

12-1-2012

## Archiving Joyce & Joyce's Archive: Ulysses, Finnegans Wake, and Copyright

Jessica Michelle Lucero  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, lucero.jessica@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Lucero, Jessica Michelle, "Archiving Joyce & Joyce's Archive: Ulysses, Finnegans Wake, and Copyright" (2012). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 1751.  
<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/1751>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

ARCHIVING JOYCE AND JOYCE'S ARCHIVE: *ULYSSES*, *FINNEGANS WAKE*,  
AND COPYRIGHT

By

Jessica Michelle Lucero

Bachelor of Arts and Sciences in English  
Mississippi State University  
2001

Master of Arts in English  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
2005

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

**Doctor of Philosophy in English**

**Department of English  
College of Liberal Arts  
The Graduate College**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
December 2012**



## THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

We recommend the dissertation prepared under our supervision by

Jessica Michelle Lucero

entitled

Archiving Joyce and Joyce's Archive: *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake*, and Copyright

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

### **Doctor of Philosophy in English**

Department of English

Beth Rosenberg, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Megan Becker-Leckrone, Ph.D., Committee Member

Anne Stevens, Ph.D., Committee Member

Kate Korgan, Ph.D., Graduate College Representative

Tom Piechota, Ph.D., Interim Vice President for Research &  
Dean of the Graduate College

**December 2012**

## ABSTRACT

“Archiving Joyce and Joyce’s Archive: *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake*, and Copyright” investigates the ways in which James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* incorporate archival institutions and archival modes such as gossip into its composition. For example, this work explores how both works, at times, present institutions such as the National Library of Ireland, and, at other times, enact archiving in its collection and preservation of historical personages relevant to Irish literature and history. Additionally, Joyce was involved in the construction of his own archive, and thereby becomes the curator of his own history as well as that of Ireland.

Importantly, this work also considers how copyright law is inextricably linked to any discussion of archives. Copyright is a multi-faceted, ever-changing set of laws that differs from nation to nation and therefore complicates what both scholars and archivists can do with Joyce’s—or other modernist authors’—materials. Recent debates between Joyce scholars and his Estate make Joyce an excellent case-study for this discussion, and also ensure that this work is both relevant and important to anyone interested in copyright, archives, and modernist authors.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to offer my sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee, composed of Drs. Anne Stevens, Megan Becker-Leckrone, and Kate Hausbeck Korgan, I am eternally grateful to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Beth Rosenberg, who went above and beyond the call of duty to meet with me anytime I needed her—during weekends and over holidays; without her, this project would not be possible.

I am beholden to my wonderful bosses at Black Mountain Institute: Dr. Carol C. Harter and Prof. Richard Wiley; their unwavering insistence on my completing this dissertation helped me make my deadlines. Thanks also to Maritza White, my confidant and fellow sushi-lover. The support of Suzanne Becker, Rebecca Boulton, Candace Griffith, Mark Salvaggio, and Jennifer Whitmer, aka the “Dissertation Support Group,” has likewise gotten me through all the ups-and-downs of the dissertation process.

I would also like to acknowledge the following archives, whose materials and exhibitions have informed my research: The Poetry Center at the State University of New York at Buffalo, the National Library of Ireland, and the Dublin James Joyce Centre. Additionally, participating in the International James Joyce Symposium, North American James Joyce Conference, the Modernist Studies Association Conference, and the 2010 Dublin James Joyce Summer School helped to make this project what it is today. I am also thankful to Drs. Anne Fogarty, Luca Crispi, and Vincent Cheng, whose scholarship and advice at these conferences have inspired me. My thanks also to the Graduate & Professional Student Association, the English Department at UNLV as well as the Study Abroad Scholarship also at UNLV for supporting my travel to these conferences

throughout the years. Additionally, I am thankful for the Marjorie Barrick Fellowship, which provided financial support during my research.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends and family. Many heartfelt thanks to Bliss Esposito Fattore, who first made me write my thesis statement in only one paragraph, and Ashley Embry Clark, who will always be my “Room” and whose poetry I love. I am eternally grateful to have found the love of my life, Dr. William Paul Miller, who has been my cheerleader and my light; his encouragement has kept me focused on the end-goal. Finally, I am beholden to my parents, Jay and Gabriele Lucero. I have read every chapter of this dissertation to them aloud, multiple times, and their feedback has been instrumental not only to the dissertation but throughout my entire academic career. I am truly the luckiest woman alive.

## PREFACE

As Jacques Derrida has written, we are possessed by “archive fever.” That is, there is an anxiety surrounding the collection and dissemination of archival materials. The term itself extends back to the ancient Greek term *arkheion*, which Derrida defines as “a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the *archons*, those who commanded” (2). In other words, Derrida links the archive with both the public and private sphere; the magistrates or archons of Classical Greece made, interpreted, and kept public laws in their private homes, thereby blurring the boundary between the function and representation of the archive. The term “archive” today is recognized as an archival institution, which collects and preserves various materials deemed important to the testimony of the past. Thomas Richards’ *Imperial Archives* traces this history back to the age of exploration, when exploration made it necessary for large repositories to store all the artifacts collected from abroad; the industrial revolution exploded the possibilities for the collection and dissemination of this information. With the rise of nationalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, these institutions changed again to present the past as a means of creating and sustaining a national identity. Furthermore, the rise in popularity of authors and other celebrity figures of the time instigated the donations of personal papers and manuscripts to both public and private repositories.

Both private and public archives were threatened during the onslaught of World War I and, later, World War II. It was during this period that the modernist authors residing in Europe had to make difficult decisions about what to do with their personal papers and libraries in order to keep them safe. James Joyce was one such author;

however, due to his financial circumstances and the constant moving he and his family did (even before the wars), Joyce was not in the position to have access to all of his most treasured materials; nor did he have the money necessary to ship his materials to other archival institutions. Joyce, however, was highly instrumental in influencing how his papers, notebooks, manuscripts, and books would be stored. With the help of his friends and family, many of Joyce's works were locked in trunks and kept in their homes; public libraries and institutions around the world have these benefactors to thank for the donation or sale of Joyce materials.

Given the importance of these collections to scholars and the heated debates over Joyce copyright and the purchase and sale of his collections, this history is important and relevant. Currently, the National Library of Ireland and the University at Buffalo are digitizing Joyce's collections; the choice between limited or open access is also hotly contested. Additionally, Joyce's works—like other works from authors of the modernist period—are currently falling out of copyright in most countries (Australia and the United Kingdom excluded). This re-emergence within the public domain comes at a unique time in history, where the current copyright laws in Europe, for instance, are still deciphering the latest addition to European copyright law. For all of these reasons, Joyce is an excellent case study for analyzing the construction and development of a larger modernist archive.

The modern legal definitions of copyright laws and contracts issued between institutions purchasing the rights to private collections, and those who sell them, effects scholars who wish to work with these materials. Why, one might ask, would anyone sell materials to institutions that would keep them from the public? One reason is because the

materials are deemed private—as with some of the Joyce papers, especially of letters sent by Joyce to his wife, Nora. In fact, Joyce’s archival collections—disbursed as they are throughout the world—have brought about quite a bit of controversy between a public’s right to know and the Estate’s call for privacy. And yet the Estate’s wish for privacy is only part of the problem. The Estate’s primary trustee is Stephen James Joyce, the grandson of James Joyce, and he has taken it upon himself to conflate issues of privacy with that of copyright. Furthermore, he considers himself to be the arbiter of taste and has—so long as he retained copyright—objected to the use of his grandfather’s materials for a variety of things including criticism, biographies, reprints of the works, new editions, theatrical adaptations, and the list goes on. The archival institutions themselves seem to have been caught in the crossfire. How the National Library of Ireland, for instance, handled the complaints of the Estate in 2002 has real implications for scholars whose research of Joyce manuscripts, letters, and photographs, for instance, hinge upon the seeming disjunction between the missions of the institution and the rights of the literary estate.

“Archiving Joyce and Joyce’s Archive: *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake*, and Copyright” therefore functions as a kind of record of what is happening at this pivotal time in Joyce scholarship. Also, as copyright law can be so confusing, this work also offers a history of these laws as they pertain to Joyce specifically. While the “Frequently Asked Questions” section published online and in the *James Joyce Quarterly* explains copyright as it pertains to Joyce, it does little to invoke the specific scholars who have been impacted or who are currently challenging copyright in a post-copyright era.

One purpose of this dissertation is to document and analyze current debates surrounding the collection, dissemination, and use of Joyce's archival materials; another is to investigate how Joyce himself viewed and represented the institution of the archive within his works—most notably in his more experimental works, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. These works reveal that Joyce was immersed in the debates over his archives and used his work to explore the concept of the archive and its impact on the future of his own legacy. They also show us how Joyce anticipates many of the issues we confront in the twenty-first century. In fact, Joyce's later texts present and embody the archive and the archival experience as well as re-imagine the counter-narratives often missing from the traditional archive.

In the texts themselves, there are connections between the archive as metaphor (as Derrida uses the term) and Joyce's invocation of libraries. Other questions pursued throughout this work include the level of involvement Joyce had in the construction of his materials into an archival repository and how Joyce incorporates issues of these institutions, such as access and preservation, into his own works. Additionally, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* portray historical personages, Irish movements, and institutions. Like any exhibition of archival material, Joyce seeks to influence the understanding of the personages and events. It is through this counter-narrative nature of Joyce's works that the texts themselves become part not only of the author-centered archive but of the historical archive of Dublin and thereby positions Joyce as both an author and curator of Irish literature. The work is archivable—people can reference them for historical personages, places and events (and even of fictionalized personages, places, and events)—and the work archives various archival institutions.

In reading this dissertation, scholars interested in *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* as well as those interested in literary archives and their institutions will gain an important perspective on the generative force that emerges from within archives and from these very works. Additionally, scholars interested in copyright gain an important insight into how legislation often stalls this generative force.

Chapter One explores the state of archival institutions throughout history but focuses specifically at the turn of the twentieth century, when archives were used as political tools meant to inspire feelings of National pride in its constituency. How war and the rise of the author to celebrity brought about the author-centered archive will also be addressed in the Introduction. However, I would be remiss to ignore the theoretical implications that these institutions have had on historiography, theories of memory, and the current desire by the vast majority of a technologically advanced public to consume and store everything. Theories introduced by Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Pierre Nora, among others, have influenced current debates surrounding the term “archive.”

An exploration into these theories is important as it allows us to elucidate Joyce’s own concept of the archive as it is tied to memory and narrative; Joyce’s writing about archival institutions such as the National Library of Ireland and the imagined library at Alexandria have arguably influenced the way these theorists think about and redefine the concept of the archive in different ways. Furthermore, by juxtaposing Joyce’s words and those of these theorists, we begin to develop a conversation about the importance of the archive to literature and scholarship. This also impacts the way we understand copyright and the archive’s place within public and private discourse.

Chapter Two addresses the gaps in criticism that surrounds Joyce's involvement in his own archive. Joyce's interest in his legacy, and in archival institutions such as libraries, clearly indicates Joyce's awareness that these organizations are increasingly involved in shaping collective history. His inclusion of these establishments within his works shows that the influence of these archives extends beyond a review of history to one of shaping the discourse of the future. This chapter therefore looks at the way Joyce has a hand in building his legacy from the early 1900s, the early point of his career as an aspiring writer, to the point wherein he faces the inevitable: death. To do so, I rely heavily on Joyce's published letters. This chapter also traces Joyce's legacy as it develops "in the hands of others"—a term I borrow from Erdmut Wizisla's brilliant "Preface" to *Walter Benjamin's Archive*—to draw attention to the reliance on others to shape his legacy.

Chapter Three argues that *Ulysses* is a textual archive that is both directed and curated by Joyce. The text becomes an exhibition of the people and institutions of June 16, 1904 Dublin. Moreover, in *Ulysses*, Joyce connects archival institutions (both imagined and real), such as Alexandria and the National Library of Ireland, in order to critique the Irish Literary Revival and the Gaelic League. In doing so, Joyce's *Ulysses* becomes a textual archive of Joyce's involvement in and critique of these movements. While traditional archives—ones recorded and preserved by the "victors" of history—would have relegated Joyce's critiques to the margins of discourse (as indeed they were throughout much of these movements), the publication of *Ulysses* ensured a place for his voice within the very structures it sought to criticize. *Ulysses* thereby offers a counter-narrative, and indeed a counter-archive, to these movements.

Chapter Four analyzes how Joyce goes beyond curator of Irish history (as exemplified in *Ulysses*) to curator of all possibilities of history in *Finnegans Wake*. One of the more interesting modes of narration that Joyce employs in this work is gossip. Gossip, of course, is one way in which to record and transmit information and can be seen within archival materials such as letters. Gossip thereby becomes both a tool and an archival construct in the *Wake*. For a work that claims to have no origin and claims its mode is both a letter and a dreamscape, gossip becomes the perfect discourse by which to accentuate these traits. Additionally, this chapter explores how gossip moves fluidly between public and private discourse. Joyce plays with this term by recording its etymological history and incorporating this term with other terms to create a portmanteau that both recalls its meaning and proffers new meanings.

Chapter Five moves away from the fictionalized representations of archival institutions in Joyce's works to Joyce's works as they are held within archival institutions such as the National Library today. I provide a history of copyright law in the United Kingdom, Ireland, and the United States and offer an archival retelling of the state of Joyce scholarship as it has been affected by these laws. Within the context of copyright law, I analyze the current contest between the Joyce Estate, run by his grandson, Stephen James Joyce, and the scholarly community. What this effectively draws our attention to is the level of debate regarding a public's right to know and the Estate's insistence on privacy. While Joyce's works are currently coming out of copyright in most European countries, more issues seem to be developing. This is important to track as these debates influence how legal systems define copyright post-copyright.

The following pages explore the ways in which Joyce accounts for these tensions inherent in copyright and in studies of archives. While this work participates in these narratives, it also investigates how his works, particularly *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, incorporate archival institutions and archival modes such as gossip into its composition. It also analyzes how, in writing these works, Joyce becomes the curator of not only his own archive but of Irish history and literature as well.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
PREFACE .....	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION: ARCHIVAL INSTITUTIONS AND THEORIES OF THE ARCHIVE .....	1
The Archive in Theory .....	6
Literature as Historical Archive .....	14
CHAPTER TWO: JAMES JOYCE’S LEGACY: AN ARCHIVE ALWAYS ALREADY UNDER CONSTRUCTION .....	23
The Building of a Legacy: Joyce as an Aspiring Writer .....	25
The Building of a Legacy: Joyce’s Archival Aspirations .....	31
The Building of Legacy: Joyce “In the Hands of Others” .....	36
The Building of a Legacy: Libraries in Joyce’s Writing .....	39
CHAPTER THREE: <i>ULYSSES</i> : JAMES JOYCE’S COUNTER-ARCHIVE .....	53
Joyce and the Gaelic League .....	57
Joyce, the National Library, and the Leaders of the Irish Literary Revival .....	64
Revising Hyde, Revising History .....	70
CHAPTER FOUR: ARCHIVING THE “GOSSIPLE” OF GOSSIP IN <i>FINNEGANS WAKE</i> .....	82
The History of Gossip .....	91
“Fairy Gutmurdherers” and “Goddestfars”: The Gossips as Godparents .....	104

CHAPTER FIVE: INHERETING JOYCE’S LEGACY: COPYRIGHT, RIGHT TO PRIVACY, AND THE FIGHTING JOYCEANS .....	115
A Brief History of Copyright: From the Early UK and U.S. Statutes to International Laws.....	121
“Fair Use” and the Archive.....	130
Collecting and Recording Joyce after Joyce: A Tale of Copyright Wars.....	134
Fighting Joyceans: 1980s through early 2000s.....	143
Fighting Joyceans: 2012 .....	149
POSTSCRIPT: WHAT COMES NEXT IN JOYCE AND ARCHIVE STUDIES .....	156
ENDNOTES .....	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	187
VITA.....	205

## CHAPTER ONE:

### INTRODUCTION: ARCHIVAL INSTITUTIONS AND THEORIES OF ARCHIVES

According to Jacques Derrida's *Archive Fever*, the homes of political figures of the classical world were the first charged with preserving the public and private documents of their respective cultures.<sup>1</sup> Elsie Freeman Finch and Paul Conway, in "Talking to the Angel," also trace the archive back to legal or official records: "Since at least the fifth millennia B. C., kings, priests, and bankers have had records offices overseen by records keepers of high rank and social privilege" (7). In both accounts of this history, the archive is part of a civilized society; once there are laws and systems of power in place, then a method and means to oversee and preserve those records develops. An important point to draw from both Finch and Conway's and Derrida's history of archival collections is that the archive is a source of authority; additionally the Bible features as an important source of this history: "Biblical stories recount the use of Babylonian archives to authorize the building of the central temple in Jerusalem and the saving of important deeds of purchase in earthen jars" (7). The emphasis on "stories" underlines an often-overlooked aspect of archives—that is that this literature has always already been connected to archives.

As sources, narratives such as those recounted in the Bible about Babylonian deeds and the documentation of building plans emphasize an important link between what is stored within an archive and how an archive itself is documented and remembered. In this example, Babylonian archives are "archived" or recorded and thereby preserved—at least in part—within the Bible. It should be noted that Biblical stories emerge out of the oral tradition. This work and other creation myths offer

prehistoric cultures a means by which to record and pass down the history of their people and their origins from generation to generation. Another example of this kind of oral record is Homer's *Iliad*, which offers an archival account of the rise and fall of Troy and the city-states that united in order to bring about its ruin.<sup>2</sup> Following the archival compositions found in oral traditions, written accounts of laws and histories utilized the medium of parchment and then paper. The records keepers were often clerics and scribes. However, once the age of exploration coincided with that of technological advancements in printing and mass distribution, there emerged a desire to document not only what had been done—i.e. the accounts of wars, heroic feats by emperors and generals—but also what was found in these other territories.

For example, in *Imperial Archive*, Thomas Richards examines the history of the Imperial British archive and argues that it developed as another way to control the colonies. Richards states: "All the great historical empires, ancient and modern, have had to come to terms with the problems of control at a distance . . . the distance involved in conquest makes travel hard and knowledge of far-flung places difficult, as most of the old stories told about empires testify" (1).<sup>3</sup> However, as Richards points out, with the advent of new disciplines, such as geography, and new technologies such as the "the railway, the steamship, the telegraph and the telephone," it suddenly became "possible for people to imagine knowing things not sequentially but simultaneously" (5-6). The distinction between understanding something simultaneously rather than sequentially is important. According to George and Maria L. Domino's *Psychological Testing: An Introduction*, to think sequentially is to think linearly, or in a series: "Sequential processing is typically based on verbal processes and depends on language for thinking and remembering; it is

serial in nature” (118); whereas “simultaneous processing involves stimuli that are primarily spatial and focuses on the relationship between elements. . . . Simultaneous processes searches for patterns and configurations; it is holistic” (118). Therefore, to think simultaneously is to think with multiple points of comparison, which make people better able to synthesize information. While sequential processing relies on “language for thinking and remembering,” the shift in perspectives to simultaneous processing is evidenced in the modernist move in literature to challenge traditional, sequential methods for relating narratives. From this emerges an entirely new way of thinking and conceiving of information. Additionally, the distinctions between genres become difficult to navigate. For example, while no one may argue that *Ulysses* is or is not a novel, it does blur the boundaries between genres by using an epic poem, *The Odyssey*, as its foundation and by employing the epic structure of line numbers in addition to the novel’s typical page numbers. The blurring of genres and experimentation of form highlights the constructed nature of narrative, genres, history, and civilization. The construction of archives and their collections also changes in the face of these shifts in thinking. The sheer amount of information shipped to archival institutions such as the British Museum surpasses legal documentation contained within earthen jars previously stored in the fifth century BCE. Everything was to be saved and included personal letters, portraits and later photographs, and in the example of ancient cultures: sculptures, columns, frescoes, entire pieces of buildings, pottery, utensils, jewelry—all of these artifacts become important for the understanding and documentation of history and therefore become important to the archive.

Additionally, transporting these artifacts and other important records and manuscripts to the British Museum demonstrates yet another means by which the British Empire attempted to retain control over its vast and expansive host of colonies—through the management of knowledge that had been produced and could be produced by the colonizing empire. As Richards states, “[T]he administrative core of the Empire was built around knowledge-producing institutions like the British Museum, the Royal Geographical Society, the India Survey, and the universities” (4). To administer control over its many colonies, England created their official institutions, which were in fact archival institutions.

One problem England faced was the sheer amount of material that administrative units had to store. Much of what was gathered and shipped back to England was stored in the basement of the British Museum. A lot of this material was unmarked and thus, in a sense, was “lost.”<sup>4</sup> The archival institution thus became “a sort of vast railway switch yard capable of being controlled by the right signals and switches, if only they could be found” (Richards 74). Furthermore, “the new Leviathan didn’t swallow information but spewed it out in a steady stream of small bits of paper, brief coded messages, timetables, telegraph codes, and red tape” (74). This Leviathan is an appropriate metaphor for the nineteenth-century imperial archive as the majority of its holdings were shipped to England from overseas. To manage the gathered information became an impossible feat. The archive becomes aligned with the stuff of bureaucracy. Access is limited not necessarily due to choice but because the information could not be found or controlled. The failure to organize and catalogue the information gathered within British archival

collections becomes a microcosm for the splintering and mismanagement of the Empire itself.

England, of course, was not the only empire to use the archive and its “knowledge-producing institutions” to further the interests of the Empire. Jennifer S. Milligan recounts that the *Archives Nationales* in France also has “a history of institutionalization: a history that is deeply implicated in the politics of the nation-state as well as the production of scholarship and the promotion of national memory and identity” (160). Just as the British Empire attempted to control its colonies through their archival institutions and the knowledge produced (as well as hidden) therein, the *Archives Nationales* “became a question of control over the memory of the state’s exercise of power over citizens; and of who had the power to mobilize or intervene in this memory to shape the body politic, to make as well as to write history” (Milligan 160). Thus with both the British and the French “knowledge-producing” institutions, the purpose was not as democratic as it is proclaimed to be today; their mission was to share information with the public as a means of control and also as a way to shape the memory of its “body politic.” After the fall of empires and the rise of nations, which resulted in an increased sense of nationalism, the priorities and management of archival institutions changed once again. Milligan explains one of these differences:

The debut of the late nineteenth century of the professional historian seeking a more objective ‘scientific’ assessment of the past exacerbated the distinction between those who cared for the historical record and those who interpreted it. As they came to view themselves as a profession, historians claimed the status of interpreters, relegating custodians of the

records to the position of handmaidens who carried all of the responsibility of the revered local historian and none of the status. (7)

While the concept of “historian” has changed throughout history and is well-documented by philosophers and historians alike, the duties of the curators are perhaps less familiar. As Milligan explains, with the development of the professional historian, the jobs of librarians and curators of archival materials began to be viewed as more custodial than “interpreter.” Milligan importantly posits that this perception of librarians is fallacious. Anyone who visits an archive today will know that librarians are vital sources of research; who better understands the nuances, the history, and the information catalogued in their collections but them? Furthermore, it is their task to organize the mass of material still untouched in boxes within their store rooms, and it falls to them to read through, catalogue, and make available these records.

### **The Archive in Theory**

While defining the archive may be difficult, literary scholars, historians, and librarians tend to agree that the purpose of the archive is to collect and preserve information. The archive, like literature, forms a link or connection to the past—a past that is intended to become part of the present cultural memory. Joyce, in *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, often refers to technology that aids in recording present moments. Those moments are thereby retrievable at some future point, which forges an artificial connection between the present and the past. Bloom, in *Ulysses*, for instance, thinks of the photograph and the gramophone at the funeral of Paddy Dignam, and Stephen

imagines a teleconnection via “trailing navelcord” which connects one to “Edenville” in the “Proteus” episode (3. 36-40).

Jacques Derrida, in “Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce,” invokes these very scenes when he recalls Bloom’s telephone conversation with staff of *The Telegraph* newspaper offices. He notes that the repetition of “yes” by the Professor in response to a conversation that Bloom has on the other end of the line echoes the double yes (“Yes, yes”) of Molly Bloom at the end of *Ulysses*; this echoing is what Derrida terms “the gramophone effect.” That is the “yes” carries with it the repetition of itself as an “affirmation, assent, consent, alliance, . . . engagement, [and] signature” (576). While the repetition is evident *a priori* in language itself, Derrida notes that “[t]he desire for memory and the mourning of the word *yes* set in motion the anamnestic machine” (576). This desire for memory and mourning is meant to remind the reader once again of Bloom at Paddy Dignam’s funeral, considering the gramophone and photograph.

In *Archive Fever*, Derrida traces the etymological history of the word “archive,” which comes from the Greek *arkheion*, meaning “initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrate, the archons, those who commanded” (2). An interesting parallel occurs between the archons, who were in charge of public laws, and their private homes. These were private dwellings that housed legal documents and blurred any clear-cut distinction between public and private. The archons, at home, were still representative of the republic, which is manifested in their obligation to safeguard important legal documents; at the same time, these men were also husbands, fathers, and friends. Collections were part of the daily life of the family and society.

Similar to Freud, the split between the archons as guardians of documents and their private life cannot be easily found.

Derrida says that it is there, in the “domiciliation” or “house,” that “archives take place” (2). The archives take residence and also function in their homes and alongside their families. This distinction becomes important because it implicitly argues that the archive is not a static entity but one that is transformed, added to, and changed. The archive is fluid and therefore blurs any artificial boundary lines drawn between the private life of the archon and the public doctrine of the people.

Joyce also blurs the distinction between public and private in both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. When discussing the gramophone of *Ulysses*, for instance, Bloom thinks of this device at a public gathering, but a gramophone itself is device typically used in the home. The answer inherent in Bloom’s question, “Besides how could you remember everybody? Eyes, walk, voice. Well, the voice, yes: gramophone” (6. 962-3), is that to remember everyone is impossible. Bloom considers placing the gramophone “in every grave” or perhaps it would be better to “keep it in the house.” He then imagines what “poor old greatgrandfather” would sound like (6. 962-64). From the grave (public) to the house (private) implies yet another question: who should hear “greatgrandfather’s” voice? Although his first consideration places the recorded voice at the graveyard where anyone could hear, it seems Bloom would have this voice domiciled in the house, readily available for the family. Additionally—to repeat Derrida’s earlier assertion—“the desire for memory” is instigated in mourning.

Furthermore, in *Archive Fever*, another kind of memory/mourning takes place. Derrida, delivering this speech at the inauguration of the Freud Museum in London,

develops the link between the collection of Freud's materials with the collection of notes and manuscripts that constitute the archive of early twentieth-century psychoanalysis. Drawing on Freud's theory of how memory operates, Derrida argues that memory is both archival and *anarchival* with the latter term relating to Freud's "death drive." In contemplating the "death drive," Derrida claims that it "never leaves an archive of its own"; it is an instinct that does not function like language because it leaves no mark and no inscription for deciphering (10). Instead, the "death drive" is a trace, an impression, and an "erotic simulacrum" (11) that consistently violates without penetration or physical markers. It erases before a record can be located. Furthermore, Derrida proclaims that the "death drive," which is *anarchivic*, "not only incites forgetfulness, amnesia, the annihilation of memory . . . but also commands the radical effacement, in truth the eradication of . . . the archive" (my emphasis 11). Thus, the "anamnesic machine" is a means to *not* forget but which—because of its repetition—is also an impetus to forget.

The threat of forgetting, or of amnesia, therefore drives our desire to document, to archive, and to record. The documentation of information does not assure our remembrance of it or even that we will have recalled having recorded it in the first place. Because we face the possibility—indeed the necessity—of forgetting, we are able to remember. However, memory—while *anarchivic*—can also act as a catalyst towards additional efforts to remember, or to piece the sequence of events, images, words back together again.

Michel Foucault, while not calling it "archive fever" or the "death drive," also points to the threat always inherent in the archive: "The archive is not that which, despite its immediate escape, safeguards the event of the statement, and preserves, for future

memories, its status as escapee” (129). The archive does not protect everything. Instead, it “defines at the outset the system of its enunciability” (129).<sup>5</sup> It is important to note that though Foucault does not think of the archive in terms of an institution, he considers it a system, similar to what Derrida and Freud call the “drive” or the “trace,” that brings about the institution. While Foucault may not be referring to the archive as an institution, what he says about the archive is that it is “first the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events” (129). This is complimentary to what Derrida says about the concept of the archive stemming from the root word *arkhē*, which “names at once the commencement and the commandment” (1). The archive is first the law of what can be said and also the system that ensures what is said can be “grouped and composed together in accordance with multiple relations” (Foucault 129). The archive, then, is the place of action, of an address—both a physical address and an address delivered to a group of people. These statements are not “accumulate[ed] endlessly in an amorphous mass” (Foucault 129) but are rather more akin to a system of “naming” which:

. . . coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, there where things commence—physical, historical, or ontological principle—but also the principle according to the law, there where men and gods command, there where authority, social order are exercised, in this place from which order is given. (Derrida 1)

The archive, therefore, is also a system of inclusion and exclusion. It sorts endlessly and translates what is commanded into language and into meaning itself. Thus the archive is the place (the *there*) where physical space or the nature of being commences or begins.

The command is also given in this space, and as a command, it must come from one place and have as its destination some other place to some other one. In other words, the archive contains within its etymology the very definition of its function; its aim is to preserve or exclude something in a given space and in this place allow (or deny) access to some other one. The archive, then, is both a place of beginnings and orders—orders in the sense that orders or laws are made as to how the space and material will be categorized, and orders in the sense of being ordered or placed away.

\* \* \*

To return momentarily to the connection between the archive and memory, we should also consider Pierre Nora's seven volume work entitled *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, or *Sites of Memory*. In this work, Nora sets up an antagonistic relationship between history and memory. The sites of memory are the “remains, the ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it” (12). Memory suffers in contemporary society because history threatens it into extinction. Nora says that “[m]useums, archives, cemeteries, festivals, anniversaries, treaties, depositions, monuments, sanctuaries, fraternal orders—these are the boundary stones of another age, illusions of eternity . . . they mark the rituals of a society without ritual” (12). Memory, on the other hand, is the active ritual of telling or living through important events while history is nothing more than a monument or a commemorative date on a calendar designed so that the person or event commemorated can be ultimately forgotten. While this may seem unduly harsh, we have only to think of Labor Day: its presence on calendars assures us that this day is a day of distinction, and yet the thought about what the distinction is generally ends there.

As Nora argues, we do not live the memory; instead we mark the history and with this trace, we see those “boundary stones of another age” (12). To recognize the past as history disconnects it from our present and therefore moves it from the present (memory) into the archive of the past (history).

Memory, according to Nora, is what is lived: “Each gesture, down to the most everyday, [is] the ritual repetition of a timeless practice in a primordial identification of act and meaning. With the appearance of the trace, of mediation, of distance, we are not in the realm of true memory but of history” (8). Memory, therefore, is more closely aligned with biological functions such as gestures and lived repetitions; language would qualify as memory rather than history based on this claim as its use is both a repetition and the means for “identification of act and meaning.” However, Nora also makes the distinction between memory and “modern memory”; the latter belongs to the “archival,” as it relies on “the materiality of the trace, the immediacy of the recording, [and] the visibility of the image” (13). Therefore, once something artificial such as computer memory, recorded images and sound are relied upon (it is really the *reliance*, I think, which Nora contends), memory changes into something else—something more akin to history. To support this claim, Nora asserts:

No society has ever produced archives as deliberately as our own, not only by volume, not only by new technical means of reproduction and preservation, but also by its superstitious esteem, by its veneration of the trace. Even as traditional memory disappears, we feel obliged assiduously to collect remains, testimonies, documents, images, speeches, any visible signs of what has been. (13)

This “veneration of the trace” and the obligation felt to “collect” everything demonstrates the anxiety that *is* archive fever—an anxiety that seems a particularly twentieth century phenomenon. Like Freud’s “death drive,” modern memory “threatens every principality, every archontic primacy, every archival desire” (Nora 12). While one of the primary functions of an archive is to store information, Nora and Derrida seem to suggest a different reason—one having less to do with offering the future a record of the past and more to do with a desire to no longer remember. With this desire, of course, comes the fear of what this instinct or even *need* to forget represents, and so the instinct to preserve (just in case) is signaled.

While this may be true, I disagree with Nora’s seemingly wholesale dismissal of the archive as history. For example, Nora portrays the archive as an historical marker erected to house the dusty relics of national and cultural remains, wherein history threatens to paralyze memory. I argue that the archive is paradoxically both history and memory; the sheer volume of information housed in the archive is too exhaustive to ever be remembered by any one person. While this may seem to support Nora’s theory that the archive houses long-forgotten dusty relics of a nation (or individual’s) past, there is another way to interpret this assertion: the very fact that information is accessible and can at any time be sorted through and reintegrated into ritualized, cultural memory (rather than history) by way of scholarship, which is another way of re-circulating the past into the present, proves that these materials of the archive are no longer forgotten and neglected relics. If there is dialogue and a recollection of materials discovered again in archival institutions, then the past becomes once more important to the present moment. To bring the past into the present is a sign of memory, not history. Therefore, the archive

is still very much tied to memory, to the retelling and re-collection of gathered information.

In considering the concept of the archive as both an institution designed to push a national, imperial, or governmental agenda and as a theoretical tool to understand our individual and cultural desire to record and preserve great stores of information, there is also an interesting connection between the archive and literature. Traditionally, of course, research in an archival institution such as a library offers scholars important insights into better understanding the author and the historical context in which a work was written. Even more interesting, however, than this would be to consider how literature can be read to better understand the archive. Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, for example, represent both aspects of this argument. The effect of recording the position of archival institutions or of analyzing the drives that motivate our cultural impetuses behind remembering and forgetting *within* the text itself establishes the text as self-reflexive and archival in and of itself. In other words, the text records and stores information and seeks to also reflexively understand the process by which this recording and storing takes place.

### **Literature as “Historical Archive”**

Allan H. Pasco argues for the legitimization of literature as “cultural repository” or “historical archive.”<sup>6</sup> Of course such an assertion is not new as historians have long relied on literature in order to offer a different perspective into history. However, literature, like gossip or hearsay, rarely receives the credence given to what is considered more factual or historical texts. According to Pasco, “[a] study of art uncovers a society’s conscious and unconscious reality in all its glory and shame” (387). In deciding whether

to include a work of fiction as evidence of the social mindset of the time, Pasco proposes the following prescription:

The more frequent, the more numerous the repeated elements or opinions or structures, the more likely that writers were dealing with one or more truths of the period . . . . When both frequency of occurrence and congruence of content or meaning occur . . . there is more reason to accept the results as an accurate meaningful reflection of culture. (387)

Thus, Pasco is in favor of using literature as historical archive so long as that literature has been compared against a wide array of other literature of that period. He is against relying too heavily on any one work or author. His reasoning to look to literature in addition to “other pertinent archives” is because literature “allows us to . . . discover[] significant attitudes that stand a good chance of reflecting the reality of the time” (389). Pasco questions if literature can really “serve as a historical archive” (373) and after consideration argues that, yes, literature can be considered a “cultural repository” but adds the caveat “when handled judiciously, . . . literature can provide a reliable window on the past” (374).

Pasco sees the potential of literature to act as reference material, to “fill in the gaps” where other more traditional historical documents are missing (375), but he falls short of seeing works of literature as influencing the development of society. For Pasco (and for many historians), a work of literature can help gauge the social attitudes of a certain time and place; however, in the case of Joyce as well as others, literature—much in the same way as political treatises of John Locke, for instance,—can actually alter the perception of that history. As more and more historians are recognizing the fallacy in

relying solely on “official documents” (especially as many of these documents become suspect due to periods of turmoil and of tyranny) literature has rejoined its pre-nineteenth century separation from history. The separation—between work as archived material and archival in and of itself—or what I call a “textual archive,” is becoming less and less distinct.

