those theories: 'the author's death,' he argues, 'was itself an authored event, requiring the authorial signatures of Barthes and Foucault'.<sup>62</sup> Seán Burke, meanwhile, points out that through the massive response to their theoretical works Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida transformed themselves from critics to authors; 'great' authors, in fact.<sup>63</sup>

As I explored in chapter four's account of Joycean disagreements, claiming one's criticism is authorised by Joyce's texts can ruffle the feathers of those who claim the same for their own, opposing work. It also, as touched upon above, runs the risk of simply mirroring the movements of critics who seek authorial authorisation and of glorifying the author who wrote such a text. Joseph Kelley's response to the Danis Rose scandal, suggesting that in the ensuing editorial argument critics authorised their readings by a belief in the author's skill, is referenced by Erwin R. Steinberg and Christian W. Hallstein in their 2003 article 'Probing Silences in Joyce's *Ulysses* and the Question of Authorial Intent':

"Since most of us believe that Joyce did everything by design, we perpetuate fictions about his intentions." In making his argument, Kelley demonstrates how Joyce scholars are simply privileging their own personal readings by declaring Joyce a genius and then self-righteously deciding what his intentions were.<sup>64</sup>

This is again reminiscent of one of Abrams' observations: that romantic critical modes – exemplified in the work of John Keble – create images of the author which serve their own purposes and contexts; an endeavour we have seen also in Homeric scholarship. These responses intimate that critical authority comes from elsewhere, from 'fictions' created by the critic herself. A similar idea is explored by R. G. Collingwood in *The Idea of History*. In the chapter 'The Historical Imagination', he investigates authority in the sphere of historical scholarship, a field in which 'authority' frequently refers to a source or a person.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Susan Sontag, 'Writing Itself: On Roland Barthes', in *A Barthes Reader*, ed. Sontag (London: Vintage, 2000), vii-xxxviii (xi).

<sup>61</sup> Michael Moriarty, *Roland Barthes* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 3.

<sup>62</sup> Adrian Wilson, 'Foucault on the "question of the author": a critical exegesis', *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 99, no. 2 (April, 2004) 339-63 (342).

<sup>63</sup> Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008). See 171-2.

<sup>64</sup> Erwin R. Steinberg and Christian W. Hallstein, 'Probing Silences in Joyce's *Ulysses* and the Question of Authorial Intention', *JJQ*, vol. 40, no. 3 (Spring, 2003), 543-54 (549).

<sup>65</sup> R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 234-5. Though first published in 1946, this was written in the 1930s. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

Collingwood details why and how a historian might however ‘tamper’ with an authority, and the consequences of these ‘emergency measures’ (Collingwood, 235 and 236). This leads him to

the discovery that, so far from relying on an authority other than himself, to whose statements his thought must conform, the historian is his own authority and his thought autonomous, self-authorizing, possessed of a criterion to which his so-called authorities must conform and by reference to which they are criticized. (Collingwood, 236)

Collingwood argues that the historian ‘is relying on his own powers and constituting himself his own authority; while his so-called authorities are now not authorities at all but only evidence’ (Collingwood, 237). Collingwood is at pains to show he is not trying to undermine historical scholarship; he is instead revealing yet another ‘discovery’: ‘that the historian himself, together with the here-and-now which forms the total body of evidence available to him, is part of the process he is studying, has his own place in that process, and can see it only from the point of view which at this present moment he occupies within it’ (Collingwood, 248). Though from a different field, Collingwood’s discussions are relevant to acts of literary criticism, suggesting perhaps a critic’s aims, or agenda, provide their own authority. The critic becomes here, in part, strangely aligned with Barthes’ reader: the final arbiter of meaning, authorised by their own act of writing through reading, able and required to ‘play’. Yet the critic is ‘part of the process,’ and critical authority in Joyce studies also relies on the critical authority of others. As in perhaps all fields of scholarship, certain critics gain canonical status; we signpost their work, their discoveries, authorising our own with such references whether in agreement or opposition. These established Joyceans and theorists are, nevertheless, also readers. Whether we view Joyce studies as collaborative or corrective, it is a catalogue of readings and readers.

Let us return to ‘The sluggish cream wound curdling spirals through her tea’. I have mentioned overreading, but we could push that further, following the motion described in the sentence and twisting downwards into the roots of these words, their etymologies.<sup>66</sup> ‘Sluggish’ has grown from the Middle English *slugge*, a lazy person, and the obsolete verb *slug*, to ‘be lazy’ – it shares its roots with ‘sluggard’, and was first connected to people, a human trait, which gives some credence to reading the word as referring to Bloom and Molly as much as it refers to the cream. ‘Cream’ has Latin and Greek roots, reaching English via Old French; etymologies also detail from the 1500s the use of ‘cream’ to refer to the absolute best part of

---

<sup>66</sup> The following etymologies are taken from John Ayto, *Word Origins: The Hidden Histories of English Words from A to Z*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (London: A&C Black, 2005), first published in 1990; *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*, ed. T. F. Hoad (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); Walter W. Skeat, *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology* (Ware: Wordsworth, 2007); the online version of *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, ed. Joseph Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller <<http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/about>>; and the *OED online* (Oxford University Press, June 2017) <[www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)> [both accessed 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017].

something, as it is used in ‘Eumaeus’s ‘a cream of a joke’. This use of cream draws the mind back to the ‘adulterated milk’, and to Bloom’s doling out of the cream ‘reserved’ normally for Molly; revenge, perhaps, if Bloom views Molly’s adultery in faintly misogynistic terms of her giving away or sharing something ‘special’. And one synonym for ‘cream’ used to describe the best of a group is ‘flower’, a reminder that our Henry Flower is not entirely guiltless. Reading ‘wound’ in isolation from the rest of the sentence we might think of its homograph, of hurt or injury – as perhaps Boylan’s letter, and Molly’s tucking of it under the pillow, wounds Bloom. ‘Wound’ in terms of ‘wind’ comes from the Old English *windan*, meaning to turn, twist, plait, curl, brandish, swing. Its Proto Germanic origin *wendan* stems from the Proto Indo-European root *wendh-*, which suggests turning, winding, and weaving. This root is also the source of the Latin *viere*, to twist, plait, weave, and of *vincere*, to bind. Furthermore, ‘wind’ is related to ‘wend’ – to proceed or, in more modern usage, to meander – which is from the Old English *wendan*, to turn, go, direct; and also to convert, or translate. ‘Wander’ is also from the PIE root *wendh-*; the use of ‘wandering’ in terms of one’s mind or affections dates back to the 1400s, with the notion of a ‘wandering Jew’ dating from the previous century. Bloom wanders through Dublin, winding through its streets, as his mind – and wife – wanders too. And caught up in the word ‘wound’ is that which contains all this: a twisted, plaited, woven text. Arguably the connotations of ‘text’ are backed up within ‘spirals’ too, coming via Middle French from the Latin *spiralis*: winding around a fixed centre, or coiling. *Spira* in Latin suggests a coil, fold, or twist as well as spiral, and the Greek *speira* refers to a winding, coil, twist, wreath, or anything wound or coiled. Calypso, Circe, and their ‘braided tresses’ spring to mind, as does the weaving of Calypso (‘she fared to and fro before the loom, and wove with a shuttle of gold’);<sup>67</sup> our own twisting ‘plotting’ when reading; and Penelope, Molly, and the woven text. I could even argue the difficulty of a complexly twisting woven text is referred to in ‘curdling’ as a word for thickening; in the etymological connotations of crossing over, or overcoming, that we find in ‘through’; and even in that deeply embedded trace of translation in ‘wound’: fighting our way through something resistant, heavy, dense, and from that making new but coexisting, palimpsestial versions of the text.

Reading, Barthes reminds us, ‘(that text we write in ourselves when we read), *disperses*’, like cream or milk in tea.<sup>68</sup> The movement described in this sentence of *Ulysses* describes reading *Ulysses*: as we flip back and forth, each rereading colours those that precede it. Our readings of the text are altered with the addition of newer readings, from revisiting a page, following up an intertext, browsing the work of a critic, or digging into etymologies. The etymological suggestions of this sentence, of braiding and weaving, further describe the

---

<sup>67</sup> S. H. Butcher, and A. Lang, *The Odyssey of Homer Done into English Prose* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 78.

<sup>68</sup> And the spiral, remember, is according to Moriarty an important form in Barthes’ writing (Moriarty, 102).

text we read and the continually metamorphosing text we write in reading: our activity, our agency, and our play. That we might then wander off in spirals to *Cold Comfort Farm* or *Arcadia* tells us more about *Ulysses* than these texts, or any others in which *Ulysses* can be found. Jonathan Goldman touches upon this on his own meander through potential Ulyssean reference: finding traces of the novel in an Elvis Costello lyric, he asks,

Are such resonances intentional, and if so, how do they affect our understanding of these works? For some, intentionality is irrelevant; any echo of Joyce inflects the text's meaning, regardless of the author's aims. With this in mind, we can consider the impulse to find such references, and see that this approach imposes Joyce as a reading filter over other cultural products. *Ulysses* is known as a hunting ground for literary allusions; in turn, the world has become a hunting ground for *Ulysses* allusions.<sup>69</sup>

This 'impulse,' or 'reading filter', or what Senn might allow me to name 'post-*Ulyssean* lenses', encourages unlimited readings.<sup>70</sup> We gain this authority of reading – if a self-analysing, worrying sort of authority – from *Ulysses*. We do so in spite of Joyce, as Joyce is not effaced in this authorising (he is more than Barthes' 'paper-author', allowed to return to the text only as a guest ('FWT', 161)). This is possible because, as the novel repeatedly upholds, opposites can be simultaneously true in *Ulysses*. The way in which we are encouraged by the text to read the text affirms an authorial presence while maintaining the need for creative and active reading, and this pre-empts, or writes in advance, the back and forth of author-centric and anti-authorial critical debate. *Ulysses* prefigures debates of intention or authority, as it prefigures Gibbons and Stoppard or the Homeric scholarship of Milman Parry; it uncannily takes up more space than it should, knows more than it should, seeping into the real world in vacant homes and missing library books. This, in turn, affirms Joyce the creator as some sort of divine genius, but also the reader as a free agent and final arbiter of meaning. Within this pre-empting gesture, even the debate of whether *Ulysses* has limits or can infinitely pre-empt is itself pre-figured, written in advance in the text which prompts such debate.

The unfathomable genius with totalising power and an inability to err, and an absence, a space for inventiveness, initiative, and creativity coexist within the reader's activity, the reader's text. Our act of reading makes this coexistence possible: *we* comprehend it. Our authority as readers is temporary and partial – not because it is superseded by the authority of the author, but because it is forged by the necessarily and wonderfully unstable text in our minds. While words for 'to read' in many European languages have origins in 'to gather' – and our own *Ulysseses* continue to shift and sway in response to what we gather within and without its printed pages – the English word 'to read' shares the Proto Germanic source *redan* with the German *raten*: 'to advise', or 'to guess'. Guessing is a creative act, informed and

---

<sup>69</sup> Goldman, 40.

<sup>70</sup> Senn, 'Remodelling Homer', in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 111-32 (119).

responding to evidence, yet transitory and subjective; ‘best guesses’ assume authority in the absence of definites, and several can coexist – just as Joyce studies affirms there can be no one correct reading of *Ulysses*. A ‘lucky guess’ is deemed successful, and connotes (often suspect) coincidence – an important part of reading Joyce for Derrida, Kenner, Senn, and anyone who has ever found something revelatory in the text by accident. Our moments of unstable clarity created while reading *Ulysses* are informed guesses, useful because they are temporary, responding to the way the novel re-enacts itself as text: woven, intertextual, difficult or unreadable, for disentangling not deciphering, demanding ‘play, activity, production, practice’ (‘FWT’, 162). We must ask again if *Ulysses* is a special case, or just a text; if I have been picking at a mode of reading specific to *Ulysses*, or at reading in general. A text which pre-empts all responses to it, which contains all its possible readings, is described by Bersani:

*Ulysses* promises a critical utopia: the final elucidation of its sense, the day when all the connections will have been discovered and collected in a critical Book which would objectively repeat *Ulysses*, which, in being the exegetical double of its source, would express the *quidditas* of Joyce’s novel, would be, finally, *Ulysses* replayed as the whole truth of *Ulysses*. (Bersani, 225)

A version of *Ulysses* that collected together all its possible readings would be only *Ulysses* repeated word for word. Could this not be said of any literary text? If *Ulysses* is an exaggeration of text, and our reading of it only any reading writ-large, then the way it provokes us to question how text, reader, and author interact is relevant to all literary encounters.

## Chapter Six

### Rewriting the Author II: Legacies and Travesties

I never knew you could write so well. It must be due to your association with me.

Joyce to Frank Budgen<sup>1</sup>

Writing in 1841, Thomas Carlyle reads the works of Shakespeare as ‘so many windows, through which we see a glimpse of the world that was in him’.<sup>2</sup> In his Homeric scholar role of 1897, Samuel Butler declares that ‘art is only interesting in so far as it reveals an artist’.<sup>3</sup> And in response to Hugh Kenner’s reading of *Ulysses* ‘not as the expression of Joyce himself but of a *persona* – the god-like thinking-machine that is the real object of modern worship’, in 1961 S. L. Goldberg sighs: ‘It sounds – one must say – remarkably boring.’<sup>4</sup> Though written over fifty years ago, Goldberg’s view is not out of date in Joyce studies. Joyce’s life and work are both of interest to critics, and often treated together: a 2016 study on *Joyce and Betrayal*, for example, reads the importance of betrayal in Joyce’s life – and *then* works. Its author, James Fraser, admits that he might be accused of reading Joyce’s texts in order to discover ‘the author’s hidden desires’. More specifically, he recognises that his approach risks reading Stephen as Joyce.<sup>5</sup> Fraser’s acknowledgement reveals how the romantic link between an author’s life or personality and works can be enhanced or removed depending on how one reads the ambiguously autobiographical elements of Joyce’s texts. It also confirms however that Stephen is not the only reason Joyceans study the author’s life: Fraser ‘intend[s] to avoid’ conflating the two, yet still treats Joyce’s ‘own thoughts, feelings, and declarations’ as a source.<sup>6</sup> This is, of course, not a Jocyean-specific tendency: while autobiographical touches might encourage a critic to delve into letters and biographies, so will an author’s status, and the general fascination in the lives of authors which exists within and without literary academia to this day. Literary biographies, collected letters, memoirs from friends, and an ongoing exchange of anecdotes result from this interest, and as an author gains more fame or celebrity, the demands for biographical works increase – in turn enhancing the author’s renown. Biographical works are in no short supply in Joyce studies, a part of what Loren Glass

---

<sup>1</sup> In Budgen, *James Joyce and The Making of ‘Ulysses’*, with an introduction by Hugh Kenner (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 317. This is part of the ‘Further Recollections’, an appendix to the 1961 edition. Unless otherwise stated, all references are to this edition and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*, quoted in M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 249.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Butler, ‘The Importance of the Enquiry’, *Spectator*, 2<sup>nd</sup> of January 1892, included in *The Authoress of the Odyssey: Where and when she wrote, who she was, the use she made of the Iliad, and how the poem grew under her hand* (Bristol: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2003), 6.

<sup>4</sup> S. L. Goldberg, *The Classical Temper: A Study of James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), 107.

<sup>5</sup> James Alexander Fraser, *Joyce and Betrayal* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 23.

<sup>6</sup> Fraser, 23.

labels ‘a bombardment of gossipy memoirs’. In his 2004 study *Authors, Inc.*, Glass links literary celebrity to modernism: to its contradiction of impersonal authors who became wildly famous. The bombardment he describes ‘affirmed the mass cultural cachet of the personalities behind these persistent assertions of “impersonality”’.<sup>7</sup> Joyce studies is as full of gossip about Joyce as *Ulysses* is of gossip about Dubliners. Among many ‘gossipy memoirs’ and biographical texts are Frank Budgen’s Joyce-assisted 1934 work *James Joyce and the Making of ‘Ulysses’*; the authorised and authorially-controlled biography by Herman Gorman; Stanislaus Joyce’s 1957 *My Brother’s Keeper*; Richard Ellmann’s 1959 biography *James Joyce*, and its new edition in 1982; Arthur Power’s 1974 recollections *Conversations with James Joyce*; Stan Gébler Davies’ *James Joyce: A Portrait of the Artist* of the following year; Alessandro Francini Bruni’s ‘Joyce Stripped Naked in the Piazza’, a 1922 lecture published in the *James Joyce Quarterly* in 1977; John McCourt’s 2000 text *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste 1904-1920*; and Gordon Bowker’s *James Joyce: A Biography* of 2011. Budgen, Ellmann, and Power’s texts have canonical status in Joyce studies, and their effect in the field goes beyond the transmission of biographical information. In this chapter I will read this canon of written Joyces, alongside and through one more (definitely non-canonical): the Joyce of Tom Stoppard’s play *Travesties*.

Stoppard’s Joyce debuted in 1974, the same year as Power’s. He shares a stage with several fictional and historical characters in a play which, in my reading, opens up connections between works of literary biography, their critical uses, and *Ulysses* itself. The fictionalisation of historical figures, including of authors, has been the subject of extensive criticism. It is one of several far-reaching areas of criticism which the discussions of this chapter could encounter – along with criticism of (auto)biography, (auto)biographical fiction, *Künstlerroman* and ‘the artist as hero’ genre more generally, biographical literary criticism, and theoretical approaches to the use of biography in criticism. While I have looked a little at the last in chapter one, and touch on the other areas here and elsewhere, they must lie predominantly outside the scope of this present chapter. This chapter functions as a preamble to my conclusion, a response to the rest of this thesis – and I therefore do not want to draw in too many new elements, but rather bring together and play with my earlier explorations and conclusions. What I present here is eventually a comparative reading of *Travesties* and *Ulysses*; it is also a reading of yet another area of Joyce studies, but one under the influence of chapter five’s conclusions and the thesis’ interest in literature as criticism. What I aim for is an irreverent reading of how Joyce’s life has been read and written, rather than a comprehensive analysis of how biographical criticism intersects Joyce studies. Many earlier questions will recur in this chapter – including the

---

<sup>7</sup> Loren Glass, *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2004), 5.

question of the life and the work, of Roland Barthes' view of a culture strictly centred around the author. I am exploring the texts used in Joyce studies in that 'powerful mode of endowing a reading with authority' Michael Moriarty describes, where we 'explain it by reference to the author's life' and thus uphold 'the notion of an authoritative reading against which other readings could be judged for deviance' – the mode Barthes railed against.<sup>8</sup> In what follows I argue that, when read with a little impertinence, the texts which facilitate a Joycean critical interest in and use of the author's life raise questions of truth, authenticity, useful fictions, genius, and authority.

Budgen's *The Making of 'Ulysses'*, Ellmann's *James Joyce*, and Power's *Conversations with James Joyce* are the most cited works of biography in Joyce studies, but it is not only for this reason that I will discuss them here. Joyce's involvement in the writing of Budgen's text adds a nice extra element to the Joyce the text promotes, while the status of Ellmann's biography (described by Davies in his own biography as having, 'to my taste, too much of the monument about it')<sup>9</sup> suggests the Joyce he presents is particularly fit for purpose. Both texts do much to enhance the perceived exceptionalism of Joyce-the-man, as befits Joyce-the-author. They also laid the ground for Power's memoir, the form of which begs close attention. Power's Joyce's long, detailed, and didactic speeches – presented as recollected truth – benefit juxtaposition with *Travesties* and its games of memory, literary fame, and history. By looking at the personality of Joyce crafted by each of these three biographical works I can continue my ongoing discussion of how the way we read an author affects how we read a text, and vice versa. This picks up several threads from my chapters on criticism and authority, as I note how these three texts are used by critics. In writing the 'real' Joyce these biographical works conversely contribute to a mythic Joyce – the out-of-reach genius discussed in my previous chapter – an effect that doubles when anecdotes are then also cited by critics. An intertextual narrative of Joyce exists beyond, yet influenced by, his semi-autobiographical novels: it is collaboratively written by biographers, memoirists, and critics. *Travesties*, to which I turn to at length as a primary text of this chapter, plays with and laughs at this mythic Joyce, and at many of the questions raised by my discussions here and elsewhere in this thesis; it also aids my emphasis on how authors are constructed. Budgen, Ellmann, Power, and Stoppard present written Joyces, and the way in which we read these Joyces has a variety of implications. The unstable, ludic Joyce of *Travesties* holds my attention, drawing this chapter back through Joyce studies and *Ulysses*.

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael Moriarty, *Roland Barthes* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 2.

<sup>9</sup> Stan Gébler Davies, *James Joyce: A Portrait of the Artist* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1975), 7.

1. 'so does the artist weave and unweave his image' (U, 186)

Clive Hart describes Budgen's *The Making of 'Ulysses'* as a 'partly fictionalised biography', not intended to be 'everywhere literally true': 'memory being fallible and fragmented, [Budgen] deliberately fictionalised to approach the truth indirectly'.<sup>10</sup> *The Making of 'Ulysses'* was written with Joyce's help; he gave Budgen letters and notesheets from which he formed several of 'the remembered conversations' which populate the text and a multitude of Joycean critical works, and helped him to write some small sections of textual discussion.<sup>11</sup> Its indirect truth works for Hugh Kenner: in his 1960 introduction to a new edition of *The Making of 'Ulysses'* he argues that Budgen 'gives us the only coherent image we possess of any portion of Joyce's life; the only one, that is, in which the man we are shown seems compatible with the major fact, the fact that justifies our interest in him: the fact that he was a very great writer'.<sup>12</sup> Budgen's text 'took,' as Kenner notes in *'Ulysses'*, 'a long time to have much effect' (*'U'*, 170), perhaps for the reasons Kenner gives in a 1987 preface to his 1956 study *Dublin's Joyce*: 'Budgen? He was "anecdotal" and "too close to his subject." One got warned against overreliance on a book like that. (But how manifest his enthusiasm! And how alive his Joyce was!)' (*D'sJ*, xi). Kenner played a significant role in bringing Budgen into the critical tradition, embracing and developing his text's emphasis on 'the centrality of Bloom' and clearly taking no notice of New Critical objections to a text so involved with its subject (*'U'*, 5). *The Making of 'Ulysses'* is a memoir, semi-fictionalised biography, and web of anecdotes mixing memories and constructed conversations to present the reader with commentaries on individual episodes and the novel as a whole, Joyce's thoughts on writing, Budgen's own thoughts on art, and recollections of Zurich. Within its narrative are some of the most-quoted Joyceisms – "I want [...] to give a picture of Dublin so complete that if the city one day suddenly disappeared from the earth it could be reconstructed out of my book", "But I want the reader to understand always through suggestion rather than direct statement", Odysseus as the "complete man in literature" – and detailed descriptions of Joyce's relationship to *Ulysses*, writing, and language (Budgen, 67-8, 21, and 15-7). In his 1972 introduction to the text Hart describes it as 'matching biography to criticism in a way that not only allows each to illuminate the other but shows their fundamental interdependence' (another example of mainstream critical attitudes in the Joycean early 1970s).<sup>13</sup> This 'matching' results in a picture

<sup>10</sup> Clive Hart, 'Frank Budgen and the Story of the Making of *Ulysses*', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 120-30 (128). This is a modified version of Hart's introduction to *The Making of 'Ulysses'* published by Oxford University Press in 1972.

<sup>11</sup> Hart, 128.

<sup>12</sup> Kenner, 'Introduction', in Budgen, ix-xv (xiv). This comment was made the year after Ellmann's biography was first published.

<sup>13</sup> Hart, 124.

of Joyce that is pointedly human yet mystical, emphasising the extraordinariness of the ‘very great writer’.

Budgen, an artist himself, shows a particular interest in Joyce’s relationship with words: with the artist’s relationship to their material. He details Joyce’s enjoyment of the German word ‘Leib’, for example, describing how Joyce ‘spoke of the plastic monosyllable as a sculptor speaks about a stone’ (Budgen, 13). He gives an evocative outline of Joyce’s understanding of language:

But to Joyce words are more than a pleasurable material out of which agreeable patterns can be made, or thought and emotion communicated. They are quick with human history as pitchblende with radium, or coal with heat and flame. They have a will and a life of their own and are not to be put like lead soldiers, but to be energised and persuaded like soldiers of flesh and blood. The commerce of life new mints them every day and gives them new values in the exchanges, and Joyce is ever listening for living speech from any human lips. (Budgen, 175)

To Joyce, Budgen summarises, words are ‘mysterious forms of expression as well as an instrument of communication’ (Budgen, 175). While in part Mallarméan, with notes of ‘the poet-speaker who yields the initiative to words’ moving like ‘a trail of fire over precious stones’, this approach to language also however emphasises a human historicism embedded within each word: mysterious yet communicative.<sup>14</sup> A tension between otherly strangeness and prosaic humanity runs through much of Budgen’s account of Joyce. His Joyce advocates the primacy of the very human Bloom over the technical or Homeric, and as a result Budgen’s reading of, for example, ‘Wandering Rocks’ is refreshingly down to earth: it is teatime in Dublin, and at teatime everyone moves around (Budgen, 123). Yet Budgen argues that ‘Some human mood must invest the work of every poet, for every poet is himself a human being. Joyce is a keen-sensed stranger, a delicate recording instrument, an artificer as ingenious, patient and daring as the hawklike man whom Stephen invokes at the end of *A Portrait of the Artist*’ (Budgen, 71). Human – yet delicate instrument, mythical artificer; Joyce and his relationship to his work extend beyond the typical.

Despite attempting to perhaps salve the excesses of Stuart Gilbert’s emphasis on the symbolic aspects of *Ulysses*, Budgen imbues the text and its author with yet more of the unusual:

Does any other prose writer know and enjoy his own work as Joyce knows and enjoys his? We expect the poet to recognise and place any one of his lines, but it must be a rare thing for the writer of prose to be able to do as much. He would need first to compose with as much care and to be very satisfied with the result. Joyce composes with infinite pains, but he looks on his handiwork when he has done it and finds it good. (Budgen, 48)

---

<sup>14</sup> Stéphane Mallarmé, ‘From “Crisis in Verse”’, in *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, ed. Seán Burke (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), 51-3 (51).

As I discussed in the last chapter, this jokey deifying tic is most obviously repeated by Kenner – while the view of Joyce as exceptional is widely declared and implied. These accounts of Joyce’s memory, of his knowledge of his own work – that unlike ‘Most human memories’ Joyce’s does not ‘begin to fail at midnight’ (Budgen, 176) – establish Joyce’s exceptionalism, as do moments where descriptions of the artist’s relationship to their materials give way to exalting portraiture. Budgen’s Joyce does not only hold huge swathes of his work in his mind after writing, able to recall any phrase of the mammoth *Ulysses*; he also does so before the text forms on the page:

The words he wrote were far advanced in his mind before they took shape on paper. He was constantly and indefatigably in pursuit of the solution to some problem of homeric correspondence or technical expression or trait of character in Bloom or another personage of *Ulysses* [...] Joyce’s preoccupation with his book was never ending. He was always looking and listening for the necessary fact or word; and he was a great believer in his luck. What he needed would come to him. (Budgen, 171 – the small ‘h’ in ‘homeric’ is his)

The uncanniness of Joyce’s compositional methods, veiled in part as ‘luck,’ grows with Budgen’s observation that ‘Something in Joyce’s head suggests to me an alchemist’ (Budgen, 12). Combining a rare, unbelievable, transformative skill and an epic mind, Budgen’s Joyce has fate on his side and can rely on luck. Thus, another set of incompatibles arises: this lucky writer is yet also a fervently toiling perfectionist, working hard to finish just two peerless sentences. Budgen’s most famous story, of Joyce seeking ‘the perfect order of words’, refers to ‘Perfume of embraces all him assailed. With hungered flesh obscurely, he mutely craved to adore’ (*U*, 312) (Budgen, 20). As Kenner details in his introduction to *‘Ulysses’*, this is a little piece of fiction: Joyce – Kenner finds in the Rosenbach manuscript – came up with another version of these sentences that he deemed good enough (*‘U’*, 5, fn. 12). This synecdochal anecdote for the care with which Joyce composed *Ulysses* sustains the impression of an obsessive hard-worker, a realism at odds somewhat with an author who also ‘ascrib[es] to the words he writes a singular force of prophecy’ (Budgen, 193).

Joyce’s ‘superstition’ relates to three stories told by Budgen, though in his phrasing it is unclear if these tales are the cause of or evidence for Joyce’s belief in his own power of prophecy. The ‘originals’ of three characters from Joyce’s texts met unfortunate ends after their publication. ‘[T]he original of McCann’, to whom Stephen says, ‘Do you think you impress me when you flourish your wooden sword?’, was arrested years later in a group ‘armed with blackthorn cudgels (a good substitute for wooden swords)’ as part of ‘a Sinn Fein rising’ – he was then executed by firing squad. The models for Davin and Lynch were also damned by Stephen’s words. Davin’s ‘original’, told by Stephen that ‘The next revolution you make with hurleysticks’, was shot by Royal Irish Constabulary Auxiliaries in the Irish War of Independence, having become mayor of Limerick. Finally, when Lynch leaves the scene in ‘Circe’ Stephen intones *‘Exit Judas. Et laqueo se suspendit’*. ‘Years after’, Budgen tells us,

‘the original of Lynch inherited a small fortune, went to London, spent it all and then threw himself into the Thames’ (Budgen, 193). Budgen moves swiftly on, no more said on the divining potential of Joyce’s written words. This is the anecdotal equivalent of a Joyce ‘in advance’; these coincidences gain significance as they are grouped together and repeated – and as they are deemed revelatory by Joyce.