While literature certainly links us to the past (imagined or otherwise), this connection is often based on records uncovered in the archive. *Ulysses*, for example, is composed of many texts and includes materials Joyce alludes to that come from the archive at the National Library of Ireland. *Thom’s Directory* is one such source.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, the fact that Joyce himself was preoccupied with libraries and the people who ran them is evidenced within both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. This makes the work meta-archival, meaning that it archives or records other archival institutions. Furthermore, both texts also record voices and experiences of early twentieth-century Ireland, which—at the time—were typically excluded from national or other public records. However, since the collection of his manuscripts, letters, and other miscellaneous material now have such a prominent presence in public archives, his voice and those marginalized voices represented in his works have become inadvertently archived and thus re-remembered or re-imagined.

Some might confuse the argument that Joyce’s literature acts as a meta-archival as being no different from saying his works are “encyclopedic” and “comprehensive.”<sup>8</sup> While his works—especially *Finnegans Wake*—are indeed abstract, comprehensive and encyclopedic, which is how Mikhail Bakhtin describes the poetics of the nineteenth century, considering the concept of the archive in relation to the works themselves lends

itself to yet another more interesting way to read Joyce's texts. In fact, Bakhtin argues that the "novel has anticipated and continues to anticipate the future development of literature as a whole" (7). The archive as represented in text, therefore, is another development that comes about from the novel, especially with the development of technology. Joyce's texts, for example, incorporate technology and even mimic its form. In *Ulysses*, for example, the emphasis on gramophone, on the recorded voice, and the printing and distribution of the daily news are mentioned throughout. In *Finnegans Wake*, the turn is towards moving pictures and even back to language, to the creation of new language through the embracing of multiple languages, dialects, and portmanteaus.

The development of the novel, as Bakhtin notes, is a radical shift in the way authors have previously written. He states that a more traditional form like the epic "has been from the beginning a poem about the past, and the authorial position immanent in the epic and constitutive for it (that is, the position of the one who utters the epic word), is the environment of a man speaking about a past that is to him inaccessible, the reverent point of view of a descendent" (13). In other words, the epic is what Nora calls "history"—it deals with the past and sees it as the "boundary stones of another age" (13). The narrator or speaker of an epic is always already in the position of descendent. This inheritance, though, does not tie the speaker to the past. The novelist, on the other hand, writes in the present and often about the present. Even if the past is the subject, it is always in relation to what occurs in the present. Bakhtin explains this change: "[I]n ancient literature it is memory, and not knowledge, that serves as the source and power for the creative impulse" (15). In the novel, however, there is a change: it is knowledge and experience that determines the form.

Bakhtin's theory of the novel helps us understand that the archive actually develops along the same trajectory as literature. In classical Greece, for instance, the archons safeguarded the laws and commandments that sustained its civilized society, while its poets imagined the past and recited epic narratives in which the creation or destruction of civilizations occurred. The modern archive, then, changed from being housed in private homes and royal societies to national or other public institutions. At the same time, the modern novel changed from being called a "history," as it was in the eighteenth century, to incorporating history into its fictive elements. Additionally, the novel reflects what is known and how what is known and experienced alters or informs our present moment. The modern novel also comments on its own construction, while the modern archive creates a record of what it is recording. For example, letters written by curators and librarians become part of the institution's archive. Additionally, these letters also become introductions or prefaces in the catalogues of its major collections. Like the modern archive, the present is what matters in the novel:

[W]hen the present becomes the center of human orientation in time and in the world, time and world lose their completeness as a whole as well as in each of their parts. The temporal model of the world changes radically: it becomes a world where there is no first word (no ideal word), and the final word has not yet been spoken. (Bakhtin 30)

Bakhtin's analysis of the temporal and thematic shifts in literature is demonstrated in Joyce's later works. For example, since no final word can be spoken, Joyce neither begins nor ends *Finnegans Wake*. It is a cycle read in the middle of both beginning and ending, thereby recording the state of the world in the center of modernity; wherein the

story is never complete but always fragmented; it is always reaching into the past while simultaneously attempting a read into the future. The same can be said of the twenty-first century archive, for it recognizes that there can never be a complete archive. The archive is forever fragmented, scattered digitally or physically among the many institutions found throughout the world. The present is always turning over or uncovering more and more pieces from the past, always expanding current holdings, and always adding to an already infinite material base. Joyce's archival collections, like his work, always already remain open, never closed, never complete, and therefore never definitive.

To return briefly to Pasco, I would like to expand upon his assertion that literature can serve as historical archive to state that sometimes, even when literature is unreliable (is not even true to facts) it can still alter the image of the past. In fact, sometimes literature can even revise the past. When it does so, the work becomes something else entirely. This is the case with Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. For example, in Dublin it is difficult to ignore the many sites of memory invoked by Joyce, such as statues erected throughout the city or placards plated in bronze and placed along the city's sidewalks and within its parks—all images of James Joyce and his fictionalized characters. Stephen Dedalus and Buck Mulligan are featured in conversation near Gogarty's pub. Joyce's *sigla* (or geometric sign) for ALP is the delta and is depicted as  $\Delta$  in his notebooks and manuscripts. This *sigla* can be found on the streets of Dublin and represents the city's admiration of Joyce's work. Davy Byrne's pub, which is made famous in *Ulysses*, has acknowledged this honor with a sandwich named after Leopold Bloom. While these images and texts are rooted in the imagination of Joyce, they have nevertheless become part of Dublin's cultural archive, an archive which reflects and also

revises the history of Ireland in its celebration of its literature—a literature, I would add, which was mostly written abroad.

Both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* are historical archives not only because they record the modes of archiving and offer counter-narratives, or memories, of historical events, but because they both offer a critique of the archival functions and thus effectively create a meta-archive. As a meta-archive, the text draws attention to the archive as an institution and the archive as a concept.

While scholars writing about Joyce have covered a great many subjects, few—if any—have explored Joyce’s works as meta-archival and supra-archival or analyzed current debates concerning Joyce’s archives and copyright. Many scholars have written about subjects dealing with archival research and Joyce ranging from biography to genetic criticism; in fact, the International James Joyce Foundation has organized these subjects into eighteen themes ranging from “Life and Letters” and “Books on Joyce (General)” to criticism and scholarship on individual works by Joyce, to “Joyce and Modernism,” to “Language and Translation,” to Joycean influences, to “Textual, Bibliographic, and Genetic Materials” and still more.<sup>9</sup> Over twenty-two works are listed under “Life and Letters,” which I mention because the authors of these works, of course, had to rely heavily on anecdotes from Joyce’s family and friends as well as materials housed in either private or personal archives. Richard Ellmann’s *James Joyce* is perhaps the most well-known and celebrated of these works.<sup>10</sup>

While archives are the traditional source for those interested in biography, new editions, and textual editing, few Joyce scholars take on Joyce’s archives in any sort of systematic way. Examples of works that do deal with Joyce’s archival materials include

Frank Budgen's *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses, and Other Writings*; Patrick McCarthy's *Ulysses: Portals of Discovery*, which I will reference in Chapter Three; Phillip F. Herring's *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from the Buffalo Collection*; James S. Atherton's *The Books at the Wake: A Study of Literary Allusions in James Joyce's Finnegans Wake* as well as many genetic critics including Michael Groden's *Ulysses in Progress*; Clive Hart & Leo Knuth's *A Topographical Guide to James Joyce's Ulysses*; Luca Crispi and Sam Slote's celebrated *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: a Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*, which was written after cataloguing and analyzing the *Finnegans Wake* notebooks held at the libraries at the University of Buffalo; Clive Hart's *A Concordance to Finnegans Wake*; and Hans Walter Gabler's *Ulysses*. Of these works, McCarthy's is the closest to an analysis of archives as institutions recorded by Joyce and archives as metaphor for memory. The rest are more source material for understanding Joyce's allusions to Joyce's composition process.

Other works such as Michael Groden's "Perplex in the Pen—and in the Pixels" offer personal reflections about working on various Joyce projects and having to work with his archival materials. Even fewer works investigate Joyce's archives—dispersed as they are—as both a place and a concept as posed by twentieth-century theorists or as playfully exhibited by Joyce himself within his novels. Janine Utell, perhaps more than any other, does this in light of the Rosenbach Manuscript and the Rosenbach Museum.<sup>11</sup> In "The Archivist, the Archaeologist, and the Amateur," Utell explores what she terms "amateur reading practices" in conjunction with theories of genetic criticism. Of the archive, Utell responds to Crispi's reading of "the archive/*Archive*" dynamic wherein she

says “it is the nature of such an institution to be stable, to preserve cultural artifacts.” The term “stable” is repeated with reference to archives and archeology. While Utell begins by saying that the *Archive* is a “stable site for the preservation of Joyce documents,” she complicates this stability by arguing that “[t]he archive itself can be unstable, constantly shifting. Its doors are opened and people are free to move through—Here Comes Everybody—and those people, those readers, bring to the texts constantly changing interpretations. The archive is always open, and the work of the reader never reaches closure.” Similarly, I argue that Joyce’s archives are widely dispersed the world over and therefore resemble his works—fragmented, decentered, cast out in multiple directions. My research, therefore, draws this connection between Joyce’s archives and Joyce’s archiving of archives, particularly archival institutions such as libraries and modes of archiving such as gossip, within his most experimental texts, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. The following four chapters develop these ideas in greater detail and draw upon theories considered in this introduction.

CHAPTER TWO  
JAMES JOYCE'S LEGACY:  
AN ARCHIVE ALWAYS ALREADY UNDER CONSTRUCTION

The fact that his archive is so bristling with contents today . . . is due to the strategic calculation with which he deposited his manuscripts, notebooks, and printed papers in the custody of friends and acquaintances in various countries. His archive landed in the hands of others, so that their documents might be delivered to posterity. . . . With the ethos of an archivist Benjamin secured the continued life of his thought. (Erdmut Wizisla "Preface" *Walter Benjamin's Archive*)

The epigraph above is written about Walter Benjamin, a German philosopher and Joyce's contemporary. According to Erdmut Wizisla, Benjamin's concept of the archive differs from that of "institutionalized archives," whose existence is "derived from the origin of the word 'archive.'" He notes the term "'[a]rchive' stems from the Greek and Latin words for 'town hall, ruling office,' which, in turn, are derived from 'beginning, origin, rule'" (1-2). Instead of considering the archive as something ruled by "order" and "objectivity," Benjamin's idea of the archive centers around "the passions of a collector" (Wizisla 2). Joyce, like Benjamin, encourages these passions of collecting in others—especially when it came to other people collecting his works. While Joyce was himself not a collector—at least not in the way Benjamin was—he did collect books (not as artifacts, of course) and kept all of his letters, notebooks, and manuscripts. Additionally, he revised his notebooks using different colored pencils in order to help those who would

later collect these items make sense of all his changes. Passions often conflict with order and yet Benjamin achieved a balance by cataloguing everything—from what he saw, heard, and experienced to where these images, texts, and expositions could be found.

Ursula Marx *et al* quote Benjamin's reflections on "Excavation and Memory":

He who seeks to approach his own buried past must conduct himself like a man digging. Above all, he must not be afraid to return again and again to the same matter; to scatter it as one scatters the earth, to turn it over as one turns over soil. For the 'matter itself' is no more than the strata which yield their long-sought secrets only to the most meticulous investigation.

While these words were not written to Joyce, Joyce does seem to have shared this philosophy. For throughout Joyce's life, his letters and his works indicate the constant return to the same matter. In *Stephen Hero*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Ulysses*, Joyce approaches his own past experiences through his craft. Joyce as author is like the man digging into his own buried past and he does "scatter it" in order for it to be returned to and turned over by himself and others. That is, the person recording the uncovering of one's own past must excavate those memories by going through the same material over and over again.

While inventorying the past, one must also, Benjamin explains, inventory the location of those memories in order to capture the image of remembering and how it came about. Joyce leaves those who would take the time to uncover his past plenty of clues of this inventory within his writing. Like Benjamin, Joyce's collection is made up of images, texts, and signs through which readers return and turn over those memories, those histories, over and over again. Furthermore, this is actually what Joyce's works *do*

and what they are about. Joyce's treatment of the past may not be philosophical in the way of Benjamin, but he treats what is collected (quotes, narratives, signs) with careful attention to their place in art and literature.

While Benjamin and Joyce never met, the reason Joyce's archive is "bristling with contents" today is because he also chose wisely those friends and family he hoped to safeguard his materials. That he, like Benjamin, wished his documents and his thoughts to resonate into posterity, there can be no doubt. Yet Joyce grappled with having an "ethos of an archivist." He recognized—from an early age, in fact—that what the author leaves behind passes from the author into "the hands of others." Similar to the way in which a work falls out of an author's control once it is published, so too is the legacy no longer in control of the author once the author is dead. This chapter explores Joyce's struggle with this ethos; through an examination of his letters and his works—specifically, *Portrait*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake*—it becomes evident that Joyce thought carefully about to whom and where his own archive should go.

### **The Building of a Legacy: Joyce as an Aspiring Writer**

While the idea of leaving behind a legacy appealed to Joyce, it was not without its complications. For the young Joyce, the author and the work were inextricably linked; this mindset would not change; however, his belief about who controls how the work—and thus the author—would be received and remembered would. Even from a relatively young and aspiring age, Joyce recognized that the writer, while author, was not the only authority of a piece of literature. In March of 1901, a nineteen-year old Joyce wrote a letter to Henrik Ibsen, whom he greatly admired. In his letter, Joyce regales Ibsen as

being the nineteenth-century dramatist whose plays may have been viewed as scandalous by some but that definitely demonstrated what modernist drama should be. Joyce even published an essay stating this, which Ibsen himself saw and acknowledged. Also in the letter, Joyce refers to his published article: “I regret . . . that an immature and hasty article should have met your eye rather than something better and worthier of your praise”—this in itself seems to indicate a rare humility in Joyce; however, he then adds: “It may annoy you to have your works at the mercy of striplings but I am sure you would prefer hotheadedness to nerveless and ‘cultured’ paradoxes” (March 1901). For Joyce, getting away from “cultured paradoxes” was the only way that literature could evolve.

Indeed Joyce goes on to explain how he has “claimed” for Ibsen “his rightful place in the history of the drama”; therefore it is not Ibsen who can claim a place in history; rather this is decided by those who come later and by those who read him. Joyce says he also “sounded [Ibsen’s] name defiantly through the college.” This defiance says as much about Joyce going against tradition as it does in recognizing where literature goes next, but this defiance is also meant to assure Ibsen that his legacy (and Joyce’s by extension) will continue. On the one hand, he writes to Ibsen to show that he recognizes in Ibsen’s drama the creation and development of a new, more modern drama; on the other hand, he implicitly points to himself as a scholar who is also “hotheaded” enough to declare Ibsen’s genius publicly. From this transaction, Joyce already recognizes that dual relationship always already exists between the writer and his audience. A writer is only successful if others are willing to sing his praises. Therefore the compliment the young Joyce pays to Ibsen, the author, is also—rather surreptitiously—a compliment he pays to himself.

Joyce ingratiates himself to Ibsen as the young “stripling” but also struts proudly as the next someone-in-the-know—the next best thing of his generation. Here, then, we see that the author’s legacy extends not just to his work but also to those who engage with the work. Joyce’s letter, therefore, implies a kind of assurance that Joyce will continue to advocate on behalf of Ibsen’s genius very much like a literary executor advocates on behalf of the Estate. Thus, Joyce-as-critic and Joyce-as-aspiring-writer (later to become Joyce-as-author) already recognizes that an author’s inheritance is inexplicably tethered not to one single entity, such as a literary Estate, but to numerous entities made up of readers, writers, critics, scholars, translators, *and* Estates.

Perhaps this is why, like Benjamin, Joyce sought to secure the “life of his thought” by carefully placing his manuscripts, notebooks, printed papers, and personal library “in the custody of friends and acquaintances in various countries” (Wizisla 1). Having moved to continental Europe on his own accord, from a country he felt could not support his aesthetic vision of modern literature, Joyce indeed made many acquaintances in various countries. Additionally, living in exile during two world wars often displaced the Joyces from living quarters in the same way as moving to find work did. Yet, Joyce still managed to organize his manuscripts and notebooks and publish a collection of short stories, a book of poems, three masterful novels, and a play—all the while keeping detailed track of reviews, advertisements, and the increasing value of each work.<sup>12</sup> Although forced by employment and familial circumstances and then again by war to emigrate all over Europe throughout his adult lifetime, Joyce nevertheless manages to ensure the safety of his legacy. For instance, when he was forced to leave Trieste his

brother moved into the Trieste apartment and watched over his things, often sending Joyce manuscripts or books whenever Joyce requested them.

Joyce recognized the importance of a literary network and yet he struggled with those he knew because he thought they were too narrow-minded in their approach to the construction of an Irish literature. For example, when Joyce met George Russell, he conceded Russell's ability to write "a lyric or two," but he "spoke slightingly of everyone else," and stated that, like Yeats, everyone had "gone over to the rabblement" (Ellmann 99). The rabblement, of course, was how Joyce saw those in Ireland who mythologized Ireland purely for the sake of mythology—especially, when that mythologizing was to the detriment of Ireland's recorded history. To ignore that the Irish were in fact a product of numerous invasions and assimilations was blasphemous to Joyce; the assumption resulted in a literature that was somehow lesser and ignored many of the things about being Irish that Joyce held dear. Joyce eschewed the rabblement in favor of a more honest portrayal of Ireland and its people as they actually were. This is one of the main arguments Joyce epitomizes in *Ulysses*—a point I will elaborate on in the next chapter.

When Russell asked Joyce to read his own poems, which he did, Joyce—even before beginning to read—noted that "he didn't care what Russell's opinion of them might be" (99). This proclamation demonstrates the bind Joyce felt himself in. He knew he needed a network of other artists and editors in order to publish and flourish; however, he just could not hold his tongue when it came to expressing his own opinion. However, Russell did like his poems, and he ultimately felt compelled to introduce Yeats to Joyce; he wrote to Yeats and said that he had met "an extremely clever boy who belongs more to

your clan than to mine and still more to himself” and insisted that Yeats meet Joyce (100).<sup>13</sup>

When Yeats did meet Joyce, in October of 1902, Yeats was thirty-seven years old and saw Joyce as “a colossal self-conceit with . . . a Lilliputian literary genius” (101); this opinion, however, did not stop Yeats from documenting this interview in his journals and of speaking with Russell about it as well. In a conversation with Russell, Yeats recollects a conversation that he had with Joyce, where he expounded on the ideas of youth and beauty. Instead of expressing gratitude towards Yeats, Joyce replied: “Ah. . . that shows how rapidly you are deteriorating. . . . We have met too late. You are too old for me to have any effect on you” (102). While certainly Joyce’s arrogance is clear, his statement about Yeats’ “deteriorating” says more about Joyce’s ideas of youth and beauty than it does about Yeats. Additionally, the idea of the artist in decline was one that haunted Joyce from the very beginning.

To return momentarily to the letter Joyce wrote to Ibsen, we will see again how early in Joyce’s career he was already thinking about the artist’s role in society and how his works would have to rely on others to be read and remembered. For example, Joyce writes to Ibsen: “Your work on earth draws to a close as you are near the silence. It is growing dark for you,” and he adds “I am sure that higher and higher and higher enlightenment lies onward” (March 1901). The letter stands as a way for Joyce to forge a connection between an author in the decline of his life and an author at the start of his own. Through scholarship and criticism, an author’s body takes on an alternative form via the corpus. The body becomes embodied through and within the text. Perhaps this, then, is the “higher and higher and higher enlightenment” an author may hope to achieve,

but he will have to rely upon the handling of his materials by others and will have to appreciate that only through the reviews, scholarship, and criticisms of others—“hotheaded” scholars or not—can that higher place ever be obtained. Joyce’s assurance to Ibsen of higher enlightenment most likely refers to Ibsen’s work living on even after his death. However, Joyce himself could not be so easily reassured upon his own deterioration. His final surgery was meant to correct a perforated ulcer, and Ellmann recounts how “Joyce . . . desperately wanted to live” but feared “losing consciousness”; Joyce’s son, George, had to persuade him to do the surgery (741). While Joyce did regain consciousness after the surgery, the damage done was too much and he died a few days later.

To meet too late, to be too old, and for one’s work on earth to draw to a close—those are all reasons to fear the end. When both of Joyce’s statements—to Yeats and to Ibsen—are read together, there is no doubt that Joyce’s interest in the decline of an artist explains the seriousness and urgency he felt about writing. Unfortunately, because Russell and Yeats (as well as others) did not always share in Joyce’s aesthetic, Joyce left Ireland, seeming to never falter in his own confidence. Indeed, by the methodical way in which he saved his notebooks and manuscripts and the scrutinizing ways in which he paid attention to the rising value of his published works, there was no doubt that Joyce thought he would be famous. This kind of awareness is exhibited in the meticulous system he developed for color-coding his writing and editing. The notebooks, draft proofs, and manuscripts he left behind have given scholars much to do and say about Joyce’s archive.<sup>14</sup> He, like Benjamin, secured for the future “the continued life of his thought” even after his death (Wizisla 1). Once Joyce established himself as a published

writer, his arrogance recedes and his craft flourishes. Joyce's concern for his legacy, however, became even more important. Joyce entrusted his most valuable collections (his personal library, manuscripts, drafts, etc) with his friends and family. If he sold his manuscripts, it was only to those he felt would most appreciate the work that went into them.

### **The Building of a Legacy: Joyce's Archival Aspirations**

In his fiction and in his actions, Joyce's concern over his legacy is evident. His attempts to exert some control over his works and his image can also be seen from the ways he chose to present his works to libraries, friends, and family. For example, he asked Harriet Shaw Weaver, who would later become his literary executor, to send the papers he sent to her regarding the international protest against Samuel Roth's pirated editions of *Ulysses* to Sylvia Beach "for her archives" (12 May 1927). He later sends Sylvia Beach the manuscript of *Dubliners* and offers to send the manuscript of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* to her as soon as his brother can retrieve it and send it from Trieste (ND 1927).<sup>15</sup>

Joyce also arranged for his published works to be presented to libraries such as Trinity and the National Library of Ireland (22 Oct 1922, Letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver). He was, in fact, astounded when the British Library "ordered and paid for" their own copy of *Ulysses* (22 Oct 1922). In 1935, Joyce asked Michael Healy to present a reproduced facsimile version of a book of verses, which was "published on special paper in green silk with gilt lettering and illuminated capitals by Lucia, a title design, and tailpiece, also signed by [Joyce]" to the library in Galway (1 July 1935); Joyce explained

that only two other libraries in the world possessed such copies: the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris and the British Museum (1 July 1935). Thus the presentation of Joyce's works (or those of Lucia's) proved a sense of accomplishment for Joyce.

In a two-part letter addressed in French to Miss Adrienne Monnier and in English to Sylvia Beach (dictated by Joyce to Stuart Gilbert), he states that he has "enclose[d] a letter from [John] Drinkwater and two photos" to Beach and asks her to "forward the letter to Miss Weaver" but insists that, before sending them to her, that she "have copies of the photographs made for [her] collection entitled *Wine and Water*" (3 September 1928). He was always thoughtful when it came to the people who supported him. In turn, he rewarded them with items for their collections, items, he knew, they would appreciate.

Joyce's kindness would also extend to his family. He sent his books, straight from the press, to libraries and to his aunt Josephine, Mrs. William Murray. Upon learning that she lent a first edition of *Ulysses* out, he became indignant. In a letter to his aunt, Joyce scolds her for lending out her signed copy of *Ulysses*, asserting that "people in Dublin have a way of not returning a book" (October 1922). He explains that the book only increases in value because he has signed it and emphasizes that it is a first edition: "In a few years copies of the first edition will be worth 100 [pounds] each, so book experts say" (October 1922). While his intent may well be to provide for his aunt's future economic security, the slight he feels in her lending his book out is both humorous and exhibits Joyce's awareness of the increase in his own market value. Further, the offense is doubled as he notes that he is sure she hasn't even read the book. While aunt Josephine may not have shown what Joyce felt is the appropriate amount of gratitude for these

signed first editions of his works nor shown appreciation for the content of the works, others like John Quinn and A. S. W. Rosenbach certainly would.

To Quinn, Joyce would sell a handwritten presentation copy of *Ulysses* in its entirety, but with Rosenbach, Joyce would attempt to buy back this very same work.<sup>16</sup> Michael Barasanti notes that Quinn “bought the corrected proof sheets of *Portrait* for 20 [pounds], in March of 1917” and then offered to buy “any other manuscript Joyce had available” (8). A year later, Quinn decided to sell the *Ulysses* manuscript. Joyce felt the sale would in the end decrease the accumulated value. In a letter to Robert McAlmon, he wrote: “Quinn did not reply to my cable but finally wrote to say he had sold the manuscript for \$1975. On the same day he bought back two poems by George Meredith (about 70 pages of manuscript) for \$1400 or \$1500” (n.d. (early 1924)). In a letter to Miss Weaver, he complained again of the sale “and on the same day and at the same sale [Quinn] bought back two manuscript poems of Meredith (50 pages) for \$1400 . . . what is one to do when a manuscript of 500,000 words is sold by an admirer who on the same day buys back a few pages of not very meritorious verse by a prose writer for almost the same sum” (8 February 1924)? His bitterness is even more evident when he mentions to McAlmon that he does not think Quinn will try to auction off his letter declining half the sum of the proceeds from the sale.

In August of 1924, Joyce realizes why Quinn was selling his library: Quinn was deathly ill. Joyce writes in a letter to Miss Weaver that “it seemed to me a lamentable affair in every way, and so far as I am concerned it did me a fair amount of harm with a public which values people by sales” (16 August 1924). However, the sale to Rosenbach actually turned out to be a wonderful one as he was a “preeminent book and manuscript

dealer” (Barasanti 9). While Rosenbach would find rare works and sell them on the market, he kept Joyce’s *Ulysses* manuscript for himself. Joyce’s inability to purchase the manuscript from Rosenbach has ensured not only its safekeeping but also highlighted to Joyce the shift in authority from author to collector. One result was that the manuscript has since come to be known as the Rosenbach manuscript thereby indicating the shift in ownership.

As generous as Joyce could be, he was not interested in being the kind of author who lets go of his material upon publication. In fact, the more experimental his writing became, the more Joyce invested in its success. Since he often published his works serially first, he would pour over the reviews, Ellmann recounts, with a sense of frustration over the lack of understanding. In an effort to correct this, he worked closely with those he trusted. For example, Joyce worked with Stuart Gilbert on his *James Joyce’s Ulysses: A Study*. When Harriet Shaw Weaver expressed confusion over *Work in Progress*, Joyce wrote out glossaries for her in his letters. In 1929, Joyce arranged for Beach to publish *Our Exagmination Round his Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*; this collection of essays about *Work in Progress* is one in which Joyce had plenty of control over. For example, Joyce writes to Weaver and explains how he “checked references and supervised the manuscript” (27 May 1929). Additionally, he also lays out his plan to get these articles about *Work in Progress* translated into multiple journals. He explains how he prompts Gilbert to contact the *Fortnightly* in Dublin and convinces the editor to take Gilbert’s article for a July issue. He also recounts how he convinces Aldington, editor of a collection of poems, *Des Imagistes*, to publish “Kevin’s page from Pt II.” Joyce writes to Eugene Jolas and states that since “[t]here [is] nothing

of mine in the current No. of “transition” could he instead “translate [Ernst Robert] Curtius[?] article for it and put in Beckett’s and the glossary part of S[tuart] G[ilbert]’s” (27 May 1929)?

A day later, he writes again to Weaver with a plan to “succeed O” (symbol for *Our Exagmination . . .*) with “X” and describes “X” as “a book of only 4 *long* essays by 4 contributors” (28 May 1929). He also succeeds in arranging for an Italian translation of Beckett’s article and “will try to do the same for Budgen’s in a Danish or Swedish one.” He anticipates Weaver’s disapproval and writes: “Do not blame me for all this intriguing. I have little or no support and have to defend a difficult cause, whether right or wrong I no longer know or care two straws” (28 May 1929). In fact, he cared even less for everyone to know he was behind these efforts. Joyce proved himself the master architect of his magnum opus.

To prove the point further, in a response to Valery Larbaud, Joyce tells Larbaud that he is right, Joyce did “stand behind those twelve Marshals more or less directing them what lines of research to follow” (regarding *Exagmination*) (30 July 1929), and he makes no apologies for it. Joyce may have had little involvement behind reader-reception, but he was going to do the best he could with the little authority he still had. Going back to Joyce’s comments to both Ibsen and Yeats in reference to an author in decline, Joyce had to do what he could to ensure his own “higher and higher enlightenment.”

To those who followed him—as he followed Ibsen—he was kind and offered his assistance and guidance. When Budgen, who had been such a help to Joyce during the making of *Ulysses*, wanted to write a book about Joyce, he liked the idea immediately but

was still skeptical. Joyce writes to T. S. Eliot: “[C]ounting Jordan Smith, Stuart Gilbert, Gorman’s two books, Louis Golding and Charles Duff, Budgen’s would be the seventh book in the field. I should like to see his illustrations and he could do a good text if he chooses a line different from the others” (22 February 1932). In March, he writes to Budgen in an attempt to support his idea but turns down Budgen’s request to include correspondence, as Joyce says “this invades Gorman’s ground,” and he asks Budgen to “outline [his] book to [Joyce] a little more precisely” (1 March 1932). In September of 1933, Joyce again writes to Budgen and tells him that he and Gilbert are going through the galleys of Budgen’s book: “Apart from corrections I am making a short list of things you ought to put in notes. It reads very well. You will certainly make a great hit and get more orders for essays or pictures just as you like” (10 September 1933). He also, thoughtfully, tells him to “hang on to your MS.” Indeed as Joyce could attest, manuscripts and collectors are a major part of the literary industry. However, as much as collectors such as Beach, Weaver, Quinn, and later Rosenbach mattered to Joyce, his works, notebooks, manuscripts, and letters ended up “in the hands of others,” in library collections around the world.

### **The Building of a Legacy: Joyce “In the Hands of Others”**

The first example of Joyce in the hands of others, of course, is the purchase of the Rosenbach Manuscript. It is preserved and exhibited in the Rosenbach Museum and Library and still of incredible value to Joyce scholars today. Derick Dreher explains that “[s]ince 1954, the Rosenbach Museum and Library has preserved and developed collections with an eye to making them accessible to a broad and diverse public, from the

interested individual to the advanced scholar” (5). Janine Utell in “The Archivist, the Archaeologist, and the Amateur” states that this archive is not only home to the manuscript but is also “the site for one of the best-known Bloomsday readings on the East Coast” (63). During Bloomsday, the manuscript is displayed outside of the museum “on a sidestreet in Philadelphia” and thousands of people gather to listen as “people read from the novel” (57). Utell claims that the Rosenbach Museum and Library is different than other archives because of this interaction. While previously calling the archive the “resting place of the authority of the author” and describing the professors who use it the “grave diggers” and “crypt keepers” of this material (53, 54), she also connects the archive, in the vein of Foucault, to an archeological site. Wherein private collections, the archived material is something that is jealously preserved, the Rosenbach archive invites the public in: with the Bloomsday readings, Utell asserts that “[t]his is not simply a reenactment of the past.”

Rather, as theorized by Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks, “it is itself a form of archaeology. By embodying the text, by living it again at a specific, localized site of celebration, by highlighting its discontinuities, the past is necessarily brought to the surface and regarded in shifting light” (63). Vicki Mahaffey expands on the idea of making a text live again when she links the term “corpus” with “corpse” stating that “Joyce knew that the corpus is brief and decomposition inevitable, for letters as for the living,” which is why Joyce’s “lifelong obsession was to resist entropy by finding new ways of making words come to life” (7). He also, as has been shown, attempted to find ways to ensure his words and thereby his legacy would continue after his death.

Michael Groden reflects that “[t]extual scholars and literary critics who have retraced Joyce’s writing in an attempt to make sense of the documents he left us and to find patterns that sometimes elude even their creator” have experienced the “complications, complexities, perplexities, and ‘stuplex[itie]s” that occur when reading Joyce (225). To say that Joyce left his readers and scholars these documents is true, but it is a truth that is complicated by the meanderings of Joyce’s notebooks, typescripts, galley proofs, and letters. Why he did not, like Gertrude Stein, for instance, simply donate his materials to a library, where he would have a better chance of controlling the intent and direction of the archive is a question about which we can only speculate. Perhaps the most obvious reason was that Gertrude Stein was in the minority—authors were not yet sending their materials off for archiving. Single-author archives, in fact, were not as common. More common during this explosion in archive building would have been the storage of the daily and weekly periodicals as well as national and historical works. Early twentieth-century archivists continued what their nineteenth century predecessors began; that is, linking the collection of history to the creation of a national identity. This identity was not yet quite linked to an individual identity. This too would change and quite rapidly because the construction of a national identity also relied on the construction of a national literature. Joyce was aware of this change in focus and addresses this implicitly in *Ulysses*, particularly in the “Scylla and Charybdis” episode. This discussion of libraries, national identity, and literature will be fully analyzed in the following chapter.

Most likely, Joyce would be pleased, however, that his works are now in library archives. After all, he often wrote about both libraries and librarians. In fact, Joyce took great pains in the recreation of the characters in Dublin, the geography, and of public

spaces; to do so, he spent copious amounts of time researching in the National Library of Ireland or—when he could no longer visit the Library—through borrowed books and detailed descriptions of Dublin from his Aunt Josephine or other friends still residing in Dublin.

### **The Building of a Legacy: Libraries in Joyce's Writing**

Joyce's works, rich with historically accurate details, often make use of both famous and lesser-known libraries. In his works, Joyce alludes to the Bodelian, the "Cottonian library"—which is now the British Museum—the library founded by Narcissus Marsh near St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin, as well as, of course, the National Library, to name just a few. Marsh's library, Don Gifford notes, is the oldest public library in all of Ireland (49). Libraries are, for Joyce, beacons of history and knowledge as well as places of inquiry and power. The library and the part it and its librarians play in the development of both the artist and scholar features in all of Joyce's works.

For example, in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, one of the first allusions to a library occurs when Stephen is a young boy sick for the first time in his tenure at Clongowe's Wood College. He is sent to the infirmary and wonders if he should write home to his mother to tell her that he wishes to come home. When he considers, instead, all the things that make him happy and that would make him feel better, the library springs immediately to mind: "There was a book in the library about Holland. There were lovely foreign names in it and pictures of strange looking cities and ships. It made you feel so happy" (I. 691-94). The memory of the library and the happy books it contains of far-off places allows the young Stephen the ability to remember what he has seen before

and imagine the places described in the book as well as what other treasures he could behold when he can once again revisit the library. Additionally, this scene in the infirmary foreshadows Stephen's later decision for self-exile. Already, from an early age, Stephen is misunderstood by both his peers and his teachers. That Father Dolan, the prefect, would believe him to make up stories about how his glasses broke or that his classmates pushed him into the ditch begins the long line of insult that would lead to his decision to leave Ireland altogether. The world as evidenced in library books have more to offer.