Described by Kenner as a ‘mentor’ and ‘the ideal reader for whom Joyce was writing’, Budgen’s value in Joyce studies lies beyond the contributions of anecdotes – though it is for these that his study is perhaps most often referenced (Budgen, ix and xi). His text has had a critical influence, confirming with Kenner’s help the central role that Bloom occupies in *Ulysses*. In this, *The Making of ‘Ulysses’* has enjoyed the same success as Gilbert’s *James Joyce’s ‘Ulysses’*: Joyce has got his message into the critical tradition, even if via a complicated and delayed route. What Budgen’s study has also achieved is the continuous presence in Joyce criticism of biographical details and stories that are repeated to the point of a mythology. Joyce’s opinions of his work are anecdotally given as reported speech and critically received, and continue to reach all readers of *Ulysses*. Many of these comments also appear in Richard Ellmann’s 1959 biography *James Joyce*. First published not long after the 1957 publication of Joyce’s selected letters – an event described by Kenner as providing ‘a deluge of information’ (*D’sJ*, xv) – Ellmann’s biography collates information from published and unpublished letters, the personal memories of various people, notes, and documents to form a detailed, epic compendium of biographical insight. It creates an enduring impression of Joyce’s mind, portraying an extraordinary character from youth to adulthood. Joyce’s letters home from school, his lists of things needed, ‘sounded like grocer’s lists’: an observation linked both to Joyce’s comment in a letter to Budgen that he has “‘a grocer’s assistant’s mind’”, and to his father’s summation that “‘If that fellow was dropped in the middle of the Sahara, he’d sit, be God, and make a map of it’”.<sup>15</sup> The young Joyce described his age as “‘half past six’”, and performed a charade of ‘sunset’ by sitting ‘in a rounded chair with just the top of his head showing over its top’ (Ellmann, 27 and 53).<sup>16</sup> In 1902, Ellmann tells us, George Russell describes Joyce the young man to W. B. Yeats as ‘The first spectre of the new generation [...] I have suffered from him and I would like you to suffer’ (Ellmann, 100).<sup>17</sup> Ellmann’s remarkable, difficult youthful Joyce parades the traits of a writing genius, a perfect fit even as a child for what we expect of one who could author *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*.

<sup>15</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce: New and Revised Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 28. Quoting Father Conmee (*Letters of James Joyce*, vol. I, ed. Stuart Gilbert (New York: The Viking Press, 1957, new. ed. 1966), 393), John Joyce (‘Interview with Mrs. Eileen Shaurek, 1953’), and James Joyce (Letter to Budgen, 2<sup>nd</sup> May 1934, *Letters*, vol. III, ed. Ellmann (New York: The Viking Press, 1968), 304). All references are to this edition of Ellmann’s *James Joyce* and will appear in parentheses with the author’s name.

<sup>16</sup> The first story is from Herbert Gorman, *James Joyce* (New York: Farrar Rinehart, 1939), 27 and Stanislaus Joyce, *My Brother’s Keeper*, ed. Ellmann (New York: The Viking Press, 1975), 40, and the second from ‘Interview with Mrs. Kettle, 1953’.

<sup>17</sup> George Russell, ‘Some Characters of the Irish Literary Movement’, shown to Ellmann by Alan Denson.

His fully grown, published, reflective Joyce – post-*Wake* – claims that the purpose of that work is just “to make you laugh” (Ellmann, 703).<sup>18</sup> This Joyce wants two things: that his reader “should devote his whole life to reading my works”, and “to keep the critics busy for three hundred years” (Ellmann, 703).<sup>19</sup>

Ellmann’s Joyce is a great fit for what we want our writers of remarkable novels to be, fulfilling a desire created by the texts themselves for their author to be extraordinary. He is also an older version of an un-ironic Stephen Dedalus, and the existence of this other written-Joyce results in some confusion. Ellmann tells us of Joyce’s first day at the school Clongowes: ‘his father reminded him that John O’Connell, his great-grandfather, had presented an address to the Liberator at Clongowes fifty years before’ (Ellmann, 27-8). Ellmann’s citation for this story is *A Portrait*. In the passages that follow, though Ellmann details the odd discrepancy, he continues to describe Joyce’s early life with reference to *A Portrait*. At one point, John Joyce’s words are from the novel, and at the open of the fourth chapter we are told about Joyce at Belvedere: ‘As he said in *A Portrait*, his soul threw off the cerements that covered it and spurned the grave of childhood’ (Ellmann, 33 and 42). This works in reverse too, as he draws direct lines from life to work, suggesting that Nora Barnacle’s 1908 miscarriage ‘helped to make Bloom’s chief sorrow, in *Ulysses*, the death just after birth of his son Rudy’ (Ellmann, 268-9). Ellmann is a reader of both Joyce’s life and work, and in *James Joyce* we find analysis of Joyce’s early and fragmentary or late and fully realised writings. As I have explored in this thesis, several early and more recent critics use *A Portrait* to infer Joyce’s aesthetic views. This is followed through to its logical conclusion in Ellmann’s use of the novel as an illustration of the author’s early life. His use emphasises a close relationship between life and autobiographically-informed fiction – close, and perhaps simple too. Ellmann’s other efforts to separate Stephen and Joyce are undermined, as his reading of their school days leaves little room for complexity, parody, or irony. The (pseudo- or semi-) autobiographical elements of Joyce’s fiction are of course part of the reason a biography was such an important milestone in Joycean criticism. Ellmann’s *James Joyce* is, after all, the only scholarly work to have its own standardised abbreviation in the *James Joyce Quarterly*, one used also by most texts in Joyce studies. Reading Stephen as an un-ironic Joyce makes a literary critical statement. Ellmann’s combination of biography and criticism in *James Joyce* contributes to an enduring presence of biographical criticism in Joyce studies, which has overridden shifts away from or debates over such modes.

Budgen’s *The Making of ‘Ulysses’* includes a particularly careful reading of self-portraiture – one which does not seem to have got into the critical tradition despite the ongoing

---

<sup>18</sup> Letter to Ellmann from Terence White Gervais.

<sup>19</sup> ‘Interview with Jacob Schwartz, 1956’, and Max Eastman, *The Literary Mind* (1931), 100.

need to evaluate the relevance of the biographical in Joyce studies. As I touched upon in chapter two, across *The Making of 'Ulysses'* Budgen reports Joyce's comments about Stephen. Observing that "I haven't let this young man off very lightly, have I? Many writers have written about themselves. I wonder if any one of them has been as candid as I have?", Budgen's Joyce describes a high level of honesty in his portrayal of Stephen (Budgen, 51). This is then carefully, if subtly, undermined: "Some people who read my book, *A Portrait of the Artist* forget that it is called *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." Joyce stresses the last four words, leading Budgen to attempt an interpretation. Perhaps the emphasis is that Joyce is

[...] no longer that young man, that through time and experience he has become a different person. Or it may have meant that he wrote the book looking backwards at the young man across a space of time as the landscape painter paints distant hills, looking at them through a cube of air-filled space, painting, that is to say, not that which is, but that which appears to be. Perhaps he meant both. (Budgen, 60-1)

Not knowing how better to interpret Joyce's words, Budgen then develops his own reading of self-portraiture – of the implied distance between Joyce and Stephen. To paint a self-portrait, he argues, one 'is fatally bound to paint himself painting himself. [...] something of objective truth gets lost in the process'. Furthermore, the artist 'is not only painting himself painting himself; he is also painting himself posing to himself'. Pulling apart differences, Budgen suggests that 'All the psychological inducements to fictify his portrait are present in greater measure for the writer than for the painter'. The writer's 'medium is not an active sense, but memory, and who knows when memory ceases to be memory and becomes imagination?' (Budgen, 61-3). Budgen's reading of the act of self-portraiture suggests a fundamental distance between the writing and written self: unless one were able to resist fiction, and be very self-aware. He uses these ideas to compare the 'portrait' Stephen to the 'all-round' Bloom, but we can also find here some sort of accidental self-reflexive acknowledgement that the point where memory shifts to imagination is a crucial issue of the genre in which he writes: memoir.

2. 'My memories, is it, then? Life and times, friend of the famous. Memories of James Joyce. James Joyce As I Knew Him. The James Joyce I Knew'<sup>20</sup>

In 1974 Arthur Power's *Conversations with James Joyce* was published as a book-length memoir, and Tom Stoppard's play *Travesties* premiered at the Aldwych theatre in London.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Tom Stoppard, *Travesties* (London: Faber, 1975), 22. I am using what was my father's copy; it is printed both upside down and back to front, and signed by the author. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

<sup>21</sup> 'Conversations with Joyce' first appeared in the *JJQ*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Fall, 1965), 41-9. It reports conversations had in 1921, many of which run over several pages. Much of the discussion revolves around other writers, and though

Power's memoir is a detailed account of conversations had with Joyce in Paris in the 1920s, while Stoppard's play presents Henry Carr's memories of Joyce (among others) in Zurich in 1917. Power opens *Conversations* with an admission:

In these conversations I have tried to reconstruct some of the talks I had with Joyce at different times from notes taken when I returned home after spending an evening with him.

I realise how inadequate much of it is, for much that was said has been forgotten or is inadequately expressed, while to give an impression of a man of such talent one would have to have talent equal to his own, as deep a consciousness of the social and psychological changes of his time as he had, and the same almost agonized gift for expressing it.<sup>22</sup>

Power's Joyce is openly reconstructed, yet still his extended speeches – despite Power's defence of rushing home to take notes – request a significant amount of faith from the reader. Though Power confesses that 'I was very talkative, while Joyce was naturally silent', his Joyce gives his opinions in long, detailed, pages-long monologues stretching the anecdotal 'he said' to its limits and beyond (Power, 9). This Joyce spouts his thoughts on what an author must do, on the difference between classical and modern literature, on Irish genius. Discussing emotion and intellect, he touches on the text he had begun to write:

And so I have tried to write naturally, on an emotional basis as against an intellectual basis. Emotion has dictated the course and detail of my book, and in emotional writing one arrives at the unpredictable which can be of more value, since its sources are deeper, than the products of the intellectual method. In the intellectual method you plan everything beforehand. When you arrive at the description, say, of a house you try and remember that house exactly, which after all is journalism. But the emotionally creative writer refashions that house and creates a significant image in the only significant world, the world of our emotions. The more we are tied to fact and try to give a correct impression, the further we are from what is significant. In writing one must create an endlessly changing surface, dictated by the mood and current impulse in contrast to the fixed mood of the classical style. This is 'Work in Progress'. The important thing is not what we write, but how we write, and in my opinion the modern writer must be an adventurer above all, willing to take every riot, and be prepared to flounder in his effort if need be. In other words we must write dangerously [...] A book, in my opinion, should not be planned out beforehand, but as one writes it will form itself, subject, as I say, to the constant emotional promptings of one's personality. (Power, 95)

Power's Joyce's lengthy opinions, as one might expect, often concern his own writing or the reception of his work:

Then in your opinion, I said, the critics and the intellectuals have boggled the issue, have not seen your intention clearly, and have put meanings into it which did not exist, which they have invented for themselves.

Yes and no, replied Joyce, shrugging his shoulders evasively, for who knows but it is they who are right. 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

---

there are traces of some of the conversations presented in the full memoir, many of the more quoted passages of the latter are absent.

<sup>22</sup> Arthur Power, *Conversations with James Joyce*, ed. Clive Hart (London: Millington, 1974), 9. All references are to this edition, and will appear in parentheses with the author's name.

creating when he wrote *Hamlet*; or Leonardo when he painted 'The Last Supper'? After all, the original genius of a man lies in his scribblings: in his casual actions lies his basic talent. Later he may develop that talent until he produces a *Hamlet* or a 'Last Supper,' but if the minute scribblings which compose the big work are not significant, the big work does for nothing no matter how grandly conceived. Which of us can control our scribblings? (Power, 89)

When quoted at length the disparity between the form of Power's memoir and his admission of attempted reconstruction is particularly apparent: following the conceit of perfect recall one finds in such texts, we are encouraged to forget that these epic aesthetic theses were formed from notes taken retrospectively decades earlier. While the image of an acolyte trying to write down every word that Joyce utters tells us something of Joyce's authorial standing, it also paints a picture of Power himself.

In a detour from his subject, Power describes his disappointment at reading the diary of Amedeo Modigliani's mistress: 'I was prepared for a revelation as I opened the leaves of her manuscript [...] But as I read on I was disappointed'. The woman's diary was more about her than about her famous lover, and leaves Power dissatisfied (Power, 84). This story echoes the risks of Power's own endeavour, however: that his memoir tells a reader more about its author, than its subject. Modigliani's mistress might also prompt us to consider the cachet of fame: her diary is of interest only, apparently, for its association with Modigliani. Power is aware that his time in Paris is only of interest for its 'revelations' concerning Joyce. He is careful not to disappoint the reader, and he is rewarded with multiple citations and new editions. In his 1991 essay 'Writer as Hero: Novelistic Prefigurations and the Emergence of Literary Biography', Michael McKeon draws an image from Samuel Johnson 'of the biographer as pickpocket'.<sup>23</sup> Teasing apart the implications of this 'monetary figure' in terms of James Boswell's 1791 *The Life of Johnson*, McKeon offers two possibilities. The first is that 'if Boswell aims to become a man of letters through the artistic construction of Johnson as a man of letters, the interests of the two cannot be expected to coincide always'. The second complicates this, suggesting instead that such 'conflict' might not exist. 'If the biography is about Johnson, it must also be about him who perceives Johnson. [...] in this respect, the reciprocity of writer and writer's author must be very close. This is perhaps only to repeat the modern truth that all biographies are in a sense also autobiographies'.<sup>24</sup> This is related to M. H. Abrams' reading of not biography, but of biographical criticism: of romantic scholars on Milton – 'each of these portraits of Milton bears a notable likeness to the portraitist'<sup>25</sup> – or the narcissistic criticism of John Keble, both relevant here given the use of Power's Joyce within

---

<sup>23</sup> Michael McKeon, 'Writer as Hero: Novelistic Prefigurations and the Emergence of Literary Biography', in *Contesting the Subject: Essays in the Postmodern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Criticism*, ed. William H. Epstein (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1991), 17-41 (37).

<sup>24</sup> McKeon, 37-8.

<sup>25</sup> 'It would appear, then, that a biographical interpretation of a work may, on its own principles, be interpreted by the biography of the interpreter; and this opens up the vista of an infinite regress.' Abrams, 254.

literary criticism. Abrams' response to Keble returns us to McKeon's first reading of the pickpocketing biographer. Keble's Homer is an authorial figure both Keble-esque and serving Keble's critical purposes – as I touched upon in chapter three. The same could be true of Power's Joyce: he provides Power with a subject, with the benefits of association, and with the authority needed to pull off a memoir. In turn, he serves the purposes of a new generation of Joyce scholars – providing them with a fresh source of authorial quotations.

Power's Joyce is quoted by critics in much the same way as Budgen's, or as Joyce's letters; Power's Joyce's attitude to planning quoted above, for example, is regularly cited in books on *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>26</sup> Brook Thomas and Tim Conley, as I have touched upon before, reference his thoughts on intention, using his quoted words to give credence to a notion of intentional anti-intentionalism that existed with Kenner before the publication of Power's memoir. These words are also quoted by critics seeking to authorise their own methodologies: by Kevin H. Dettmar in *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism*, to argue he can read as much or as little postmodernism in *Ulysses* as he likes; by Jean Kimball in *Odyssey of the Psyche: Jungian Patterns in 'Ulysses'*, to defend analysing the text for Jungian secrets; and by Daniel Bristow in *Joyce and Lacan: Reading, Writing, and Psychoanalysis*, making the same defence 'as Joyce himself said'.<sup>27</sup> The questions that such citations raise feed into a complex web of interlinked critical issues: Power himself describes his text as 'an impression,' so is Power's Joyce authentic? What does that mean? Does it matter that, unlike Budgen's text, *Conversations* was written without Joyce's help? Could we argue that the author of these long speeches constructed from old notes and memory is Power himself? And in making such an argument, and thus undermining the use of Power's Joyce by critics, would we be in turn affirming the validity of using direct authorial commentary in criticism? One thing is clear: Joyceans do not seem interested. Even in Conley's study of author and reader intentions and mistakes – an otherwise intensely self-reflexive piece of criticism – Power's Joyce is quoted without query.

Stoppard's *Travesties* has great fun with the authenticity of memoirs, the reliability of memory, and how proximity to 'genius' affects 'normal' people. It portrays Carr's memories of Dadaist Tristan Tzara, distinctly-non-Dadaist Vladimir Lenin, and Joyce; the fictionalised recollections of Carr merge with literary and biographical texts in an account of an apparently very real encounter between Joyce and Carr, a consular employee. In a story told by both Budgen and Ellmann, after Joyce and Carr were involved in a production of *The Importance*

---

<sup>26</sup> See for example Finn Fordham in *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unravelling Universals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 9; Kevin J. H. Dettmar in *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 167; John Bishop in the notes of *Joyce's Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), 454 n. 7.

<sup>27</sup> Dettmar, 50; Jean Kimball, *Odyssey of the Psyche: Jungian Patterns in 'Ulysses'* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997), 137; and Daniel Bristow, *Joyce and Lacan: Reading, Writing, and Psychoanalysis* (Oxford: Routledge, 2017), 83.

of *Being Earnest* in Zurich they engaged in a legal dispute over the cost of a pair of trousers bought by Carr for his role. Carr reportedly irritated Joyce sufficiently to warrant inclusion in *Ulysses* as the Private Carr of the ‘Circe’ episode: ‘I’ll wring the neck of any fucker says a word against my fucking king’ being one of his better lines (*U*, 554). Stoppard doubles this abuse by portraying Carr in *Travesties* as a doddering old man who unreliably remembers and re-remembers Zurich, 1917 in such a way that ‘the story (like a toy train perhaps) occasionally jumps the rails and has to be restarted at the point where it goes wild’, as a stage direction explains (Stoppard, 27). In performance, abrupt changes in lighting and a loudly chiming cuckoo-clock make the sudden shifts clear and easy to comprehend, if a little startling at first.<sup>28</sup> These resets allow Carr to edit his recollections and acknowledge that he has gone wrong somewhere; they also emphasise the influence of texts on his memories as they are told and retold in differing idioms. The plot of *The Importance of Being Earnest* gives structure to much of Carr’s recollections; *Travesties* also lifts from the play some character names, modes of speaking, phrases, and jokes. The opening of the second act quotes from *Memories of Lenin* directly, and a whole section of the first act mimics the catechistic question and answer form of the ‘Ithaca’ episode of *Ulysses*. Mistaken and adopted identities extend beyond the importance of being, or not being, Tristan Tzara as Carr gives several versions of the characters. So, as Carr is damned to fiction in *Ulysses*, Joyce is damned here: reduced variously to ‘an Irish nonsense’, to the questioner of Tzara in the style of ‘Ithaca’, and to a magician – and in each incarnation trying to borrow a little money and wearing the mismatched halves of two suits (which at one point swap: ‘My wardrobe got out of step in Trieste, and its reciprocal members pass each other endlessly in the night’) (Stoppard, 33 and 96).

Both as an old man remembering and a young man remembered, Carr has a gloriously patchy memory of Joyce. Carr calls Joyce Doris, Phyllis, Deidre, and Bridget, and in his guise as ‘Irish nonsense’ Joyce and every other character speak in limericks (the best being Joyce’s last) (Stoppard, 49, 53, and 95):

An impromptu poet of Hibernia  
rhymed himself into a hernia.  
He became quite adept  
at the practice except  
for occasional anti-climaxes.

When I want to leave things in the air  
I say, “Excuse me, I’ve got to repair  
to my book about Bloom –”  
and just leave the room. (Stoppard, 35-6)

---

<sup>28</sup> These extra effects are also suggested in the stage directions (27). In the Apollo Theatre production in 2017 (dir. Patrick Marber), the lights dimmed or coloured slowly as the scene lost its way, suddenly returning to full brightness with an extremely loud cuckoo-clock noise as the scene reset (seen 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017).

*Ulysses* also has quite an impact on Carr's memory: in the Ithacan section, for instance, Joyce carefully requests biographical information in the cool yet ridiculous tones of scientific enquiry:

Quote judiciously so as to combine maximum information with minimum liability.

[...]

Quote discriminatively from Ball's diary in such a manner as to avoid forfeiting the goodwill of his executors.

[...]

Corroborate discreetly from any contemporary diarist whose estate is not given to obsessive litigation over trivial infringements of copyright. (Stoppard, 58-9)<sup>29</sup>

Elsewhere, a joke of Buck Mulligan's is placed in Joyce's own mouth: he warns against making poetry and water in the one hat (a reference for the Joycean members of the audience) (Stoppard, 62).<sup>30</sup> As Joyce works on 'Oxen of the Sun' in the library ('Deshill holles eamus [...] Thrice', 'is it a chapter, inordinate in length and erratic in style, remotely connected with midwifery?') his endeavour is mocked by several characters ('what possible book could be derived from reference to Homer's *Odyssey* and the Dublin Street Directory for 1904') – including by Carr in a particularly Wildean joke (Stoppard, 18, 97, and 44). Asked where he is from, Joyce replies: 'Dublin, don't tell me you know it?' 'Only from the guidebook,' sneers Carr, 'and I gather you are in the process of revising that' (Stoppard, 47). Joyce is only one of several characters, and in no way directly involved in the central romantic plot, but his presence provides much of the best humour in the play. While some of this is at his own expense, or at Carr's, it is at times directed at retrospective anecdotal memoirs of those who knew great artists. *Travesties* harks back to a time before Joyce's celebrity or fame was established, and Carr's recollections are openly revisionary:

It is true I knew him well at the height of his powers, his genius in full flood in the making of *Ulysses*, before publication and fame turned him into a public monument for pilgrim cameras more often than not in a velvet smoking jacket [...].

[...]

To those of us who knew him, Joyce's genius was never in doubt. To be in his presence was to be aware of an amazing intellect bent on shaping itself into the permanent form of its own monument – the book the world now knows as *Ulysses*! Though at the time we were still calling it (I hope memory serves) by its original title, *Elasticated Bloomers*.

Carr goes on to describe Joyce as:

in short, a complex personality, an enigma, a contradictory spokesperson for the truth, an obsessive litigant and yet an essentially private man who wished his total indifference to public notice to be universally recognised – in short a liar and a hypocrite, a tight-fisted, sponging, fornicating drunk not worth the paper, that's that bit done. (Stoppard, 22-3)

<sup>29</sup> We also must wonder whose estate caused Stoppard enough trouble to warrant reference in the play itself... sadly, *Travesties* is not included in Paul K. Saint-Amour's *The Copywrights*.

<sup>30</sup> See Mrs Cahill in the previous chapter, 147, fn. 7.

Joyce's personality (when not confused with a smoking jacketed Wilde) is unfixed in Carr's memory and in the play as a whole: it varies to serve different purposes, is influenced by Joyce's own texts, and depends greatly on the tone of the play at any given moment. It also mimics the contradictory images of and statements about Joyce we find in Joycean criticism and biography; or perhaps Joycean critical opinions mimic Henry Carr – he is not the last to read *Ulysses* as a self-conscious monument to Joyce's intellect.<sup>31</sup>

Stoppard's, or Carr's, Joyce fulfils his role of recollected artist by putting forth his view on art – as does Tzara, and with different cause, Carr himself. Amongst the mistaken identities, pastiches, and resets, there is ongoing discussion of the validity of art – lent a particular edge by the First World War context and the Zurich location: 'My dear Tristan,' says Carr, 'to be an artist *at all* is like living in Switzerland during a world war. To be an artist *in Zurich, 1917*, implies a degree of self-absorption that would have glazed over the eyes of Narcissus' (Stoppard, 38). Carr and Tzara's arguments about art and artists cause some notable scene resets, usually where Tzara's chanting or screaming of 'dada dada dada' coincides with Carr's fury over the self-worth of artists: 'The idea of the artist as a special kind of human being is art's greatest achievement, and it's a fake!' (Stoppard, 46-7). Towards the end of Act One, when Tzara and Joyce discuss Dadaism while Joyce conjures silk hankies and flags from his hat, Tzara reaches another pitch of hysteria:

Your art has failed. You've turned literature into a religion and it's as dead as all the rest, it's an overripe corpse and you're cutting fancy figures at the wake. It's too late for geniuses! Now we need vandals and desecrators, simple-minded demolition men to smash centuries of baroque subtlety, to bring down the temple, and thus finally, to reconcile the shame and the necessity of being an artist! Dada! *Dada! Dada!!*

(*He starts to smash whatever crockery is to hand; which done, he strikes a satisfied pose. JOYCE has not moved.*) (Stoppard, 62)<sup>32</sup>

Joyce's response is worth quoting in its entirety:

You are an over-excited little man, with a need for self-expression far beyond the scope of your natural gifts. This is not discreditable. Neither does it make you an artist. An artist is the magician put among men to gratify – capriciously – their urge for immortality. The temples are built and brought down around him, continuously and contiguously, from Troy to the field of Flanders. If there is any meaning in any of it, it is in what survives as art, yes even in the celebration of tyrants, yes even in the celebration of nonentities. What now of the Trojan War if it had been passed over by the artist's touch? Dust. A forgotten expedition prompted by Greek merchants looking for new markets. A minor redistribution of broken pots. But it is we who stand enriched, by a tale of heroes, of a golden apple, a wooden horse, a face that launched a thousand ships – and above all, of Ulysses, the wanderer, the most human, the most complete of all heroes – husband, father, son, lover, farmer, soldier, pacifist, politician, inventor and adventurer... It is a theme so overwhelming that I am almost afraid to treat it. And yet

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, the critics mentioned in chapter five: Leo Bersani, Vicki Mahaffey, and Michael Patrick Gillespie.

<sup>32</sup> At the Apollo Theatre performance, Tzara began this speech with real, affecting seriousness and anger – lasting right up until his final pose.

I with my Dublin Odyssey will double that immortality, yes by God *there's* a corpse that will dance for some time yet and *leave the world precisely as it finds it* – and if you hope to shame it into the grave with your fashionable magic, I would strongly advise you to try and acquire some genius and if possible some subtlety before the season is quite over. Top o' the morning, Mr. Tzara!

(*With which JOYCE produces a rabbit out of his hat, puts the hat on his head, and leaves, holding the rabbit.*) (Stoppard, 62-3)<sup>33</sup>

There is a hint of Wilde in this Joyce's reference to 'the season', and a final flourish of 'Irish nonsense', yet also a view of the character Ulysses we know from Budgen's Joyce. Amongst all the silliness, parts of Joyce's speech – and of Carr's and Tzara's earlier – have the weight of seriousness about them, allowing the play to explore art's relationship with and responsibility to history, politics, and war. *Travesties* asks what art should be, what genius means, and how real-life people are presented within fictional and biographical texts, playing in its self-consciousness with the tropes of memoir, a genre of writing which raises the same questions.

3. 'if the whole thing wasn't a complete fabrication from start to finish' (U, 573)

Stoppard's Joyce is formed of historical and biographical information taken primarily from Ellmann's *James Joyce* and mixed with quantities of *Ulysses*; he is thus constructed in response to and from his own literary texts, and from personal anecdotes, memories, biographies, and letters.<sup>34</sup> From a facetiously formal perspective, Stoppard's Joyce is constructed in the same way as Budgen's, Ellmann's, or Power's – an obscure combination of texts, facts, memory, and fiction. And Stoppard's Joyce, in this, is formally similar to *Travesties* itself – which is in turn reminiscent of *Ulysses*: fiction populated by real people, historical events, and a multitude of literary and non-literary texts. *Travesties*' relationship to *The Importance of Being Earnest* echoes *Ulysses*' with the *Odyssey*: the characters unknowingly play more than one role, the plots are layered over one another, and the later text exists in parallel with its precursor.<sup>35</sup> In 'Count Zero Splits the Infinite', Clive James points out that at times in *Travesties* it appears *The Importance of Being Earnest* is being concurrently performed off-stage, such as when Tzara leaves the stage and is heard '(voice off)' exchanging lines with Carr playing Algernon (Stoppard, 63): 'so that exit becomes an entrance in a play (the *other* play) [...] It isn't helpful to call such effects dazzling, since they are not meant to dazzle nor be effects – they are glimpses into the kaleidoscope of possibilities, devices by

<sup>33</sup> In both the 2017 Apollo Theatre production and a 2011 production by the Birmingham Repertory Theatre Company (dir. Philip Wilson), Joyce conjured a live rabbit.

<sup>34</sup> In his 'Acknowledgements' Stoppard lists Ellmann's *James Joyce* and John Gross' *Joyce* as amongst the texts from which he has 'profited variously – and gratefully' (Stoppard, 15).

<sup>35</sup> The Birmingham Rep even staged both plays with the same cast for a season.

which you can see further'.<sup>36</sup> We can see the infectious intertextuality of Joyce's texts in another self-conscious story of his life: Mary M. and Bryan Talbot's 2012 graphic novel *Dotter of Her Father's Eyes* layers Mary Talbot's childhood (as the daughter of Joyce scholar James S. Atherton) over the life of Joyce's daughter Lucia, and borrows lines from the films *The Red Shoes* and *The Graduate* in its telling.<sup>37</sup> Back in *Travesties*, such intertextuality and Joyce's proclamations on artistic genius and importance are – unsurprisingly – undercut. The hat from which Joyce pulls handkerchiefs, flags, and a rabbit, plays an important role. Before his interrogation by Joyce, Tzara is seen composing poetry by pulling out and replacing pieces of paper in a hat (echoing an earlier scene in which Joyce locates his notes on 'tiny scraps of paper' in his pockets) (Stoppard, 19). When Joyce later enters the stage with paper in his hair and on his shoulders, it becomes apparent whose hat Tzara was using. While Joyce fires Ithacan questions at Tzara he slowly replaces these pieces of paper in his hat, before conjuring out of it a white carnation made of the scraps. Joyce's conjuring parodies the 'magician' artist of his speech, and perhaps also his own work: the white carnation is made of the scraps of another man's art, a collage of previous texts worked anew. The paper flower, which ends up in Tzara's buttonhole, is a small and silly version of the woven or mosaic text, of the activities of the scissors and paste men Joyce and Stoppard.