In Chapter Three of *Portrait*, Stephen's positive associations of libraries changes to something more destructive. At this point in the narrative, Stephen is remorseful for the sins he has committed. He attends a sermon and once again a library is invoked, only this time not by Stephen but by the preacher, who places conscience, or thought, as the second pain, which "afflict[s] the souls of the damned in hell" (III. 940). The priest claims that memories of past pleasures will be dreadful:

In the lake of all-devouring flame the proud king will remember the pomps of his court, the wise but wicked man his libraries and instruments of research, the lover of artistic pleasures his marbles and pictures and other art treasures . . . . They will remember all this and loathe themselves and their sins. For how miserable will all those pleasures seem to the soul condemned to suffer in hellfire for ages and ages. How they will rage and fume to think that they have lost the bliss of heaven for the dross of earth, for a few pieces of metal, for vain honours, for bodily comforts, for a tingling of the nerves. (III. 947-63)

For the priest, fire represents a Puritanical view of hell. Past pleasures of a sinful nature include “libraries and instruments of research” as well as art and “the pomps of court.” Stephen is cautioned about anything that draws attention away from God. This includes worshipping knowledge. In the infirmary, for instance, Stephen does not find solace in God; he finds solace in a memory of a book. This creates a disjunction between the image of the library as place of refuge with books about foreign and strange places with one of sin. To seek knowledge invokes Lucifer’s hubris before the fall of the angels from heaven and into that “lake of all devouring flame.”

This episode too foreshadows Stephen’s development from a child with keen interest in all forms of knowledge (books, life, and emotional as well as sexual experience) into an artist, who will ultimately reject the Church in favor of his own way. Later he will write: “The artist, like the God of the creation, remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined, out of existence, indifferent, pairing his fingernails” (V. 1467-9). If God exists, then he is distant and aloof. The artist’s handiwork, too, remains behind for judgment, but the judgment does not come from God nor the artist but posterity. Stephen Dedalus’ comment to Lynch about the role of the artist occurs, interestingly enough, en route to the National Library of Ireland (V. 1471), and thereby proves once again how essential the library is to Joyce’s ideas about knowledge, art, and—ironically—the preservation of legacy.

Prior to Stephen’s revelation, Stephen leaves the church and goes to the University. In a description that overturns the preacher’s hellfire sermon but echoes a kind of divine intervention, Stephen hears his calling: “[A] confused music within him as

of memories and names which he was almost conscious of but could not capture even for an instant; . . . A voice from beyond the world was calling” (IV. 726, 733).

The voices calling are his fellow school mates, Dwyer and Towser. He recognizes them “by their speech,” and he is chilled. Yet as he stands there “in deference to their calls and parried their banter with easy words[,]” he is being called into existence, into his namesake: “The Dedalus.” They continue to call morphing his name into many different ways “Stephanos! . . . Dedalos! . . . Bous Stephanoumenos! Bous Stephaneforos” (IV. 735-740)! Instead of seeing this name calling as ridicule, Stephen views this as his calling, his coming into being. He is Dedalus, “that fabulous artificer.” It is this realization that sends his soul from “the grave of boyhood”—those shackles of the priesthood—to “freedom and power,” that comes from the University and creativity. From this point onwards, Stephen will not follow the path of the Priest but that of the artist, which removes any of the power and guilt that previously plagued him.

The representation of the library within this narrative, therefore, undergoes a parallel transition with that of Stephen as a boy into Stephen as artist. The library becomes an imagined space for the development of the artist as well as for a place for sustained and uninhibited creativity; it starts as a place of refuge for a young boy, looking out into the world through the beautiful images found in books, and develops into a sinister place that lures young minds away from God, and finally emerges as a dynamic space, a new refuge characterized by the exchange of ideas, where the artist can interact with the world through the vast storehouse of materials; it becomes a place where creativity and the artist can be nurtured and sustained. While Joyce himself does not state this is his epiphany for himself, the fact that the library once again emerges in *Ulysses*

underscores its importance as a space wherein the artist can develop. This assertion becomes more complicated when what Stephen is dealing with is no longer the books collected in the library but the librarians themselves.

In *Ulysses*, this storyline continues at the National Library of Ireland. Stephen Dedalus, that “fabulous artificer” creates a theory which epitomizes the artist, like God, to be invisible and indifferent. To George Russell and the librarians—John Eglinton, Richard Irvine Best, and T. W. Lyster—he says that Shakespeare’s work can be interpreted using events from Shakespeare’s private life. Russell is disgusted by Stephen’s biographical hypothesizing and censures him for “prying into the family life of a great man” (9. 181). Stephen’s argument is that Anne Hathaway cuckolds Shakespeare and that *Hamlet* is autobiographical, which tells a story of a murdered King—murdered at the hands of his brother, who becomes the Queen’s lover. King Hamlet himself, Stephen will say, is the ghost of Shakespeare talking to the ghost of his son, Hamnet Shakespeare, who died during William Shakespeare’s life.

John Eglinton, a librarian at the National Library of Ireland and editor of *Dana*, a new and cutting-edge Irish Literary magazine, berates Stephen: “Do you mean to fly in the face of the tradition of three centuries? . . . she died, for literature at least, before she was born” (9. 214-216). Stephen’s retort to Eglinton ignores his comment to instead place Anne solidly back into the physical realm of mortality. He says, “she died at age thirty-seven having born Shakespeare’s children and seen him to his deathbed” (9. 215-22). The difference in Eglinton and Stephen’s interpretation has everything to do with bringing the author down from a pedestal and into the realm of reality.

Best, however, reacts contrary to both Russell and Eglinton; he encourages Stephen to continue on with his theory. Of all the librarians at the National Library, Best is the one who provides Stephen with the most latitude in his creativity. Most likely this is due to the real Richard Irvine Best, who has the “ethos of an archivist” (Wizisla 1). In reality, Best was the more scholarly librarian; he was a translator of Gaelic and of Celtic myths. He also kept and published the private correspondences between himself and George Moore as well as with other literary figures.

In *Ulysses*, Best states: “But Hamlet is so personal, isn’t it? . . . I mean, a kind of private paper, don’t you know, of his private life” (9. 362-363). Whether the pronoun “his” refers to Shakespeare or to Hamlet blurs the distinction between reality and fiction and underlines the way in which narrative, in any form—private paper, drama, or biography of “his private life”—must always already be imagined. Stephen’s theories aim to take biographical and historical context in order to offer other interpretive lenses by which to understand that same text.

Interestingly, Stephen’s theories result in a debate that extends beyond the understanding of Shakespeare’s text to include what is considered the best methods of inquiry for scholarship. Stephen and Best seem to agree that contextual information can be an important interpretive feature of research; whereas Russell absolutely will not budge from more traditional methods and, furthermore, would rather risk offense and leave in the middle of Stephen’s presentation than challenge him to support his claims. Additionally, by using the real names of librarians, as Joyce does, from the National Library of Ireland into a fictional work, Joyce adds depth to Stephen’s argument; the prying into the family life of a great man is turned on its head to expose the people in

charge of the future development of Irish literature and scholarship and their predispositions toward ideas about scholarship.

Also, the parallels between Stephen's experiences with the narrative representations of the librarians with those of Joyce's experience with the real-life persons bearing these characters' names cannot go unstated. Joyce, while well known to Russell, Eglinton, Lyster, and Best, like Stephen, was not always well received. Also like Stephen, Joyce was often excluded from literary salons such as the one mentioned in this episode of *Ulysses* by Best to Russell. Stephen's thought, "See this. Remember" presents the reader with a declaration to remember how Stephen was treated; from biographical information from Joyce's biographers as well as from his private correspondence, this narrative representation of literary shunning over nontraditional investigatory methods offers scholars an echo of how Joyce was treated. "See this. Remember" marks the schism between Joyce and members of the Irish Literary Revival as well as between Stephen Dedalus and those characters bearing the same name.

Moreover, *Ulysses* becomes an archive of these people and their treatment of Stephen. Through the "coffined thoughts" that surround Stephen "in mummycases, embalmed in the spice of words," Joyce becomes curator of this debate—that is, he figuratively mummifies these words so they can be preserved and noted by others (9.352-353). In the next chapter, I argue that the National Library of Ireland in *Ulysses* becomes a space which exemplifies Stephen's transformation and through which Joyce is able to archive its early curators; consequently he also weaves himself as author into that historical narrative. Before moving onto the next chapter, however, it is worth mentioning that there is another library that figures prominently in Joyce's works. The

library of Alexandria, while imagined, its collections mostly lost, becomes a kind of totem to which Joyce frequently returns.

In the “Proteus” episode of *Ulysses*, for instance, Stephen famously recalls “Remember your epiphanies written on green oval leaves, deeply deep, copies to be sent if you died to all the great libraries of the world, including Alexandria” (3. 141-143).<sup>17</sup> The library at Alexandria was damaged twice by fire: first in 47 B. C. by Julius Caesar and completely destroyed by another fire in A. D. 641 “during the Arab conquest” (Gifford 51). That Stephen recalls this desire to send his epiphanies to all the libraries including one that was destroyed by fire draws a connection between archives, destruction, and resurrection.

The library at Alexandria, with its theme of physical destruction, also appears in *Finnegans Wake*, this time in connection with something larger than the artist’s archive. Joyce writes: “And so it all ended. . . And so everybody heard their plaint and all listened to their plause. The letter! The litter! And the soother the bitther! Of eyebrow penciled, by lipstipple penned. Borrowing a word and begging the question and stealing tinder and slipping like soap” (93. 22-25). The letter is the “kay” (93. 22) or key to following this work’s wandering maze. However, like many artifacts, it is no longer fully comprehensible; it is a letter but it is also part of the littered mound that Biddy the Hen will retrieve, pecking at it so that “[t]he letter! The litter!” is riddled with holes similar to the Gilgamesh tablets, wherein the story is inscribed but never fully legible.

What is borrowed is “a word,” which is never stable, its referents “slipping like soap.” With the stolen tinder, the letter is associated with fire, with burning, and again with total destruction. This excerpt is followed by a long list from which “[t]he letter!

The litter” is borrowed, begged, stolen, and slipped: “From dark Rosa Lane a sigh and a weep . . . from hymn Op. 2 Phil Adolphos the weary O, the leery O, . . . from Timm Finn again’s weak tribes loss of strength to his sowheel” (93. 27-35). The reference to “2 Phil Adolphus” is actually another way to say “Ptolmey II Philadelphus,” who founded the library at Alexandria. From “hymn,” or him, the reader transitions to “Timm Finn Again,” or Tim Finnegan, and the themes of resurrection. Finnegan’s death inspires the folk song that immortalizes his death and his life. What the narrator(s) are telling us is that the main character’s trial has come to an end: “The solid man” or HCE has been “saved by his sillied,” or rivered “woman. Crackajolking away like a hearse on fire” (94. 3-4). Hearse and fire further fuses the image of death with the promethean gift of life through fire. However, it is through this journey of the letter that “Sin fromm Son, acity arose finfin fun fun, a sitting arrows” (94. 18-19), a position I will demonstrate further in Chapter Three.

And so the cycle of life and of narrative, interwoven from within the very language itself, repeats itself; or as Joyce puts it: “rallthesameagain. . . So pass the push for port sake” (94. 27, 33). In this example the library at Alexandria is aligned with the letter once lost, now found. Imagined or aflame, the archive’s contents are always threatened; they can be hidden and buried, lost, and damaged, but the pieces left—the remains—become part of another narrative and thereby tethered to another history and are thus interwoven within another archive. Like Derrida’s *Le Carte Postal*, we are to consider these letters, or “envois” as “the remainders of a recently destroyed correspondence. Destroyed by fire or by that which figuratively takes its place” (The Post Card 3). *Finnegans Wake* joins Ptolemy with Finnegan and Alexandria with the littered

mound. What happens to the archive becomes part of the archive's history. The archive is not solely comprised of the work but also includes the interactions of that work within other works.

Another example of a library in the *Wake* occurs during HCE's trial: "Our library he is hoping to ye public" (313.02). Library here is Irish slang for pub, and not just any pub—it is HCE's pub. It cannot be coincidence that Joyce associates Ptolemy the II, founder of the Library at Alexandria, with Tim Finnegan, who at his own wake is awakened by the pouring of whiskey; the resurrection happens at the pub, just as the figurative re-resurrections of an historical and cultural moment occur and reoccur with every excavation/exhibition of an archive.

Perhaps it makes sense that the transformation from boy to artist in *Portrait* to the postcreator that comes out of *Ulysses* would end in *Finnegans Wake* with yet another transformation. For example, in this last work, Joyce alludes to the bombing of the Public Records office on 30 June 1922.<sup>18</sup> The papers from this archive were "blown from all over Dublin and many archives irreplaceably lost."<sup>19</sup> However, rather than focus on the destructive nature of the fire, a loss similar to the one at Alexandria all those centuries ago, Joyce writes of metamorphosis:

Where the inflammabilis might pursue his comburenda with a pure  
flame and a true flame and a flame all too gasser, soot. The worst is over.  
Wait! . . . In the lost of the gleamens. . . a message interfering intermitting  
interskips from them (pet!) on herzian waves, . . . a butterfly from her  
zipclasp handbag, a wounded dove astarted from, escaping out her  
forecotes. Isle wail for yews, O doherlynt! The poetesser. And around its

scorched cap she has twilled a twine of flame to let the laitiest know she's  
marrid. (232. 3-5, 9-15)

With these flames all turns to “soot” or ash and “the worst is over,” but the juxtaposition of the soot with the “gleamens” or glow of dying embers heralds a new message of hope and of life. The message is what remains and interferes with ever-changing life. Alluding to the story of Noah’s ark, a butterfly and “wounded dove” “escape” from the waves to perform an announcement of marriage. The “twine of flame” that surrounds the “scorched cap” presents both an image of destruction by fire and also the birth of something new, something different, something “marrid.” “Marrid,” of course, combines the words “marred” with “married” and effects a connection between something destroyed and marred such as two lives previously separated but then later joined, or resurrected, into one life as in marriage.

Therefore, the artist develops along a trajectory of intense struggle. From the shackles of boyhood, which in its description resembles the grave and death, to an artist in exile, a creative genius, who through word and works, may not escape death once his flame is extinguished but his message will “interskip[]” away. This will only happen, of course, if that message is kept safe in multiple locations. The artist must send his epiphanies—whether on green oval leaves or in pages of script or processed into type—to all the world’s libraries; for these are the places where art is kept alive, even with only an echo of its creator or artificer left behind.

The idea of the library definitely interested Joyce and became the metaphor for an artist’s evolution; its archival properties further the opportunity for the work’s continual resurrection. However, outside of art, libraries interested Joyce only on a practical level.

To be published, for Joyce, is to have made it into print, but to be read was more difficult and therefore more important; to be remembered as a great artist was the impetus behind saving his published works as well as the notebooks, drafts, and manuscripts. This understanding of his own desire to be archived also developed over time. This interest increased Joyce's involvement in both the production and reception of his work.<sup>20</sup>

Perhaps Joyce's interest in his work would extend no further than to its reception and the increase in its value if not for concern over censorship laws, literary piracy, book seizures by customs authorities, obscenity trials in America, and both praise and criticism coming from the world over. All of these things kept Joyce constantly engaged with his artistic and authorial image. This concern would also extend to the preservation of his material, especially in light of the two world wars fought on European soil—soil from which he and his family were often forced to relocate. Yet with every move Joyce made, he had friends and family protecting his small horde, which included his notebooks, manuscripts, drafts, letters, and—above all—his books. Even after his eyesight was so far gone that he had to rely on others to transcribe his work, Joyce continued to keep or have others keep for him these materials. The reason for this archiving seems to be because Joyce was confident in his genius. Yet, this confidence would wane in light of what would happen after his death. Library collections—both private and public—have, in fact, helped to keep Joyce's writings accessible.

The concept of an archive is indeed a complicated one for Joyce. On the one hand, he wanted more than anything to be recognized and his work appreciated; he saw the collecting of his material as a means to ensure his legacy, but he refrained—or tried to—from controlling the outcome. Exceptions, of course, exist. The sale of the

handwritten *Ulysses* manuscript from Quinn to Rosenbach is one such exception. While he did not manage to send all of his work to all the libraries of the world, he sure did have a hand in trying. He relied on the kindness of his friends, who were to become the overseers of his collections. He sent many manuscripts to Harriet Shaw Weaver and Sylvia Beach, and the former was to become his first literary executor. Yet while Joyce did not mention sending his drafts and notebooks to library collections in the way that others like Gertrude Stein did, he did recognize the library and its archiving capacities as an important part of a literary legacy. He recognized their value and acknowledged the impact that both libraries and the librarians have had on him by immortalizing them forever within his work. Additionally, scholars are assured of Joyce's desire for his works to be kept safe in archival collections for he left behind such detailed notebooks, with color-coded revisions, in order to make his composition process and the evolution of his ideas clear to scholars for centuries to come. Making his works and the craft of producing these pieces understandable was important to Joyce. Furthermore, to have his archival materials studied would have certainly been appreciated by a writer who also had spent such time researching other authors and their works.

Joyce struggled with the desire to control and not control his developing legacy, and in fact, Joyce, in the hands of others, has done well especially post-copyright. The daily appearance of Joyce's name and works throughout the world attests to his ever-pervasive influence on both academic and popular culture. Whether this is due in larger part to Joyce scholarship and criticism or to the way in which his popularity as a difficult author has resulted in his iconic status remains indistinguishable. The following two chapters take a closer look into the representation of archives within *Ulysses* and

*Finnegans Wake*. Rather than focus solely on these representations, these chapters explore how the texts themselves become meta archives—that is in the way they, through fiction, record the construction of archival institutions and various modes of archiving.

## CHAPTER THREE

### *ULYSSES*: JAMES JOYCE'S COUNTER-ARCHIVE

See this. Remember. (James Joyce *Ulysses*)

The previous chapter examined Joyce's personal papers and the recollection of his friends and family to show that he had a hand in guiding the direction of his archive. Joyce's understanding of the archive and the development of the author-centered archive also lead him to consider the archive and its representation in fiction. This chapter goes further into the fictional borders of *Ulysses* to explore another aspect of archives as represented in Joyce's *Ulysses*. For example, the representation of Ireland's premier archival institution, the National Library of Ireland, and the librarians responsible for its early successes are both featured in the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode. This representation creates a kind of meta-archive, wherein the institution of archiving and its archivists are, in turn, also archived within *Ulysses*—a text whose manuscripts will ultimately end up archived within the National Library of Ireland. Furthermore, in the recording and exhibiting of librarians such as Thomas W. Lyster, Richard Irvine Best, and William Kirkpatrick Magee (pen name John Eglinton), Joyce documents their involvement with both the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival—two movements which sought to mold the future of an independent Ireland through a renewed emphasis on the Gaelic language and an idealized vision of its past. Both movements were highly influential in creating the need for a totally Irish history in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and in shaping the future direction of Irish scholarship and

the arts. Therefore, Joyce's fictional representation of the library and those librarians involved with the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival become important to understanding Joyce's critique of these movements; additionally, reading *Ulysses* explores how those involved in the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival were not only the key architects behind the future of these movements but also how these movements would ultimately be remembered. *Ulysses*, therefore, becomes a counter-archive of both, in which Joyce, like Stephen, reminds the reader to "See this. Remember" (*U* 9. 294).

Joyce was critical of the Gaelic League for the same reason he was critical of the Irish Literary Revival—he felt these organizations and the people who ran them (with quite a bit of overlap between them) did a disservice in their rendering of what it means to be Irish and especially of what it means to be an Irish artist. Joyce had set ideas about what Ireland's new literature should and should not be. For example, Ireland's literature should not be written to further some moral or religious purpose but should, instead, present "the everlasting hopes, desires and hates of us, or deal[] with a symbolic presentment of our widely related nature" ("Drama and Life" 41).<sup>21</sup> Instead Irish literature had a duty to represent Ireland as it in fact really is.

Perhaps the clearest Joyce ever came to a definition of what Irish literature is and what Ireland is about comes from the "Holy Office," a self-published broadside of 1904 (the year, of course, when he met Nora Barnacle and the year in which *Ulysses* is set). In this poem, Joyce criticizes the Irish Literary Revival because they "dream their dreamy dreams," while the poets and artists of the future (such as himself) have to "carry off their filthy streams" (Lines 49-50). According to Joyce, a poet must ". . . enter heaven, travel

hell, / Be piteous or terrible” in order to be “A Dante . . . unprejudiced” (11-12, 16). Therefore, it was an artist’s duty to leave behind the dream-world of the Romantics in favor of a more open and honest way of writing; the artist of the twentieth century would instead have to deal with everything from the mundane to the extravagant, and he must do it in an unprejudiced manner. What is vulgar is not necessarily antithetical to art, and—as *Ulysses* exemplifies—Joyce saw both the beautiful and the vulgar as realities of modern life to be recorded and assimilated into a modern literature.

While the Gaelic League and Irish Literary Revival of 1904, for the most part, ignored Joyce’s literary aspirations, *Ulysses* is the textual space created by Joyce through which he is able to re-inscribe himself back into that history; in other words, the Joyce that the Gaelic League and Irish Literary Revival dismissed has been re-inscribed to reflect a different reality. It is this reinscription of himself as author and—in parts—as fictionalized Stephen Dedalus that distinguishes Joyce from other authors, and thereby distinguishes his texts as something more than historiography or encyclopedic. This is not to say that the work is not encyclopedic or historically grounded; sections of the text can also be read as meta archival. In “Scylla and Charybdis,” for example, Joyce writes about the National Library of Ireland, an institution which was still in its infancy and which would become a premier archival institution. At the time Joyce was a student at University College Dublin, from 1898-1903, he often went to the National Library, and he did meet and debate with the librarians, who were very active in the literary and language movements in Ireland. Furthermore, he not only wrote a fictionalized representation of 1904 Dublin based on real personages and places—as he also does in *Portrait* and *Dubliners*—but he also included archival institutions, the most obvious and

most important is the National Library. Joyce's depictions of the librarians and the Irish Literary Revival as well as the Gaelic League not only creates a space for Joyce's fictionalized persona, Stephen Dedalus, within that history but it also has literally placed Joyce and his work back into the library—among those who would most likely never have included him in the first place. His voice, which was then not taken seriously, is now taken very seriously. That his characters and his book are celebrated by the National Library (and throughout Dublin) every June 16<sup>th</sup>—where people walk around reciting his work, reliving an experience that only ever happened in fiction, and donning Edwardian costumes—says something more meaningful about the work; it transcends into something else, something extraordinary. Thus *Ulysses*, I argue, goes beyond the ordinary fictionalized recording of history; it offers instead a change in the historical record, effecting a kind of *supra* archive; it transcends boundaries between fiction and reality not only in its subject matter but also in how that subject matter is remembered and even celebrated the world over today. In other words, *Ulysses* is more than a counter-narrative in that it blurs the line between fact and fiction in its exhibition of the past; the conflation of real and imagined events changes the way readers remember and revise both modern Irish history and modern Irish Literature.<sup>22</sup> There are numerous ways Joyce does this in all his works; for this chapter, however, I will concentrate only on Joyce's critical response to Douglas Hyde, the leader of the Gaelic League, and the editors, librarians, and curators of the Irish Literary Revival and Joyce's participation in Irish Literary Revival through an analysis of the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of *Ulysses*, before finally demonstrating Joyce's literal re-writing of this history through his revision of

Douglas Hyde's poem, "My Grief on the Sea." In the next chapter, I will explore gossip as an archival and narrative mode perfect for texts which act as supra archives.

### **Joyce and the Gaelic League**

Hyde delivered his famous speech, "The Necessity of De-Anglicizing Ireland" to the Irish National Literary Society in 1892, thus ensuring the association of Ireland's language revival with that of its literary one. The speech's popularity instigated the development of the Gaelic League in 1893 with Hyde as its head. Additionally, Hyde's published collection of poems, *The Lovesongs of Connacht*, further integrated him into the Irish Literary Revival, which was led primarily by W. B. Yeats, Lady Gregory, and George "AE" Russell. The premise of Hyde's speech is that the Irish people have diverged from "the right path" and "ceas[ed] to be Irish" because they have forgotten their language in favor of English; they have dropped "their euphonious Irish names" for "monosyllab[ic] English" ones; and they read books in English and yet "know nothing about Gaelic literature." In order to combat this, Hyde and others like him looked for opportunities to reinvigorate the Irish arts through a re-discovery (albeit imagined) of their Irish roots.

One such enterprise was the Irish Literary Theatre, which, at the end of the nineteenth century (1899), debuted Yeats' *The Countess Cathleen*. Joyce was among the few who were not scandalized by the play's content. However, in 1901, Joyce became disappointed in the Irish Literary Theatre and their production of Hyde's *Casad-an-Súgán* as well as Yeats' and Moore's *Diarmuid and Grania*<sup>23</sup>; he wrote "Day of the Rabblement" as a response, claiming that the Theatre that had been a "champion of

progress” had disappointingly “surrendered to the popular will” and become “the property of the rabblement of the most belated race in Europe” (70). Already Joyce was positioning himself to become a leader in this movement. The problem was that nobody else seemed quite to agree with him.

However, Joyce did not immediately set himself against the Gaelic League and their emphasis on reviving the Irish language; at the urging of his friend, George Clancy, Joyce enrolled in a Gaelic course offered under Patrick Henry Pearse who, in 1903, became the editor of the Gaelic League’s newspaper, *An Claidheamh Soluis*, or the *Sword of Light*. Robert Tracy explains how Joyce “mediat[es] on, quarrel[s] with, and revis[es] Hyde’s efforts to promote an Irish culture based on the Irish language and Irish tradition” (154). Tracy’s “Mr. Joker and Dr. Hyde: Joyce’s Politic Polyglot Polygraphs” maintains that while Joyce “declined to write in Irish, and remained skeptical about the revival of the Irish language, he recognized the revolutionary implications in the project, for it called into question all assumptions about how one speaks or writes” (154). Unfortunately, Joyce’s experience with the language course taught by Pearse resulted in an ultimate rejection of his teachings.

The main reason for this absolute rejection had to do with the Gaelic League’s attitudes toward the English language. Richard Ellmann’s *James Joyce* provides an anecdote of how Pearse denounced one of Joyce’s favorite words, “thunder,” because Pearse said it was an “example of verbal inadequacy” of the English language. Joyce wholeheartedly disagreed with this sentiment as he considers the English language to be just as much his as it was England’s. Moreover, Joyce, as a lover of many languages, disliked exclusion of any language in favor of another. Therefore, Joyce balked against

the League's ideas because they "found it necessary to exalt Irish by denigrating English" (61). English was the language Joyce grew up speaking and in which he chose to write.

Additionally, wholesale rejections of any kind were sure to lose Joyce's sympathies, having recently separated from arguably one of the more dogmatic religions the world has ever known, which is perhaps why even after the disastrous language courses offered by Pearse, Joyce still did not completely reject the Gaelic League. For example, in 1907, Joyce lived in Trieste and was asked to present a few lectures on Ireland. In one such lecture later published as "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages," Joyce presents a short history of the Gaelic League; to their credit, he notes that "the only Irish grammars and dictionaries that existed in Europe until a few years ago, when the Gaelic League was founded in Dublin, were the works of Germans" (155). Indeed, it was because of Hyde, who in an attempt to stimulate Ireland's pride in her ancestry and language, posited "the Irish language is worth knowing," before asking: "or why would the greatest philologists of Germany, France, and Italy be emulously studying it?" Hyde also states that Ireland "does possess a literature," again, before asking: "or why would a German savant have made the calculation that the books written in Irish between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries, and still extant, would fill a thousand octavo volumes?" Joyce agrees with this argument and recounts to the Trieste audience that the "dusty archives of the Germans" are filled with their studies of "Celtic languages and the history of the five Celtic nations" (155). There is a sense of pride Joyce exhibits here in his home and in the Irish language. Indeed this pride is one of admiration for a strong Irish past. The size and magnitude of such a collection would have appealed to Joyce for

whom literature is in a constant state of evolution. While the past plays an important role for the present, it is never to subsume the present.

Joyce contends that the German archives still have value for those interested in Celtic studies, and while there is nothing wrong in studying Gaelic, there is something wrong with the politics of the Gaelic League, whom Joyce holds responsible for ruining the Irish language (*CW* 155). Joyce portrays the League as being no better than a secret club where its members “write to each other in Irish and often the poor postman, unable to read the address, must turn to his superior to untie the knot” (156). Additionally, Joyce comments that the Irish youth walk around the city speaking the “harsh and guttural” language “perhaps a little more emphatically than is necessary” (156), thus becoming posers and purposefully exclusionary. The Gaelic League becomes, for Joyce, a means by which to put down the British; however, for those Irish who do not speak the language or have a vested interest in the Gaelic League and their agenda can be detrimental. Furthermore to insist on an Irish language as a means of getting back to Ireland’s roots is disingenuous and no more authentically “Irish” than speaking English, which was the language the majority of the Irish population in 1904 spoke. There is a disjuncture that occurs between the Gaelic League’s understanding of Ireland’s past and Joyce’s. For example, Joyce recalls that the Gaelic League sought to re-envision an Ireland as a “very old nation” and “to renew [itself] under new forms of glories of a past civilization” (157). However, what those “glories of a past civilization” actually *were* is another matter entirely.

According to Joyce, the Druids were among the earliest settlers of Ireland and were the descendants of the Egyptian race (156).<sup>24</sup> Joyce reminds us that Ireland’s next

invaders were the Danes and the Norwegians, who were defeated by Brian Boru just outside Dublin (159); this defeat marked a new beginning in which “the Scandinavians . . . did not leave the country, but were gradually assimilated into the community” (159-60). The Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival again ignore this assimilation. Joyce, in contrast, argues “we must keep in mind if we want to understand the curious character of the modern Irishman” (159-60). The modern Irishman may very well include the “new Celtic race,” but what must also be remembered is that this race is “compounded of the old Celtic stock and the Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman races” (161)<sup>25</sup>—a fact that neither the Gaelic League nor the Irish Literary Revival cared to underline in their campaign for recreating an authentic Irish past. Whereas Joyce celebrates the assimilation of languages, people, and art, the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival were proposing a completely imagined—and what Vincent Cheng calls “inauthentic”—view of the past.<sup>26</sup>

For example, Hyde largely ignores this portion of Irish history where there are many different invaders who either assimilate into Irish culture or force the Irish to assimilate to theirs. In either case, their descendents make up the modern Irishman. Hyde, instead, argues that the Irish people “must strive to cultivate everything that is most racial, most smacking of the soil, most Gaelic, most Irish.” What is “most Gaelic, most Irish” is—for Joyce—the problem with Hyde’s logic; he certainly is not referring to the Egyptian-Druids or the Scandinavian and Norman race. A perfect example of this willful ignorance occurs when Hyde states that “in spite of the little admixture of Saxon blood in the north-east corner, this island is and will ever remain Celtic at the core, far more Celtic than most people imagine.” Furthermore, to be “smacking of the soil” refers to the Irish

peasants and agricultural workers. Hyde thinks they, like the crops they yield, need cultivating. They become nothing more than icons by which Hyde and the Irish Literary Revival can use in their re-imagining of an Irish past.

Joyce's "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages," however, gets closer to Irish history than Hyde's "Celtic at the core" speech. Hyde fails to mention any other invaders, who have—through the ages and as Joyce suggests—assimilated into the people of modern Ireland. Still, Hyde argues that the best way to develop Ireland is "[o]n racial lines," where the Irish can thus "create a strong feeling against West-Britonism." It is this anti-British sentiment and denial of the assimilation of other cultures, then, that Joyce takes issue with in his lecture. Joyce claims that "[t]he ancient enemies made common cause against the English aggressors, with the Protestant inhabitants (who had become *Hibernis Hiberniores*, more Irish than the Irish themselves) urging on . . . the descendants of the Danish and Norman and Anglo-Saxon settlers [to] champion[] the cause of the new Irish nation against the British tyranny" (161). Drawing attention to being "more Irish than the Irish themselves," Joyce reiterates his earlier point that Ireland is composed of the people from many cultures; if anything, it is this diversity *through* assimilation and not rejection *of* assimilation that created an island rich in literary successes.

From Joyce's "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages," we know that he thought the Irish language "a harsh and guttural tongue"(156) and that those who spoke it, usually overly-enthusiastic youths, made those "speaker[']s of *beurla* (that is, English) feel[] like a fish out of water, confused" (156). To say that it is not *nice* to exclude people by speaking a language they do not understand is trite, and yet it is true and a point that Joyce makes.<sup>27</sup> Joyce saw the Gaelic League and those who followed it, including some

of the members of the Irish Literary Revival, as imposters, whose only interest in the Irish people was based on a nostalgia for an imagined Irish past that never existed.

Additionally, just as Joyce did not ever fully reject the mission and vision of the Gaelic League (just its figurehead, Douglas Hyde), he also did not seek to reject the Irish Literary Revival. In fact, the “Scylla and Charybdis” episode of *Ulysses* is a representation of the kind of access Joyce did enjoy—especially during his college years at University College Dublin—to those involved in the Literary Revival. For example, in the early 1900s, Joyce was doing his best to establish himself with literary giants such as W. B. Yeats and George Moore, and the editors and librarians of the still fairly new National Library of Ireland, such as George “AE” Russell, John Eglinton (W. K. Magee), T. W. Lyster, and Richard Irvine Best.<sup>28</sup> These were the people who fostered and promoted young Irish artists.

“Scylla and Charybdis,” like the other episodes in *Ulysses*, portrays one of Ireland’s most esteemed establishments: the National Library.<sup>29</sup> Additionally, this chapter continues Joyce’s critique of Hyde but also implicates those directly involved with the Irish Literary Revival; it offers readers a unique perspective into the Library itself and of the men who, through employment or patronage, frequented the establishment and made it an intellectual hub for young Irish scholars and the literary elite who encouraged them.<sup>30</sup> Ultimately, though, Joyce criticizes the Revival for their failure to fulfill their mission to “champion progress” by “producing European masterpieces” (“Day of the Rabblement” 70). Joyce wanted originality in Irish literature, not a continuation of the Romantic tradition and certainly not works which valued instruction for the Irish people at the expense of well-written verse.<sup>31</sup> For Joyce, quantity of publication was not as

important to art as quality; furthermore, art that existed purely for political purposes did a disservice to the people who read the material as well as to the progress of modern art.

It is important to understand the relationships between these characters, whose real-life personas made up a powerful conglomerate of the publishing and highly-charged political literary scene and also how this one episode—perhaps more than any other—explores the break that occurs between Joyce and his nation; this chapter also shows how, in an ironic reversal of literary fame and fortune, Joyce is able to overcome their critiques of his artistic vision and re-write history to include him in it.

### **Joyce, the National Library, and the Leaders of the Irish Literary Revival**

Dermot Foley's "Librarians as Authors: An Uncritical Review" reflects warmly upon the National Library's second director, Thomas W. Lyster. Lyster spent a total of forty-two years at the National Library and twenty-five of those as its chief librarian (109). While Lyster was an author in his own right, publishing *English Poetry for the sYoung* and translating many German works into English such as Duntzer's *Goethe*, he was first and foremost a librarian, priding himself on "assisting others to write than in being himself a writer of books" (Foley 109). Perhaps this is why Lyster so enthusiastically "encouraged the students of nearby University College Dublin to use the library[']s" extensive reference library (Long 270).

In *Ulysses*, Joyce depicts Lyster moving back and forth between the chambers and the reading room, passing constantly "through those portals of discovery" to aid the library's patrons. For a director, he was certainly in high demand, and, from Joyce's descriptions of him, he was devoted to all the Library's patrons. The description of Lyster

overheard talking to Bloom about the library's collection of newspapers further testifies to the hands-on nature of Lyster's directorship as well as to his firm belief in his position as one of service and not of privilege.

Furthermore, Lyster frequently wrote in the Library's publication and also published his letters to the Library's Board of Trustees requesting more space and more resources. It is fairly easy for someone interested in the rise of public libraries and its early librarians to read through the essays and library publications; however a work such as *Ulysses*, an international sensation, would perhaps reach a wider audience than library publications. *Ulysses*, it might be argued, is partially responsible—at the very least—for promoting the Library as an important literary space with its librarians who act as conduits to the political and cultural agendas ongoing in Ireland.