*Travesties* bears further comparison with *Ulysses*; both texts, for example, explore subjectivity by allowing a character's thoughts to structure the narrative. Carr's badly-controlled, restarting, confused memory gives *Travesties* its structure, and, as I have variously explored in chapters three and five, Bloom's mental meanderings affect *Ulysses*' form in a multitude of ways. Bloom's thoughts lead to gaps and errors in *Ulysses*, from the missing visit to Dignam's widow, to incorrectly detailed finances, to the adjusted account of his day he gives to Molly. Carr's memories form – we find out at the end of a play – an impossible situation, as Joyce and Lenin were actually in Zurich a year apart. This final exchange between Old Carr and his correcting wife Old Cecily reveals *Travesties* to be another adjusted account by husband to wife. Furthermore, by being drawn thus irresistibly back to *Ulysses* through *Travesties* we find yet more consonance between each text and the genres of literary memoir, biography, and autobiography. Exploring subjectivity is one way in which *Ulysses* and *Travesties* raise questions of reliability, of truth, of the borders between reality and fiction; questions raised by the extended biographical anecdote of a memoirist. A memoir written by

---

<sup>36</sup> Clive James, 'Count Zero Splits the Infinite', in *Encounter*, November 1975, on James' website – an archive of his works. <<http://www.clivejames.com/pieces/hercules/stoppard>> [accessed 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017].

<sup>37</sup> Mary M. Talbot and Bryan Talbot, *Dotter of her Father's Eyes* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2012). Many source texts are listed in this graphic novel, which also includes a sort of visual intertextuality: photographs of real artefacts are included in the illustrations, along with Atherton's copy of *Wake*, with annotations and pressed flowers in its pages. *The Red Shoes* and *The Graduate* are not listed as source texts, but are quoted. 'Why do you want to dance?' 'Why do you want to live?' 'Well, I don't know exactly. But I must' 'That's my answer too.' are lines from *The Red Shoes*; in *Dotter*, the exchange is between Lucia Joyce and Beckett (71). 'Will you kiss me? Will you marry me?' 'I don't know' is from *The Graduate*, and in *Dotter* is spoken by Bryan and Mary Talbot (61).

an author's acquaintance is concerned with the personality of the artist, the life and work of the artist – and the relationships between – as is *Travesties*, and, through Stephen, *Ulysses*. To explore the personality, life, and work of the artist Power's *Conversations*, *Travesties*, and, to a lesser extent, *Ulysses* create author characters. These texts write an author, and in doing so they engage in writing authorship.

The written authors of memoir and anecdote rely on the trust with which we invest each 's/he said'; this is reinforced each time a critic references the words of Power's Joyce. To determine the authenticity of 'Joyce said' we look to the scribe of those words, to the memoirist: that Power knew Joyce appears sufficient, given we have no other way to know if Joyce spoke thus. This doubles the effect of the preterite tense which, as I discussed in chapter three, Roland Barthes describes in *Writing Degree Zero*: the preterite tense, or 's/he said' function of third person narration, 'signifies a creation' and 'is a lie made manifest, it delineates an area of plausibility which reveals the possible in the very act of unmasking it as false' (*Zero*, 46-7). This inherent aspect of third person narration is in a way an act of concealment; as Barthes claims, 'Behind the preterite there always lurks a demiurge, a God, or a reciter' (*Zero*, 46). As we turn to Power to determine the validity of his Joyce's words, remaining unable to fully unveil what combination of truth and fiction we are reading, we double Barthes' description of writing – 'Its task is to put the mask in place and at the same time point it out' – and though Barthes' analysis relates to writing in the third person 'in the novel' here we find the same effect in the reported speech of a first person memoir (*Zero*, 48). Masks and concealment provide yet another thread between Power's memoir and its contemporaneously published counterpart *Travesties*, if we unpick the title of the latter. A travesty is a literary burlesque of a serious work. Etymologically, 'travesty' comes from an adjective with specific connotations of being dressed-up: from the French *travesti* – to be dressed in disguise – and the Italian *travestire* – to disguise by clothing. Its Latin roots are *trans*, across or over, and *vestire*: to clothe.<sup>38</sup> *Travesties* is heavily populated with dressing up and disguise, along with fake, confused, and forgotten names and roles. Carr repeatedly refers to his character in *The Importance of Being Earnest* as 'the other one', forgetting the role of Algernon while to some extent playing it in *Travesties*. The name-swapping and elements of disguise from Wilde's play are doubled in Stoppard's as Tristan Tzara and Henry Carr pretend to be Jack Tzara and Tristan Tzara respectively; *Travesties* itself dresses up as *The Importance of Being Earnest*. Joyce's name is forgotten and mistaken by Carr, and we learn eventually that not only did Carr never hold the role of Consul in Zurich as he pretends but that a 'Bennett' did. Bennett, furthermore, is the name with which Carr refers to his butler, who not only apes

---

<sup>38</sup> Etymologies taken from John Ayto, *Word Origins: The Hidden Histories of English Words from A to Z*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (London: A&C Black, 2005), and the *OED online* (Oxford University Press, June 2017) <[www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)> [accessed 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017].

the Wilde character Algernon's butler Lane, but is revealed to have yet another part to play. Displaying vast knowledge of the Russian Revolution in an early, reset scene, Bennett is revealed later to at least have 'radical sympathies' and at most be a disguised, undercover Bolshevik; spies are mentioned often – if subtly – in *Travesties* (Stoppard, 96). Carr, meanwhile, is greatly concerned with clothing – he unknowingly plays Algernon in his obsessions with which suit and studs he will wear, he is convinced to knowingly play Algernon in Joyce's production by the promise of two costume changes, and he is much offended by Joyce's mismatched suits. And in the background, there is perhaps a pun on the legal suit and countersuit brought by Carr and Joyce over the cost of some costume trousers.

In chapter three I discussed disguise and textual dressing up in *Ulysses*: they are defining features of the form, content, styles, and characters of the novel. To refer back to the Latin roots of 'travesty' – *trans* and *vestire*, or across/over and to clothe – we might think particularly of M'Intosh, whose identity is confused with the overclothes he wears. John Paul Riquelme even argues 'that all the book's styles, including the initial one, are disguises, personae, masks',<sup>39</sup> and there is something of this stylistic dress-up in *Travesties* too. The scene resets, styles are borrowed from other texts, parts of plot and sections of dialogue are repeated in new modes. Yet despite the 'resetting' of such scenes some plot and information survives across stylistic hops: Bennet's secret identity, for instance, or Carr's knowledge of Joyce's christened middle name (Augusta). In this way these resets have a little essence of *Ulysses*' episodic shifts, clothed in styles which alter their contents to a variety of extents. We might even think of Kenner's suggestion that in *Ulysses* Homer 'educates us still, not least when we glimpse him in the mocking mirrors of a novel that was not long ago thought to travesty him, but that in fact soberly, exuberantly pays him intricate homage' (*J'sV*, 95. My emphasis). *Ulysses* is a complicated reading of its precursor; perhaps we can argue the same of *Travesties*. Though the obvious precursor to Stoppard's play is *The Importance of Being Earnest*, in that playful intertextual relationship between the two texts *Travesties* points more to *Ulysses*. It perhaps does still travesty Joyce's novel, but while also paying it homage: it pulls at and admires it, mocks and echoes it, exploring concerns which are relevant to the questions reading *Ulysses* raises. In the fun *Travesties* has with disguised characters and text, role playing and playfulness, lies and truth, fiction and reality, it asks questions about authors: about their personalities, their genius, their responsibilities to society, the stories we tell about them, and their relationship to their texts. Even the joke of Doris, Phyllis, Deidre, Bridget, Joyce relies upon the impossibility of forgetting Joyce's name: upon a Foucault-esque awareness that 'Joyce' does far more than refer to the man James Augustine/Augusta Aloysius

---

<sup>39</sup> John Paul Riquelme, *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 220. Karen Lawrence makes a similar point across *The Odyssey of Style in 'Ulysses'* (1981).

Joyce. We can therefore read another form of writing woven into the mixture of biography, history, fiction, and rewriting that forms the play: that of literary criticism. *Travesties* reads and responds to *Ulysses*, asking and exploring questions the novel raises that have implications beyond its pages: it reads and responds to literary memoirs and biographies, and our society's interest in authorial genius and authorial commentary; to the treatment of art and artists under Lenin; to Dadaism and what it reacted against; and even (if we want) to the class divides of *The Importance of Being Earnest*, subverting the small role of a lowly butler. Finally, *Travesties* reads, responds to, and rewrites Joyce.

Both Budgen and Power's texts acknowledge their elements of fiction, reaching towards authenticity by merging the white lie with the 'truth'. In this their texts mirror their Joyces: contradictory combinations of otherly and real, of mythical and human. Budgen's question, 'who knows when memory ceases to be memory and becomes imagination?', applies to his own text as well as to Joyce's *A Portrait*. It is of course relevant also to Power's *Conversations*; yet while it is usual to note the less-than-honest presentation of Budgen's conversations with Joyce, the same caveats are not applied to Power's. In his own introduction Power calls his memoir 'inadequate', arguing that 'to give an impression of a man of such talent one would have to have talent equal to his own'. He acknowledges an impossibility in his endeavour, that he can at most only attempt to write Joyce. Yet the authority given to his Joyce by critics infers a completeness, a Joyce so utterly Joyce his words are treated like those in his letters. The formal similarities between Power and Stoppard's Joyce beg a playful but useful question: what if a critic were to reference Stoppard's Joyce in the same way? What stops us from using *that* Joyce's words about the relationship between art and history, for example? The reason critics will reference Power's Joyce and not Stoppard's relies, as noted above, on a pact of authenticity. Power is authentic because he knew Joyce, even if fifty years previously, and the critic is then not only authentic in referencing him but also reaffirming Power's authenticity through the act of citation. That agreement, to give faith to the written Joyces of a Power or a Budgen, contains within it a reiteration of criticism's continuous seeking of the author's authority and ceaseless investment in a link between the life and the work. This search is hard to avoid, and can be difficult to identify. My own use of Samuel Butler's Homeric theory in chapter three, for example, is in part authorised by previous Joycean critics – those critics in turn were authorised by Stanislaus Joyce, who 'kindly informed' the critic W. B. Stanford that *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey'* was important to his brother.<sup>40</sup> In chapter five I reference the authorially-provided schematic colour of 'Lotus

---

<sup>40</sup> Kenner, among many others, references this in *Joyce's Voices*, 111. W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 276, fn. 6.

Eaters'. Even my reliance in this thesis on etymologies could be read as authorised by Joyce: his fascination with words is detailed in many texts, including in the caricatured 'Joyce Stripped Naked in the Piazza'.<sup>41</sup>

There remains, however, an identifiable instability to these written Joyces. They are products of writing, like 'scores' of inferred, critically written Homers – and could thus be treated as if as unstable as text: each being temporarily altered by acts of reading. In 'Joyce the Verb' Fritz Senn clarifies 'Reading Joyce (you see, we use the name but don't mean the person)'<sup>42</sup> – yet when reading Joyce's texts, Joyce the 'event', there is often a reading of the person, the author. Readings of Joyce the author and Joyce the biographical man do have an impact on critical readings of Joyce's texts, and thus are a part of them; one more, further way in which asking how we read the text involves asking how we read the author. The characters presented by Budgen, Ellmann, Power, and Stoppard are also readings of Joyce – his life and texts. Jacques Derrida argues in 'Two Words' against the phrase 'reading Joyce': the idea of 'having "read" Joyce' amuses him, and he suggests instead that we 'stay on the edge of reading Joyce'.<sup>43</sup> Derek Attridge, meanwhile, in 'Reading Joyce' describes the 'pleasures' which 'rely on qualities of inexplicability, unpredictability, inexhaustibility'.<sup>44</sup> As textual constructions, are the Joyces of memoir, biography, and anecdote as constantly in flux as the Joyce of *Travesties*, as the text of *Ulysses*? Are the Joyces of literary criticism? We cannot reconstruct a complete Joyce, cannot finish reading him, nor fix a permanent image of him. Discussing the author is to discuss instabilities: we must attempt to perceive and pick apart a layering of acts of reading and writing, all of which are positioned in changeable relation to one another. Happily, we are prepared for this by *Ulysses* – more than ready to understand conclusions are malleable, to conclude understandings are temporary, and to enjoy how the strength and usefulness of both are enhanced by their mutability.

---

<sup>41</sup> Or do I take my authority for the relevance of etymological analysis from Roland Barthes, from his continued references to the metaphorical roots of the word 'text'? Or from Fritz Senn's etymological readings?

<sup>42</sup> Fritz Senn, 'Joyce the Verb', in *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995), 7-34 (9).

<sup>43</sup> Jacques Derrida, 'Two Words for Joyce', in *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, ed. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 145-58 (149-50).

<sup>44</sup> Derek Attridge, 'Reading Joyce', in *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*, ed. Attridge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1-30 (2).

## Conclusion

In a history of changing attitudes towards the author, Roland Barthes' essays 'The Death of the Author' and 'From Work to Text' constitute the most extreme movement away from the author as either arbiter of meaning or source of authority. They also most explicitly emphasise the importance of the reader and of the text, and explore the potential relationships between reader, text, and author. These essays pit author against reader, phrasing the authority of each as mutually exclusive: the open, limitless text can have no author. They also describe modes of reading and qualities of text which strongly resonate with *Ulysses*. The ways in which *Ulysses* draws attention to our activity of reading, and the involvement of Joyce in the novel's reception, have made Joyce studies a highly self-reflexive field, and one which has variously pre-empted questions later explored by literary theorists in the 1960s and 1970s. Discussing how to read *Ulysses* became an inescapable aspect of Ulyssean criticism at a very early stage in its reception, and the question of how to read the author is caught up in questions of how to read the text. In part through authorially-authorized studies, Joyce ensured that a key enquiry of early criticism was how one should handle the novel's intertextual relationship with the *Odyssey*. This enquiry has fallen in and out of fashion, and the far-reaching effects of how *Ulysses* rewrites not only the *Odyssey* but also scholarly readings of Homer have been mostly overlooked. These effects create a complex web of authorial and readerly roles, strands of which confirm that explorations of authorship manifest not only in poststructuralist theory and pre-theory Joyce studies, but in both Homeric scholarship and the Homeric games of *Ulysses*. There was, however, a sustained resistance to poststructuralist theory in Joyce studies. Anti-authorialism and the birth of the reader was given little credence and had little impact, and – curiously – several critical studies argued for a return of the author in a discipline which had never quite abandoned the author's authority. In its endless expansion, the discipline continues to overwhelmingly argue against any notion that one reading of *Ulysses* is correct; advocating a freedom of reading that somehow coexists with an ongoing reliance on authorial authority. This contradiction has arisen in response to the way in which *Ulysses* makes us read, but it is also pre-figured within that activity of reading. Reading *Ulysses* puts the reader in an active and creative role, while also highlighting the uncanny talents of its author. In reading *Ulysses*, however, we create our readerly authority. We can also create an author, one not unrelated to the author described in anecdotal works of biography: informed by and informing such constructions of the biographical author. We can thus view the author not as an authoritative source of meaning, but as an unstable part or product of our reading. The limitless text and the author coexist, comprehended in our reading.