Lyster's second-in-command, Richard Irvine Best, wrote to such an extent that Foley claims he is "a writer's or a scholar's subject" (109). Best is regaled for his correspondences and with his "recorded reminiscences of Moore, Yeats, Joyce, and other giants of his time" (Foley 111). Indeed, at the National Library, one can read Best's letters, including an archive that he himself collected and catalogued based on his correspondences with George Moore from 1913-1932.<sup>32</sup> Like Joyce, Best and his colleagues at the Library knew the benefit of saving correspondences and recording their own reminiscences for the benefit of posterity. For a library, the archives become the keystone to their success as an institution and the way into Ireland's collection of knowledge, art, and history for its citizens. The librarians were indeed the "rear-guard" of the literary movement and "served over and above the call of duty"<sup>33</sup> to exemplify the idea that an "Ireland educated is Ireland free"<sup>34</sup> (Foley 117, 111).

In addition to being an excellent reference library, the National Library was intent upon acquiring manuscripts and monographs depicting the Irish language and especially its mythology. Long lauds Best's *Bibliography of Irish Philology and of Printed Irish Literature* (Dublin, 1913) and "its companion volume covering 1913-1941 (Dublin, 1942)" as the "standard [Irish] bibliographies" still used today (271). Best, hired in 1904 as the Library's Assistant Librarian, was the "first Celtic scholar" on the Library's staff. His influence is demonstrated by the Library's focus toward acquiring materials for their Celtic studies collections (Ling 686).<sup>35</sup> Additionally, Best was also known for having translated D'Arbois de Jubainville's *Le Cycle Mythologique irlandais*. Joyce references Jubainville in "Scylla and Charybdis," where Best shows Haines *Le Cycle Mythologique irlandais* and tells Haines where he can purchase Hyde's *Lovesongs of Connacht*.

Also interesting to note is that Best's translation of Jubainville was serialized in Arthur Griffith's weekly at the request of George (AE) Russell, who became the editor of the *Irish Homestead* and later still of *The Irish Statesman*. I mention Griffith publishing Best's translations and these periodicals in order to establish the network that existed between editors and librarians.<sup>36</sup> AE, while an activist for the Irish Agricultural Organization Society and editor of the *Irish Homestead*, was also a poet, essayist, and novelist. He was also instrumental in introducing writers including Joyce to the more established authors like Yeats and George Moore. Arthur Griffith was, of course, the founder of Sinn Féin, and editor of the *United Irishman*. His patronage ensured that poets and essayists with Nationalist intentions were published; moreover, if Griffith was displeased with a critic of the Nationalist Movement or its literature, he had the means by which to censure. For example, when Joyce, after the death of William Rooney (who was

a co-founder of the *United Irishman* and whose poems were frequently published in this same weekly), wrote an unfavorable review of Rooney's poetry for the *Daily Express*, Griffith responded with a vitriolic rebuke. Furthermore, of John Eglinton, another librarian and prominent Irish essayist, Griffith complained of his "barbarous fetish of cosmopolitanism" and claimed that Eglinton had no concept of Ireland or her people (qtd in Scott 347).<sup>37</sup>

Eglinton was also depicted in *Ulysses* and by 1904 was already a well-known essayist and had just begun the little magazine, *Dana*, which was established to promote "independent thought" (Eglinton 134). He, perhaps more than any other writer, shared Joyce's disillusionment with Hyde, the Gaelic League, and the Irish Literary Revival. Rebecca Creasy Simcoe called him "the critical adversary of [the Irish Literary Revival's] most influential leader, his former schoolmate [Yeats]" (77). Furthermore, the debates Eglinton engaged in were often through letters, a series of which were published in 1898 in the *Daily Express*; this is the same daily that also published many of Joyce's early essays.

Eglinton "advocate[s] the rejection of local themes and promote[s] more universal, cosmopolitan writing" (Simcoe 77). In 1906, his most famous essay in the collection *Bards and Saints*, "The De-Davisisation of Irish Literature," claims that the followers of Thomas Davis "were wrongly guided by the single-minded desire to exalt the excellence of their own race rather than by the need to explore the soul of an individual consciousness apart from an interpretation of nationality" (Simcoe 78). Joyce would have certainly read or known Eglinton's stance on the literary debates, and Eglinton would have seemed a good ally for him. Yet Eglinton claims he was puzzled by

Joyce's interest in making his acquaintance (132). While Joyce was certainly not one of Eglinton's favorite young scholars, he did respect the way Joyce stood alone; Eglinton recalls that he enjoyed "listening to [Joyce's] careful intonation and full vowel sounds" (132). Of Joyce's Hamlet speech depicted in *Ulysses*, Eglinton thinks it a good fabrication of likely events; additionally, he remembers one early morning<sup>38</sup> when Joyce did come into the Library having just "walked into town from Sandycove" after having "been thrown out of the tower"; he asserts that "Joyce held his own by his unflinching 'recollectedness' and by his sententious and pedantic wit, shown especially in the limericks on the various figures in the literary movement with which from time to time he regaled that company of roysterers [*sic*] and midnight bathers" (137).

Eglinton is also more interested in promoting and molding a new Irish literature. In *Ulysses*, he proclaims that "[o]ur young Irish bards . . . have yet to create a figure which the world will set beside Saxon Shakespeare's Hamlet" (9.43). This is an important challenge for Joyce (and Stephen-through-Joyce) because he wishes to have the kind of renown that the name "Shakespeare" exemplifies. Stephen's answer to this is to portray the iconic figure of "Shakespeare's Hamlet" (and his claim that Hamlet, the King, is really a portrait of Shakespeare himself) as a real character with human faults. In Joyce's view, it is no use for modern literature to idealize in the way of the Romantics or to ignore the more "ugly" realities (as was the way of Victorian artists); instead, modern writers must tell the truth and include everything—from bowel movements to marital affairs. In the library scene, Joyce argues against Shakespeare's wife as having such an affair.

We know that the young Joyce of 1902 disagreed with most of the tenets of the Irish Literary Revival, and yet he still strove to maintain his relationships with them. It is of course not surprising for writers to seek connections with influential editors who might publish their works; in fact, the newspaper periodicals were the primary medium sought in which to publish reviews and especially original works. However, perhaps less obvious would be why Joyce sought to network with librarians; of course, Eglinton is an exception in that he was also editor of the new independent magazine, *Dana*, and had already published one of Joyce's works.<sup>39</sup> As recently stated, the primary goal of librarians like Lyster and Best was to help the next generation of Irish writers succeed. The creation of a literary archive of anything related to Irish folklore, language, or history was lynchpin of the library's policies on acquisitions and collections; however, establishing bonds with current Irish writers, especially those who shared in their vision for an Irish literature that differentiated itself from England.

Eglinton, again, is the exception in that his vision for an Irish literature was more in line with Joyce's own cosmopolitan ideas; Joyce did not seek to follow English author's leads, but he did look to Scandinavian greats such as Henrik Ibsen in order to better reflect the age in which he lived. Furthermore, Joyce also saw writers such as Dante, Vico, Bruno, and even Shakespeare (despite his assumed English origins that some Irishmen sought to debate) as literary exemplars and a literary lineage to which he sought to belong. Joyce did alter the landscape of modernist literature, focusing on epiphanies, or moments of creation, and a writing style that reflected the conscious workings of the mind.

It is through *Ulysses* that Joyce is able to act as curator and cataloguer of a moment in time of the National Library of Ireland; in this moment, he characterizes the people—including the readers, the librarians, and the students and other patrons who relied on their expertise—and the physical space of the reader’s room and private offices of the librarians. Moreover, Joyce exhibits a fictionalized conversation and internal monologue that embodies not only the institutionalization of the library but its subsequent influence upon the literary society of 1904 Dublin. In an historical moment where the literary powers largely ignored or disagreed with Joyce’s vision for an Irish literature, *Ulysses* is the textual forum and fictionalized archive wherein Joyce revises that history to include himself in it.

### **Revising Hyde, Revising History**

Joyce’s complaints against the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival had to do with what he saw as their fabrication of a blatantly romanticized Irish past. This romanticization would not have bothered Joyce as much if the message did not come at the expense of the art. This next section explores how Joyce, in *Ulysses*, puts the writing process on display; from inspiration to the epiphany that leads to a poem written on the shores of Sandymount, which is later revealed in the newspaper offices and whose message, while subtle, is perhaps most tangible in the National Library of Ireland, Joyce shows everyone that he is the Irish bard “which the world will set beside Saxon Shakespeare’s Hamlet” (9.43). The poem Stephen writes is a revision of Hyde’s “My Grief on the Sea,” which is part of the larger collection of Hyde’s *Lovesongs of Connacht*. This collection appears twice in “Scylla and Charybdis” and is an important

way in which Joyce criticizes both Hyde and the Irish Literary Revival by proving himself the better artist.<sup>40</sup>

In “Scylla and Charybdis,” Best explains to Eglinton and Stephen that Haines left the library to find Hyde’s *Lovesongs of Connacht*. Best points out that Haines is “quite enthusiastic” about the collection (9. 93-4). So enthusiastic, it seems, that Best cannot persuade him to come into the private section of the Readers Room, which was the librarian’s offices, to hear the discussion of Stephen’s analysis of *Hamlet*. Instead, Haines insisted on running to “Gill’s to buy it” (9. 93-5). Haines’ dismissal of Stephen reminds him immediately of the discussion he has with Haines at Martello Tower earlier that morning.

In “Telemachus,” Haines is introduced as being an unwelcome “usurper” of Martello Tower, where he bothers Stephen with his intention of collecting Stephen’s sayings (1.480) as well as Stephen’s theory of *Hamlet* (1.545), which is why it is strange that he prefers purchasing Hyde’s poems to hearing an actual debate between the highly influential librarians and Stephen Dedalus. Haines, therefore, exemplifies Joyce’s primary complaint of those who would rather “apprehend [the Irish] in the land of faery” rather than observe the Irish actually debating literary theories in the National Library (“Drama and Life” 45).

Eglinton responds to the news that Haines is gone to buy Hyde’s *Lovesongs* with: “The peatsmoke is going to his head” (9.101)—a criticism Joyce would find fair; however it is Russell’s response that is telling. Joyce writes:

People do not know how dangerous lovesongs can be, the auric egg of  
Russell warned occultly. The movements which work revolutions in the

world are born out of the dreams and visions in a peasant's heart on the hillside. For them the earth is not an exploitable ground but the living mother. The rarefied air of the academy and the arena produce the sixshilling novel, the musichall song . . . but the desirable life is revealed only to the poor of heart, the life of Homer's Phaeacians. (9. 103-110)

Russell's depiction of the secrets of the world revealed to those whose life revolves around a reliance on nature to produce crops and nourish their animals is shortsighted. This description echoes tenets set forth by the British Romantics such as Wordsworth and Coleridge (and we can add to this list Yeats as well), who saw the academy as being less important to understanding life and writing poetry than isolation and the experience of nature. Love songs can indeed be dangerous because in them they lament the difference between those who work the land and those who exploit the land. Hyde's *Lovesongs*, then, can be read as a political act by which to inspire a revolution. Russell, being the editor of the *Irish Homestead*, is concerned with agriculture and the rights of farmers. Therefore, he is not warning against a revolution but rather warning that the revolution is immanent.

The depiction of the peasant dreaming and having visions on the hillside becomes the iconic figure for the proponents of the Gaelic League and Irish Literary Revival. According to Edward Hirsch, the Irish Literary Revival, like the Gaelic League, emphasized rural Ireland and especially the "Irish peasant" as emulating an authentic Ireland, or one that is "Celtic at its core." In fact, the Irish peasant was important because this was one symbol of Ireland that the British used in order to denigrate the Irish as a drunken and illiterate race; the image of "Paddy" doing a drunken Irish jig stems from

such stereotyping. The Celtic Revival specifically took aim to debunk this myth and recreate the Irish peasant as a person tied to the country and ingrained in Ireland's rich folkloric history. Hirsch, in "The Imaginary Irish Peasant," contends that "the portraits of the peasant generated by the different Irish poets, dramatists, fiction writers, and antiquarians during the Literary Revival were radically opposed to one another" (1117). Joyce was even among the artists rewriting or—as Hirsch calls it—"aestheticizing the Irish peasant" (117). However, Joyce was opposed to doing this reimagining in a manner not in accordance with his aesthetics—the modern artist must leave behind the "dreamy dreams" of the past and focus instead on what was actually there.<sup>41</sup>

For Joyce, the Celtic Revival's answer to the British "Paddy" only succeeded in perpetuating another stereotype—one which ignored the fact that not all peasants resembled the stereotype and indeed not all would be considered Irish. Hirsch states that "[t]he Irish countryside . . . was populated by a diverse grouping of the rural poor, nearly infinite in its social gradations, that comprised of small farmers, labor-landholders, landless laborers, and itinerant workers" (1117). Some peasants were refugees from other countries, others were gypsies, and still others came from rural Ireland. For one thing, not all peasants could speak Irish. Perhaps this was the cardinal sin of the Irish Literary Revival—trying to create a vision of Ireland through art that failed to tell the truth in any sort of interesting way. For Joyce the artist should not pander to the masses but should stand before men and "act as mediator in awful truth" ("Drama and Life" 42).

In "Telemachus," Joyce acts as this "mediator of awful truth" in a scene in which Haines, "the penitent thief" (9.102) is confronted with an Irish peasant in the character of the woman who delivers Mulligan and Stephen their milk. Haines, excited to meet

someone who resembles what people like Hyde and Russell describe as the Irish peasant, speaks to her in Gaelic. She, of course, does not understand him and asks if he is speaking French. When asked if she speaks Irish, she responds: “I’m ashamed I don’t speak the language myself. I’m told it’s a grand language by them that knows” (1.415, 433-434). “Them that knows” refers to those who have the time and money to expense on language classes. The milk woman would not have time to learn Gaelic.

Joyce is not against having Irish peasants in literature—an assumption one might misinterpret from his rejection of the Irish Literary Theatre’s “Celtic” productions; however, for Joyce, the milk woman is rendered truthfully—not as the British stereotype of the Irish “Paddy,” but also not as the stereotype of the “more Irish than Irish” peasant. Hirsch states that “[f]or Dedalus—as for Joyce himself—the peasant is distanced as a completely different physical type, someone wholly Other,” which was “a direct attack on the nationalists [who portrayed the peasants as being “Celtic at the core” and thus the true descendents of the Irish race], but it was also a sideways revision of the Yeatsian mystifications of the peasant life” (1127). For example, Stephen describes her as she is pouring milk into the jug: she has “[o]ld shrunken paps” and Stephen wonders if she is perhaps a “messenger” with “secret[s] . . . from a morning world” (1.397-400). The “morning world” is not some sort of faery-inspired world but one of perhaps the farm, where the woman must work, “[c]rouching by a patient cow at daybreak in the lush field” (1.400-1); she is “a witch on her toadstool” and “[a] wandering crone” (1.401, 404). Thus, Joyce recognizes the “wholly Other[ness]” of the woman but will not take this description to the extent that the Irish mystics do; for Joyce, the woman could be a “witch” or a “wandering crone” who is indeed tied to the land and to the people through

the production and distribution of milk, this indeed symbolizes what Hirsch calls Joyce's "revision of Yeatsian mystifications of peasant life." However, she is not the depiction of the idealized descendent of the Irish race.

Joyce's description of the woman's interaction with Haines and Mulligan creates a stark differentiation between Stephen's descriptions of her as the deliverer of milk, filled with her secret experiences of her morning's work. For example, Haines only sees the woman as nothing more than an encounter with an *authentic* Irish peasant, and when she fails to make the myth a reality, he is done with her. In their interaction, Joyce exposes Haines' ridiculous assumption that all peasants speak Gaelic and also a more accurate truth, which is that the population that speaks Gaelic is small and typically located more in the West of Ireland; it is also the place—in the area of Connacht—where Hyde's *Lovesongs* are set—is where Gaelic is still heavily practiced—and therefore not in the city of Dublin.<sup>42</sup>

The example of the milk woman is the first example of Joyce, as the better artist, staying true to his convictions; the artist must mediate the truth, not ignore it. The second instance of this is in "Proteus," where Stephen wanders along Sandymount Strand on his way into city center. On his journey, Stephen observes two "cocklepickers," (another name for gypsies) (3.342). This scene becomes significant because while Stephen is watching the gypsies gather their shells, he is inspired and writes down a poem. Joyce describes this process and thus records its importance to the reader.

Stephen's description of the cocklepickers is, on the surface, idealistic and feeds into the glorification of peasants and their seemingly simplified existence. However, the scene is only superficially idealistic. Joyce turns the myth of the Irish peasant on its

head.<sup>43</sup> Cocklepickers are peasants who wander the countryside in search of wares such as seashells to sell, but Stephen describes them as “red Egyptians” (3.370) and thereby aligns them with the earliest descendents of the Irish. Recall that in “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages,” Joyce explains that “[t]he religion and civilization of the ancient people, later known by the name of Druidism, were Egyptian” (156).

Stephen describes them—like he does the milk woman in “Telemachus”—in terms of their labors: they “trudge” along the beach “[s]houldering their bags” (3.370). Like Adam and Eve, the woman is the man’s “helpmate” as she with “bare feet” and “[w]ith woman steps . . . followed . . . Spoils slung at her back” (3.375, 372-3).

Stephen watches her as she:

trudges, schlepps, trains, drags, transcines her load. . . Tides,  
myriadislanded, within her, blood not mine, *oina pontoon*, a winedark sea.  
Behold the handmaid of the moon. In sleep the wet sign calls her hour,  
bids her rise. (3. 393-97)

The descriptions of this woman carrying and dragging her load behind her presents her as laboring under this proverbial bag in which she carries her load. This bag also echoes the “midwife’s bag” that Stephen sees earlier in this episode (3.32). Stephen imagines that the midwife’s bag is filled with “[a] misbirth with a trailing navelcord”; these are “cords [which] all link back” presumably to “Edenville” or to the beginning (3.36, 39). This then reminds him of “mystic monks” (3.38), which, of course, alludes to the “Druid priests,” or “holy men” of Ireland’s ancient “Egyptians” (“Ireland, Saints and Sages” 156); additionally, “mystic monks” would also refer to the modern followers of the Theosophist Society; W. B. Yeats, Lady Gregory, and AE Russell were all prominent

members of this society, which explains why Stephen, earlier in this episode, will cut off suddenly from his musings and ask “Will you be as Gods? Gaze into your *omphalos*” (3.48).

Stephen therefore recalls this earlier musing as he watches the woman trudging along on the beach. He imagines that like the midwife, this woman also carries more than the load over her shoulders; she carries the “tides . . . within her” and draws the moon “in her wake” (3. 394). She too is described in mystical terms, and as the ancient Druids worshipped the sun and the moon, Stephen describes this woman as one of their descendents. Just as the milk woman is a descendent of one of Ireland’s races, so too is the cocklepicker. Had Haines been there to watch them on the shores, he still would have missed the essential point that Joyce, through Stephen, is making. Haines thinks that being a worker of the land equates with speaking Gaelic and that this language, above all others, somehow links one back to its ancient beginnings.

At this point in the scene, Stephen thinks to himself: “Bridebed, childbed, bed of death, ghostcandled. . . . He comes, pale vampire, through storm his eyes, his bat sails bloodying the sea, mouth to her mouth’s kiss” (3.397-9). These lines are echoed almost exactly in “Aeolus,” where the poem that is composed on Sandymount Strand is revealed:

On swift sail flaming  
From storm and south  
He comes, pale vampire  
Mouth to my mouth (7. 522-5)

The image of violence, death, and afterlife resonate within the poem: “flaming” “storm” and “pale vampire” create a sense of urgency—as if the man returning is starved and

eager for his destination. The descriptions on the shore of “bed of death” and “ghostcandled” resonate with the themes of Stephen’s argument about *Hamlet* in “Scylla and Charybdis.” Stephen begins with the question, “What is a ghost?” (9. 147) before theorizing that Hamlet is Shakespeare’s ghost kept alive through art. Stephen further argues that *Hamlet*, in particular, is a play in which Shakespeare records, through art, a history of their family. Furthermore, the reference to “bridebed, childbed, bed of death” from “Proteus” (inspired by the gypsies on the shore) refers us to “Scylla and Charybdis” in the form of “Mother’s deathbed” (9. 221) and “Secondbest / Bed” (9. 698-9). Both refer to Ann Hathaway (as well as to Stephen’s refusal to pray at his mother’s request as she lay dying on her deathbed) and her second-best bed left to her by Shakespeare. Stephen asks why she wasn’t left with his best bed and uses this as evidence that Ann is the like the “guilty Queen” from *Hamlet*.

Perhaps more important than Stephen’s theory of Hamlet as Shakespeare’s ghost is the process by which Joyce shows the composition of the poem written on Sandymount Strand. While we are not privy to the poem until “Aeolus,” we can see Stephen working through the poem in “Proteus”; he thinks: “mouth to her mouth’s kiss,” and then thinks, “Mouth to her kiss. No . . . Mouth to her mouth’s kiss” (3. 399-400). In the poem itself, the last line is “Mouth to my mouth” (7. 525). This line is almost a direct quote from Hyde’s last line: “His Mouth to my mouth” (“My Grief on the Sea”)<sup>44</sup>. Additionally, in both poems there is a reference to “South.” In Stephen’s poem, there is a man who comes “From storm and south” and in Hyde’s this line reads, “He came from the South.” Therefore, we know this is a rewriting of Hyde’s poem.<sup>45</sup> Nowhere in *Ulysses* does Joyce

give credit to Hyde except by the clues he leaves in the many allusions to *Lovesongs of Connacht*.

The epiphany Stephen experiences wherein the “Mouth to her mouth’s kiss” becomes “Mouth to my mouth” devolves (or evolves) to “Mouth to her moomb. Oomb. Allwombing tomb” (3. 399-400, 402). Therefore the kiss that the lover awaits from her beloved, who sails from the south—in Joyce’s revision—becomes both a kiss of life and a kiss of death. The mouth of the speaker meets the mouth of the vampire. She represents the Gypsy on the shore as well as the midwife whose bag is filled with navel cords that link us like telephone wires back to Edenville. The vampire represents he whose mouth would cover hers and therefore presume to tell her story; those who like Hyde and Haines would rather ignore the truth about these women (they are midwives, they are Gypsies, or milk women) in favor of mysticizing them, are depicted here as ignorant; they do not speak Gaelic. Additionally, Stephen’s poem sees life in death and death in life. Where the womb is the place where life begins, it is also a tomb; being born means being born into a mortality that is finite and limited. The vampire’s kiss, in the poem, is both the kiss of death and the kiss of life. The kiss is thereby immortalized in verse.

In “Oxen of the Sun,” Joyce writes: “Mark me now. In woman’s womb word is made flesh but in the spirit of the maker all flesh that passes becomes the word that shall not pass away. This is postcreation” (14.293-4); this echoes the “red egyptian’s” “allwombing tomb” (3.401) in “Proteus,” and “Eve. Naked wheatbellied sin” (9. 541) in “Scylla and Charybdis.” It may be true that God breathed life into Adam and in doing so the word became flesh; however, God “inspired” Adam and his descendents and so marks

the moment where the artist takes back the inspiration from all the “flesh that passes” and through postcreation creates “the word that shall not pass away.” The artist creates life.

Joyce has found a way to make his works represent aesthetic theories with the added bonus of doing so through the writings of other writers. The works become testaments to these debates—literally testifying the sentiment behind what has been said and by whom. For all Joyce’s “scorn” and revenge against those who failed to promote his vision of art, to be included in *Ulysses* is to be forever tethered to the history of its composition and its reconstruction of Irish identity. What is more, those who are seen to have been Joyce’s target—characters like Eglinton, Yeats, George Russell, and Best—even after reading *Ulysses* have gone on record to speak on his behalf or even to acknowledge that Joyce’s descriptions were not so far off the mark.<sup>46</sup>

*Ulysses*, when read as a critique of the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival, re-imagines an Irish history that records Joyce’s part in it—a part that might have been forgotten and absent from the archives if *Ulysses* had not been so popular. Both “Proteus” and “Sycclla and Charybdis” chapters in *Ulysses* are instrumental in understanding Joyce’s intricate response to these movements. Joyce’s rejection and revision of the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival are evidenced in both. In “Proteus,” the reader sees the artist—in this case, Stephen Dedalus—inspired by the ocean, death, and life on Sandymount Strand. The reader then is witness as Stephen, after taking these sights and experiences in, has an epiphany and begins to scribble down words onto a slip of paper that he gets by tearing off a page of Mr Deasy’s article for the *Freemans Journal*. In “Sycclla and Charybdis,” what Stephen writes in “Proteus” is revealed as a poem from Hyde’s collection, *The Lovesongs of Connacht*—the very

collection that Haines leaves the National Library of Ireland to seek at Gill's bookshop. In recording Stephen's encounters with the Irish peasants, (as represented by the milkwoman in "Telemachus" and the cocklepickers in "Proteus") and with the librarians at the National Library of Ireland, Joyce criticizes both the Gaelic League and the Irish Literary Revival. In so doing, Joyce re-inscribes himself back into these movements that ultimately did not—at the time—accept him.

In the next chapter, I explore the ways in which *Finnegans Wake* moves beyond revising history and the reinscription of the author back into that history by investigating the ways in which history and narrative are recorded. Specifically, I argue that the word "gossip" (with all its derivatives) is perhaps the most important mode functioning within that work. The history of Anna Livia Plurabelle (ALP) and Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker (HCE), two of this work's main protagonists, is related through gossip. This relation between the gossiper and gossipee becomes important in my discussion of "gossips" etymology. Ultimately, gossip is both the method of recording and the presentation of recorded information within the narrative; additionally, gossip's history is also archived within the *Wake*, which results in a text that is once again both meta- and supra-archival.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ARCHIVING THE “GOSSIPLE” OF GOSSIP IN *FINNEGANS WAKE*

Mutt: Let erehim ruhmuhrmuhr . . . Countlessness of livestories have netherfallen by this plage, flick as flowflakes, litters from aloft, like a waast wizard all of whirlworlds. Now are all tombed to the mount, isges to isges, erde from erde. Pride, O pride, thy prize!

(James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*)

In the previous chapter, I argued that *Ulysses* is a textual archive containing within the confines of its pages a history of a single day in 1904 Dublin. In an exhibition of any archive (textual or otherwise), details such as dates and locations contextualize the materials presented. In *Ulysses*, these details were crafted around the sixteen-hour wanderings of Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom as well as the intricately described physical locations that acted as the setting for the protagonists. As evidenced by the numerous Joycean walking tours in Dublin today and based on the episodes of *Ulysses*, Joyce was indeed an excellent curator of Dublin’s historical personages and places. *Finnegans Wake*, on the other hand, may not contain as many obviously concrete details as *Ulysses*, but there are still many places exhibited or depicted by Joyce. Dublin’s Phoenix Park, for instance, is the site where HCE’s alleged indiscretion occurs, and the Wellington Monument and museum, located outside Phoenix Park, are also given substantial textual space within the *Wake*. Additionally, the geography of Dublin (and also Ireland) are not only referenced throughout the work, they are also cited; that is, the

river Liffey and Howth environs appear personified throughout the book as variations of the book's two main protagonists: ALP and HCE.<sup>47</sup>

Both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* present and embody the archival experience of gathering, interpreting, and exhibiting information. What makes these works different from others is the way in which the material is presented. For example, there is an awareness of how history and literature are constructed and this awareness is presented reflexively. The works themselves exhibit the process of writing and documenting or reviewing history. Whereas *Ulysses* presented the recording of information on gramophones, slips of paper, photographs, or via print advertising, *Finnegans Wake* is a work that emphasizes and celebrates the oral recording of information; information in the *Wake* is both gathered and interpreted orally. Writing and written records such as those uncovered in the mound in the *Wake* are indeed important, but those records are almost always incomplete without public and private commentary. The *Wake* focuses on filling in the blanks telling the story not discovered; this telling is presented in many ways wherein gossip is a major component. This chapter argues that Joyce presents gossip as an important mode for relaying information; this chapter also looks at the ways in which Joyce is aware of gossip's changing definitions throughout history. Gossip is important to this discussion of Joyce and the archive because the repetition of the word "gossip" in conjunction with its etymology actually creates an archival record of gossip's many meanings. Additionally, *what* is gossiped—the stories of the *Wake*—are also important to analyze because these are the stories that the *Wake* archives; the way in which this information is gathered and interpreted by the anonymous narrator(s) is important to any discussion of archives.

*Finnegans Wake* does not contain any specific historical time or space but it does record the near-infinite spatial and temporal possibilities of language and narrative inherent in the reconstructions of “the Fall,” which is represented in the *Wake* onomatopoeically. For example, “bababadalgharaghtakamminarronkonnbronntonnerro-  
nntuonnthunntrovarrhounawanksawntooohooordenenthurnuk!” represents the sound of the Fall (3. 15-7). An analysis of the epigraph explores these near-infinite possibilities and reconstructions. For example, in Book 1, there is a scene between Mutt and Jute where they mention the Fall (of Finnegan, of Ireland, of Adam); at one point Mutt compares the fall or death of man with the construction of rumors and “lifestories.” All the “countlessness of lifestories” fallen onto the “nether” regions of this “plage” are recorded. The closest to immortality one can get is left in traces, in echoes, and in the “mount”ains of papers left behind.<sup>48</sup>

Even from “litters” of the archive, immortality depends on the “ruhmuhrmuhrs” or gossip of others. This seems appropriate as the *Wake*, after all, is a book about cycles. Those who lived before are called forth into the present by some record, some collection of statements bound together by a name, a theme, or an event. They are to account for the mistakes of the past and to testify for their extraordinary achievements as well as to prove that a connection to the past can even exist. For these reasons, perhaps above all others, is there an impetus for archives; we require these evidences in order to construct a history for the future. Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*, with its myriad combinations of histories, myths, legends, and ideas, is one such archive.

Interestingly, these “litters” or letters (that is letters in all its connotations: units of meaning, epistles, envoys, language) are not so different from rumors or gossip, and yet

most seem to consider rumors as something trite and not worthy of study. In the epigraph above, Mutt begins with this statement: “Let erehim ruhmuhrmuhr,” which implies “Let us hear him remember,” “Let us hear him rumor,” as well as “Let us hear him murmur.” In effect, Joyce joins “rumor” with memory in “remember” and also to rumor’s eventual vocalization in “murmur.” Traditionally, rumor is maligned in the same manner as gossip—something which has no bearing on truth or fact; ironically, however, much of what is known of people and specifically what is known of the characters of *Finnegans Wake* comes to us in the form of rumor and gossip. Additionally, “erehim” implies both homonyms of “here,” as in “here in this space” as well as the auditory form of “to hear”; furthermore, “ere” can also imply “err” as in “error” or “ere” as in “only” so that “Let erehim ruhmuhrmuhr” comes to mean “let us hear only him, here in this place, even if he errs as he murmurs the rumor and the memory.” What the reader hears (here, at this point in the reading of the narrative(s)) are the infinite “lifestories,” or histories, which are now en“tomed” within the mountain. The mountain is symbolic of HCE and echoes the mounds of orange peels and litter in which Biddy discovers the letter. The mountain also suggests the archival text that is *Finnegans Wake*. Thus these stories have fallen and are promulgated “flicks of flowflakes” through the mechanism of gossip. These “litters” and “letters” are left for the voyeuristic reader to be picked up and picked through. The act of reading and interpreting, then, makes way for the reader to participate in this construction as well. The reader not only hears the rumors of the *Wake* but also helps to spread this gossip. The *Wake* can also be seen as the “mount” in which all that has passed is en“tomed” within the work.

In Book I, Chapter 8, which is also known as the “Anna Livia Plurabelle ” (ALP) or “The Washers at the Ford” chapter, gossip is the primary tool being used to relate information. In this section, the reader listens as two washerwomen wash the townspeople’s laundry and gossip about the owners of the clothing. That the gossip is reproduceable (we can read it over and over again) shows that it is archivable, offering a record of these voices and their stories. Furthermore, gossip takes on a privileged position in this chapter (as well as within the *Wake*), since it represents both the material (the background of HCE and ALP) as well as the subject (the gossips as constructors of these narratives and as the transition from washerwomen into tree and stone).<sup>49</sup>

The reader—through the very process of reading the gossip—becomes complicit in this gossip. That gossip is by its very nature transient makes it all the more appropriate that the act is transferred to the reader. The transient nature of the gossip is not something that should necessarily be denigrated (some scholars claim that the washerwomen of 1.8 are merely agents or that their gossip is nothing more than idle chatter); on the contrary, Joyce shows in *Finnegans Wake* that gossip is actually an important creative mechanism. As a creative discourse, gossip shapes and contains both the characters’ and the readers’ opinions. The paradox, of course, is that gossip is both archivable (it is recorded—oftentimes in personal letters, biography, and in historical texts; it is also stored in archival repositories and often published for public consumption) and yet resistant to archiving (the source of the gossip, its origin, is difficult to point to, leaving only its trace, unverifiable. Through repetition, gossip becomes “truth”). Additionally, gossip blurs the distinction between the public and the private. Often what is gossiped about is some private scandal; in *Finnegans Wake* that scandal so often has to do with accusations of

HCE's indiscretions. Yet the spreading of gossip is also very public. In Chapter Four, I will argue that this public/private divide is further complicated by the disagreements over unpublished materials between Joyce scholars and the Estate.<sup>50</sup> Joyce was aware of these subtleties and put gossip to play in *Finnegans Wake*.

In *Shakespeare and Joyce: A Study of Finnegans Wake*, Vincent Cheng outlines a model for reading gossip as archival material. Cheng claims that all the events of the *Wake* are "ultimately determined by the beholder (in the forms of gossip, criticism, history books, and so on) and nothing is ever conclusive" (24). Throughout Joyce's works, one can see how he articulates and re-articulates what history is. In *Portrait*, for instance, Stephen famously calls history "the nightmare from which he cannot awake." This theme continues into *Ulysses* until finally being celebrated in *Finnegans Wake*. Cheng notes this change as Joyce's grappling with what Aristotle calls the "room of infinite possibilities." This book is a place where what has happened can happen again or can happen in different ways; all possibilities are possible. Taken together with Giambattista Vico's cyclical view of history, this reality of "the exploration of practically every possibility" can finally be "exulted" (Cheng 24). Gossip thereby becomes the tool by which this dreambook of infinite possibilities is constructed and then translated to the reader.

Furthermore, Jacques Derrida, in "Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce," notes that Joyce "has at his command the computer of all memory, he plays with the entire archive of culture" (579). The text itself has no origin, no beginning, and therefore the news of what is contained therein would find little need for sources or origins either. It is always already "hearsay," or gossip, and for those of us who "can always at least

dream of writing *on* Joyce,” *Finnegans Wake*, like *Ulysses*, is the retelling of what is heard, of what has been told to us; this “us” includes the imagined reader, us-as-readers, and Joyce himself, for what is *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* but a (re)collection of epic narratives, myths, and overheard conversations in a re-imagined landscape of archival text?

An archive is a storehouse of material created in order to collect annals, catalogues, maps, published letters and literature relevant to a nation’s history; additionally, periodicals such as daily or weekly newspapers, little magazines, and journals (news and public opinion repositories) also found a home in the archives. *Finnegans Wake*, especially, sustains the idea that the text, while always already archivable material (the book itself and its manuscripts, copy edits etc. are all materials stored in the archives), is not a mere collection. In fact, by its composition and construction, it is archival; that is, the work becomes the archive, containing within its textual borders (borders not unlike those that encase the materials held within an archival institution) an abundance of information; this information is portrayed in the *Wake* as having been created—not by the author alone but by Biddy the Hen, the “biografiend,” the washerwomen, and even the reader.