In the introduction to this thesis, I looked briefly at the ways in which other modern literature has explored questions of authorship. I returned to this focus in the third chapter,

arguing for the fictive potential of the Homeric Question, and again in the last chapter's reading of textual representations of Joyce. By emphasising the capacity of fiction to both prompt and answer challenges to received notions of the relationships between author, reader, and text, this thesis responds directly to any limitation of such discussions to theoretical or philosophical spheres – as seen, for example, in Seán Burke's *The Death and Return of the Author*. However, it was necessary to begin this thesis with a chapter focusing on theoretical and critical shifts in how the author has been understood, and how this has affected understandings of the reader's role, the properties of texts, and the interconnections between all three. This was both to contextualise Barthes' anti-authorialism within an ongoing shifting debate, and conversely to in a way remove it from its context – to be free to then allow elements of it to chime with a number of observations. Following thus the request for playful, open reading, I have been able to compare aspects of anti-authorialism with the work of pre-poststructuralist and anti-theory Joyceans, and with straight-faced and tongue-in-cheek Homeric scholars; with the ways in which we read texts without authors, and texts which exalt their author; and with *Ulysses* itself. This has developed an argument begun in that first chapter: that Barthes' death of the author is still a relevant site of inquiry for literary studies today.

As an almost caricatured piece of literary theory, my emphasis on the death of the author informs the pre- and post-theory hinge of chapters two and four, which together analyse the ways in which Joyce studies has engaged with questions of authorship, readership, and textuality. Chapter two focuses on three aspects of early Joyce studies: Joyce's involvement and the effects of authorially-authorised criticism, readings of Stephen Dedalus as Joyce, and the habits of Joycean criticism which resulted from each. Criticism of *Ulysses* quickly became as much about how to read the text as it was about the text itself, and, as criticism is in part an act of reading, became self-reflexive. It grew into a discipline with a corrective urge yet an openness to multiplicity, traits which we can trace back to the reception of the Homeric in *Ulysses* and Joyce's own role in that reception. Joyce studies' treatment of the *Odyssey* in *Ulysses* has ramifications in terms of the author, as well as for critic and reader. At a Symposium in Utrecht, I was once told there 'is nothing more to say' about *Ulysses*' relationship with the *Odyssey*. By pulling at an intertextual link many think fully explicated, chapter three is a close reading in retaliation to such an idea and the attitudes it reveals. Finding Samuel Butler's *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey'* and its response to Homeric scholarship between 'Eumaeus' and the *Odyssey* exposes ways in which the episode plays with oral and written performances of narrative and of authorship. Authorially-seeking Homeric scholarship is rewritten in *Ulysses*, and that rewriting is completed by our activity of reading: our efforts are the echo, as we mimic a creative mode of author-less reading which searches for and constructs an author.

The third chapter discusses how Barthes' descriptions of text and reading resonate with the text and reading of *Ulysses*' interactions with the *Odyssey*. Though the chapter also emphasises how poststructuralist theory is only one manifestation of questions of how author, reader, and text function, the relevance of Barthes' work sets up the focuses of chapter four. Beginning the second half of the thesis yet reaching back to its partner chapter two, it continues to assert that Joyce studies has always asked and provoked questions about the author-reader-text relationship. One way in which it has done so is in its disjointed reception of poststructuralism and other literary theoretical approaches. By paying attention to this reception, focusing on the debate surrounding the notion that deconstruction is a Joycean activity – that Jacques Derrida claims would not be possible without Joyce – and on the similarities between theoretically-aligned and -opposed critics, I develop my argument of a contradiction in Joyce studies. The boom of criticism and ever-growing variety of approaches give credence to the explicit statements of many Joyceans warning against critical works which attempt to be the correct reading of *Ulysses*, the best and final – or any works which try to deal in definite statements about the novel. Yet Joyceans-past have vociferously asserted that certain theoretical approaches are wrong (even where those approaches also proclaim the impossibility of final readings), and continued to seek authorial authority. Furthermore, the current and strong turn to politically, historically, and biographically informed criticism suggests that, at certain times, there are 'wrong' and 'right' ways to read *Ulysses*. In each shift in Joyce studies, in each book, chapter, article, or paper, the critic makes a choice of how to read the relationship between author, reader, and text. These generally go unnoticed, let alone explored, and even studies focusing on or touching upon issues of authorship can overlook the implications of their own critical modes and tendencies. Questions prompted by this relationship are thus everywhere in Joyce studies, but the field has missed its own contradictory attitudes towards the author and ceased to ask what causes them.

Chapter five is my response to this unexplored area, returning once more to a close reading of the text of *Ulysses*, and a close reading of how we read it. Chapter three examined the unknown suggested by a misplaced '(sic)', which referred back to 'Calypso' and the word 'metempsychosis'. It is to 'Calypso' that chapter five also returns to investigate the ways in which *Ulysses* prompts us to read. I argue that the novel provokes limitless, authorless reading, where the reader gains authority in their active, creative endeavours. By then bringing 'Wandering Rocks' into a discussion of narrative games, the chapter asks how the ways in which *Ulysses* gives authority to the reader, and demands we test the limits of our reading, also glorify the author. Again, the reading and the text resonate with Barthes' descriptions of both, but the 'birth of the reader' is not 'at the cost of the death of the author'. In chapter three I read a 'birth' of the reader strangely in the service of finding an author; in my arguments of chapter five, through the birth of the reader the author is not only located but deified. A

freedom of author-less reading and a god-like genius author co-exist within the text we create while reading *Ulysses*, and through this fecundly unstable text we derive authority. Though in some ways adjacent to the main argument of this thesis, my final chapter brings together conclusions of one through five. In particular, through its analysis of the biographical Joyce in Joyce studies via the fictional Joyce in *Travesties*, it plays with the notion that we the readers construct the author. Referring back to performances of authorship and creative author-hunting discussed in chapter three, and the suggestion that convenient versions of the author are crafted to suit a critic's purposes, chapter six proposes that for the reader or critic all Joyces are text-based. They are thus unstable, flexible, and in crucial part formed by our activity of reading. Biographical Joyces are also constructions, and therefore are figures in flux rather than an unarguable permanence. This argument takes a concept and tests it: that there is a particular mode of reading which *Ulysses* prompts, and that it is one which ignores boundaries, chronology, and perceived hierarchies of authority – thus gaining its own creativity and authority.

Perhaps I get carried away in chapter six: it is after all an exercise in how audacious a reading of the author can be (and as the thesis title suggests, I find contrariness useful). But creative reading is a response to *Ulysses*, and in our activity of reading we complete a fertile aspect of its rewriting of the *Odyssey* and perform the final steps of forming a genius author. Questions about our role as readers, the role of the author, and how both interact with the text have always been present in Joyce studies – along with their resultant contradictions. These questions are formed by our reading, and are therefore not exactly *in Ulysses*, but rather present in the text and intertexts we create when reading. The extent to which we refer to the author's authority is therefore determined by us. In an Ithacan mode, the Joyce of *Travesties* asks Tristan Tzara to answer a question while 'Grasping at any opportunity for paradox as might occur'.<sup>1</sup> There are several more paradoxes in this thesis, as in *Ulysses* conflicting opposites can be simultaneously true. Joyce studies decrees against the notion of there being a single correct reading of *Ulysses*, but is implicitly striving towards it. The return of the author has been argued for in a scholarly field which has always worshipped its author. Critics against theory produce theory-esque arguments, making theoretical criticism both highly relevant and irrelevant. There are elements of anti-authorialism in *Ulysses*, which point at their author and are themselves authored. Furthermore, a birth of the reader caused by the death of the author allows a mode of reading not dissimilar from one enabled by a belief in a god-like, genius, all-knowing author. These paradoxes are not an escape, a way to avoid decisions or conclusions. In its contradictions a paradox is an incitement to creativity and openness, and thus highly

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom Stoppard, *Travesties* (London: Faber, 1975), 57.

appropriate to the topic of this thesis – to questions which arise from the text the reader writes in reading, and are thus significant to *Ulysses*.

These paradoxes are also facets of my response to the opening questions of this thesis, of this research formed through readings of *Ulysses*, criticism, and reading itself. The novel encourages a reader to question the authority of an author by emphasising the reader's activity and the text's intertextuality and openness. It draws attention to the reader's role through an intertext of Homeric scholarship, through the difficulties caused by the ways in which characters' thoughts are narrated, and by ensuring that 'how to read *Ulysses*' is a constant query for both reader and critic. These effects work together by both undermining and affirming the author's skill and authority. Revisiting the Homeric intertextuality of *Ulysses* is germane to questions of authorship and readership for several reasons. The reception of that intertextuality prompted several key traits of Joyce studies, including its corrective urge. The interaction of 'Eumaeus' with the *Odyssey* and the Homeric Question makes the reader mimic authorially-seeking Homeric scholars, and this reveals a way in which we as readers create further intertextual echoes through our activity of reading. Questions of the roles and relationship of author, reader, and text have been inconsistently acknowledged and responded to in Joyce studies, despite the self-awareness of the field. Joyce studies is complexly and significantly involved in the upkeep of the genius author. This author-centric scholarly environment affects reading and criticism by undermining particular theory-aligned critical responses, keeping biography consistently important to criticism throughout a number of critical shifts, and providing critics with a god-like author with whom to authorise their own readings. Despite this, Barthesian anti-authorialism is pertinent to *Ulysses* as it describes both how we read and the text itself, and resonates curiously with aspects of Joycean criticism. It is possible that questions such as these have been put on a back burner in the field not only because of general changes in interest and focus, or of the unfashionableness of poststructuralism, but also because of the strength of the author's perceived authority and of the critic-authors who invoke it, affirm it, and are invested in it.

Answering the final questions which opened this thesis requires more grasping at paradox. Is *Ulysses* a special case, an unusual text? It is, in that it is an exaggeration of text demanding an exaggerated mode of reading and thus dragging the implicit out into the open. But in this, it is not, as it thus shares qualities inherent to any text and any reading. So, are the questions *Ulysses* prompts of author, reader, and text relevant to the wider literary field? And if so, how? The specificities of *Ulysses*, its idiosyncrasies and excesses and difficulties, are what makes it relevant to any literary encounter. The complexity of the text, its overt intertextuality, its style of narrative, its extra-textual authorial hints, and its adoring critics are extremes of the norm: all literary texts are formed of networks of associations, and previous texts, all require us to navigate narrative in order to grasp character and event. Many carry

authorial advice and commentary on book-jackets, in introductions, collections of letters, interviews in newspapers, or even social media – and those that do not are marked for that lack. Critics will seek these comments out, and in varying degrees determined by fame, celebrity, and canonical status, critics will establish the significance of the link between the texts and the name of their author. These exaggerations contained in the pages of *Ulysses* and formed by our responses to it are what makes it more broadly relevant: its extremes of text, reader, and author. *Ulysses* and our reading of it make the inherent apparent, how all texts are formed of other texts, all readings are creative, and yet all authors have authority, and how – as confirmed by criticism and popular culture – we continue to be fascinated by the link between an author’s life and work. Reading *Ulysses* is an activity germane to any literary encounter because it draws attention to how we read and how that relates to our notions of the author; it is relevant because it raises questions which have been left in the background of literary studies, and affirms their continuing significance. My answer to those questions is that there can be something of a reversal, where a co-existence of author and reader is possible without reinforcing a hierarchy of author over reader, and where the author is in part created by the reader, and given a role or an authority of her choosing. Whether one agrees with this suggestion or not, the role of the author remains an important site of inquiry in literary criticism.

My approach to this site of inquiry, interrogating the activity of reading, properties of text, and habits of criticism, could be a fruitful way to explore newer types of critical authorship in Joyce studies. Collaborative digital projects, such as online annotated texts and online ‘text hackathons’, have implications for another canonical authorial figure: the Joyce Critic. Amanda Visconti’s *Infinite Ulysses* was a (just recently archived) online open annotation project, and is unlikely to be the last such endeavour.<sup>2</sup> Creating a way in which anyone can annotate text raises intriguing questions: who moderates? Who has the authority to curb, correct, or delete annotations – and by what criteria? A hypertext of critical readings of *Ulysses* could take us by a series of clicks down a rabbit hole of source texts, or back through layers of critical debates over a certain word or passage. Would open access to this sort of resource devalue the role and authority of academic critic? It is not inconceivable that if any reader could contribute annotations, their value could be assessed in clicks – or ‘likes’. A very different practice of digital criticism forms yet further challenges: ‘text hackathons’ are large, communal sessions (often lasting days) in which participants use the methods of data analysis to interrogate all manner of texts. This mode of analysis is described in the

---

<sup>2</sup> Amanda Visconti, *Infinite Ulysses* <<http://infiniteulysses.com/>> [accessed 15<sup>th</sup> December 2017]. The site was archived in October 2017.

advertisement of a recent event as ‘extracting knowledge’.<sup>3</sup> Huge volumes of online texts – including works of literature – are treated as datasets, and mined using search tools and analytic programs. Is this a form of reading? How will results be received by literary critics? Could this work be done by an algorithm? Text hackathons cultivate a sense of subversion: they are modelled after web hackathons, and pointedly challenge norms. These projects raise questions of ownership – owning text, but also owning interpretation – and of how critical analysis involves a tension between individual and collaborative work. These digital responses to literature suggest new modes of author, critic, or reader – website designer, moderator, annotator, text hacker – which similarly rely on concepts of creativity and authority.

New methods respond to the old, developing and altering, or simply adding more resources, more options. In non-sequential fits and starts, this thesis has described authorship as a changeable mode: my readings of *Ulysses* have led me to flashpoints in the development of the author of contemporary culture. In ‘Eumaeus’, for example, I find the transition from oral to written composition and transcription, but I also find a phase of absolute division between nineteenth century classical scholars, split over their interpretations of ‘Homer’. In ‘Calypso’ and ‘Wandering Rocks’ my readings enacted a debate over two extreme understandings of the author, aping twentieth century challenges to the author question. I have been prompted to read and reference readings of the end of literary patronage, the shift towards intellectual property, modernist modes of celebrity, the death of the author, the return of the author, and the author on Twitter. Querying the author-reader-text triad, as I have, emphasises these re-modellings: this is one way in which this thesis highlights the import of diving into layered histories of notions, readings, challenges, and retreats. This practice could be as useful for readings which attempt to pay the author no heed, as it would be for readings in which the biographical author is highly important. An identity-related approach, for example, could be strengthened by an analysis of how the biographical author to whom they refer has been formed by the first readers of the work and the life. Historical and political forms of criticism could benefit too from interrogating how the relationships between author, reader, and text have informed their sources. Continuing to analyse how a reader interacts with an author could therefore create a bridge between approaches which are usually deemed to be polar opposites. Querying the relationships between author, reader, and text is relevant to readings for which context is unimportant, and to readings in which context is crucial: all involve inherent presumptions about such relationships, and research in either mode could be richer for paying attention to those fundamental attitudes.

---

<sup>3</sup> Gabriel Egan, ‘Text Hackathon’. This is a call for participants at an event held at De Montfort University, 10<sup>th</sup> November to 12<sup>th</sup> November 2017. <<http://cts.dmu.ac.uk/events/hackathon/>> [accessed 11<sup>th</sup> September 2017].