While everyone assumes an understanding of what gossip is—usually oral communication between small groups of people generally about other people—few know how the word “gossip” came about or even how it came to its negative connotations. John Beresford, argues in *Gossip of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* that by “gossip,” he means in “the ‘favorable sense’”; gossip, for Beresford, is “easy, unrestrained talk, writing, especially about persons or social events” (5).<sup>51</sup> More and

more, historians and literary scholars are writing about their experiences in archives, which further supports a link between the private interests of individual historians and scholars and both the public and private nature of some of these research projects.

In the *Wake*, the word “gossip” appears numerous times and upon closer inspection is arguably one of the most important words of this work. For example, evidence of gossip in the *Wake* appears as “gossip,” as portmanteaux of gossip, and as gossip translated into other languages.<sup>52</sup> There are numerous other references to “gossip” strewn throughout the *Wake*. Examples include: “aplapping streamlet” (*plappern*) (57. 11), “Twitchbratschballs” (*Tritschtratsch*) (72. 02), “pratsch” (*Tratsch*) (101.26), “gossip” (125. 18), “wig in your ear” (193.13), “gossipaceous Anna Livia” (195.04), “Good mother” (213.29),<sup>53</sup> “Latin me that, my trinity scholar, out of eure sanscreed” (215. 26),<sup>54</sup> “reder!” (*Rederei*) (249. 14), “plaudered” (*plaudern*) (269. 05), “chats and hobnobs” (274. 08), “gossip” (316. 12), “greenwood’s gossip” (450. 33),<sup>55</sup> “goddestfar, deputizing for gossipocracy,” (476. 04),<sup>56</sup> “Malawunga” (499. 10),<sup>57</sup> “ghostly gossips,” (594. 26), “tittle-tell tattle” (597. 8-9), “wagging” (619.07), “goosip” (623. 04), “Clatchka!” (623. 22), and “guessp” (624. 17).

Synonyms of “gossip” such as “hearsay” also appear in the *Wake*. For instance, Joyce writes: “Thus the hearsomeness of the burger felicitates the whole of the polis” (23.14-15). “Hearsomeness” is another way to say “hear say” and it also implies the German “gehorsam,” which means “obedient.” Therefore, the obedience and the reliance of “hear say” on the part of the “burger,” which is German for citizen, both happily facilitates or recreates the “polis,” which is Greek for “city.”<sup>58</sup>

Hearsay also appears in an overtly archival scene where Bidy the Hen henpecks the letters out of their mound: “It is not hear or say of some anomorous letter, signed Toga Girilis. . . . We have a cop of her fist right against our nosibos. We note the paper with her jotty young watermark” (112.29-32). What is heard or said of this letter, which is described as “anomorous”, meaning both “lawless” (stemming from the Greek *anomos*), anonymous, and amorous, is that it is a copy. The copy of Bidy Doran’s “fist,” which could be both her beak or her claws, is watermarked into the copy. This “watermark” also implicates Anna Livia Plurabelle, who is represented as the river Liffey, is thought to be the composer of this letter. As it is a “cop” or “copy,” it is always already read second-hand.

Joyce, thus, gathers together words, joining them together in order to create and sustain new meaning. To return momentarily to the term “gossiple,” for instance, we discover that this portmanteau conceals “Gospel” with “gossip” and might even be argued to invoke the terms “disciple” and “spell.” This is an unlikely joining given gossip’s rather trivial connotations and Gospel’s religious (and serious) overtones. Yet “gossip” is a word Joyce frequently invokes and uses as a building block for other neologisms in *Finnegans Wake*; moreover, the act of gossiping itself is threaded throughout the work and is highlighted within an entire chapter. Therefore, Joyce becomes a curator not just of narratives but of their modes as well. Within the *Wake*, gossip becomes the archival process on display, recording both the transmission of information and the vehicle of that transmission itself. Before launching into a close reading, it is helpful to begin with the history of gossip. A better understanding shows

that Joyce employs all the various definitions of gossip and is aware of its importance and changes throughout history.

### **The History of Gossip**

The importance of gossip as a means of communication and as a way of recording information has caught the attention of historians and literary scholars. For example, Robin Dunbar, in *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*, explains that the great apes form bonds and establish hierarchies by grooming each other; people have evolved in such a way that population has grown exponentially, making living in intimate quarters where we can groom one another an impossible feat. Dunbar therefore concludes that humans developed language in order to substitute for physical intimacy; gossip, therefore, became the substitute for grooming—a fact made more interesting when considered in the context of Book 1.8, wherein the washerwomen, while not grooming the characters of the *Wake per se*, pick apart their sins from the dirty clothes that they launder.

For some scholars, like Jan B. Gordon, gossip—as a means of resistance—highlights the social struggle of marginalized groups; this gossip, while possibly negative or malicious in its criticism of dominant, imperial groups, can be viewed positively in that it provides a voice and a means of expression against authority.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, this subversive form of communication is safer than others in that its traceability due to its multiplicity of sources is nearly impossible. Gordon notes that this is one advantage because it exemplifies “the strategic decentering of narrative authority”; gossipers draw on sources, which—even when named—have the information always already

secondhand. Therefore, gossip “subverts the intentionality of utterance”; gossip is never “serious” as such, with its promulgators relying on gossip’s more “trivial” connotations as mere chatter to fend off any sort of intentional maliciousness, and the fact that the listener is privy to the gossip, places him or her into “an especially entrusted” position (60). Those who gossip do so in private and in order to form closer bonds to one another, bonds based on trust and secrecy (although with gossip, the secret is never kept for long) and with the added benefit of releasing tensions associated with feelings of disenfranchisement and marginalization.

Interestingly, the word itself has not always meant what it does today. While most scholars interested in the study of gossip mention the etymology of the word gossip, Susan E. Phillips’ *The Problem with Gossip in Late Medieval England* offers a more thorough analysis. Gossip originally comes from the Old English term *godsip*; the suffix *-sip* refers to the adjective “akin, or related” to God.<sup>60</sup> The term also referred to someone (male or female) who would be present and act as sponsor at a baptism; in other words, the term “gossip” denoted the rights and responsibilities attributed to a godparent. During the fourteenth century, this term extended to include close friends, and in the seventeenth century included specifically those female friends who were invited to attend the birth. In between these centuries, the term began to take on its more negative connotations: “A person, mostly a woman, of light and trifling character, esp[ecially] one who delights in idle talk; a newsmonger, a tattler.”<sup>61</sup>

Phillips begins with the first definition and relates how “women who accepted the role of ‘gossip’ were bound by spiritual kinship to both mother and her newborn child” (153); this extension from the responsibility of spiritual guidance over a newborn child to

include both secular and spiritual responsibilities toward the mother is not something necessarily expected in a godparent: the gossips, “as the mother’s spiritual kin, supported her through labor, remained with her during the lying-in, and accompanied her to church for her purification or churching—the ceremony through which the mother was cleansed of the impurities of childbirth and reintegrated into the community of the faithful” (153-4). However, Phillips maintains that gossip, during the medieval period, was not a marginalized discourse; rather it was “the discourse of the authoritative center,” employed by “canonical poets and ecclesiastical authorities as well as unruly women” (207) to “air [. . .] community grievances” and to serve “as a powerful model for the exchange of secrets” (207). Through this exchange, Phillips links “gossip” to “confession,” drawing on both its secular and sacred connotations.

Patricia Meyer Spacks’ *Gossip* (1985) sets the critical and theoretical stage for a more serious analysis of gossip as a social and narrative convention. Her claim that “[t]he subject matter of gossip and that of the realistic English novel largely duplicate one another” (x) might strike the reader at first as outrageous. To “reduce” the novels of Henry James, George Eliot, and Jane Austen to the subject matter of gossip seems to censure the novelists on moral grounds (even though, as Spacks points out, early novels were seen as a lesser literary form when compared to poetry). However, this is far from the case; in fact, Spacks’ goal in writing *Gossip* was to reexamine a word so often associated with negative connotations and to reattribute to its meaning, more positive attributes.

Gossip, according to Spacks, is a means of “deliberate circulation of information [and] deliberate testing of opinion” not necessarily with malicious intent (5). In the case

of the *Wake*, we will soon see that gossip is deeply embedded in the idea of circulation. ALP, the river that circulates water throughout the book, also circulates the gossip of the washerwomen who relate the townspeople's scandals as they wash clothes along the river banks. What is more, the gossip circulated by these women often has to do with ALP herself. That the intention of the gossip is not malicious shows how in tune Joyce is with all the connotations of this term. For Spacks, there exists also what she terms "serious gossip," which she says, "exists only as a function of intimacy" (5). Gossip brings people together and it seals bonds between those involved; "serious gossipers," Spacks relates, "use talk about others to reflect about themselves" and to "express wonder and uncertainty and locate certainties, to enlarge their knowledge of one another" (5). Spacks helps to redefine gossip and, with these definitions in mind, a more thorough analysis of the gossip *in* the *Wake* and of the gossips *of* the *Wake* can be done.

In the case of the washerwomen, these are serious gossipers. They do indeed use talk to reflect on their own characters as we shall shortly see. However, before we do, it helps to begin first with how the washerwomen come into being. In Book 1.7, Justius says to Studiosus (another Shem/Shawn dynamic): "Come here, Herr Studiosus, till I tell you a wig in your ear. We'll do a whisper drive, for if the barishnyas got a twitter of it they'd tell the housetops and then all Cadbury would go crackers . . . It's secret!" (193. 13-17). The "wig in your ear" is the "secret" being told and also the subject of the secret; HCE, after all, is also called "Earwicker" and associated with the earwig bug. The need for a "whisper drive" to elude the barishnyas exemplifies gossip as a subversive form of communication; secrets are exchanged to one in order to be kept from others. Additionally, the stereotype of women alone (Barishnya is Russian for a young,

unmarried girl (McHugh)), perpetuates the stereotype of women as unruly and unable to control themselves from shouting out secret after secret from the rooftops.<sup>62</sup>

However, the illusion that somehow men manage secrets better than women is immediately contradicted in the following lines:

I had it from Lamppost Shawe. And he had it from Mullah. And Mull took it from a Bluecoat schooler. And Gay socks jot it from Potapheu's wife. And Rantipoll tipped the wink from old Mrs Tinbulett. And as for she was confussed by pro-Brother Thacolicus. And the good brother feels he would need to defecate you. . . That a cross may crush me if I refuse to believe in it . . . Sh! Shem, you are. Sh! You are mad! (193. 17-28)<sup>63</sup>

The secret's path back to its "origin" is complicated by questions such as: Is Mrs Tinbulett the instigator of the secret to Brother Thacolicus in confession? Or does she hear a confession, which Brother Thacolicus has heard and then tells to her? While Justius seems to trace gossip back, he can only go so far before he ends momentarily with "Sh! Shem, you are." This phrase, like much of the book, is incomplete. Furthermore, references to "pro-Brother Thacolicus" and "good brother" in conjunction with the oath "[t]hat a cross may crush me if I refuse to believe in it" blurs the lines between the sacred and the profane. Indeed, the lines between church and citizens are effectively blurred here as are the distinctions between confession and gossip; what is supposed to be mediated between parishioner and God is subjected to a trial by fire in the form of gossip. Gossip thus acts as a mechanism by which to shame individuals into following civic or church law.

To recall Phillips' argument that religion frequently uses gossip to keep track of their congregation, it makes sense that Joyce too would have taken those aspects of gossip's long history into consideration. Along the same lines as exchanging secrets and being a tool for the authoritative center, gossip becomes a more secularized version of confession. The Middle Ages, indeed, saw both confession and gossip as the perfect way by which to track the moral progress of its followers. Gossip, therefore, can be seen as a supplement to confession in which the healing of the spirit comes from confessing the sins of the body (with the proper amount of penance, of course).

Confession and baptism play important roles in *Finnegans Wake*. Gossip becomes a means by which to keep social order and a means by which social bonds are maintained. In Book 1.8, the two washerwoman begin to quarrel a bit about why the other one has all the easy laundry tasks such as laundering the "coifs and guimpes," (or the cap and shoulder portions of a nuns habit), while the one complaining has to do the more demeaning jobs such as cleaning the dirty handkerchiefs. Instead of arguing, one pulls out another article of clothing and the other begins discussing the odor that emerges from it:

I can tell from here by their eau de Colo and the scent of her odor they're Mrs Magrath's. And you ought to have aird them. They've moist come off her. Creases in silk they are, not crampton lawn. Baptiste me father, for she has sinned! Through her catchment ring she freed them easy, with her hips hurrahs for her knees' dontelleries. (204. 30-36, 205. 1)

When the two washerwomen begin to fuss about who has more work, the way to mend any resentment occurs through the gossip of Mrs Magrath's clothing, whose creases in

her silk come not from doing ladylike things but from wearing too much perfume and shaking her hips so as to entice other suitors. This kind of gossip, rather than contain malicious intent, does, like Spacks suggests, ease tensions between one another.

Additionally, this gossip helps to strengthen their relationship even more.

For example, the phrase “baptiste me father for she has sinned,” highlights an important aspect of the washerwomen’s relationship to each other and to the towns people. Joyce conflates baptism and confession in order to blur the lines between sacred, secular, and authority. With confession, one usually begins: “Bless me, father,” (not baptize me) and one typically ends with “for I have sinned.” One does not typically confess for another. And yet, in the *Wake*, this is exactly what happens. The washerwomen confess or gossip about the sins of these people and in the washing clean of the clothes figuratively confess and rebaptize them again. They are speaking and acting for these people, in the same way that the parents, godparents, and priest will speak on behalf of a baby in a baptism. Collectively it will be up to them and the congregation to enforce the laws and social dictums onto the child. The first archons of the Judeo-Christian era were the clergy; genealogy, of course, was an important component to documenting the history of a people. Furthermore, records of baptism were also important in the record-keeping of a town. The gossips at the river, while confessing and baptizing the sins of the people clean again, are also recording and repeating the information for as long as the section itself is read and re-read again.

One purpose of gossip is, of course, to form a mechanism by which society sets standards. As Phillips suggests, to be gossiped about, in a community, is generally a way to embarrass or admonish someone. However, gossip in the *Wake* doesn’t exactly occur

this way. Finn Fordham in *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake* mentions that there is surprisingly not much judgment that comes from the washerwomen. They refer and record the naughty bits of gossip in people's lives and not completely without judgment but definitely without any sort of penance aside from a good laundering. In the *Wake*, gossip passes out of the clothing through an oral account and then drifts downriver, fading into faulty recollection, and ultimately losing its potency.

In *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce makes this combination of church and gossip clear; a woman is described as she speaks to her priest:

over a hup a'chee her eyes dry and small and speech thicklish . . . to her particular reverent, the director, whom she had been meaning in her mind primarily to speak with . . . trusting, between cuppled lips and annie lawrie promises . . . that the gossiple so delivered in his epistolear, buried teastotastally in their Irish stew would go no further than his jesuit's cloth.  
(38. 16-24)

The term “gossiple” is interesting in itself because of the way it joins what is said, the gossip, with the “Gospel.” After all, the gospels are the recorded conversations between Jesus and his disciples. To go even further, “gospel” means “good news.” Indeed, the context of the passage suggests just this linkage; over a cup of tea, a woman gossips into the priest's “epistolear” (a word that joins “epistolary” or letters with “ear” so that gossip becomes unwritten letters for the ear) what she has heard from the Cad in the park. The Jesuit priest—who is supposed to be someone to be trusted and who takes vows of silence and confession seriously—is described as an “overspoiled priest Mr Browne, disguised as a Vincentian, who, when seized of the facts, was overheard . . . by

accident—if, that is, the incident it was an accident for here the ruah of Ecclesiastes of Hippo outpuffs the writress of Havvah-ban-Annah—to pianissimo a slightly varied version . . .” (39. 25-31). Again the blurring of what is seen as more secular (gossip) with the sacred (confession to a priest) affirms the importance of gossip for the Church as well as for the parishioners.

Thus what Joyce makes clear is that gossip is one of the most effective means of communication. Narratives such as the scandal at Phoenix Park involving HCE are transferred in both “whisper drives” as well as spoken “between cuppled lips” into a Priest’s “epistolar.” An epistle refers, of course, to a letter, which is generally a reference to private correspondence but which is often deemed relevant and indeed pertinent to safekeeping in an archive or even published in book form.

Joyce also explores its more savage and malignant uses—slander: “The wararrow went round, so it did, (a nation wants a graze) . . . privately printed at the rimepress of Delville, soon fluttered its secret . . . byway to the rose of the winds and blew of the gaels, from archway to lattice and from black hand to pink ear, village crying to village . . . and he who denays it, may his hairs be rubbed in dirt” (43. 21-31). Gossip spreads around from village to village like a “wararrow” making what was once private now public by way of a national interest; even the manner through which such gossip goes round—“from black hand to pink ear”—as well as “printed at the rimepress,” or printed in the papers suggests gossip’s potential for major political or societal ramifications. Gossip is therefore needed for national consumption—“a nation wants a graze”—and public/private war. This shared desire for news of a private and therefore more scandalous nature is exemplified in the publishing of gossip by the dirty laundry discussed by the washerwomen.

One of the main criticisms, of course, for reading gossip as archival is that it relies mostly on hearsay, which makes tracing its “source” or “origin” virtually impossible. In a work that treats all sources as equal and asserts that tracing the origin of anything is not only impossible but also irrelevant (there can be no origins when history occurs in a cycle), gossip becomes the perfect model by which to archive.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, gossip has always been the cornerstone to any archival institution. For instance, gossip provides historians, literary critics, biographers, and librarians with such insights as can be found in personal letters, notebooks, diaries, and even audiovisual recordings such as photographs and home videos. Information obtained from these materials can be found within biographies, scholarly articles, and reputable historical texts as well as repeated orally throughout historical tours. Gossip, like the archives themselves, are paradoxical—its subject can be recorded, stored, and preserved and yet, almost always, gossip elides verification; still gossip is useful in that it contextualizes the mores and ideologies of society on both personal and public levels.

Grace Eckley sees Wakean gossip as a confirmation of the convention that “rumours historically yield more credibility than facts” (131). Indeed, the gossip of the washerwomen alongside the river Liffey refers to the newspapers as a source: “It was put in the newses what he did” (196. 20). Of course, Joyce may have been commenting on the state of news media in the 1930s, or he might also be highlighting the way many newspapers get their story by relying first on rumors and gossip. The “newses” the washerwomen refer to are chronicled throughout the *Wake* and include both national and local periodicals. The list of newspapers in the *Wake* includes: “the nation” (6.15), “Evening World” (28.20), “Morganspost” (Morning Post) (36.05), “a northern tory, a

southern whig” (Northern Tory) (42.28), “eastanglican chronicler” (East-Anglican Chronicle) (42.28), “landwester guardian” (Manchester Chronicle) (42.29), “Dublin Intelligence” (Dublin Intelligencer) (49.18), “Frankofurto Siding” (Frankfurter Zeitung) (70. 5), “pagan ironed times” (Irish Times) (79.14), “Irish daily independent” (Irish Independent) (118.02), “sibbering’s eagle” (Skibbereen Eagle) (302.13), “Tara Tribune” (Tribune) (375.24), “Weekly Standard” (439.36), “Corth examiner” (Cork Examiner) (519.24), “Instoppressible” (Insuppressible) (568.16), “Durban Gazette” (Dublin Gazette) (602.19), and “Morning post” (617.22). The “newses,” therefore, prints gossip and is used by gossips (the washerwomen) effecting a cycle of supply and demand, wherein the source remains indecipherable—yet nevertheless important to the telling of the tale.

Letters, too, contain information about someone or something heard from someone else. Moreover, descriptions of how the letters were written, to whom, by whom, and how they were delivered (or mis-delivered or never delivered) are prevalent in the *Wake*. In Book 1.4, for example, Joyce writes that HCE was “saved by his sillied woman” (94. 3); he was saved by a letter she supposedly had written—the question of who actually wrote it is never fully answered. In fact, because of the mystery surrounding this letter, it too becomes part of the *Wake* and is even thought to *be* the *Wake*.

Moreover, gossip is incorporated into the *Wake* in a manner strikingly similar to Derrida’s analysis of *le mal de archive*. For example, Derrida describes this “trouble of the archive” as both a need and a sickness and calls it “archive fever”:

It is to burn with a passion. It is never to rest, interminably, from searching for the archive right where it slips away. It is to run after the archive, even if there’s too much of it, right where something in it anarchives itself. It is to have a compulsive, repetitive, and

nostalgic desire for the archive, an irrepressible desire to return to the origin, a homesickness, a nostalgia for the return to the most archaic place of absolute commencement. (91)

To search for the archive, or memory as Derrida puts it, is to “burn” and “run” to the place, to the site of a memory just as it “anarchives” itself or slips away. The search is equated with that original moment, that “archaic place of absolute commencement”—that place where things begin and where commandments are given.<sup>65</sup> If, as Derrida claims, the archive takes place “there where things commence . . . [and] there where men and gods command” (1), then this is a place of authority, a place where order—especially social order is exercised (1). The desire to return to this place of beginning, where the archive thunders into being, can never be fully realized. Gossip figuratively also runs through the *Wake*, in the form of ALP, who is also the river Liffey, and is also compulsively repeated. The repetition emerges in a variety of languages and slangs. Therefore, reading the *Wake* is also a bit like running “after the archive”—always in search of meaning.

Variations of gossip appear throughout the *Wake* and include “wig in your ear” (193. 13),<sup>66</sup> “Tilling a teel, telling a toll” (7. 5). Gossip is compared to a “wararrow” and a “ballad stumpstamped on to a slip of blancovide” (43. 21). Furthermore, Joyce creates a direct association with gossip as archive material; he describes it as “superscribed and subpencilled” into “litterish fragments” that stay there and “lurk dormant until re-discovery” (66. 16, 25); this re-discovery is “remembered in connection with what has gone before (69. 29) and it is the fodder for the news, to be reported, “constated,” and sent back, “zurichschicken,” (German for “to send back”), but back to where? The letter is undeliverable. Instead it is buried in a mound and hen-pecked into

discovery, its remnants poured over by a “biografiend,” and its contents hinted to be the text of *Finnegans Wake* itself.

Furthermore, the compulsion to repeat is also evidenced throughout the *Wake*. The following list, however, is taken solely out of Book 1.8.: “O tell me all about Anna Livia . . . . Tell me all. Tell me now” (196. 1-3, 4-5). “Tuck up your sleeves and loosen your talktapes,” “ptellomey soon,” “O, tell me all I want to hear!” “Tell us in franca lingua,” “Tell me moher. Tell me moatst,” “Tell me. Tell me. Phoebe, dearest, tell, O tell me” “Odet! Odet! Tell me the trent of it” “Listen now. Are you listening?” “Onon! Onon! tell me more. Tell me every tiny teign. I want to know every singul ingul,” “Tell me, tell me, how cam she camlin through all her fellows,” “Dell me where, the fairy ferse time! I will if you listen” “Drip me the sound . . . . And drip me the why” “O go in, go on, go an! I mean about what you know,” “Never stop! Continuarration! You’re not there yet. I amstel waiting. Garonne, garonne!” “Tell me quick and dongu so crould!” “I can’t tell you how. . . O but you must you must really. Make me hear it gurgle gurgle . . . I swear I’d pledge my chanza getting to heaven . . . to hear it all, aviary word!” “Describe her! Hustle along, why can’t you? Spitz on the iern while it’s hot . . . Oceans of Gaud, I mosel hear that!” “I’ll tell you a test. But you must sit still. Will you hold your peace and listen . . . ?” “I want to get it frisk from the source” “But O, gihon! I lovat a gabber. I cold listen to maure and moravar again” “Tell me of John or Shuan?” “Tell me, tell me, elm!” and finally “Tellmetale of stem or stone” (196-216). The compulsion to “tell” and to “listen” reaches an almost fevered pitch with the exclamations of “O go in, go on, go an!” and “Never stop! Continuarration!” The washerwomen, whose words these are, exhibit a need to both relate and to hear gossip. There is a particular sense of urgency, excitement, and

anxiety that exemplifies their “archive fever.” The two washerwomen, therefore, act as conduits and as the keepers of all the stories; their fervor to remember equals their desire to hear again. In 1.8 they, therefore, also serve the function of curators and presenters of all Wakean gossip with their constant attempts to get at the root of an issue. Whether that issue is ALP’s “fairy first time” or about whose underwear they are washing, their need to know drives the narrative forward and provides the reader with another piece of the puzzle.

### **“Fairy Gutmurdherers” and “Goddestfars”: The Gossips as Godparents**

The reader meets the gossips—the godfathers and godmothers of the *Wake* before ever knowing that this is who they are. For example, throughout the *Wake*, the reader meets the forefathers (literally four fathers), but it isn’t until book 3.3, that these forefathers are “traipsing through the tangle” and are described as the “godsons’ goddestfar” (476 4-5). The term “goddestfar” stands for the Danish *gudfar*, meaning “godfather” and *bedstefar*, meaning grandfather, or literally “best father.” Therefore the four men coming upon Shaun are his godfathers.

Joseph Campbell’s *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake* explains that there are four characters (the forefathers) who appear throughout the *Wake* in various guises; sometimes they are called the “Four Old Men,” other times the “Four Chroniclers,” or “Four Master Analysts of Ireland,” or even the “Four Evangelists.” These descriptions highlight both their age—they are “old men”—and their station in life; they are the “analysts” and “chroniclers” of the *Wake*. That they are “deputizing for gossipocracy” and are themselves proponents of gossip is made ironic by the fact that they are described

as “four slobberishly senile old judges who remember and rehearse the anecdotes of old times” (Campbell 8).

The better-known gossips are, of course, the washerwomen of 1.8. Like the *Wake*'s godfathers, the godmothers are also not young. In the “Ricorso” chapter of the book, ALP describes the women who baptized her sons (Shem and Shaun) as “those two old crony aunts [who] held them out to the water front. Queer Mrs Quickenough and odd Miss Doddpebble” (620. 18-20). To hold Shem and Shaun at the waterfront symbolizes a baptism and their status as the godmothers.

However, they are also the gossips of HCE in that they wag their tongues in their telling and retelling of the scandal that occurred at Phoenix Park. ALP, in thinking of HCE and the crimes he has committed, considers how he would prefer that “his fury gutmurderers . . . redress him” (617. 18). The term “fury” and its implied “fairy” for “fairy godmother” reminds the reader that “fairy tales,” in particular, are not always nice; indeed they are typically moral tales that contain warnings against ill behavior and feature punishments of nightmarish proportions. The neologism “gutmurderers” combines the German word “gut” for good with “murderers,” suggesting just such violence. To invoke Mary Chamberlain: their redressing of HCE's sins becomes an event in and of itself, a performance as it were, that emerges from traditional genres of storytelling.

ALP herself makes the connection between “gossips” as both “newsmongers” and “godmothers”: “And when them twos has had a good few there isn't much more dirty clothes to publish. From the Launderdale Minssions” (620. 20-21). The women of Book 1.8 are furious launderers as is evidenced in directives such as “wallop it well with your

battle and clean it” (196. 16-17). When ALP considers that HCE wishes the “fury gutmudherers to redress him well,” she means that HCE wishes the washerwomen to dress him “well” again (in clean clothes and to make him well). She also means to “redress” in order to compensate for his grievance. The godmothers, or gossips, through their washing clean of dirty laundry, do at least address (and redress) the wrongs done by others. This directly foreshadows—or flashes back—to a memory of the forefathers gossiping about ALP’s first time.

In Book 1.3, the forefathers:

[A]nswer from their Zoans; Hear the four of them! Hark terrorar of them! I, says Armagh, and a’m proud o’it. I, says Barna, and whatabout it? Hee haw! Before he fell hill he filled heaven: a stream, alplapping streamlet, coily coiled um, cool of her curls: We were but thermites then, wee, wee. (57, 7-15)

In this quote, the four fathers or masters are indeed gossips. First there are the typical regal announcements to “Hear” and to “Hark” before they commence with relating the fall of HCE.<sup>67</sup> Additionally, the term “alplapping” contains “plapping,” which stems from the German term “plappern,” which means to gossip. Like gossip personified, the stream—that is representative of ALP—wears down the alp-like HCE into a hill with her “alplapping streamlet” and with the cool of her curls she coiled coily around him. And in this particular moment—the moment before the fall—foreshadows and recalls the moment where ALP loses her virginity to Michael Arklow. The forefathers claimed to be “thermites.” This term “thermites” echoes “hermits,” which the gossips use when referring to Michael Arklow. Arklow, of course, is the name of the man or “local

heremite,” or hermit, who upon meeting Anna Livia, “forget[s] the monk in the man” and “plunge[s] both of his newly anointed hands. . . in her singimari saffron strumans of hair” (203 18-26). Whether the forefathers are confusing themselves with Arklow or wishing they were the ones to deflower ALP or even that Arklow is another version of themselves, ALP’s first time becomes a topic of discussion.

We begin, then, watching these washerwomen come to life on the banks of the Liffey conversing freely while doing the citizen’s laundry:

O

tell me all about

Anna Livia!

. . . Wash quit and don’t be dabbling. Tuck up your sleeves and loosen your talktapes. And don’t butt me—hike!—when you bend. Or whatever it was they threed to make out he thried to two in the Fiendish park. (196.1-3, 6-11)

The conversation, like the river at its narrowest, flows readily into one current of discussion, into another, and back again. Their commands to each other exhibit the familiarity with which they address one another as well as create a visual scene for the reader of these two bending and expressing the dirt from the clothing with the same enthusiasm as they do with Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker’s scandal.

As in any society, there are standards or limits to which we are all subject; Wakean society is no different. In the conversations of the washerwomen, these limits are verbalized: “Yssel that the limmat?” (198.13) one of the washerwomen asks the other in response to the limits that Anna goes to for the sexual satisfaction of her Humphrey.

The authority granted within a marriage is where things get even more ambiguous. There are laws created to support or supersede God's law. One of the main means of control is gossip. To be talked about—especially one's sexual reputation—still today carries a stigma that acts as conscience and warning in matters having to do with sex. In the *Wake*, of course, the scandal in Phoenix Park is heavy with sexual innuendo. The ambiguity surrounding HCE's exhibition stands in stark contrast with Adam and Eve's prelapsarian existence inside the Garden of Eden. Joyce creates this link when the washerwomen discuss the loss of Anna's virginity: "Tell me, tell me, how cam she camlin through all her fellows, the neckar she was, the diveline?" And the answer is this:

She sid herself she hardly knows whuon the annals her graveller was. . . . It was ages behind that when nullahs were nowhere, in county Wickenlow, garden of Erin, before she ever dreamt she'd lave Killbride and go foaming under Horsepass bridge . . . . Well, there once dwelt a local heremite, Michael Arklow was his riverend name, . . . and one venersderg in junojuly, oso sweet and so cool and so limber she looked, . . . in the silence, of the sycamores, all listening, the kindling curves you simply can't stop feeling, he plunged both of his newly anointed hands . . . in her singimari saffron strumans of hair" (202. 24-36, 203. 1-25).

She did not know who in the annals her "graveller" was, which suggests the Four Master Analysts indeed, but as it is retold, it is also Mickael Arklow, the reverend hermit from the County Wicklow. The symbolic representation of nature and Anna Livia's place within that nature echoes the Edenic freedom—especially sexual freedom—to explore; for instance, the Hermit is not chastised by the gossips, nor do they seem scandalized by

his momentary lapse from abstinence. Furthermore, the descriptions of Anna Livia's beauty and innocence is enhanced by her natural surroundings. "Kindling curves" refers to both the sycamore tree or to Anna Livia, and her "strumans of hair" continues to blur the distinction between her nature and her surroundings. The final "Maas" refers to mass, which as a monk, he is both attendant and performer.

The gossip about Anna Livia helps to create a mythos about her, the result of which actually empowers her. Anna's private life and sexual history feeds the gossip's dual desire to know as well as to relate to their own lives; essentially, gossip becomes a means to live vicariously through the experiences of someone who is idolized. Furthermore, her history, including exploits, are discussed with relatively little chastisement or judgment. Perhaps the closest we get is when the washerwomen discuss Anna's "fairy ferse time" (203. 16), where her beauty makes Michael Arklow "forget the monk in the man" because "he cuddle not help himself." Finn Fordham's "Anna Livia's 'very first time'" sees the act of the "reverend" Michael Arklow as "quasi-paedophilia" and argues that normally "shame and excuse [would] surround the event . . . and portray the priest as exploiting the unequal power relations between himself and the girl" (68). However, shame and excuse are really not a part of the washerwomen's tone at all, as Fordham attests they find the situation "comic, forgivable, natural" (68). She is described as "mothernaked" (a term reminiscent of the first woman, Eve, which means mother of us all as she washes and grooms herself. Anna prepares herself like a goddess going to war with "grains of incense" (207.1), "fallen griefs of weeping willow" (207.2), and "bracelets," "anklets," "armlets" and a jetty amulet for necklace of clicking cobbles and

pattering pebbles” (207.4-6) as her armor. Perhaps less like Eve here in and more like goddesses and demigoddesses of Greek mythology.

And yet she is also like Eve, taking a page from the serpent to deceive Adam, first man, into the fall from ignorance into knowledge through a taste of the apple. Similarly, she tricks him as Hera tricks Zeus in the Iliad XIV (see McHugh, I think): “Then, then, as soon as the lump his back was turned, with her mealiebag slang over her shulder, Anna Livia, oysterface, forth her bassein came” (207.17-20). A river basin carries the drainage from the land into a body of water. Anna, therefore, becomes the river basin, carrying the runoff from her “mealiebag.” Like Eve and Hera, two powerful female protagonists in literary history, Anna’s success in carrying forth her own will comes at the expense of her husband’s knowledge—she must work to deceive him—and yet unlike Eve and Hera, Anna’s purpose is to avenge her husband’s name. As some have pointed out, Anna is a complex character so that while she avenges, she also accuses him. The bag slung over her shoulder suggests the Pandora and Santa Claus myths—as critics have suggested; less frequently suggested is the gypsy-woman “selling” her wares.

When this scene is compared to the more recent scandal of Humphrey and the immediately gossiped about scandals of Anna Livia—also of a sexual nature—the tone is different:

And didn’t she up in sorgues and go and trot doon . . . puffing her old dudheen . . . Calling [‘every shivant siligirl or Wensum farmerette’] in, one by one (To blockbeddum here! . . .) and legging a jig or so on the sihl to show them how to shake their benders and the dainty how to bring to mind the gladdest garments out of sight and all the way of a maid with a

man . . . . Throwing all the neiss little whores in the world at him! (200.17-32)

The tone is more lascivious, more prone to a jezebel than an Eve bringing all the young maids—those “siligirls” and “farmerettes” in—and teaching them how to “shake their benders” and wear “the gladdest garments” in order to please her man. And yet the authority that speaks to the holy sacrament of marriage and a wife’s duty to her husband are clearly articulated here and actually not so far a field from Biblical references to King Solomon and Sheba<sup>68</sup> and the rather explicit Song of Songs, or to Rebecca and Hagar with Abraham and the split of the Kingdom of God between Christianity and Islam, between Isaac and Ishmael, where tales of a King’s harem filled with his wife and those she teaches the art of love.

In both renditions of this event, Anna Livia’s hair becomes an important signifier of inescapable desire, of lust, and of downfall or perhaps just of falling—as in into orgasm. Neither HCE nor Michael Arklow the priest (nor apparently the forefathers, who were thermites then) could help themselves around her. The retelling of the event echoes that of Adam who, like Eve, could not help from eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge.

However, there is also another way to read this section other than Anna Livia leading to HCE into “falling hill.” That is after he falls ill, she wraps her hair around him. Patrick McCarthy in “Making Herself Tidal” claims that “Gossip feeds on itself, ultimately erasing all traces of its origins in a stream of talk that resists efforts to restrict it to a core of meaning” (174). The “stream” by which “Earwicker’s sins” are washed away is Anna Livia. Thus gossip, again with reference to baptism and also confession,

wipes clean the slate and makes way for the forgiveness and regeneration of HCE, ALP, and all their hundred and eleven aleveens.

The gossips thus see Anna as the first mother, the wife who brings about the first Fall, and the mother who bore her children in pain for a destiny in which they would always be torn between love and war; additionally, Anna is a siren, a temptress, going beyond merely bringing other women to her husband's bed to having time and occasion enough to "have a flewmen of her owen" (202.5-6). Her own exploits are associated with love in both physical and spiritual senses: "Then atoss nare scared that lass, so aimai moe, that's agapo" (202.6-7)! Thanatoss, Greek for death, could not scare the mother of all, the siren on the river, for she can achieve "agape," that spiritual, metaphysical love through the physical world of love and sex: "Die little Eve, die." Death in the *Wake* is nothing more than a metaphor for change. The *Wake* is literally a text of dying and waking; what happens in-between is an archival recording and re-recording of a thousand and one narratives blurred together and fueled by gossip.

Her children, like their mother, become part of the mythos of this chapter; one asks the other "Wharnow are alle her childer, say?" to which the other answers "In kingdome gone or power to come or gloria be to them farther? Allalivial, allalluvial! Some here, more no more, more again lost alla stranger" (213. 30-33). Their stories conflate and confound normal narrative temporality and spatiality. They are in many places at once—they are from the Bible, and so echoed in the gossip's revising of the Lord's prayer: "In kingdome gone or power to come or gloria be to them farther?" (In kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven) To end this with a question highlights the uncertainty which comes with gossip—the source is untraceable and yet its

mystery and uncertainty heightens its credibility past believability into faith, or into myth. The archive, too, relies on an acceptance similar to faith. For example, few question how an institution comes by their collections; they are mostly concerned with the collection being available to them than by the mysterious process by which manuscripts and miscellany are verified.

In the end, the washerwomen themselves become part of the myths as they turn from two gossips into Tree and Stone. They are the “dumb” made to “speak” of the “gossipaceous Anna Livia” by the “lifewand” of Shem the penmen (195. 4-5). They are the godmothers, or gossips, of Shem and Shaun and confidants of their mother. At the end of the book, the narrator who has been silent throughout this episode, silences them once again *deus ex machina* back into Tree and a Stone—back into the “Telmetale of stem or stone,” back into the beginning of the “tale told of Shaun or Shem,” and back into “the chittering waters of . . . Night!” (216.3, 215.35, 216.5)

Joyce, in *Finnegans Wake*, explores the archival properties inherent in gossip as a mode of communication. Additionally, Joyce relies on the archive of gossip’s history found in its etymology. Through the literalization of the washerwomen as gossips, Joyce not only tells the history of HCE and ALP, he also shares the history and relationship of these two women with one another as longtime colleagues and friends and their relation to Shem, Shaun, HCE, and ALP. Furthermore, the repetition and transformation of gossip (as a term) and of the gossips (from the washerwomen to stem and stone), Joyce creates an archival record of gossip and of the gossips themselves.

In the next chapter, gossip once again has a role to play—this time a more implicit one than in its fictionalization and representation in *Finnegans Wake*. In this final

chapter, we return to the Joyce legacy of the first chapter and explore its ongoing development in an era after Joyce and in the throes of confusion and turmoil over international copyright laws.

One thing is certain, while Joyce's copyright depends on amendments to current copyright laws, some of his works, like those materials archived within the *Wake*, still remain en"tomed" to the "mount" in boxes and digitized online at the National Library of Ireland, the library at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and many other places. The "[p]ride. O Pride thy prize" heralded by Mutt in Book 1.7 of the *Wake* has become an economical reality as legal battles are waged even after Joyce copyright has—in some countries—expired. The following chapter, while journalistic in nature, is so for a reason; in the present moment, it is far more important to record what has happened and what is happening in order to give Joyceans and those modernist scholars, whose author's works still fall under copyright or are just coming out of it, the information they need to make up their own minds regarding what can be done (in terms of publishing scholarship and working with estates) and what might be done (in terms of copyright reform).

## CHAPTER FIVE

### INHERITING JOYCE'S LEGACY: COPYRIGHT, RIGHT TO PRIVACY, AND THE FIGHTING JOYCEANS

The artist, like the God of the creation remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, pairing his fingernails. (James Joyce *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*)

In the epigraph above, Stephen Dedalus depicts the artist as being “like the God of creation” in that he “remains within or behind or beyond or above his handiwork, invisible, refined out of existence, indifferent, pairing his fingernails.”<sup>69</sup> This certainly does not remain true for artists today. Joyce has been anything but “refined out of existence”; the fact that he relied heavily on his own experiences in his works, most clearly evident in *Portrait* and *Ulysses*, keeps Joyce resolutely within his handiwork. Copyright, while not a new law, had undergone some significant transitions—transitions which would impact the way in which Joyce published his works and how they would be read and analyzed long after his death. Perhaps partially due to this law, Joyce became invested in his work—in the production, in the rising value of the product, and finally in how that product was interpreted. Like other authors before him, Joyce expected to transcend his mortality and to continue providing economically for his family.

Of course, death—and what it would cost to die—was something that concerned Joyce greatly. By the end of Joyce's life, this concern extended to worries about the mounting debt his deteriorating health was costing his family. Richard Ellmann recounts

how Joyce was concerned about the cost his family could incur before what resulted in his final surgery. However, far more worrisome was how he would be remembered. In the first chapter, I discussed a letter her wrote to Ibsen in which the young Joyce saw the death of the artist as moving on toward “higher and higher and higher enlightenment.” That enlightenment is contained and preserved within the traces of works left behind for others. In the sixth episode of *Ulysses*, the “Hades” chapter, Joyce explores the idea of death and how people remember others after they have passed. For example, in this episode, Bloom is just coming from Paddy Dignam’s funeral. He considers how people remember those who die: “People talk about you a bit: forget you . . . . Begin to be forgotten . . . . Besides how could you remember everybody? Eyes, walk, voice. Well, the voice, yes: gramophone . . . . Remind you of the voice like the photograph reminds you of the face” (*U* 6. 853-4, 872, 962-67). What is interesting about this passage is the way Bloom shifts point of view. The “you” refers to both those who have died and to Bloom himself. In an effort to answer his own line of questioning, Bloom turns to artificial means of memory (re)production. What Joyce is pointing to is that the production of memory-making such as the gramophone and photograph may well act as reproduction for memory; however, these advancements did not mean that “you [could] remember everybody” or that you would not “begin to be forgotten.” Photography and sound recordings may help but it takes “you” to remember to look or listen to these things in the first place. That being said, Joyce certainly did not want to be forgotten, and in 1924 and 1929 did what he could to ensure that those who wished to remember could hear his voice, reading excerpts of *Ulysses* and “Anna Livia Plurabelle” respectively.

In a lecture given at the Dublin James Joyce Summer School in 2010, Damien Keane illustrated how the 1929 recording of Joyce's voice reading from the "Washers at the Ford" episode indicates that Joyce would be the author of not only the printed text but also the recorded one. In recording his own voice reading his own work, a doubling occurs. This doubling creates an echo of the author that will continue to resonate so long as the technology and medium exists to replicate it. Unfortunately for Joyce scholars, until recently, this recording was not readily available—held captive under the restrictions of copyright. While Joyce only produced two recordings with His Masters Voice (HMV), Joyce designed the labels, of which only thirty were made, and had his signature pressed into metal to be placed over the record. Clearly Joyce, like Bloom, saw the gramophone (and the photograph) as a way for people to remember him. In the recording, the author becomes part of the foreground. With the recorded voice, the author no longer remains inaudible; nor can he remain "indifferent." Rather, as Luca Crispi calls it, the author—in recording—is able to create "the third dimension of the printed text."<sup>70</sup> In recording his voice reading his own work, the author thereby provides the reader with a sense of how the work can or should be read. Vocal inflections, for instance, can become a kind of directive, similar to a film director's casting and positioning of the actors in an adaptation of a novel. Authorial intention, then, trades a portion of the reader's involvement for that of the artist's. This is not to say one way is better than another; the third dimension of the text adds another layer to artistic development.

It is not surprising, then, that scholars, interested in simulating historical context, wish to use the technological advancements of the twenty-first century to adapt the text in multiple, simultaneous directions. For example, at the 2012 International James Joyce

Symposium held in Dublin, there were many presentations of such new scholarly directions. One idea included creating a website of *Ulysses* wherein the opening scene would have short film clips to introduce a visual perspective of Martello Tower, with the sounds of waves crashing against it. In this project, the reader would see the shaving instruments Buck Mulligan might have used (had he been real) and would also see the surrounding area of Sandycove before even the first words from the work are read. If recording the author's voice is the third dimension of the printed text, multi-media renditions of these texts add the possibility of infinite dimensions. Again, this is similar to film. The person creating the site, in the case of *Ulysses*, is not the author but an outside source. The implication of the text being adapted or re-created in such a creative way both de-emphasizes and re-emphasizes the author. On the one hand, he is no longer the sole creator, but on the other hand, contextual and biographical details included on such sites serve to remind the reader of the "Eyes. walk. voice" as portrayed in Bloom's stream-of-consciousness in *Ulysses*. Not all, however, remain convinced that multi-media presentations of Joyce material are the way to go.

For example, one cautionary complaint against this project comes from Fritz Senn, the most senior Joyce scholar and founder of the Zurich James Joyce Foundation. His argument is that such a project might destroy how the work was originally read; when first reading the work, one does not know he is at Martello Tower with Stephen but rather gradually gains this knowledge throughout the episode. While the argument is certainly not without merit, the author's intention is important only insofar as it provides the reader with *one* way to understand or experience the work. Negating technology and the way in which readers now experience works of art in order to attempt a re-

presentation of how it once was read ignores the importance of the changing experience of reading in the twenty-first century. Given Joyce's interest in technology as depicted throughout his works and in the way that technology can change or influence the way we remember someone seems to indicate Joyce's awareness of all of these implications.

For example, we now have the technology to read a work while listening to audio and linking to photographs and maps. The ability to experience these works in a manner many consider quite in line with Joyce's tastes and aesthetic should be taken advantage of. Joyce may or may not have foreseen these advancements but one thing is for sure: the Joyce community at large is planning these projects for the enjoyment of many and to further highlight Joyce's continued presence as one of the greatest writers of all time. Furthermore, this is not a recent development. Joyce's works have already been adapted for the screen and for audiences of popular culture.<sup>71</sup> Additionally, scholars have written biographies and created facsimile copies of all extant archival materials and published these copies in sixty-three volumes to make Joyce's materials more accessible.

This is also not the first time someone has come up with the idea to create an interactive site for *Ulysses*. Michael Groden was involved in the development of the *James Joyce Archive* and also a hypertext version of *Ulysses* for the web. However, until 1 January 2012, all of these proposed developments had to seek the permission of the James Joyce Estate. With the expiration of copyright, this is no longer true in most countries and for most of Joyce's works. In order to gain a better understanding of what works can be used freely and which still require Estate permissions, an overview of copyright and its complicated evolution is needed; from there, we can explore the evolution of Joyce and copyright. Such an overview is necessary as it empowers those

who wish to work on modernist authors and their archival materials; this is true whether or not that research is accomplished within an archive or through a “fair use” of published materials.

While an aspiring Joyce scholar may not be deterred by the stories recounted by Joyceans the world over concerning Stephen James Joyce, the grandson and a literary trustee of the James Joyce Estate, the fact remains that if the Estate denies permissions or charges exorbitant fees (which the Joyce Estate has been wont to do), publishers can deny publication and therefore threatens the ways in which academics typically progress. A project that is denied permission can cost an academic his or her promotion or tenure. What may feel like a life’s work spent researching and writing can all be for naught. Examples of those whose research was stymied by the Estate’s interventions include Danis Rose, whose work on three projects resulted in lawsuits and legal threats, and Carol Loeb Shloss, whose drive to publish her biography on Joyce’s daughter, Lucia, resulted first in an expurgated work and later (after a lengthy legal battle that would require the aid of Stanford law professors Lawrence Lessing and Robert Spoo) a fully restored edition.

Additionally, with contracts between estates and archives, the mission of the archive is now in jeopardy. On the one hand, archives serve the interests of the author in that it secures for posterity the safekeeping of his works. On the other hand, archives aim to solicit scholars to visit its establishments, peruse its collections, and contribute to the continued development of scholarship. To do this requires public access to its holdings. The latter mission of archives, however, has sometimes been at odds with the wishes of the Joyce Estate, which uses copyright and right to privacy arguments to push its own

agenda. What that agenda is varies; however, one thing remains consistent: Joyceans involved in biographical research, especially as relates to the Joyce women, and Joyceans interested in adapting Joyce's work are sure to come under the scrutiny of Stephen James Joyce, who sees it as his mission to protect the Joyce family privacy and arbitrate any creative endeavors that use his grandfather's work.

While this aim does not in and of itself necessarily warrant criticism, the abuse of copyright to further what can only be described as a personal vendetta against academics has serious ramifications—for publishing as well as tenure and promotion. Furthermore, scholars argue that the Estate's consistent permission denials, public ridicule, and scathing editorials actually hurt scholarship as well as diminish any future interest in James Joyce's works.

It must also be stressed that copyright is not a stagnant and fixed law; Joyce has already come out of copyright in the U. S. once in the early 1990s, only to return to it once again with the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act. This chapter explores a brief history of copyright and its impact on Joyce studies in order to show the complexities that current scholars of modernist works face today.

### **A Brief History of Copyright: From the Early UK and U.S. Statutes to International Laws**

Copyright has undergone numerous revisions since its inception. The first English copyright law was the Statute of Anne of 1710, which provided protection “against unauthorized printing to the author or proprietor of a new book” for a period of fourteen years with the option of another fourteen “if the author survived the original term of

protection” (Jaszi and Woodmansee 4). The motivation behind this Statute came not from the authors themselves but from their publishers who were deeply distressed by the free-for-all printing and reprinting of works after the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695. Their demand for legislation to codify their right to printing culminated in the 1710 legislation. Ironically, the proprietors, in an effort to strengthen their case, also argued on behalf of the author, whose consent to these “pirates” was never provided. Arguments surrounding the levels of hardship authors had to endure helped ensure the passing of this legislation (Jaszi and Woodmansee 6).

The proprietors never dreamed that more and more authors would go the route of Daniel Defoe in professionalizing themselves as entrepreneurs and thereby seeking “the right to prosecute book piracies . . . themselves” (Defoe qtd. in Jaszi and Woodmansee 6). By going after literary pirates, authors gained more attention as the creators of these works and as therefore deserving credit for these creations, which the public enjoyed. Previously, only the publishers who had purchased the rights to publish these works from authors were considered in these matters. With Defoe and other authors arguing for authors’ rights against piracy, attention was therefore drawn away from the publishers as the primary beneficiaries in these statutes to the authors themselves.

In 1790, the U. S. Congress enacted its first copyright legislation. This was done fourteen years after declaring independence from England and three years after the drafting of the Constitution wherein Congress is given the power “to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writing and discoveries.”<sup>72</sup> The Copyright Act of 1790, for the most part, copied the British Statute of Anne of 1710 in that it provided for

the author or his proprietor the benefit of copyright for a period of fourteen years with an option of an additional fourteen years, should the author survive the limitation. It also required authors or their proprietors, before publication, to “deposit a printed copy in the clerk’s office of the district court where the author or proprietor”<sup>73</sup> resides and also to submit a printed copy to the Secretary of State “to be preserved.”<sup>74</sup> These requirements suggest that even the U. S. saw the correlation between the building of a nation and the tracking and preservation of the nation’s literature. In fact, the filing of the manuscript would change after 1870 with the creation of the United States Copyright Office, located in the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress, of course, is the largest and arguably most prestigious archive in the United States. Currently the Library of Congress seeks to archive Twitter’s entire Tweet Archive.<sup>75</sup>

David Saunders, in *Authorship and Copyright*, notes that the U.S. Copyright Act of 1790 ironically “allows the free importation, vending, reprinting and publishing of any book written or published abroad by any person not being a citizen of the United States and in this way provided affordable English-language reading material for the growing population” (155). British authors were, of course, upset by this clause; Charles Dickens, on two separate book tours to the United States (1842 and 1867-68), was so angered that American booksellers could pirate books, publish them, and make good money without ever paying the author that he lobbied the U.S. Congress to overturn the Act of 1790.<sup>76</sup>

In between the Statute of Anne and the British Act of 1838 was the British Act of 1814, which added a total of twenty-eight years or the life of the author to its copyright statutes. To some, this still did not suffice. William Wordsworth, for example, made it his mission to campaign for perpetual copyright (Jaszi and Woodmansee 4); however, in

1837, Thomas Noon Talfourd convinced Wordsworth to help him lobby for his bill, which called for “the extension of copyright to sixty years” (Jaszi and Woodmansee 4). The opposition to this extension came from publishers who objected to an increase of sixty years because they felt it would be “injurious to the public” and would surely “check the circulation of literature” (Jaszi and Woodmansee 4-5). The term “injurious” is important to note because it underscores what Robert Spoo says about copyright: the expiration of copyright is a reversion of rights *back* to the public. In other words, a work published is always intended for a public audience to enjoy and to stimulate the intellectual consciousness. As has already been explained, copyright came about in order to protect the publisher and later the author from piracy. However, Wordsworth countered the argument that an extension of copyright would be injurious to the public through a portrayal of the author as the head of his family with economic concerns regarding their welfare both during his lifetime and after. Addressing publishers directly, Wordsworth stated that if the bill would be denied, they “would unfeelingly leave a weight upon [the author’s] spirits, which must deaden his exertions; or [worse] . . . force him to turn his faculties . . . to inferior employments” (qtd. in Jaszi and Woodmansee 5). Such “inferior employments” included substandard writing, apparently due to the author exerting the majority of his energies in order to find ways other than writing to make money; Wordsworth argued that this would certainly negatively impact the time he has to take in his own surroundings and thoughts, which lead to creative masterpieces.<sup>77</sup>

Alfred Yen argues that amendments in copyright law have been made and must continue to be made in order to offer a better balance between authorial and public interests (160-61). Wordsworth’s claims for economic stability fall under what Yen

describes as a two-model theory of copyright. For example, Wordsworth's claim regarding the pressures of individual talent to create a work of original genius supports what Yen calls the first and more dominant theory of copyright. This model states that copyright "exists solely to provide necessary economic incentives for the production of creative work" (Yen 160-61). In other words, copyright in favor of the author was initially instigated in order to promote more writers to creative endeavors. However, Wordsworth also argued that publishers and copyright officials should take into account the author, his family, and the need to provide for the family after an author's death by way of an inheritance; this argument is what Yen terms the second model for copyright.

This second model is described as "the legal vindication of a person's moral right to property in the fruits of [his] labor." The model surpasses the initial incentive for writers to write and in return enjoy economic gain in favor of a more draconian concept of authorship—that being that the work produced is under the sole direction of the author; it is then the author's discretion how that work can be used. One problem with moral rights—especially in perpetuity—is that it stalls creative production by others who are inspired by the work. For example, any form of adaption or parody, criticism, scholarship, or even republication of an edition is threatened under such a model. The public would essentially retain zero rights to the work if moral rights were ever awarded in perpetuity.

In the case of Talfourd and Wordsworth, the result of their lobbying efforts was not exactly what either had hoped for. In 1842, an act to extend the length of copyright from twenty-eight to forty-two years, "or if the author survived that period, life plus seven years" was passed (5); copyright would not see another major extension in Britain

until 1911 and in the United States until 1978. Both the 1911 and 1978 amendments awarded copyright to the author for the term of his life plus fifty years.

Aside from attention to copyright legislation on a national scale, revisions to copyright were also being sought internationally. In 1887, the Berne Convention met for the fifth time and ratified five propositions,<sup>78</sup> which had been circulated prior to the first meeting in 1883: “Of those that met, ten nations ratified the Berne Convention, thus instituting the principle of a universal regime of author’s rights” (Saunders 169). This is important because it locates publishing and copyright into a global model—one that sought to streamline copyright. Furthermore, one major effect of the Berne Convention was that authors no longer needed to file for copyright in each individual country. Prior to the Berne Convention, authors who sought copyright protection in other countries would have to file for copyright in each additional country; furthermore, this often required the author to also publish the materials with a publisher in that country. Since the United States did not sign the Berne Convention until 1989, writers from outside the U. S. were forced to work with numerous publishers (Saunders 166). For example, Joyce had to find both an American and British publisher even though he already had a publisher in Sylvia Beach for *Ulysses* and Harriet Shaw Weaver for *Finnegans Wake*. To simply export a book overseas did not ensure copyright protection.

The legal issues of shipping a book across international borders frustrated modernist authors to no end. Spoo recounts Ezra Pound’s frustration with what he termed “the trinity of legal forces,” which included “obscenity statutes, the discretionary powers of customs and postal officials, and the copyright law” (qtd. in *Copyright Protectionism and its Discontents* 634). While obscenity laws belonged more to the realm of censorship

than to copyright laws, a work that was deemed obscene would most certainly affect the author or publisher's copyright. For example, the problem for Joyce, and indeed others whose writings were deemed "obscene," was that customs and postal officials could and did destroy hundreds of copies shipped to publishers for printing. At that point, filing for copyright would no longer be an option. Spoo determines Pound's intent: "Quite simply, manuscripts and books by foreign-domiciled authors had to pass through customs and the mails before they could come to rest in the hands of American publishers, printers, and readers" (634).

Almost ten years later, because of heavy lobbying by the Disney Corporation, the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act, also known as the Mickey Mouse Protection Act, was passed and increased "all future and existing American copyright terms by twenty years" (Spoo 206). This means "works published between 1923 and 1978 now enjoy copyright protection for ninety-five years from the date of first publication (unless they entered the public domain earlier through the copyright owners' failure to renew)" (Spoo 206). Due to this 1998 legislation, the 1934 Random House *Ulysses* will now enter public domain on 1 January 2030; *Finnegans Wake* on 1 January 2035. Richard Ellmann's edition of Joyce's *Letters I*, in 2053, *Letters II and III*, in 2062. This is not the case for Ireland, the United Kingdom, or the most of the other countries that fall within the European Union. For these countries, all of Joyce's works entered the public domain as of January 1, 2012. This law, however, presumably does not affect the Ellmann collected letters as they were published in the U.S.; therefore, they still would fall out of copyright in the U.S. and in Europe ninety-five years from the date of first publication.

Most scholars, especially modernist scholars, were dismayed with the extension. Spoo calls this a “foreshortening of the public domain,” which negatively affects “the fate of modernism and the shape of the literary canon” (207). Works published in the early part of the twentieth century are “at a competitive disadvantage,” Spoo argues, because they remain largely inaccessible and scholars are occasionally blocked from quoting or reprinting the work. The result is a monopoly on the side of the copyright holders, who can therefore demand outrageous prices for quoting permissions (207-9).<sup>79</sup> Traditionally, the Joyce estate charges twenty-five cents per word. However, as Spoo and others point out, this price fluctuates with the will of the Estate (“FAQ” 774). As most scholars do not have a disposable income or receive institutional funding for permissions, they often cannot meet high transaction costs, resulting in a denial in permission.<sup>80</sup> This in turn stalls the production of scholarly publication. Therefore, this issue is not one that should be taken lightly, especially for anyone doing research on Joyce or any author whose work still falls under copyright.

Indeed, extending copyright is flawed because, as Yen has explained, it is too heavily reliant upon the economic rights of the author. Additionally, the rights of the public are (under current extensions) thereby ignored. Spoo might agree with this argument as he sees the expiration of copyright as a reversion back to the public (208); to revert back to the public “suggests that the public retains an equitable interest in authors’ works from the moment they are created” (Spoo 208)—after all, the work is conceivably written to be read. The public only temporarily suspends their own interests “for the duration of copyright, so that authors may reap the rewards for creativity” (Spoo 208).

Thus, copyright becomes an incentive for creativity as well as public acknowledgement of a writers' right to attribution.

Copyright in the Republic of Ireland has also recently undergone a change; while acknowledging that Irish law is beholden to directives issued by the European Union, Ireland's Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, Richard Bruton, called for a review of the Copyright and Related Rights Act of 2000. According to this Department, the purpose of the review is "to identify any areas of the legislation that might be deemed to create barriers to innovation and to make recommendations to resolve any problems identified."<sup>81</sup> Ireland is therefore not only embracing the digital revolution and marketplace, but it is also making a commitment to finding a better way to balance the state-endorsed monopoly of copyright with public innovation and creativity. As the law currently stands in the Republic of Ireland, copyright "expires seventy years after the death of the author, irrespective of the date on which the work is first lawfully made available to the public"; this is why, in Ireland, Joyce's works reverted back to the public domain on 1 January 2012. However, for those countries in which Joyce is still at least partially under copyright, it should also be noted that according to the United Kingdom's "fair dealing," and the United States' "fair use," provisions, copying or quoting from a work for the purpose of research and/or education is not an infringement so long as "sufficient acknowledgement" accompanies the reproduction. In other words, since Joyce is still in copyright in the U. S., it behooves those working with U. S. publishers and U. S. archives to understand a bit more about fair use.

## “Fair Use” and the Archive

While copyright provides for the compensation of an author’s work as well as a legal defense against those who pirate, publish, or perform sections of the work without seeking the Estate’s permission, it also provides guidelines for user’s rights. With these rights in mind, the 2006 International James Joyce Symposium held a special panel on “James Joyce: Copyright, Fair Use, and Permissions.” This panel was chaired by Paul K. Saint-Amour, whose own work on copyright has resulted in two monographs: *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination* (2003) and *Modernism and Copyright* (2011). Robert Spoo, Michael Groden, and Carol Loeb Shloss were also panelists. Groden’s work with the Joyce Estate in gaining permissions for *The James Joyce Archive* in the 1960s and did not continue as he was later denied permissions for his mixed-media *Ulysses* project. Furthermore, Carol Loeb Shloss’ then-pending lawsuit against the James Joyce Estate for misuse of copyright ensured that the discussions were timely.

As a result of this panel, the panelists co-authored a *Frequently Asked Questions* guide to Joyce and copyright, which is accessible from The International James Joyce Foundation home page<sup>82</sup> as well as excerpted in Volume 44 of the *James Joyce Quarterly*. The authors note that it is their intention “to acquaint scholars, performers, and adaptors of James Joyce’s work with the principles of copyright protection and users’ rights and to help them to productive interactions with the Estate of James Joyce in the event they choose to seek permissions to quote from, perform, or adapt Joyce’s work, and also to enable them to know better when copyright permissions are not legally necessary” (my emphasis 753). Within this stated purpose—and especially in the final clause—lies a

history of difficult interactions with the Estate, which include the bullying of scholars by threats of litigation (particularly by one of its trustees, Stephen James Joyce), accusations of right to privacy violations, and most recently, a lawsuit, which resulted in a settlement between Shloss and the Estate.

“Fair Use” played a key part in this lawsuit and is defined as copying a work “for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research”; therefore, fair use is “not an infringement of copyright” (U.S.C. Title 17, Section 107). Furthermore, since 1992, this right also extends to unpublished works such as letters or manuscripts. What constitutes “Fair Use,” according to U.S.C. Title 17, Section 107, is another matter entirely dependent upon the following factors:

1. the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
2. the nature of the copyrighted work;
3. the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
4. the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

To date the law does not stipulate on percentage or number of lines or words permissible to quote. FAQ notes that if a work is “transformative” rather than “superseding,” it is more likely to fall under “Fair Use.” “Transformative” is defined as “add[ing] something new, with a further purpose or different character, altering the first with new expression, meaning, or message” (qtd in FAQ 761). Therefore, scholarly works would be more

likely to fall into the “transformative use” category in that there is “a reasonable amount of discontinuously quoted material to critical commentary and analysis, in contrast to a full page or several pages of uninterrupted quoted material” (761). However, as Mark A. Fowler posits, in “The Quick in Pursuit of the Dead,” if an agreement about what qualifies as “fair use” cannot be met, “there is always the threat that litigation may ensue, generating unwelcome legal expenses, potentially disrupting publication plans, and even adversely affecting a scholar’s reputation” (218). This is certainly the case with Schloss’ publication of the biography, *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake* as well as Groden’s hypertext *Ulysses* project.

While “Fair Use” has recently gained more publicity in Joyce studies due in particular to a panel on “Fair Use” at the International James Joyce Symposium, other limitations to copyright still apply. For example, libraries and archives are allowed to make copies of materials; this is especially useful in light of the fact that some archives have handed documents over to Estates without question. According to Title 17, Section 108, libraries and archives are permitted to either one or three copies of published or unpublished materials. A library can make no more than one copy if:

1. the reproduction or distribution is made without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage;
2. the collections of the library or archives are (i) open to the public, or (ii) available not only to researchers affiliated with the library or archives or with the institution of which it is a part, but also to other persons doing research in a specialized field; and

3. the reproduction or distribution of a the work includes a notice of copyright that appears on the copy or phonorecord . . .

A library can make three copies “for purposes of preservation and security or for deposit for research use in another library or archives of the type described in the” previous clause:

1. the copy or phonorecord is currently in the collections of the library or archives
2. any such copy or phonorecord is reproduced in digital format is not otherwise distributed in that format and is not made available to the public in that format outside the premises of the library or archives.

This clause is similar to the Republic of Ireland’s, which states that copies can be made for exhibition purposes, including “a work or part of a work which has not been lawfully made available to the public.” For instance, at the James Joyce Summer School in July of 2010, students of the school were able to view Joyce manuscripts as well as reproduced images of the notebooks. The images were projected onto a screen and analyzed for evidence of Joyce’s composition process. Had this provision for libraries not been instituted, students would not have had been afforded this unique learning opportunity.

As in the United States, Irish copyright dictates that a “librarian or archivist of a prescribed library or prescribed archive may . . . make a copy of a work in the permanent collection of the library or archive in order to preserve or replace that work or to replace in the permanent collection of another prescribed library or prescribed archive a work which has been lost, destroyed or damaged” (statute 65 of Copyright and Related Rights Act of 2000). Not only can a copy of the work be made but if an archive in another

location, which also had this work, needs another copy, the library with the better copy can reproduce it without infringing on copyright. Additionally, if a library hosts an exhibition, the library can create a copy for the exhibition (Statute 66); this permission extends to “a work or part of a work which has not been lawfully made available”; in other words, an unpublished document. However, if the copyright owner has made specific demands prohibiting the copying of the unpublished work (i.e. such as in a contract), then the copy cannot be reproduced.

### **Collecting and Recording Joyce after Joyce: A Tale of Copyright Wars**

Immediately after Joyce’s death the estate was managed by Harriet Shaw Weaver, a patron and publisher of Joyce’s. Later, the estate fell into the hands of Joyce’s children, Georgio and Lucia Joyce. After both of their deaths, the transfer of the trusteeship shifted to Georgio’s son, Stephen James Joyce. Prior to this transaction, the estate was managed with minimal interference. Examples of successful projects published under Weaver and Georgio Joyce’s trusteeship are included in the following list: Maria Jolas’ *Pastimes of James Joyce* (1941), and *James Joyce Yearbook* (1949), *Stephen Hero* (1944), Jonathan Cape’s *The Portable James Joyce* (1947), Stuart Gilbert’s *Letters* volume 1 (1957), Richard Ellmann’s *James Joyce*, the *Collected Letters* volumes 2-3 (1966) and *Selected Letters* (1975). A. Walton Litz, Michael Groden, David Hayman, Danis Rose and Hans Walter Gabler edited the sixty-three volume facsimile production of Joyce’s notebooks and manuscripts, the *James Joyce Archive* (1977-79)<sup>83</sup>; it was also published with permission from the literary estate. The editions with major revisions that were allowed to be published included *Collected Poems* (1936), Ellsworth Mason’s and Richard

Ellmann's *Critical Writings* (1959), *Stephen Hero* (1963), *Dubliners* (1967, 1993), *Exiles* (1973), *Finnegans Wake* (1959), *Giacomo Joyce* (1968), Norman Jeffaries and Brendan Kennelly's *Joycechoyce: The Poems in Verse and Prose of James Joyce* (1992), *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1993) and *Ulysses* (1922, 1932, 1934, 1936, 1961, (synoptic edition edited by Hans Walter Gabler in 1984, and trade edition edited by Hans Walter Gabler in 1986)). I mention this detailed list in order to demonstrate the amicable nature between scholars, publishers, and the Estate during this period. Joyce scholarship thrived under the earlier regimes.

However, after the estate entered into the trusteeship of Stephen Joyce, in 1976, a definite shift can be noted. Suddenly it became difficult to publish on Joyce; this applied not only to biographies and new editions of Joyce's works but to anything the Estate felt like it should challenge, including interpretive or adapted works inspired by Joyce. Joyce is, of course, not the only literary estate to have what has been described as difficult relationships with would-be authors and editors on Joyce, his work, and his biography. Recently, in June 2012, an article in the *Daily Beast* used this headline: "James Joyce's Grandson Stephen and Literature's Most Tyrannical Estate." Thus even post-copyright, such a title is still attributed to Stephen Joyce. I wish to explore this "tyranny" and investigate the most recent developments on the Estate since the return of many Joyce works to the public domain.

In 1995, Michael Groden began mapping out a hypertext edition of *Ulysses*. In June of 1996, Groden was one of eight people chosen to create a multi-media project co-sponsored by NYU's Interactive Telecommunications Program and the Voyager Company to "match each scholar with a professional multimedia producer, designer, and

programmer” to create the project. At the time the article was published, Groden had already acknowledged that the CD-ROM production was a prototype but that CD-ROM divisions of commercial publishers were being shut down in favor of publishing onto the Internet. He wanted to include:

[T]he text of *Ulysses*; definitions and annotations; an archive of major published critical books and articles on *Ulysses*; source works such as *The Odyssey* and *Hamlet*; basic help for students; maps; photographs, ideally period ones, of the buildings and streets in Dublin, historical figures and events; film and video versions of parts of *Ulysses*; an audio version of *Ulysses* and recordings of songs that are mentioned, quoted, hummed, or sung; searching and indexing features; and space for users to add their own comments and links.

It would have been a multi-media archival production of *Ulysses*, and its aim was to allow readers of all levels to read and understand the work. By making instantly available references and definitions, and allowing the reader to hear the songs and the noises that Joyce himself would have heard, would offer a reading experience like no other. The idea was innovative and revolutionary.

Unfortunately for Groden, the Estate took this project from him. This project highlighted what can be done with Joyce’s works and had an interdisciplinary emphasis on both textual and digital scholarship; it promised the world a new and exciting way to read Joyce’s *Ulysses* and would increase the exposure of Joyce to all readers, including those completely new to Joyce. To have it cancelled due to copyright misuse shows that the system of copyright is broken. If you go to the website that was to launch on June 16,

2004, this is the message from Michael Groden: “The editors of ‘Digital *Ulysses*’ were unable to reach an agreement with the Estate of James Joyce for permission to use the texts of Joyce’s works in the project, and as a result work on ‘Digital *Ulysses*’ (and by extension the earlier ‘James Joyce’s *Ulysses* in Hypermedia’) is suspended” (<http://publish.uwo.ca/~mgroden/ulysses/>). This suspension is typical of the Estate after having come under the control of Stephen Joyce.