This is one way in which the importance of this research reaches beyond Joycean criticism to literary studies in general, as it deals with issues common to the study of any text. These issues are also pertinent beyond literature: the creation and reception of any artform raises equivalent questions. Debates by cultural commentators, for instance, over how to approach the ties between the life and work of an artist, author, film director, or producer are a very current illustration of how unsettled – and how unsettling – questions of authorship can be (though with a very different emphasis from the explorations of this thesis). The Joycean implications, meanwhile, of my readings and conclusions revolve around critical self-awareness: continuing to re-ask old questions about how we turn to, construct, or ignore the author; analysing what the authorial implications are for how we view the fabric of *Ulysses*' text; preserving Joyce studies as a place where no correct reading exists; and exploring what we can achieve when reading in the way *Ulysses* encourages us to read. Unpicking an episode, passage, sentence, word, is no mere pettifoggery; nor is returning to the formation of critical responses anything to do with a desire to seek historical curiosities. Those earlier encounters are present in our own, and returning to them is thus a way of asking how we read *now*. It is no more possible for there to be one reading of the author than for there to be one reading of *Ulysses*; nor a single way to read the interactions of author, reader, and text.

## **Bibliography**

- Abrams, M. H., *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971)
- Ackroyd, Peter, *Notes for a New Culture* (London: Alkin Books, 1993)
- Adair, Gilbert, *The Death of the Author* (New York: Melville House, 2008)
- Altieri, Charles, 'Modernist Innovations: A Legacy of the Constructed Reader', in *Modernism*, eds. Ástráður Eysteinnsson and Vivian Liska (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007)
- Attridge, Derek, 'Criticism's Wake', in *The Augmented Ninth, Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium, Frankfurt 1984*, ed. Bernard Benstock (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988), 80-7
- *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- *Peculiar Language: Literature as Difference from the Renaissance to James Joyce* (London: Methuen, 1988)
- 'Signature/Countersignature: Derrida's Response to *Ulysses*', in *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Andrew J. Mitchell and Sam Slote (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), 265-80
- ed., *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- ed., *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Casebook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Attridge, Derek, and Daniel Ferrer, eds., *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- Axelrod, Mark, *Borges' Travel, Hemingway's Garage: Secret Histories* (Normal and Tallahassee: Fiction Collective Two, 2004)
- Ayto, John, *Word Origins: The Hidden Histories of English Words from A to Z*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (London: A&C Black, 2005)
- Baldick, Chris, *Criticism and Literary Theory from 1890 to the Present* (London: Longman, 1996)
- Banville, John, 'Survivors of Joyce', in *James Joyce: The Artist and the Labyrinth*, ed. Augustine Martin (London: Ryan, 1990), 73-81
- Barger, Jorn, 'Review: *Probes: Genetic Studies in Joyce*. European Joyce Studies 5 by David Hayman, Sam Slote', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Spring, 1997), 389-93
- Barker, Egbert J., *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005)

- Baron, Scarlett, 'Hoaxville: Reading Perec Reading Joyce', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 'Joycean Avant-Gardes', guest eds. Catherine Flynn and Richard Brown, vol. 52, no. 2 (Winter 2015), 367-412
- *'Strandentwining Cable': Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Barthes, Roland, 'The Death of the Author', in *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), 142-8
- 'From Work to Text', in *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), 155-64
- 'From *Writing Degree Zero*', trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith, in *A Barthes Reader*, ed. Susan Sontag (London: Vintage, 2000)
- *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977)
- 'On Reading', in *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 33-43
- *The Pleasure of the Text*, trans. Richard Miller (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990)
- *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989)
- *S/Z*, trans. Richard Howard (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990)
- 'Writing Reading', in *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 29-32
- Bayard, Pierre, *How to Talk About Books You Haven't Read*, trans. Jeffrey Mehlman (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007)
- Beckett, Samuel, et al, *Our Examination Round his Factification for Incamination of 'Work in Progress'* (London: Faber, 1961)
- Beja, Morris, and Shari Benstock, eds., *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989)
- Benjamin, Walter, 'The Author as Producer', in *Understanding Brecht*, trans. Anna Bostock (London: Verso, 1998), 85-103
- *One-way Street and Other Writings*, trans. J. A. Underwood (London: Penguin, 2009)
- Benstock, Bernard, 'The Fabulous Voyaging of Richard M. Kain', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 8-22
- *Narrative Con/Texts in Joyce* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991)
- ed., *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth, Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium, Frankfurt 1984* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988)
- Bersani, Leo, 'Against *Ulysses*', in *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Casebook*, ed. Derek Attridge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 201-29

- Binet, Laurent, *The Seventh Function of Language*, trans. Sam Taylor (London: Harvill Secker (Vintage), 2017)
- Birriotti, Maurice and Nicola Miller, eds., *What is an Author?* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993)
- Bishop, John, *Joyce's Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986)
- Boheemen-Saaf, Christine van, 'Joyce in Theory/Theory in Joyce', in *James Joyce*, ed. Sean Latham (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2010), 153-69
- *Joyce, Derrida, Lacan, and the Trauma of History: Reading, Narrative, and Postcolonialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- Boldrini, Lucia, *Joyce, Dante, and the Poetics of Literary Relations: Language and Meaning in 'Finnegans Wake'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria, and Franca Ruggieri, eds., *The Benstock Library as Mirror of Joyce*, Joyce Studies in Italy 7 (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2002)
- Borges, Jorge Luis, *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*, ed. James E. Irby and Donald A. Yates (London: Penguin, 2000)
- Brannon, Julie Sloan, *Who Reads 'Ulysses'? The Rhetoric of the Joyce Wars and the Common Reader* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003)
- Braun, Rebecca, *Constructing Authorship in the Work of Günter Grass* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Briggs, Austin, 'Breakfast at 7 Eccles Street: Oufs Sacher-Masoch?', in *Joyce in Trieste: An Album of Risky Readings*, ed. Sebastian D. G. Knowles, Geert Lernout, and John McCourt (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007), 195-209
- Bristow, Daniel, *Joyce and Lacan: Reading, Writing, and Psychoanalysis* (Oxford: Routledge, 2017)
- Brivic, Sheldon, *The Veil of Signs: Joyce, Lacan, and Perception* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991)
- Brooker, Joseph, *Joyce's Critics: Transitions in Reading and Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004)
- Bruni, Alessandro Francini, 'Joyce Stripped Naked in the Piazza', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 2, Joyce Reminiscences Issue (Winter, 1977), 127-59
- Budgen, Frank, *James Joyce and The Making of 'Ulysses'* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961)
- Burke, Seán, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008)
- ed., *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995)

- Butcher, S.H., and A. Lang, *The Odyssey of Homer Done into English Prose* (London: Macmillan, 1924)
- Butler, Christopher, 'Joyce and the Displaced Author', in *James Joyce and Modern Literature*, ed. W. J. McCormack and Alison Stead (London: Routledge, 1982), 56-76
- Butler, Samuel, *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey': Where and when she wrote, who she was, the use she made of the 'Iliad', and how the poem grew under her hand*, ed. Tim Whitmarsh (Bristol: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2003)
- *The Authoress of the 'Odyssey': Where and when she wrote, who she was, the use she made of the 'Iliad', and how the poem grew under her hand* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1922, republished by Forgotten Books, 2008)
- Cahalan, James M, "'Dear Reader" and "Drear Writer": Joyce's Direct Addresses to His Readers in *Finnegans Wake*', *Twentieth Century Literature*, vol. 41, no. 3 (Autumn 1995), 306-18
- Castle, Gregory, 'James Joyce, *Ulysses*', in *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 272-4
- Caughie, John, ed., *Theories of Authorship* (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981)
- Cixous, Hélène, 'At Circe's, or, the Self-Opener', in *Early Postmodernism: Foundational Essays*, ed. Paul Bové (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), 387-97
- *The Exile of James Joyce*, trans. Sally A. J. Purcell (London: Calder, 1976)
- *Readings: The Poetics of Blanchot, Joyce, Kafka, Kleist, Lispector, and Tsvetayeva*, trans. and ed. Verena Andermatt Conley (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991)
- Claiborne Park, Clara, 'Author! Author! Reconstructing Roland Barthes', *The Hudson Review*, vol. 43, no. 3 (1990-1), 377-98
- Clarke, Austin, "'Stephen Dedalus": The Author of *Ulysses*', in *Reviews and Essays of Austin Clarke*, ed. Gregory A Schirmer, *Irish Literary Studies* 40 (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1995), 43-5
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein, eds., *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991)
- Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961)
- Conley, Tim, *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003)
- Connor, Stephen, 'Authorship, Authority, and Self-Reflection in Joyce and Beckett', in *Re:Joyce'n Beckett*, ed. Phyllis Carey and Ed Jewinski (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992), 147-59

- Cosgrove, Brian, *James Joyce's Negations: Irony, Indeterminacy and Nihilism in 'Ulysses' and Other Writings* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2007)
- Culler, Jonathan, *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983)
- Davies, Stan Gébler, *James Joyce: A Portrait of the Artist* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1975)
- Derrida, Jacques, *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge (New York and London: Routledge, 1992)
- 'Signature Event Context', trans. Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman, *Glyph 1* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), 180-1
- 'Two Words for Joyce', in *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, ed. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 145-58
- 'Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce', trans. Tina Kendall, rev. Shari Benstock, in *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 253-309
- 'Ulysses Gramophone', trans. François Raffoul, in *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Andrew J. Mitchell and Sam Slote (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), 41-86
- Dettmar, Kevin J. H., *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996)
- Diepeveen, Leonard, *The Difficulties of Modernism* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003)
- Donovan, Stephen, Danuta Fjellestad, and Rolf Lundén, eds., *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008)
- Dunleavy, Janet Egleson, ed., *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991)
- Ebury, Katherine, *Modernism and Cosmology: Absurd Lights* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
- Eliot, T. S., *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber, 1975)
- Ellmann, Richard, *James Joyce: New and Revised Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)
- '*Ulysses*' on the Liffey (London: Faber, 1972)
- Enos, Theresa, 'Reports of the 'Author's' Death May Be Greatly Exaggerated but the 'Writer' Lives on in the Text', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 4, Essays in Honor of George Yoos (Autumn, 1990), 339-46
- Epstein, E.L., 'The Irrelevant Narrator: A Stylistic Note on the Place of the Author in Contemporary Technique of the Novel', *Language and Style*, vol. 2, no. 1 (Winter 1969), 92-4

- Erwin, John W., *Annunciations to Anyone: The Disclosure of Authority in Writing and Painting* (New York: Peter Lang, 1990)
- Flack, Leah Culligan, *Modernism and Homer: The Odysseys of H.D., James Joyce, Osip Mandelstam, and Ezra Pound* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Folkenflik, Robert, 'The Artist as Hero in the Eighteenth Century', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 12 (1982), 91-108
- Fordham, Finn, *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unravelling Universals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Foucault, Michel, *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977)
- Fowler, Robert, 'The Homeric Question', in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Robert Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 220-32
- Frank, Joseph, 'Spatial Form in Modern Literature', in *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*, ed. Michael J Hoffman and Patrick D. Murphy, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005), 61-73
- Fraser, James Alexander, *Joyce and Betrayal* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016)
- French, Marilyn, *The Book as World: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1976)
- Friedman, Susan Stanford, 'Weavings: Intertextuality and the (Re)Birth of the Author', in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 146-80
- Gallix, Andrew, 'Roland Barthes' challenge to biography', *Guardian*, 14<sup>th</sup> August 2015, Books Blog <<https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/aug/14/roland-barthes-challenge-to-biography>> [accessed 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017]
- Gallop, Jane, *The Deaths of the Author: Reading and Writing in Time* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011)
- Gass, William H., 'The Death of the Author', *Salmagundi*, no. 65 (Fall, 1984), 3-26
- Genette, Gerard, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980)
- Gibbons, Stella, *Cold Comfort Farm* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949)
- Gilbert, Stuart, *James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (London: Faber, 1960)
- Gillespie, Michael Patrick, 'Kenner on Joyce', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 142-54
- *Reading the Book of Himself: Narrative Strategies in the Works of James Joyce* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989)

- ed., *Foundational Essays in James Joyce Studies* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011)
- Gillespie, Michael Patrick, and Paula F. Gillespie, *Recent Criticism of James Joyce's 'Ulysses': An Analytical Review* (Rochester: Camden House, 2000)
- Glass, Loren Daniel, *Authors Inc: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2004)
- Goldberg, S. L., *The Classical Temper: A Study of James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961)
- Goldman, Jonathan, 'Afterlife', in *The Cambridge Companion to 'Ulysses'*, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 33-48
- Gordon, John, 'Spot the Author', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Fall 1990), 291-2
- Graziosi, Barbara, and Emily Greenwood, eds., *Homer in the Twentieth Century: Between World Literature and the Western Canon*, ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Graziosi, Barbara, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Gross, John, *Joyce* (London: Fontana/Collins, 1971)
- Haas, Lidija, 'Roland Barthes: "Author, I'm Sorry"', *Telegraph*, 12<sup>th</sup> November 2015 <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/books/what-to-read/roland-barthes-centenary-death-of-the-author/>> [accessed 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017]
- Hall, Edith, *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's 'Odyssey'* (London: I. B. Tauris and Co, 2008)
- Hart, Clive, 'Frank Budgen and the Story of the Making of *Ulysses*', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleston Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 120-30
- Hart, Clive, and David Hayman, eds., *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': Critical Essays* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974)
- Hassan, Ihab, '( ): *Finnegans Wake* and the Postmodern Imagination', in *Light Rays: James Joyce and Modernism*, ed. Heyward Ehrlich (New York: New Horizon, 1984)
- Hawthorn, Jeremy, 'Authority and the Death of the Author', in *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*, ed. Stephen Donovan, Danuta Fjellestad, and Rolf Lundén (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008), 65-88
- Hayman, David, and Sam Slote, eds., *Genetic Studies in Joyce*, European Joyce Studies 5 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995)
- Hayman, David, *'Ulysses': The Mechanics of Meaning*, Revised and Extended Edition (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982)