This suspension is seen by many as an overreach of the Estate. However, at the time, this was apparently their right under copyright statutes. The Joyce community would just have to wait. Unfortunately, the Estate’s new policy as the arbiter of taste did not stop with Joyce scholars. The institutions purchasing Joyce materials for their archives also felt the wrath of Stephen Joyce. For example, in 1991, the James Joyce/Paul Léon Papers were unsealed in the National Library of Ireland. A catalogue summarizing the contents of these papers, including descriptions and sometimes even fully-printed letters appeared. While such detailed summaries are beneficial to researchers, materials omitted from the catalogue (including descriptions) continue to be a source of frustration.

Mary T. Reynolds’ review of these papers explains that some of the materials have been handed over, upon request, to Stephen James Joyce; other papers that are classified as having a “purely personal family nature” are sealed and remain so until December 31, 2050. Reynolds comments: “No specific information is given about these sealed items, neither their nature, nor their dates. They are not represented in the catalogue, and the forward states only that the Library ‘has decided not to allow access to or publication of these papers’” (122). Inherent in this statement is an exasperation at the mixed messaging of this archival institution. Clearly the Library is attempting to placate

both the Estate (Stephen James Joyce) and potential threats of litigation with their mission of providing access to the public. The good news, of course, is that this is an archival institution whose duty is also to preserve these documents. While the materials remain sealed, the eventual possibility of their being opened one day to the public is imminent. Joyceans were disgruntled but placated, except when discovering that some of these materials were given to Stephen.

This is not the first time that scholars have had only speculations regarding missing material; Joyce's first literary executor, Harriet Shaw Weaver, often omitted information from letters with the presence of ellipses. Reynolds explains when Weaver released her collection of Joyce correspondence, "she always made typewritten copies from which she omitted many passages, sometimes most of the letter. Such deletions were always scrupulously three-dotted, indicating the presence of elision" (123). While she saw interest in Joyce's manuscripts and letters as a good thing—especially as it allowed for the continued circulation of Joyce's name, thereby providing his family with a much needed source of income—she always tried to balance what she thought was private from what she thought should be public. Even when genuinely concerned about respecting the family privacy, Weaver still showed due respect to future scholarship. The missing information is well-documented, which, at least, provides scholars with a record of omission to be filled out at some future date; additionally, Reynolds allows that "[t]his procedure, though cumbersome, allowed everything but the personal information in the letter to be made public, and such information has been invaluable in understanding Joyce's innovative genius" (123).

As is the fashion in scholarship, Michael Patrick Gillespie responds to Reynolds' review of the catalogue with what amounts to a critical treatise on the state of Joyce scholarship during this time. The title of his article, "'The Prying into the Family Life of a Great Man': A Survey of the Joyce/Léon Papers at the National Library of Ireland" comes, of course, from a line in *Ulysses*. This is a complaint uttered by George Russell as he "oracles from the shadows" (9.181) and censures Stephen Dedalus. Russell's problem with Stephen's analysis is that it relies on family life and indiscretions. For Russell this prying is a sort of violation. The move, then, of the Joyce manuscripts to the National Library of Ireland presents an opportunity for scholars to pry into the family life of Joyce and presents a sort of delicious irony. Gillespie carries this irony further in his comparison of Stephen James Joyce's appearance at the April 6<sup>th</sup> commemoration ceremony to that of George Russell's figurative appearance on June 16, 1904. The fact that certain of Joyce's materials are sealed and that the Estate has some of the papers is—for some Joyceans—an affront to scholarship.

Gillespie describes this violation as being opposed to "the spirit of a free and open development of scholarly research" (278) and recalls how Senator David Norris, a beloved champion of Joyce scholars as well as avid Joyce reader, sees Stephen Joyce's presence as a "distorted echo of genius" in which the author is being "censored" but "this time at the instigation of a person bearing the name of Stephen, the name of Joyce's character in *Ulysses*" (qtd in Gillespie 278). What is being consumed, we do not know. But Stephen's reasoning is a right to privacy. To be fair, Gillespie refers scholars to the bequest made by Paul Léon to the National Library via Count O'Kelly. Léon entrusted the materials to O'Kelly during a time of war and great upheaval in order to ensure their

preservation. In this bequest, Léon arranged that the materials would be sealed for fifty years after the author's death and further stipulated that a member of Joyce's family should be consulted (279). However, fifty years past Joyce's death is 1991, the year these materials were sold to the National Library of Ireland. Their unsealing should have been complete were it not for the Joyce Estate and the additional twenty years added to European copyright law.

However, Gillespie argues, Joyce scholarship should not be deterred by the continued sealing of some of its documents; of the material available there is plenty to foster new and exciting research. Scholars can take away an "enhanced awareness that [the available collection] present[s] of Joyce's personal and public life and artistic milieu" as well as "the relationship that he enjoyed with his close friend Paul Léon" (Gillespie 279). Prior to its unveiling, letters written to and from Harriet Shaw Weaver after 1937 as well as from letters "with the editors both at Faber and Faber and at Viking Press" were unknown. Additionally, scholars with an interest in the influence of works Joyce was reading or works requested by Joyce from Paul Léon, Michael Healy, and Richard Irvine Best can be found in these materials.<sup>84</sup> Furthermore, "the sheer volume of letters inevitably draws attention to the need to revise existing collections, the desirability of printing a separate volume, and the economic constraints of the current publishing environment" (Gillespie 292); he also points to "the possibility of someone undertaking a revision of the Ellmann biography or of presenting a series of biographies dealing with portions of his life" (292). Therefore, while the library may be acting within the means of the original bequest (even if this is to the chagrin of Joyce scholars), there is still work that can be done.<sup>85</sup> The point would be well taken if it weren't for complications in

getting that work published, complications brought on by the Joyce Estate's claim to copyright.

In 2002, the National Library again unveiled another Joyce archival purchase, this time from Alexis Léon, Paul and Lucie Léon's son. Sean J. Murphy's article on this purchase, "Trade in Joyce Manuscripts," was published in his internet "Irish Historical Mysteries" blog. Stephen Joyce challenged Léon, in the *Sunday Times* on 16 February 2003 "to produce proof that the manuscripts were in fact his mother's property." No comment by Léon was ever mentioned; although, the National Library's Director, Brendan O'Donoghue, asserts that "the vendors" were indeed "the legal and beneficial owners of the materials" (qtd. in Murphy). Of the materials uncovered, the missing *Ulysses* notebooks 3, 5, and 9 are included and thereby complete the 1991 purchase of notebooks 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8. This indeed qualifies as a significant find and thereby places the National Library of Ireland as one of the preeminent archives for Joyce scholarship. Furthermore, this archive is accessible to anyone interested in these materials. Anyone wishing to view the materials may do so by making an appointment with the National Library's manuscripts department, but she cannot see anything without first signing a document, whereby the scholar declares under penalty of law that he or she understands that this material is copyrighted and that any permission to copy and/or publish from this material must first result in seeking, in writing, the written permission from the Joyce Estate. Clearly, this policy may have changed with the reversion of Joyce material back into the public domain. However, with the uncertainty of where unpublished materials fall in Ireland—i.e. are unpublished materials protected under

copyright or are they like the published works and in the public domain—this document still remains in effect.

Furthermore, these questions cause serious concerns. Spoo explains the issue with the example of the National Library signing contracts with the sellers of such collections: Donors and sellers of manuscripts often place restrictions upon a library's use of the materials which it acquires. These transferors, whether the copyright owners or not, can ensure by contract that certain documents will remain sealed for a specified number of years, that documents will be shown only under certain conditions or to pre-approved persons, or that no photocopying (or other copying) will be made of documents. (205) This contract imposes even stricter conditions than even that of copyright. Copyright at least contains, in the U. S., fair use, and, in the U.K., fair dealing. This, Spoo describes, "is a blessedly porous mechanism that permits some copying" (205). Regarding the extension to the sealed documents contained in the 1991 Léon Cache, Spoo laments the irony that "an unpublished work might enter the public domain after the expiration of its federal copyright term but remain sealed in an archive, and so inaccessible to the public, under state contract law" (206).

For a work to be inaccessible begs the question: what is the purpose of preserving a document if it can be barred from public viewing? One answer is that most documents that are sealed in an archive are in this state for a limited amount of time; whether scholars agree with the length is not currently up for debate. However, perhaps more archives should consider this issue more thoroughly before entering into any contractual agreement wherein federal copyright law could be rendered ineffectual once reaching the end of its term. As institutions that claim as their mission the increase of access to its

holdings, this must be a concern. So far as copyright goes, this is a federal mandate, which deals both with the author's natural rights to claim ownership of a product that stems from his or her thoughts and ideas as well as the author's right, for a limited amount of time, to compensation.

### **Fighting Joyceans: 1980s through early 2000s**

One of Stephen's main arguments against Joyceans is the apparent disregard, according to him, of his family's right to privacy. He says: "[Scholars and biographers] have no regard for the fallout on those still living who can be and are affected by what they write" ("Private Lives" December 31, 1989). What Stephen Joyce has taken particular offense to is the publishing of the 1909 private correspondence between Joyce and Nora as well as the later biographies of Nora and Lucia Joyce.<sup>86</sup> Since the 1950s, with the purchase of rather erotic letters written between James Joyce and Nora Barnacle in 1909 and Ellmann's request to the Estate to publish these letters, Stephen, who was not then a trustee but beneficiary, vehemently objected to these transactions. Carol Loeb Shloss claims that he took such offense because he felt "the reputation of his grandparents would be damaged by the revelations contained in their correspondence" (245). These complaints continued in the early 1980s, when another publication of the letters was granted for Ellmann's *The Selected Letters of James Joyce*, volume 2 (245). Shloss recounts how Joyce was adamant in his accusations of violation: "Intimate very personal private letters, which were never meant for the public eye, have been sold, pirated, and published. I condemn and deplore this intolerable shameless invasion of privacy as would my grandparents, were they standing beside me here today" (246). A

few years later, in 1988, Stephen Joyce used his “increased influence” to force Brenda Maddox to excise the entire epilogue of her biography of Nora Joyce as well as limited the publishing and “use of Joyce’s, Nora’s, and Helen Fleischmann’s letters” (246). Shloss would face these same obstacles in her research and publication of *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*, a biography of Joyce’s daughter.<sup>87</sup> However, these are by no means the only scholarly projects Stephen has railed against; other examples include proposed new editions of *Ulysses*, Bloomsday webcasts, reproduction of a work in at least two anthologies as well as an anticipated choral performance, which would have used a total of “eighteen words” from *Finnegans Wake*. Stephen denied them all.<sup>88</sup>

In 1997, the Joyce Estate took its ire out on both publishers and scholar. Danis Rose had published a new edition of *Ulysses*. Stephen Joyce’s problem with this edition was that it “incorporated a small amount of manuscript material that had remained unpublished after Joyce’s death.”<sup>89</sup> While some may argue this is well within the rights of the Estate, other lawsuits and threats become clearly misuse of copyright. In 1998, the Estate filed a lawsuit against a globalized celebration of Bloomsday; while the Estate had no legal footing to stand on, the following year, support was withdrawn for fear of another round with the Estate. In 2000, Stephen threatened the composition of a choral piece, which used eighteen words from *Finnegans Wake*. According to the legal brief against Joyce and misuse of copyright, they stated that the only reason the piece was threatened was because Stephen Joyce “did not like the music and thus deemed even eighteen words too much.” For the Estate to grant Kate Bush permission for her rendition of the Penelope chapter and also Amber’s “Yes,” which uses more than eighteen words of this same chapter, underscores the inconsistencies that exist within the Joyce Estate.

Another example of Stephen's vitriol occurs in 2004: as part of the Republic of Ireland's "ReJoyce" Festivities celebrating the centenary of Joyce's *Ulysses*, the National Library of Ireland launched an exhibition of the recently acquired Joyce notebooks purchased by the library in 2002.<sup>90</sup> Of the National Library of Ireland, Stephen threatened to press charges if it displayed Joyce's manuscripts, which it owned. D. T. Max, who calls him "the injustice collector" in his article for the *New Yorker* in 2006, adds that "[t]he Irish Senate passed an emergency amendment to thwart him" allowing the library to display it anyway. This was accomplished under the leadership of Senator David Norris. The emergency amendment allowed for those works that once fell out of copyright and then later back into copyright to be available for public display. Senator Norris is summed it up on the Senate floor this way:

It is completely anomalous and very unsatisfactory that James Joyce should have come out of copyright in 1991, stayed out of copyright for three and a half to four years and then, during one of the tidying up operations of the European Union in which it decided to harmonise everything including the shape of bananas and the length of sausages, come back into copyright. Moreover, the Union decided to harmonise upwards in the direction of the French and German copyright laws.<sup>91</sup>

While the quote is quite humorous in its satirical account of the European Union's "tidying up [of its] operations," it does remind the reader that copyright is law, and thereby is legislated by elected officials. Changes to these laws, so far, have not been on the side of the public.

However, what concerns me the most is the Estate's misuse of copyright when it comes to accessing archival material. In an editorial piece to *The New York Times*, Stephen asserts that he is not the "diabolical Stephen James Joyce feeding letters one by one into a roaring fire"; however, he adds that in June of 1988, he did announce that he had "destroyed all my aunt Lucia's letters to my wife and myself." He was angered by Maddox's book *Nora: The Real Life of Molly Bloom*. While he did destroy the letters, he emphasizes that he did not destroy them by fire. It seems that in order to be diabolical, it would require the presence of fire—a distinction quite lost, I'm sure, on those most interested in those letters. A letter destroyed by any other method would be considered a diabolic gesture indeed. Furthermore, Stephen announced that he had not destroyed any of his grandfather's papers or letters but then quickly adds the qualifier "yet."

Indeed it seems Stephen sees himself and his family as the victims of Joyce "biografiends"; while I wholeheartedly sympathize with what I am sure is difficult territory through which to maneuver (who would want their grandparent's naughty letters published for the world to see?), legally his insistence of the right to privacy is not protected under copyright. Lawrence Lessing *et al* argued that such a legal opinion has precedents in *Bond v. Blum* (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1966) and *New Era Publ'ns Int'l v. Henry Holt & Co.* (2d Cir. 1989).

However, some have argued that the right to privacy should be included in copyright legislation. For example, in 1890, Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis co-authored an article on “right to privacy” for the *Harvard Review*; they argued that this right should pertain to copyright. Arguments for this legislation came about as a proposed “remedy for the unauthorized circulation of portraits of private persons” and the invasion of photographers and “newspaper enterprise” from invading “the sacred precincts of private and domestic life” (195). Warren and Brandeis argue that in regards to expression, one always has the right over one’s “thoughts, sentiments, and emotions” and furthermore, one has control over how these expressions are “communicated to others.”

While not specifically stated, copyright is invoked by Brandeis and Warren. Examples of letters, diary entries, poems, essays or masterpieces are provided and “[i]n every such case the individual is entitled to decide whether that which is his shall be given to the public. No other has the right to publish his productions in any form, without his consent” (199). According to the authors, copyright laws aim to “secure to the author, composer, or artist the entire profits arising from publication” (200). The authors differentiate between “common-law protection” for someone’s expression becoming public (i.e. the person “control[s] absolutely the act of publication” and “copyright law,” which prevents others from profiting from one’s published work. Warren and Brandeis write: “The design of the law must be to protect those persons with whose affairs the community has no legitimate concern, from being dragged into an undesirable and undesired publicity” (214). While the right to privacy in regards to copyright is an interesting argument—and one that Stephen insists upon—the questions become twofold:

who would the right to privacy protect, and would it extend to the family of he whose work actually falls under copyright?

These questions become rhetorical and moot because to date privacy continues to be separate from copyright legislation. Furthermore, federal law does not protect the right to privacy and publicity. Even on the Library of Congress' website, which is the official location of the United States Copyright Office, it offers this disclaimer: "Patrons desiring to use materials from this website bear the responsibility of making individualized determinations as to whether privacy and publicity rights are implicated by the nature of the materials and how they may wish to use such materials."<sup>92</sup> Disclaimers are by nature meant to shift the legal and ethical responsibility away from the source and onto the individual. In relation to copyright, the Library of Congress maintains: privacy and publicity rights protect the interests of the person(s) who may be the subject(s) of the work or intellectual creation. Issues pertaining to privacy and publicity may arise when a researcher contemplates the use of letters, diary entries, photographs or reportage in visual, audio, and print formats found in library collections.

This is indeed an issue for many Joyce scholars who wish to quote from letters in the archive or wish to use audio of Joyce reading his works. Perhaps Stephen could win a suit of libel or slander against what he perceives are lies about his family, or he could stick with what copyright can protect (or at least what it could, as it has since—in some instances—reverted back into public domain). Instead, Stephen insists—to put it mildly as Bernard Benstock did—on “getting more involved with that heritage and inheritance” of his grandfather’s works. An example of this involvement occurred at both the 1984 and 1986 James Joyce International Symposia, in which Stephen “address[es] the

assemblage on both occasions” (3). According to Benstock’s interview with Stephen, for a fair and reasonable permission price, scholars are allowed to quote from primary works, but he is quick to explain that “biographical territory, however, will henceforth be carefully guarded” (3). Yet biography is not the only territory that met with Stephen’s indignation; when he discovered that Irish institutions were selling “Bloom’s lemon soap” and “neckties, and other gimmicks” reminiscent of *Ulysses*, he once again threatened litigation.

Stephen Joyce wants to protect his grandfather’s memory, and so he has insisted on asserting the right of copyright in order to arbitrate taste. Today—in some countries—he no longer retains this right. Joyce’s works have reverted back to the public (for the second time). The bitter taste of copyright, however, has not left the Joyce community. Instead, the torch seems to have passed from Stephen to one who has suffered under Stephen’s reign more than most; that scholar is Danis Rose.

### **Fighting Joyceans: 2012**

The 2012 International James Joyce Symposium returned to Dublin and was heralded the world over as the year Joyce’s works fall out of copyright.<sup>93</sup> Questions and confusions remained, however, over which countries enjoy his works in the public domain and which countries’ scholars will still need to seek permission to quote. This confusion did not stop *The New Yorker* from reporting a Tweet aimed directly at Stephen Joyce. Mark O’Connell writes:

On New Year’s Eve, the Twitter feed of UbuWeb . . . posted a link to an article in *The Irish Times* about the expiry of European copyright on the

work of James Joyce. The link was accompanied by a curt message to Joyce's grandson and sole living descendent: 'Fuck you Stephen Joyce. EU copyright on James Joyce's works ends at midnight.'

O'Connell adds that while this statement may be confrontational, "the sentiment it expressed is widespread." Additionally, in what must have been a glorifying response to Stephen's indignation against Sweny's Pharmacy, the sellers of Bloom's lemon soap, the pharmacy-turned-museum held a public reading of *Dubliners*. O'Connell records that the reading of *Dubliners* was so large that they moved the reading to "the bar of the Montclare Hotel." Furthermore, the reading became a "reminder of what 'public domain' actually means: Joyce's work now belongs to the people." And yet the people still find ways to argue.

The "public domain" is not yet open to everyone, and critics still argue for perpetual copyright. Copyright, as we have discussed, protects both the publishers, who invest in the works of authors, and the authors, who rightly receive compensation for goods delivered to the public. However, the public is not protected in discussions of perpetual copyright. Additionally, there are a great many items not yet for sure in the public domain such as "posthumous publications—the letter[s] and manuscripts, for instance, as well as "Stephen Hero" and "Giacomo Joyce." These items are currently being debated.

According to Sean Latham, a Joyce scholar and editor of the *James Joyce Quarterly*, "the unpublished work . . . is now coming out of copyright in the U. S.," (qtd. in O'Connell).<sup>94</sup> This has already inspired several projects that would publish on these works. What that means, of course, is that letters recently uncovered would be published;

a new biography has already come out (with mixed reviews). Additionally, new editions of all of Joyce's works are set to come out in Europe; however in the U.S., *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* have already been out of copyright. Questions for American scholars concerning copyright can be answered in the recently updated in the "Frequently Asked Questions" section of the Joyce Foundation website.

In the United States, U.S. first editions of *Chamber Music*, *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Exiles* are in the public domain. Also included are "the episodes of *Ulysses* as published in the *Little Review*. Up for debate is the 1922 Paris first edition of *Ulysses*."<sup>95</sup> According to Robert Spoo, this is arguably in the public domain in the United States. Still, many are reticent to go against the Estate on this and most who quote from *Ulysses* use the Gabler edition, which is under copyright protection. In the European Union, United Kingdom, and Republic of Ireland, "All editions of Joyce's works published during his lifetime are in the public domain"—except for in Spain as they have a copyright term of "the author's life plus 80 years."<sup>96</sup> Copyright will expire in Spain at the end of 2021. In Canada and Australia, publishing on Joyce is simpler: "all editions of Joyce's works published during his life time are in the public domain." In the United States, the 1934 Random House edition of *Ulysses* enters public domain in 2030, *Finnegans Wake* in 2035, 1961 Random House edition of *Ulysses* in 2057. The *Selected Letters* in 2071; and *The James Joyce Archive* (through 1977) enters the public domain in 2073.

In the case of Danis Rose, Ithys Press, and a fanciful letter from Joyce to his grandson, Stephen James Joyce, more bitterness remains. The letter that Joyce wrote to Stephen on September 5<sup>th</sup>, 1936 was actually a kind of children's story. Terence Killeen

notes that Ithys Press copied the letter word-for-word and published it as a children's story entitled *The Cats of Copenhagen*. The manuscript was “found” years ago when either Danis Rose or Anastasia Herbert (also known as Stacey Herbert), “a well-known Joyce specialist who was involved in organizing the National Library’s ‘James Joyce and *Ulysses* exhibition’ in 2004)” (Killeen “Joyce Children’s Story”) visited the Zurich James Joyce Foundation. A copy of the letter was made (the original letter is still in Zurich) and as soon as copyright expired, published and currently being sold for €300 for a standard copy or €1200 for a deluxe copy.<sup>97</sup> Zurich was never contacted, permissions never sought; feelings were indeed wounded. Currently there are no legal actions being sought against the publisher (Anastasia Herbert) or the Director of Ithys Press (Danis Rose). The Estate has no say in this case, but one would think that the Foundation would, given that the original manuscript is proprietarily theirs. Furthermore, by publishing this piece, Rose and Herbert receive a twenty-five year copyright. Permissions to quote from this letter must be sought from them. It seems the true meaning of public domain now emerges: we trade one Estate for many, even when—as Spoo says—“not one iota of creativity is needed.”<sup>98</sup> The implication is, of course, that works inspired by Joyce or adapted from Joyce would indeed deserve such a copyright, whereas those wherein a simple copying takes place does not. Legally, though, unpublished works published belong to either the owners of the manuscript (as in French law) or the first person who publishes from that manuscript (as in other European nations).

Rose, who had been thwarted over and over again by the Estate, appeared at the International James Joyce Symposium and made an appeal to the 2012 assemblage. The gist of it is that he has suffered the ire of the James Joyce Estate since he was sued over

his *Ulysses* edition.<sup>99</sup> Additionally, he had purportedly found “seven new ‘short stories’ written by Joyce after *Ulysses*” (Killeen “Rose Still a Thorn”); he wanted to publish these as a collection entitled *Finn’s Hotel*. He also spearheaded a “new edition of *Finnegans Wake* (co-edited with his brother, John O’Hanlon) . . . only to be blocked by the Joyce estate.” It was finally published in 2010, but it was published in a limited edition and is—for most part—cost-prohibitive.<sup>100</sup> Naturally, this was the kind of profiting from Joyce’s works that the Estate (and some Joyceans) despise.

While copyright reverted back to the public, a new kind of copyright now exists. The phrases “zombie copyright,” “resurrectionist copyright,” and “copyright after copyright” have all been used to describe the current situation in Joyce studies.<sup>101</sup> In the European Union, this relates to the first person to lawfully publish or make available an unpublished document no longer held under original copyright. The phrase “make available” is important when considering the next lawsuit that Danis Rose is pursuing against the National Library of Ireland.

On May 7, 2012, Killeen reported that the “National Library of Ireland has put its collection of James Joyce manuscripts online, free of charge,” and he explains how the library acquired its collection and how scholars may access it. Killeen also notes that the collection was rushed to be put online and that the resolution is low. The reasoning behind this rush was that it was “in response to a pre-emptive strike by the Joyce scholar Danis Rose,” who, it seems, announced that his *House of Breathings* publishing company is planning to release *The Dublin Ulysses Papers*, “a six-volume edition of papers and notebooks held by the National Library of Ireland” (*James Joyce Newstletter*). The National Library claims this collection is theirs, and in an effort to impart its mission of

preservation and access to the public, it published phase one of its plans “to provide the widest possible access to a number of James Joyce manuscripts.”

Rose’s appeal to Joyceans, in 2012, regarding the publication of *The Cats of Copenhagen* without even a note to the Foundation was that the matter was between the publisher (Ithys Press) and the Foundation. However, others there disagreed and called him out on his involvement publishing this work; Rose is, after all, the director of Ithys Press. Unfortunately, Rose refused to engage further on this topic. However, he did say that he did not intend on stopping people from publishing from the collection owned and preserved by the National Library of Ireland. He merely did not want someone else to publish them first, thereby giving someone else the ability to do to him what Stephen Joyce did. His only request is that those who intend to publish on Joyce “must [only] ask” for his permission. This last statement seems eerily familiar and indeed echoes Stephen’s own past remarks. When Hans Walter Gabler asked why Rose did not extend the courtesy of requesting permission of Fritz Senn, Director of the Zurich James Joyce Foundation, Rose hedged again and responded that there are others involved in that issue. However, the overwhelming applause that erupted in response to Gabler’s question (and not to Rose’s hedging) undoubtedly indicates that most agree with Gabler and Senn—a breach of trust has occurred. Sadly the breach comes from within.

What we are left with is more waiting. Joyceans await word from the courts regarding whether or not unpublished materials in the European Union are also out of copyright. Some Joyceans seek reform to copyright—or at the very least—to clarify copyright after copyright. The owners of the manuscripts are rightfully the archives that house them. In the case of *The Cats of Copenhagen*, the rights should belong to the

Zurich James Joyce Foundation, and in the case of the Joyce collection at the National Library of Ireland, the rights belong to the Library. Anything other than that feels like another era of lording copyright over one another.

## POSTSCRIPT: WHAT COMES NEXT IN JOYCE AND ARCHIVE STUDIES

Historically, copyright has protected the publishers and authors of a creative work. The extensions of copyright to protect the families of authors years after the author's death has been of little benefit to the public, who, after all are, the consumers of these works. While copyright certainly discourages piracy, it has also had the unfortunate consequence of making the trustees of an estate the arbiters of taste. Authorial intention simply extends to the trustees of the estate, who most certainly are not the authors of the work called into question. The public, whose rights to the work revert back to them upon the expiration of copyright, are beholden to those trustees, and perhaps this should not be the case. If we consider what it means to publish—that is to take a work and have it printed for *public* consumption—in relation to what copyright does, then we can judge how the public, during this time, places its rights to these published works *temporarily* on hold in order to protect the publisher and author from the unlawful printing or piracy of the author's original ideas. In no way, however, should a published work ever be under perpetual protection. A work published is intended *for* the public and the public thereby has a right to do with that work what it wants; such, of course, is one premise behind free speech and free enterprise.

The archival institutions housing these works and their antecedents—such as manuscripts, notes, or other miscellany including photographs, journals, and letters—have come into conflict with copyright laws and with contracts between the sellers of these archival holdings. The conflict comes at the cost of access. While not all archives are held within public institutions, many of Joyce's archives are. These institutions, therefore, bear the burden of ensuring the policing of patrons; what they are looking at,

how they access the materials, and whether or not copies can be made, notes can be taken, or if signatures are required, all points to the decidedly private and censorial aspect of archives.

Joyce certainly accounts for tensions surrounding public/private divides in public settings such as the newspaper offices or the National Library of Ireland in *Ulysses* or at the river where the washerwomen publically clean the townspeople's laundry and thereby also publish their "dirty laundry" for the world to see in *Finnegans Wake*. Additionally, the *Wake*, from the very presentation of Finnegan's "wake" (as being a public and drunken affair occurring in a public house/church), indirectly pursues this line of questioning. One will recall that Finnegan awakes from his death-sleep upon the townspeople's pouring of whisky but is shushed and ordered back to sleep as the next generation has already supplanted him (1.1). The ballad printed in the *Wake* and sung at his wake is one that Joyce, of course, did not seek permission to quote. It was a well-known folk song; as such, its author is unknown and therefore does not own copyright. The rights to this song therefore revert back to the public.

While "Archiving Joyce and Joyce's Archive" has participated in a narrative about Joyce's copyright and also Joyce's archives, it has also looked for ways in which Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* have incorporated archival institutions and archival modes such as gossip into its composition. After a brief overview of the rise of archival institutions throughout history, this work then focused on, what Ian Hamilton terms "the imperial archive" in order to juxtapose this to archives as they have developed in the twentieth century. This period of history, in particular, saw the rise of author-centered archives with theories evolving around the concept of the archive. Important to this work

have been the theories of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Pierre Nora. Their ideas offered a unique way in which to juxtapose these concepts with a discussion of private and public spaces as metaphors for history and memory; additionally, the conversation is, in turn, expanded with an exploration of Joyce's use of both public and private modes of communication.

Joyce, like Benjamin, had the "ethos of an archivist," and yet Joyce, as archivist, struggled with letting go of his material. For example, he constantly attempted to influence the way people understood his works. His legacy—both in his hands and in the hands of others—is complicated by issues of copyright and disputes with the literary estate. Moreover, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* are archival and *archiving* in their presentations of libraries and other archival institutions. The private act of gossip becomes public in *Finnegans Wake* and is in itself an oral form of archiving. In the *Wake*, it is even more so as Joyce portrays gossip's etymology, which is in itself a type of historical archive of the word. All of these strands—the evolution of Joyce's archive and the archiving of archival institutions in the texts in relation to copyright—tell a story about not only Joyce's archive but of archives in general.

For example, Joyce often referred to libraries in his works and portrayed them as beacons of history and knowledge. Joyce connects these institutions to the Victorian concept of history as a cycle. What is left of history, what is stored in books and found in libraries, is always already threatened. In fact, like the library at Alexandria, materials and legacies often are hidden, buried, or lost forever; however, the remnants of this destruction leaves behind a history of its own. These fragments therefore become part of another history and are interwoven into yet another archive. Joyce's *Ulysses* and

especially *Finnegans Wake* present this cyclic nature of both history and archives. What happens to Alexandria is integrated into the narratives of both works and therefore becomes part of the historical narrative of those works and that of Joyce's. Therefore, the archive, which is a repository for history, is in turn historicized in these narratives. In turn, that narrative is archived in libraries and private archives around the world, and thus the cycle continues.

Bruce Arnold, in a review of *The Restored Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce, presents this cyclic nature of history as represented by the structure of *Finnegans Wake*. He says:

Finnegans Wake begins in mid-sentence. We are reading the second half of a wonderfully obscure, but beautiful, piece of phrasing beginning a description of the Liffey and the sea and of Dublin Bay.

. . . . The first half of the sentence is at the end of the book. And like a broken link in a chain, forged again in the white heat of the writer's mind, the great loop of the book imposes a perfect circularity and self-reflexive intra-textuality on the enclosed events. (May 19, 2012)

The idea of "circularity" and the "self-reflexive intra-textuality of the enclosed events" offers an apt description of the book; I would only add that the chain is forged not only in "the white heat of the writer's mind" but also in that of the *readers'* and certainly within the minds of Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon, the editors of this particular work.

Additionally, "the great loop of the book imposes a perfect circularity" prompts other connotations such as "circular" and "circulation." For one thing, the circulation of this particular work from Joyce to the world, is delivered piecemeal, first serially, and then in

book-form. To cycle back even further, the composition of this work derives from multiple sources, has gone through multiple drafts, and alludes to other literary works, hearsay, and archival research. Similarly, the action of circulation is a distinguishing feature of a public library. The book, a text whose sideboards enclose the events within it, circulates from library to patron and back again. That is, the library patron uses the library and through this use maintains the efficacy and mission of these institutions to provide access to its holdings.

A public institutions' archival holdings, however, are not always so easily accessible, and certainly not so easily circulated out to patrons. In fact, often these items are protected from the public by these archives in order to safeguard the objects from deterioration or decay. Therefore, "Archiving Joyce and Joyce's Archive" investigated Joyce's works as being meta-archival and counter-archival. What we discovered was that Joyce anticipated the development of his archive and, in turn, the complications inherent in all archives.

Future scholarship on archives cannot ignore the fact that Joyce's archives (as well as other archives) are changing to incorporate the digitization of these materials for better preservation, and in some lucky cases, increased and world-wide access. For those who lament the turn from original materials to digitized ones, Stephen G. Nichols' "An Artifact by Any Other Name: Digital Surrogates of Medieval Manuscripts," argues that digital copies are actually better than the original; one can manipulate a manuscript much differently on the screen than one can when handling the document. In fact, one of the most important reasons to digitize collections is to create what Nichols calls "digital surrogates," which in turn makes the preservation of the original that much more likely.

Nichols also posits that digitization is actually restoration; he states: “In the case of a badly deteriorated book or newspaper, preservation will restore life to the object, rendering it once again accessible to scholars” (137). In other words, the digital surrogate not only preserves but can indeed resurrect the document in its new digitized form. Some archival institutions such as the one in Buffalo offer Joyce scholars the best of both worlds. One can search the Joyce archives and read through material digitally, or one can visit an exhibit, which features many of the “original” items.

Ideally, the digital revolution will ultimately lead to a way in which one can “incorporate rare and semirare materials readily into [the] course and classroom, something not possible with the original” (Nichols 139) thereby making what might not be readily available to the public even more available. The next logical step should be to analyze how digital archives change the way we teach or even read. It seems that digital technology makes materials more accessible to teaching. For example, the use of Youtube videos or access to digitized manuscripts allows the instructor to show the changes made to varying editions of a work. Additionally, digital tools such as Voyant allows users to visualize the text in different ways. One can draw connections between words often used by an author in a work or across an entire corpus or even create a social map highlighting the intersections between characters or words. The benefits or drawbacks to these tools are as of yet unclear.

All of these strands—the evolution of the Joyce archive, his works, the archiving of archival institutions in the texts, and copyright—tell a story about not only Joyce’s archive but of archives in general; these archives are changing to incorporate the digitization of these materials for better preservation, and in some lucky cases, increased

and world-wide access. How to store, catalogue, navigate, and exhibit the textual remains of an author is the problem of the archivist, the librarians, and the scholars who work with these materials; how to best utilize the archived material is the work of the scholar and the critic. Taken together, the archive is the space that both directs and redirects research and scholarship. Whether or not these changes will lead to increased access or alter the way one reads and researches altogether remains to be seen. Additionally, how these advancements will affect future copyright provisions are still unclear. It will be the job of future scholars, therefore, to be engaged in these debates.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Classical era, Greece's legislatures were called "archons" and it was these men who made laws as well as kept them—that is "it is at their home, in that *place* which is their house (private house, family house, or employee's house), that official documents are filed" (Derrida 2).

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Richards in his introduction to *The Imperial Archive* talks about how a nation's empire, before the nineteenth century, controlled the knowledge of their conquests: "All the great historical empires, ancient and modern, have had to come to terms with the problems of control at a distance. Empires may have armies and navies, but they also have messengers, or systems for conveying messages" (*Imperial Archive* 1).

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, his sources of "old stories" take into account both oral and written texts such as Homer's *Odyssey* and even Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. This turn once again to narrative accounts of history (be they real accounts or imagined) will become important to my later argument that ideas about archives are always changing. For now, I would like to just point out that today, archival collections are typically treated more seriously (as objective rather than subjective); overlooked is how narrative is still very much engaged with the history of the archive. If we consider the kinds of materials archived—maps, manuscripts, and captain's logs on the one hand, but also diaries, letters, and photographs on the other—it becomes clear that the stories told in diaries, letters, and photographs have always mingled the private with the public. Furthermore, these materials are often utilized by historians and scholars to more accurately reflect the past, yet their importance is belittled because of their narrative quality.