- Hayman, Ronald, *Contemporary Playwrights: Tom Stoppard*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (London: Heinemann, 1979)
- Herring, Phillip F., *Joyce's Uncertainty Principle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987)
- Henke, Suzette, *James Joyce and the Politics of Desire* (London: Routledge, 1990)
- Higgins, Charlotte, 'The Lost Books of the Odyssey', *Guardian*, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2010  
<<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/may/15/lost-books-odyssey-zachary-mason>> [accessed 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017]
- Hoad, T. F., ed., *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- Hollier, Denis, 'Foucault: The Death of the Author', *Raritan*, vol. 5, no. 1 (1985), 22-30
- Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. Walter Shewring (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Iser, Wolfgang, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978)
- *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974)
- 'Ulysses and the Reader: Wolfgang Iser Discusses the Importance of Ulysses in the Development of "Reader Response" Criticism', *James Joyce Broadsheet*, no. 9 (October 1982), 1-2
- Jaffe, Aaron, *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Jaffe, Aaron and Jonathan Goldman, eds., *Modernist Star Maps: Celebrity, Modernity, Culture* (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate, 2010)
- James, Clive, 'Count Zero Splits the Infinite', *Encounter*, November 1975  
<<http://www.clivejames.com/pieces/hercules/stoppard>> [accessed 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017]
- Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake* (London: Faber, 1975)
- *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (London: Penguin, 1984)
- *Ulysses* (London: The Bodley Head, 1960)
- *Ulysses*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (London: The Bodley Head, 2008)
- *Ulysses: the 1922 text*, ed. Jeri Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Kain, Richard M., *Fabulous Voyager: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947)
- Kelley, Joseph, 'A Defense of Danis Rose', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 35/36, vol. 35, no. 4 - vol. 36, no. 1 (Summer - Fall, 1998), 811-24
- Kelly, Dermot, *Narrative Strategies in 'Ulysses'* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988)

- Kenner, Hugh, *Dublin's Joyce*, Morningside Edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987)
- *Flaubert, Joyce and Beckett: The Stoic Comedians* (London: Dalkey Archive Press and Normal, 2005)
- *Joyce's Voices* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1978)
- *The Mechanical Muse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987)
- *The Pound Era* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971)
- 'Ulysses' (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980)
- Kershner, R. Brandon, 'Intertextuality', in *The Cambridge Companion to 'Ulysses'*, ed. Sean Latham (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 171-83
- Kestner, Joseph, 'Virtual Text/Virtual Reader: The Structural Signature Within, Behind, Beyond, Above', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 1/2 (Fall 1978/Winter 1979), 27-42
- Kidd, John, 'Making the Wrong Joyce', *The New York Review of Books*, 25<sup>th</sup> September 1997 <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1997/09/25/making-the-wrong-joyce/>> [accessed 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017]
- 'The Scandal of *Ulysses*', *The New York Review of Books*, 30<sup>th</sup> June 1988 <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1988/06/30/the-scandal-of-ulysses-2/>> [accessed 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017]
- Kimball, Jean, *Odyssey of the Psyche: Jungian Patterns in 'Ulysses'* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997)
- Knight, Diana, ed., *Critical Essays on Roland Barthes* (New York: G. K Hall and Co, 2000)
- Koliades, Constantine, *Ulysses Homer; or, a Discovery of the True Author of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey'* (Whitfish, Montana: Kessinger, 2010)
- Kristeva, Julia, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980)
- Lamb, Charles, *The Adventures of Ulysses*, ed. John Cook (Edinburgh: Split Pea, 1992)
- Lancaster, Ian, *Forgetful Muses: Reading the Author in the Text* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010)
- Larbaud, Valéry, 'James Joyce', in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Robert H. Deming, 2 vols. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), 252-62
- Latham, Sean, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to 'Ulysses'* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Lawrence, Karen, *The Odyssey of Style in 'Ulysses'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)

- Lernout, Geert, *The French Joyce* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990)
- Levin, Harry, *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk: New Directions, 1941)
- *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk: New Directions, 1960)
- Levine, Jennifer, 'Rejoycings in "Tel Quel"', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 1/2, 'Structuralist/Reader Response Issue' (Fall, 1978 - Winter, 1979), 17-26
- Levitt, Morton P., 'Harry Levin's James Joyce and the Modernist Age: A Personal Reading', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 90-105
- Lewis, Wyndham, *Time and Western Man* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1927)
- Litz, A. Walton, *The Art of James Joyce: Method and Design in 'Ulysses' and 'Finnegans Wake'* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961)
- 'The Genre of *Ulysses*', in *The Theory of the Novel: New Essays*, ed. John Halperin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974)
- Litz, A. Walton, Louis Menand, and Lawrence Rainey, eds., *Modernism and the New Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Loekle, Simon 'Dazibao: Senn and the Arts of Reader Maintenance', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 42/43, no. 1-4 (Fall 2004-Summer 2006), 333
- Luce, J. V., *Homer and the Heroic Age* (London: Futura, 1979)
- Lyotard, Jean-François, *The Lyotard Reader and Guide*, ed. Keith Crome and James Williams (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006)
- *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984)
- MacCabe, Colin, *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* (London: Macmillan, 1979)
- 'The Revenge of the Author', in *Subject to History: Ideology, Class, Gender*, ed. David Simpson (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991), 34-46
- 'Uneasiness in Culture', *Cambridge Review* 93, no. 2208 (2<sup>nd</sup> June 1972), 174-7
- Mahaffey, Vicki, *Reauthorizing Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- Mahon, Peter, *Imagining Joyce and Derrida: Between Finnegans Wake and Glas* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2007)
- Mason, Zachary, *The Lost Books of the 'Odyssey'* (London: Vintage, 2011)
- McArthur, Murray, 'The Example of Joyce: Derrida Reading Joyce', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2 (Winter 1995), 227-41
- McCarthy, Patrick A., 'Stuart Gilbert's Guide to the Perplexed', in *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 23-35
- McCourt, John, ed., *James Joyce in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

- McKeon, Michael, 'Writer as Hero: Novelistic Prefigurations and the Emergence of Literary Biography', in *Contesting the Subject: Essays in the Postmodern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Criticism*, ed. William H. Epstein (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1991), 17-41
- Melaney, William D., ed., *After Ontology: Literary Theory and Modernist Poetics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001)
- Milesi, Laurent, ed., *James Joyce and the Difference of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Miller, Nancy K., 'Arachnologies: The Woman, The Text, and the Critic', in *The Poetics of Gender*, ed. Nancy K. Miller (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 270-95
- Moriarty, Michael, *Roland Barthes* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991)
- Morris, Daniel, 'Review of *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain*, Kevin J. H. Dettmar', *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 43, no. 4 (Winter 1997), 1030-3
- Mullin, Katherine, *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Myrsiades, Kostas, ed., *Reading Homer: Film and Text* (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 2009)
- Nabokov, Vladimir, *Lectures on Literature*, ed. Fredson Bowes, intro. John Updike (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980)
- Nagy, Gregory, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975)
- Nash, John, *James Joyce and the Act of Reception: Reading, Ireland, Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- ed., *Joyce's Audiences*, European Joyce Studies 14 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002)
- Nehamas, Alexander, 'What an Author Is', *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 83, no. 11, Eighty-Third Annual Meeting American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division (November, 1986), 685-91
- Nicholson, Adam, *The Mighty Dead: Why Homer Matters* (London: William Collins, 2014)
- Nolan, Emer, "'Who's he when he's at home?": Re-reading Joyce and Modernism', *Modernism/modernity*, vol. 12, no. 3 (2005), 505-9
- Norris, Margot, *The Decentred Universe of Finnegans Wake: A Structuralist Analysis* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976)
- 'Review: *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 3 (Spring, 1986), 365-70
- *Virgin and Veteran Readings of 'Ulysses'* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)
- Novillo-Corvalán, Patricia, *Borges and Joyce: An Infinite Conversation* (London: Legenda, 2011)

- O'Brien, Flann, *Stories and Plays* (New York, Penguin, 1977)
- O'Muirithe, Lara May, 'Interview with Fritz Senn', *New Dublin Press*, June 15<sup>th</sup> 2014  
 <<http://newdublin-press-old.squarespace.com/updates/fritz-senn>> [accessed 16<sup>th</sup> December 2017]
- Osteen, Mark, 'Review: *James Joyce and Critical Theory*, Alan Roughley', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 30/31 (Summer – Fall, 1993), 909-12
- Page, Denys, *The Homeric 'Odyssey'* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955)
- Parrinder, Patrick, *The Failure of Theory: Essays on Criticism and Contemporary Fiction* (Brighton: Harvester, 1987)
- Peake, C. H., *James Joyce: The Citizen and the Artist* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977)
- Peretz, Evgenia, 'James Frey's Morning After', *Vanity Fair*, June 2008  
 <<https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2008/06/frey200806>> [accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017]
- Pierce, David, *Reading Joyce* (Harlow: Pearson, 2008)
- Platt, Len, *James Joyce: Texts and Contexts* (London: Continuum, 2011)
- Porter, James I., 'Homer: The History of an Idea', in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Robert Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 324-43
- Pound, Ezra, *Early Writings: Poems and Prose*, ed. Ira B. Nadel (London: Penguin, 2005)
- Power, Arthur, 'Conversations with Joyce', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Fall, 1965), 41-9
- *Conversations with James Joyce*, ed. Clive Hart (London: Millington, 1974)
- Power, Mary, 'The Discovery of "Ruby"', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Winter, 1981), 115-21
- Pucci, Pietro, *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987)
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel, 'James Joyce (1882-1941): Theories of Literature', in *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Modern Criticism and Theory*, ed. Julian Wolfreys (New York: Continuum, 2002), 673-80
- *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991)
- 'The Joyce of French Theory', in *A Companion to James Joyce*, ed. Richard Brown (Malden: Blackwell, 2008), 254-69
- Rawes, Alan, and Jonathon Shears, eds., *Reading, Writing and the Influence of Harold Bloom* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010)
- Remnick, David, 'The War Over Ulysses', *Washington Post*, 2<sup>nd</sup> April 1985  
 <[https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1985/04/02/the-war-over-ulysses/5bc5964b-0486-4005-beb7-1e56e36590d2/?utm\\_term=.0245708ccace](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1985/04/02/the-war-over-ulysses/5bc5964b-0486-4005-beb7-1e56e36590d2/?utm_term=.0245708ccace)>  
 [accessed 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017]

- Ridgeway, Ann, 'Two Authors in Search of a Reader', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 4 (Summer 1964), 41-51
- Riquelme, John Paul, *Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983)
- Robillard, Amy E., and Ron Fortune, eds., *Authorship Contested: Cultural Challenges to the Authentic, Autonomous Author* (New York and London: Routledge, 2015)
- Rose, Steve, 'JT LeRoy unmasked: the extraordinary story of a modern literary hoax', *Guardian*, 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016 <<https://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/jul/20/jt-leroy-story-modern-literary-hoax>> [accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017]
- Roughley, Alan, *James Joyce and Critical Theory: An Introduction* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991)
- *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999)
- Saint-Amour, Paul K., *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003)
- 'Review: James Joyce and the Difference of Language by Laurent Milesi', *South Atlantic Review*, vol. 70, no. 1 (Winter, 2005), 189-93
- Sandulescu, C. George, and Clive Hart, eds., *Assessing the 1984 'Ulysses'* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1986)
- Sartiliot, Claudette, *Citation and Modernity: Derrida, Joyce, and Brecht* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993)
- Saunders, Max, *Life-writing, Autobiografiction, and the Forms of Modern Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Seidel, Michael, *Epic Geography: James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Princeton and Guilford: Princeton University Press, 1976)
- Senn, Fritz, *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput, 1995)
- *Joyce's Dislocations: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984)
- 'Letter to the Editor', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1 (Fall, 1986), 115-6
- 'Review: Prodding Nodding Joyce: The "Reader's Edition" of "Ulysses", Edited by Danis Rose: Some First Impressions', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 4 (Summer, 1997), 573-83
- *Ulyssean Close-ups* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2007)
- Skeat, Walter W., *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology* (Ware: Wordsworth, 2007)
- Skrabanek, Peter, 'Finnegans Wake – Night Joyce of a Thousand Tiers', in *The Artist and the Labyrinth*, ed. Augustine Martin (London: Ryan, 1990), 229-40

- Slote, Sam, 'Ulysses in the Plural: The Variable Editions of Joyce's Novel', *The National Library of Joyce Studies* 5 (Dublin: 2004)
- Sontag, Susan, ed., *A Barthes Reader* (London: Vintage, 2000)
- Staley, Thomas F., 'Notes and Comments', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Fall, 1965), 1-2
- Steinberg, Erwin R., 'Author! Author!', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 4 (Summer 1985), 419-25
- Steinberg, Erwin R., and Christian W. Hallstein, 'Probing Silences in Joyce's *Ulysses* and the Question of Authorial Intent', *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3 (Spring 2003), 543-54
- Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Stoppard, Tom, *Arcadia* (London: Faber, 1993)
- *Travesties* (London: Faber, 1975)
- Talbot, Mary M., and Bryan Talbot, *Dotter of her Father's Eyes* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2012)
- Thomas, Brook, *James Joyce's 'Ulysses': A Book of Many Happy Returns* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1982)
- Thurston, Luke, ed., *Re-inventing the Symptom: Essays on the Final Lacan* (London: Karnac, 2002)
- Tynan, Maeve, Maria Beville, and Marita Ryan, eds., *Passages: Movements and Moments in Text and Theory*, (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009)
- Van Caspel, Paul, *Bloomers on the Liffey: Eisegetical Readings of Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986)
- Vichnar, David, *Joyce Against Theory: James Joyce After Deconstruction* (Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 2010)
- Walker, Cheryl, 'Feminist Literary Criticism and the Author', *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 16, no. 3 (Spring, 1990), 551-71
- Wilson, Adrian, 'Foucault on the "question of the author": a critical exegesis', *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 99 no. 2 (April, 2004), 339-63
- Wilson, Edmund, *Axel's Castle* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950)
- 'James Joyce's *Ulysses*', in *The Portable Edmund Wilson*, ed. Lewis M. Dabrey (New York: Da Capo Press, 1997), 150-67
- Wolf, Friedrich August, *Prolegomena to Homer*, trans. Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and James E. G. Zetzel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985)
- Wollaeger, Mark A., 'Stephen/Joyce, Joyce/Haacke: Modernism and the Social Function of Art', *ELH*, vol. 62, no. 3 (Fall, 1995), 691-707

### Online media

*Aspen* no. 5 and 6, 'The Minimalism issue'  
<<http://www.ubu.com/aspen/aspen5and6/index.html>> [accessed 21<sup>st</sup> April 2017]

Beck, Harald, and John Simpson, *James Joyce Online Notes* <<http://www.jjon.org/joyce-words/eatondhp>> [accessed 13<sup>th</sup> December 2017]

Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*  
<<http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/about>> [accessed 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017]

Egan, Gabriel, 'Text Hackathon' <<http://cts.dmu.ac.uk/events/hackathon/>> [accessed 11<sup>th</sup> September 2017]

Frame, Douglas, 'New Light on the Homeric Question: The Phaeacians Unmasked', included in 'A virtual birthday gift presented to Gregory Nagy on turning seventy by his students, colleagues, and friends', The Centre for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University <<https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4453>> [accessed 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017]

*OED online* (Oxford University Press, June 2017) <[www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)> [accessed 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017]

Smith, Michelle, 'The "death" of J. K. Rowling: Why it doesn't matter what she has to say about Harry Potter' <<http://theconversation.com/the-death-of-j-k-rowling-why-it-doesnt-matter-what-she-has-to-say-about-harry-potter-35762>> [accessed 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017]

Visconti, Amanda, *Infinite Ulysses* <<http://infiniteulysses.com/>> [accessed 15<sup>th</sup> December 2017]

### Television

'The Modern World: Ten Great Writers: James Joyce's *Ulysses*', dir. Nigel Wattis (*BBC*, 10<sup>th</sup> January 1988)