<sup>4</sup> Richards notes that "preeminently among the knowledge-producing institutions of empire, the British Museum was represented as charged with the collection of classified

---

knowledge, both ordered knowledge, and, increasingly, secret knowledge . . . . By 1867 nine of its ten departments carried the bulk of their work outside the walls of the museum, and like many other Victorian societies, the museum sponsored knowledge-gathering expeditions in the colonial world” (“Archive and Utopia” 107).

<sup>5</sup> Alan Sheridan in *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* explains how Foucault examines “the conditions governing the production of statements” of which the “archive” is a major component (101). The inherent rules of a discourse are produced by the archive. It isn’t what one would normally consider an archive: “an inert depository of past statements preserved for future use” (Sheridan 101) but “the very system that makes the emergence of statements possible” (101).

<sup>6</sup> Pasco posits that all literature falls into this category of “cultural repository,” but focuses primarily on literature of late 18<sup>th</sup> century France but says that “when approached with historical discernment and critical acumen, literature becomes an increasingly reliable archive” (379).

<sup>7</sup> *Thom’s Directory* takes as its task of recording the “administrative, banking, ecclesiastical, industrial, professional, social and statistical life of Ireland” since the mid eighteenth hundreds. For more detailed information about Alexander Thom, the Scotsman who took on this monumental task of publishing the *Thom’s Official Directory* and the directory itself, see Joseph W. Hammond’s “The Founder of ‘Thom’s Directory’” in *Dublin Historical Record* 8.2 1946. However, at the point where the work went into publication and increased in popularity as a work of art followed by the subsequent archiving of its drafts and manuscripts, *Ulysses* became a part of the archive itself and became itself archival.

---

<sup>8</sup> Bridgette Sandquist’s dissertation does an excellent and thorough job analyzing the *Wake* in terms of epic and encyclopedic conventions. In her second chapter, “The Wake of the Encyclopedia,” she analyzes the *Wake* in terms of these differing perspectives on the encyclopedia, which include “the reference works that come to mind when we think of encyclopedia . . . the various encyclopedic fictions remembered by the *Wake*; . . . the encyclopedia as metaphor for the scope and size of the *Wake* . . . [and] encyclopedic strategies such as lists and catalogues” (102).

<sup>9</sup> For the entire breakdown of these subjects, go to <https://joycefoundation.osu.edu/resource-center/bibliography-on>

<sup>10</sup> It is also worth mentioning that Ellmann’s archive, housed at the University of Tulsa, is a rich repository for those interested in Joyce and other authors such as Oscar Wilde and W.B. Yeats as well as those interested in Ellmann himself.

<sup>11</sup> The history of the Rosenbach Manuscript will become more important in the next chapter, which looks at how Joyce sought to continue controlling his manuscripts, even after they had been sold to investors.

<sup>12</sup> *Dubliners, Poems Pennyach, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Ulysses, Finnegans Wake, and Exiles.*

<sup>13</sup> In a different exchange with another writer, Thomas Mosher, Russell describes Joyce as being “proud as Lucifer” but writing “verses perfect[ly] in their own technique and sometimes beautiful in quality” (100).

<sup>14</sup> Some examples include Richard Ellmann’s *James Joyce*, Michael Groden *et al*’s *James Joyce Archive*, and Hans Walter Gabler’s corrected and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*. For a complete and most up-to-date Bibliography of Genetic Studies on Joyce, see

---

<http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/GJB.jsp>, which was originally compiled by Sam Slote but recently updated by Ronan Crowley.

<sup>15</sup> It is interesting to note that this is, apparently, the same manuscript that he—eight years prior—had promised to Harriet Shaw Weaver (20 July 1919). However, there is no evidence that Miss Weaver was in any way offended or perhaps even aware of this.

<sup>16</sup> In February of 1924, Joyce writes: “Dear Quinn: Can you find out, directly or indirectly, for what figure Mr (or Dr) Rosenbach will relinquish his grip on his (or my) MS.? It seems to me he may be approachable, as apparently he asks for six months to fumble in other people’s trousers in order to find the money.”

<sup>17</sup> Michael Barasanti, curator of the Poetry Collection at the University at Buffalo, claims that Stephen “is embarrassed by the ‘green oval leaves’ because they do not represent true artistic work as much as a desire to be famous, to have artifacts of himself in the hands of admirers” (8). For Barasanti, the scraps of paper that Stephen forgets to take from the National Library and the paper he literally scraped together by ripping it from the article Mr. Deasy wants him to bring to the editors shows that Stephen knows that these scraps are somehow more “homely and real” than the oval leaves of his imagination. Furthermore, the “scraps” Stephen uses in *Ulysses* is more “reminiscent of the scraps of paper that Joyce collected as part the composing process of *Ulysses*.” These scraps become “working documents . . . [w]here one shows the author as he would carefully present himself, the other is almost accidental, a witness to an unguarded moment of composition” (Barasanti 8). However, reading about the scrap of paper in the printed document of *Ulysses* is a transcription that echoes the presentation of those

---

epiphanies transcribed upon “green oval leaves” for all the world’s libraries, including one destroyed by fire.

<sup>18</sup> “On 30 June 1922, the Public Record Office, situated in the Four Courts, was shelled to cause the anti-Treaty IRA forces holding it from April to surrender” ([www.fweet.org](http://www.fweet.org)).

<sup>19</sup> For more information, visit “Home Fweet Home” website, otherwise known as Finnegans Wake Extensible Elucidation Treasury at [www.fweet.org](http://www.fweet.org).

<sup>20</sup> William Gass calls the twentieth-century artist’s involvement in all aspects of the work (from conception to publication) transliteracy and deems Joyce among the most transliterate of them all. Gass cites as an example the way Joyce planned everything from the color of the cover of *Ulysses* to its advertisement and promotion.

<sup>21</sup> Joyce’s *Critical Writings*, especially “Drama and Life,” “The Day of Rabblement,” and “The Holy Office,” presents Joyce’s views on art and of his criticisms against where the Irish Literary Revival was taking it. Additionally, Joyce’s *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* expresses his literary aesthetic.

<sup>22</sup> I am indebted to John S. Rickard’s *Joyce’s Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of Ulysses*, which argues that *Ulysses* “develop[s] its own memory”; Rickard calls the work “a textual repository of words, phrases, objects, and sounds” and notes that this “construction of a textual memory in *Ulysses* may have been Joyce’s response to a number of theories of memory” (118). Thus, more than acting as a textual repository for Dublin’s historical personages, *Ulysses* goes beyond the collection and storage of the various discourses to re-present and re-process those discourses from the privileged vantage point of archival analysis.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann note that until these two plays were announced, Joyce enjoyed the company's second play, Edward Martyn's *The Heather Field* as well as George Moore and Edward Martyn's *The Bending of the Bough*; after which, Joyce tried his hand at a drama of his own, but William Archer "pointed out serious flaws with it, and Joyce went no further" (*Critical Writings* 68).

<sup>24</sup> This fact becomes important when reading the example of the "cocklepickers" in the "Proteus" episode of *Ulysses*. The "cocklepickers" are gypsies, which Joyce also calls "red Egyptians."

<sup>25</sup> For more details on Joyce's argument of the modern artist's responsibility, see his essays "Drama and Life," "Day of the Rabblement," and his 1904 broadside, "The Holy Office."

<sup>26</sup> For an excellent analysis on the anxiety of influence over cultural memory and the purposeful recreation of a nation's past, see "Inventing Irishness: Authenticity and Identity" in Vincent Cheng's *Inauthentic: The Anxiety Over Culture and Identity*.

<sup>27</sup> In *Ulysses*, Joyce exemplifies how exclusionary speaking Gaelic can be. In "Telemachus," Joyce introduces the character of the milk woman—a woman who would fit the Gaelic League's description of the Irish Peasant, except for the fact that she does not speak Gaelic. Her interaction with Haines, the British "usurper" visiting Ireland in order to "experience" "Irishness" (as depicted by Hyde), is one of inaccurate assumptions. When the milk woman states she does not understand Gaelic—a point which should reveal Joyce's point that not speaking Gaelic does not make the milk woman any less "Irish" than others—Haines ignores this as exception rather than rule.

---

<sup>28</sup> Even after publishing “The Holy Office” in 1904 where he lambastes the especially Yeats, Moore, Russell, and Eglinton, he still—even later—writes to them and includes articles or reviews. In a postcard sent to Best (MS 11,001) dated April of 1909, Joyce sends Best his article on Oscar Wilde and asks that he “remember [Joyce] to Magee.”

<sup>29</sup> The National Library of Ireland, along with the National Museum, was established by the *Dublin Science and Art Museum Act of 1877*.<sup>29</sup> In fact, the library’s origins stem even further to the Royal Dublin Society’s charter of 1749 (Long 271). By 1890, all documents and library of the Royal Dublin Society and the Joly Library made its way into the National Library.

<sup>30</sup> Gerard Long’s “The National Library of Ireland” explains that the library was open to “respectable persons of all classes, who [were] desirous to avail themselves of it for the purpose of literary research” (266); this edict was extended to include the scholars at University College Dublin by the second Librarian, Thomas W. Lyster. Furthermore, Long notes that this was the first “explicitly ‘national’ library in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, preceding the establishment of the Free State over forty years” (268).

<sup>31</sup> Joyce expresses his dismay for the Irish Literary Theatre’s productions of Mr. Martyn and Mr. Moore’s play, which he saw—at best—as having “wonderful mimetic ability”; furthermore, he sees George Moore as having once been among the great “English novelists” but that now Moore’s “conversion” over to “the movement” makes his literature weak (“Day of the Rabblement 70-71). In his critique of William Rooney’s poetry (after Rooney’s death), Joyce censures Rooney (and those who follow his line of

---

writing) for his “weary verses,” which were clearly written “for papers and societies week after week” (“An Irish Poet” 86).

<sup>32</sup> The title of this collection is *Forty-one Letters of George Moore to Richard Irvine Best of the National Library on Literary Topics: 1913-1932*. MS 3884. However, when I inspected the collection, I counted forty-five letters.

<sup>33</sup> In an October 1917 letter from Moore to Best, Moore thanks him for marking a manuscript and sending it to him and adds “when I asked you to mark the pages, believe me, I did not contemplate putting you to the trouble you appear to have taken.” On many other occasions, Best has provided Moore his service such as proof-reading one of Moore’s manuscript (Oct. 24, 1916) or for more information about Irish shepherds and Turkish sheep dogs (19 June 1915) or for ideas on Gaelic names (24 July 1924).

<sup>34</sup> Ironically, perhaps, Moore, whom Best enjoyed many years of friendship with, was not so keen on this idea of an educated Ireland—at least not so far as writing literature for everyone: “I abhor the Modern idea that literature is written for everybody and sent round with the morning loaf and the milk up to standard. And that is an exact description of Modern literature” (April 9, 1917).

<sup>35</sup> Ling states that Best was—for over twenty-five years—“in charge of Irish manuscripts as editor, custodian and purchaser” (687).

<sup>36</sup> Readers of the *Irish Homestead* were typically the Irish farmer and worker cooperative (Bowles 4), while readers of Griffith’s *United Irishman* were those citizens who believed in the Nationalist’s agenda for a Free Ireland. That Russell recommended Griffith publish Best’s translation makes sense given its subject matter. Sen Ling’s essay on Best argues that he translated this important work on Irish mythology because “he saw . . . there was

---

an eagerness to know something about the ancient Gods of Ireland and the mythic races of old” (683). For more detailed information on the Best’s commitment to the School of Irish Learning, which was established in 1903, see Sen Ling’s “Richard Irvine Best: Librarian and Celtic Scholar.”

<sup>37</sup> Bonnie K. Scott. “John Eglinton: A Model for Joyce’s Individualism.” *JJQ* 12.4 (Summer 1975) 347-357.

<sup>38</sup> The actual quote from Eglinton’s “The Beginnings of Joyce” essay is as follows: “Eglinton admits that “in the interview of the much-enduring Stephen with the officials of the National Library, the present writer experiences a twinge of recollection of things actually said” (148).

<sup>39</sup> There is a well-known anecdote of this in *Ulysses* and in Ellmann’s biography of Joyce as well as from Eglinton’s own reminiscences where Joyce was the only contributor to receive remuneration; Eglinton writes that Joyce actually “chortled” as he pocketed the money.

<sup>40</sup> Robert Adams Day suggests that Joyce probably does rewrite Hyde’s poem to prove himself the better poet.

<sup>41</sup> Evidence of this can be found in “Holy Office” published by Joyce in 1904 and also in “Drama and Life,” where Joyce lays out what he thinks good drama should be.

<sup>42</sup> In “Language and Landscape in the Connemara Gaeltacht,” Peter Maguire explains how an Act of Parliament in 1652 “expelled the defeated Gaelic [or Catholic] Irish” to Connacht, which is why Gaelic is still spoken there today.

<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, the cocklepickers, while generally considered wanderers, drifters, this scene actually recalls Stephen’s portrayal of peasant life in *Portrait*. In this work,

---

Stephen—as Edward Hirsch posits—“thinks of an emblematic peasant woman first as a ‘type of her race and his own’” (“The Imaginary Peasant” 1124). The term “race” associated with the idealized version of the Irish “peasant” being [quote from Hyde’s 1892 speech] is meant to refer to Hyde’s 1892 speech. However, as Hirsch points out, while Dedalus associates himself here with this woman, he next describes her as “a batlike soul waking in consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness” (qtd in “Imaginary Peasant” 1124). Hirsch stops short of linking this image to the assimilated Hyde poetry jotted down in “Proteus,” recalled in “Aeolus” and then referred to in “Scylla and Charybdis.”

<sup>44</sup> The portion that is revised is Hyde’s final stanza from “My Grief on the Sea,” which reads:

And my love came behind me—  
He came from the South;  
His breast to my bosom,  
His mouth to my mouth.

<sup>45</sup> Robert Adams Day notes that the inspiration for Hyde’s poem comes from a woman who lived in the County Roscommon, which is in Connacht.

<sup>46</sup> For example, the BBC did a series of recordings where Richard Irvine Best and John Eglinton were asked questions about their contemporaries; one of these contemporaries was Joyce. Terence de Vere White’s “Richard Irvine Best and his Irish Literary Contemporaries” and Sen Ling’s “Richard Irvine Best: Librarian and Celtic Scholar” offer excellent summaries of how Best viewed his characterization of himself in *Ulysses* and what his opinion of Joyce was. Furthermore, John Eglinton’s *Irish Literary Portraits*

---

also acknowledges Joyce's contribution to Irish Literature as well as that if he had published the early draft of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, his magazine, *Dana*, which only lasted a year, might "have had rare value in the book market" (136).

<sup>47</sup> ALP and HCE are referred to by several names, including Anna Livia Plurabelle and Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker, and are also incarnated into other characters throughout the *Wake*. This chapter will primarily identify these characters using ALP and HCE except in cases of direct quotation.

<sup>48</sup> This example of the artist's immortality left behind in traces of materials left behind is reminiscent of Joyce's letter to Henrik Ibsen, written as a young aspiring artist to an aging and mature artist.

<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, the tree is associated with the "reed" or the instrument by which to record information and the stone is the material which receives the information—stone tablets etc. I suppose there is also something to be said for stone being able to carve meaning into a tree but the image of the stone as monument or building-blocks for a physical repository works alongside that of graphite on paper to create the pages of this book.

<sup>50</sup> This disagreement, ironically, has led to some heated editorials in newspapers worldwide as well as in scholarly journals such as the *James Joyce Quarterly*. These published, and therefore very public, pronouncements of who has done what to prevent information from coming out or for leaking private information out to the public might be read in the same manner as gossip in the *Wake*.

<sup>51</sup> Interestingly, Beresford also asserts that gossip is mainly concerned "with the human side of history," which he defines as "the lives and characters of various men and women, whether celebrated or altogether obscure, who flourished at any time within" the

---

seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (5). The emphasis on “human side of history” makes Beresford’s research both sociologically and anthropologically-oriented. When one no longer has the first-person accounts for live interviews as one would doing oral history, the next best thing is to research published and unpublished materials; the published materials come from “contemporary authorities” (5), while the unpublished materials come from archival collections and include letters, diaries, and even manuscripts. Furthermore, Beresford’s mention of the subjects of his studies being men and women “whether celebrated or altogether obscure” highlights the social and dialogic motivations behind many oral history projects.

Beresford’s *Gossip* actually includes quite a bit of research, a word not usually associated with this term. For example, in his chapter, “The Gossip of the Reign of Queen Anne,” Beresford cites doing research in the British Museum, which included digging through many volumes published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which he says he had hoped would “guide him to a certain obscure corner of the literary world” and ended up leading him to *The Manuscripts* of Carl Cooper, K.G. That Beresford includes the obstacles of his own research and where they lead him or didn’t lead him reinforces the “gossipy,” or more personal nature of his quest for information. Beresford acknowledges that these manuscripts did not bring him any “nearer to [his] original goal” but that he “found them so fascinating” he decided to share them with others (his readers) (161).

<sup>52</sup> Interestingly, German is the predominant foreign language Joyce chooses to depict the various slangs for gossip.

---

<sup>53</sup> The earliest recorded definition for *gossip* is as follows: “One who has contracted spiritual affinity with another by acting as a sponsor at a baptism” (*OED*, 2<sup>nd</sup> online edition).

<sup>54</sup> A screed is a piece of gossip as in the form of a letter.

<sup>55</sup> The phrase “telling a Greenwood” is slang for lying and is named after “Sir Hamat Greenwood, chief secretary of Dublin Castle from 1920, involved in cover-up of British violence” (*Fweets of Fin*).

<sup>56</sup> *Ibd.* *Gudfar* is Danish for “godfather,” and *bedstefar* is Danish for “grandfather (literally ‘best father’), “godfather” is the archaic form of gossip.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibd.* *Malalingua* is Italian for “slanderer, gossip-monger”

<sup>58</sup> Translations for “hearsay” found in *Finnegans Wake Extensible Elucidation Treasury*, or [Fweet.org](http://Fweet.org).

<sup>59</sup> Additionally, Karma Lochrie’s *Covert Operations: The Medieval Uses of Secrecy* addresses “the devolution of confession into gossip . . . and explore[s] the medieval representation of gossip” and looks at how gossip was used as an oral form of resistance (7). Lochrie notes that in the medieval times, gossip was viewed as “confession’s stigmatized parody, its debased ‘other’ that marks the feminine, especially women’s bodies and their speech” (7). For an even fuller discussion of gossip in medieval England, see *Transforming Talk: The Problem with Gossip in Late Medieval England* by Susan E. Phillips. Phillips’ argument is that while gossip is indeed transgressive, it was also used by authorities such as the priests in order to control their parishioners.

<sup>60</sup> *Gossip*, n. Second edition, 1989; online version November 2010.

<<http://www.oed.com:80/Entry/80197>>; accessed 17 March 2011. Earlier version first

---

published in New English Dictionary, 1900. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “gossip” first as “[o]ne who has contracted spiritual affinity with another by acting as a sponsor at a baptism.” The term itself can be traced back to the Old English word “godsib” meaning “akin” or “related to God” and was initially always applied in the masculine—a point worth mentioning given its current association with women.

In the case of this definition, the spiritual affinity one had as a sponsor at a baptism made that person a godfather or godmother. It seems likely that the evolution of gossip from godparent or sponsor of a child was indicative of an already important relationship between the parents of the child and the gossips. The second definition of gossip is perhaps the more accustomed: “A familiar acquaintance, friend, chum. formerly applied to both sexes now only (somewhat arch) to women.” Gossip, therefore, encompasses both a spiritual and secular order of meaning.

Finally, gossip also means “[a] person, mostly a woman, of light and trifling character, esp., one who delights in idle talk; a newsmonger, a tattler.” This, of course, is the more common and recent of the three definitions. In this definition, the spiritual affinity is all but lost; however, in the *Wake*, all three definitions are incorporated, providing a resurrection or revival—however brief—to the earlier, now obsolete, references.

<sup>61</sup> It is interesting to note that some of the earliest periodicals published evoke this definition of gossip: *The Tattler*, *The Idler*, and *Table-Talk* are all such examples. Today, of course, gossip magazines such as *US Weekly*, *Star*, *Explorer*, and even *People* magazines offer up weekly or monthly stories featuring candid and staged photographs of recognized social or political figures or leaked stories that involve some celebrity

---

scandal. Even the terms “candid” or “leaked” connote this specific definition of gossip, wherein something or someone is exposed. Joyce, of course, would have been aware of the earlier references to gossip magazines and even included popular titles such as *Titbits*. Gossip, n., definition 3. Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> I find Joyce’s use of the word “twitter” interesting here in light of our twenty-first century social network, Twitter, which is not dominated by any one sex but used equally as indeed a way to “shout from the rooftops” the latest news; in fact, recently, Twitter has been credited with being the catalyst of protests for government change in Libya, Tunisia, and Egypt.

<sup>63</sup> Moreover, Cheng asserts that Shaun’s assertion of Shem’s madness is the first direct accusation of madness in the *Wake*; Shaun-Mercius, according to Cheng, represents Polonius, the father of Ophelia and Laertes. Polonius is also the character in *Hamlet* who thinks that Hamlet is mad. However, the “gossiple so delivered in his epistolear” also represents the poison that is poured into the porches of King Hamlet’s ear by the King’s own brother, Claudius (Cheng 25). Since the theme of fighting brothers is a prominent theme in the *Wake*—as is this sequence of delivery into the “epistolear” (or delivering an “epistle” or letter into the “ear”—the example therefore also echoes another delivery of gossip, poured into the porches of Shem’s ear by his brother Shaun.

Cheng considers the *Wake* “a collection of all the poisonous and ‘gossipaceous’ (195.04) variations of the HCE tale” (25) and provides a list of these repetitions: “King Hamlet’s death by poison poured in his ear; the tales told about Hamlet and Shakespeare by Stephen Dedalus; every scholar’s reading or retelling of Hamlet; H.C. Earwicker and earwigs; the rumours and gossip that bring about HCE’s downfall; the various and variant

---

versions and interpretations of HCE's tale; the stories at the *Wake* to which we, as guests and auditors, are called to list; the *Wake* itself; and, finally, every past, present, and future reading or interpretation of *Finnegans Wake*—all are related by analogy or equating poison in the ear with gossip or speculation” (26).

<sup>64</sup> Humpty Dumpty, Adam and Eve, the source to the river Liffey, the Ballad of Tim Finnegan, and the fable of Finn McCool as equal and—what is more—are all parts to the same story.

<sup>65</sup> Derrida defines the term “archive” as having a root word *arkhē*, which “names at once the commencement and the commandment” (1).

<sup>66</sup> In Book 1, Chapter 7, where Justius is speaking to Studiosus (another Shem/Shawn dynamic), Justius says: “Come here, Herr Studiosus, till I tell you a wig in your ear. We'll do a whisper drive, for if the barishnyas got a twitter of it they'd tell the housetops and then all Cadbury would go crackers . . . It's secret!” (193. 13-17). The “wig in your ear” is the “secret” being told and also the subject of the secret; HCE, after all, is also called “Earwicker” and associated with the earwig bug. The need for a “whisper drive” to elude the barishnyas, which is Russian for a young, unmarried girl (McHugh), once again perpetuates the stereotype of women as unruly and unable to control themselves from shouting out secret after secret from the rooftops.

<sup>67</sup> Once again, this is “Hear” and “Hark” are reminiscent of “hearsay.”

<sup>68</sup> Joyce clearly intended this link between Solomon and Sheba with this quote: “When they saw him shoot swift up her sheba sheath, like any gay lord salomon, her bulls they were ruhing, surfed with spree. . . . He erved his lille Bunbath hard, our staly bred, the trader. He did” (198.3-9). The allusion we know from McHugh's *Annotations* comes

---

from I Kings 10 and relates the relationship between King Solomon and Sheba.

“Bunbath” echoes “Banba,” or the “poetic way to say Ireland” and “lille” echoes “isle,” “little,” and even “Lillith,” who is Adam’s apocryphal first wife before Eve.

<sup>69</sup> Megan Becker-Leckrone argues that Joyce himself ironizes such a representation of “God = Artist,” which she asserts “does not compute”; she emphasizes that “Joyce’s own narrative structures work to disqualify on many levels” (The Static of Genesis in *Finnegans Wake* 182).

<sup>70</sup> Luca Crispi called the recording “the third dimension of the text” in response to Dr. Keane’s lecture at the Dublin James Joyce Summer School in 2010.

<sup>71</sup> Immediate examples include *Ulysses* 1967 and John Huston’s *The Dead* (1987). More recent examples include Robert Berry’s comic adaptation of the original 1922 *Ulysses*.

<sup>72</sup> United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

<sup>73</sup> US Copyright Act of 1790, Sec 3.

<sup>74</sup> US Copyright Act of 1790, Sec 4.

<sup>75</sup> For more information, see the April 15, 2010 Library of Congress “News Release,” “Twitter Donates Entire Tweet Archive to Library of Congress.”

<http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2010/0-081.html>.

---

<sup>76</sup> Prior to Dickens' book tours, the British Parliament passed the Act of 1838, which stated that American publishers illegally reprinting works protected by copyright in other countries were, in fact, pirates. The divide was short-lived because, as Saunders relates, the rise of Germany's influence in European copyright discussions resulted in America and England banding together.

<sup>77</sup> As a side-note, the sheer amount of—what some might consider “bad” literature—that has since made it into print seems to disprove Wordsworth's assumption that copyright is the impetus behind providing incentive for people writing; or that writing good literature is somehow tied to copyright. I do not disagree that copyright is necessary to protect an author's rights; I take issue with it being the impetus for creative activity.

<sup>78</sup> For a detailed summary and analysis of the International Literary Association, which lead to the Berne Conventions of 1883-1887, see David Saunders' “Internationalisation of Copyright” in *Authorship and Copyright*.

<sup>79</sup> For more details, see Spoo “Copyright Law and Archival Research,” especially pages 207-209, and Spoo “Injuries, Remedies, Moral Rights, and the Public Domain.”

---

<sup>80</sup> The refusal of permission can be viewed as a form of censorship as it certainly can prevent entire passages from being published. The irony is that one who despised censorship of his own materials and who would have faced copyright infringement charges due to his liberal and unauthorized use of quotation (without any attribution or permissions ever being sought), is himself censored and his words rendered virtually inaccessible. I say virtually because the Fair Use Clause in Title 17, section 107 of the United States Copyright Law provides for exceptions to the copyright holder's exclusive rights of ownership.

<sup>81</sup> More information pertaining to all parts of this review can be found on the Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation website:

[http://www.djei.ie/science/ips/copyright\\_review\\_2011\\_hm](http://www.djei.ie/science/ips/copyright_review_2011_hm)

<sup>82</sup> Note: the FAQ website hosted by prominent Joycean scholars and lawyers has been recently updated to help clarify which works still fall under copyright and in which countries. For more information, visit: <https://joycefoundation.osu.edu/joyce-copyright/fair-use-and-permissions>.

<sup>83</sup> The four major collections of Joyce materials at the time were the British Library, the University at Buffalo, Cornell, and Yale. It should be noted that the National Library of Ireland did not at this time have a major Joyce collection. Furthermore, the materials preserved in these libraries were themselves fragmented with many missing parts. Groden explains:

The British Library possesses materials that Joyce gave to Harriet Shaw Weaver . . . . These documents include the *Ulysses* notesheets and the bulk of the drafts, manuscripts, typescripts, and proofs for *Finnegans Wake*.

---

The Poetry Collection of the State University of New York at Buffalo purchased a vast collection of documents that Joyce left behind in Paris, many of which were saved from his apartment during World War II by Joyce's friend Paul Leon and were exhibited in 1949 at the Librarie La Hune, along with additional materials that were accumulated by *Ulysses* publisher Sylvia Beach. These materials include all of the notebooks for *Finnegans Wake* and, for *Ulysses*, many early drafts, typescripts, and proofs. A third repository is Cornell University, which obtained the manuscripts and letters that Joyce left behind in Trieste and that were kept by his brother Stanislaus. These include many of Joyce's newspaper articles and critical essays and other documents from the 1900s and 1910s. And, finally, Yale University possess a wide range of documents from a collection that John J. Slocum built up in the 1940s and 1950s as he prepared his 1953 bibliography of Joyce's works. Other institutions with large and small collections of Joycean materials include the Harry Ransom Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin; the Croessmann Collection at Southern Illinois University; Harvard University; Princeton University; the Rosenbach Library in Philadelphia; the National Library of Ireland; the New York Public Library; the University at Tulsa, University College, Dublin—and this list does not cover every collection. (226-7)

I include this long list in order to emphasize how massive the Joyce archive is and what a large expense the interested researcher must face in order to research in multiple archival centers. Additionally, the proposed project to photocopy Joyce's notebooks and

---

manuscripts from all of these holdings would have seemed for most one way in which to combat the cost of doing research from Joyce's manuscripts; yet not everyone was convinced that a sixty-three volume *Archive* of these documents would be the best bet. First, the cost to produce these works would have to result, and indeed did result, in a costly and limited publication: "only two hundred and fifty copies of the series were produced for sale, and the price was a staggering five thousand dollars in 1977 dollars . . . royalties and fees" which had to be paid to the James Joyce Estate and the libraries (230). Second, to get the collaboration of each library was another matter, however, it seems that at this time, the Literary Estate was disposed to have such a work published, for even if the librarians were vehemently opposed, they could not deny the editors of this collection access or prevent them from taking photographs or making copies.

<sup>84</sup> Richard Irvine Best was, in 1904, a librarian at the National Library of Ireland; he later took over as Director in 1929, serving in this position until 1940. He was also characterized in "Scylla and Charybdis" episode at the National Library in *Ulysses*.

<sup>85</sup> I sent a query to the NLI requesting information regarding whether this material is still sealed (given that materials have now reverted back to public domain with the expiration of Joyce copyright) or if these letters (between James Joyce and Nora Barnacle) were indeed presented to Stephen James Joyce as some have reported. I await their reply 8/31/12.

<sup>86</sup> It should be noted that with Ellmann's publication of the 1909 letters (even expurgated) in the 1950s came the ire of Stephen Joyce, who, at that time, was a beneficiary and not yet trustee of the James Joyce Estate (Shloss "Privacy and the Misuse" 245).

---

<sup>87</sup> The crux of Shloss' argument, and eventual lawsuit against the Estate of James Joyce, was the misuse of copyright, which hinged upon the argument of the right to privacy. Shloss' position is that the copyright of a work does not include a right to privacy. In fact, Shloss argues that privacy is an antiquated argument which belongs "first of all, to a bourgeois family whose ability to enclose itself and to keep secrets would have differed markedly from that of both similar families in the more distant past and contemporary families in more fragile economic circumstances" (247). Given that the Joyce family was "the urban poor" the concept of protecting the family "reputation" is not actually a legitimate concern (248). Instead, privacy was allotted only those "prosperous or influential" families whose reputation, if besmirched, would "destabilize[e]" societal order (249). For this reason, Shloss argues, "Stephen Joyce's sense of outrage at privacy's violation belongs neither to the young James Joyce's class position nor to our own twenty-first-century worries about privacy" (249).

While I can certainly understand Shloss' point, I hardly think Stephen "sense of outrage" stems from some misplaced notion of his family's historical status. Instead, I think that Stephen's assertion of right to privacy has to do with protecting the image—not of James himself—but of his grandmother and of his aunt. In a blog posted after the settlement was reached between the Estate and Shloss, "Anon" writes this about the "scholarly fair-use" debate: "Shloss wanted access to private medical records to buttress her theory that Joyce's daughter, who was institutionalized for mental illness, was really—according to Shloss—a victim of family incest"(March 27, 2007 8:20 AM). Furthermore, anonymous claims that "compassionate, decent human beings would agree that it is anyone's right to protect their family from tabloid exploitation."

---

<sup>88</sup> For more detailed summary of these occasions, see Robert Spoo’s “Injuries, Remedies, Moral Rights and The Public Domain” in the *James Joyce Quarterly*, volume 37, issue 4, pages 333-365.

<sup>89</sup> For more information on this case, read the February 9, 2007 legal brief, “Plaintiff’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter.”

<sup>90</sup> See "Copyright and Related Rights Bill", (29 June 1999)

<sup>91</sup> Matthew Rimmer recounts the details of this threat and adds that Stephen also “threatened to sue the Irish Government for breach of copyright if there were any public readings or recitations as part of ‘Rejoyce Dublin 2004.’” The Irish Government, in preparation for the centenary celebration of Bloomsday, contributed over 700,000 pounds (Rimmer). Stephen rejected a proposal for the performance of *Exiles* and “warned other organisations planning to use Joyce’s words as part of their celebration, including the Irish National Library, Irish national television, RTÉ, and the James Joyce Centre in Dublin” (Rimmer).

<sup>92</sup> More information can be found on the Library of Congress’ website:

<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/copothr.html>

<sup>93</sup> The 2004 International James Joyce Symposium also took place in Dublin for the special celebration of one-hundred years of Bloomsdays.

<sup>94</sup> This excerpt comes from Mark O’Connel’s 11 January 2012 piece in the *New Yorker*, “Has James Joyce Been Set Free.” The title itself implies that prior to 1 January 2012, Joyce was not free.

<sup>95</sup> This is from the revised “Frequently Asked Questions” guide on copyright, “Joyce Works in Copyright and in the Public Domain” published on the James Joyce

---

Foundation website: <https://joycefoundation.osu.edu/joyce-copyright/fair-use-and-permissions/about-law/public-domain>

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> For more detailed information about how this letter was gifted to the Zurich James Joyce Foundation, see Terence Killeen's "Joyce children's story published in Dublin to dismay in Zurich" in *The Irish Times* on February 8, 2012.

<sup>98</sup> Spoo said this at the 2012 International James Joyce Symposium "Copyright After Copyright" keynote speech.

<sup>99</sup> Indeed, Stephen James Joyce (according to Rose) "would only grant permission to publish" four volumes of *Finnegans Wake Notebooks at Buffalo* ("published under the editorship of Vincent Deane, Daniel Ferrer, and Geert Lernout in 2001" (JJQBlog April 27, 2012), if Rose was "removed from the project." In 2012, Rose sued Deane, Ferrer, Lernout, and the publisher Brepolis for agreeing to this demand and "still us[ing] work he had written without permission or acknowledgement" (JJQBlog April 27, 2012). This case was settled out of court and its proceedings have not been disclosed.

<sup>100</sup> The cost was reported by Killeen at the 2012 Symposium as follows: Standard edition €300, Deluxe edition €900. He added that the *Cats of Copenhagen* sold the lettered deluxe edition for €1200.

<sup>101</sup> Ronan Crowley coined "zombie copyright" at a roundtable session on Joyce and copyright. Robert Spoo used the term "resurrectionist copyright" on this same panel.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Nate. "Is James Joyce's Estate Misusing Its Copyright?" *Ars Technica*, 13 June 2009  
<http://arstechnica.com/uncategorized/2006/06/7048-2/>. 13 June 2009.
- Atherton, James S. *The Books at the Wake: A Study of Literary Allusions in James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. Southern Illinois UP, 2009.
- Barsanti, Michael J. *Ulysses in Hand: The Rosenbach Manuscript*. Rosenbach Museum and Library, 2000.
- Barthes, Roland. *A Barthes Reader*. Edited by Susan Sontag. Hill and Wang, 1983.
- Batchelor, John ed. *The Art of Literary Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Bazargan, Susan. "The Headings in 'Aeolus': A Cinematographic View." *James Joyce Quarterly* 23.3 (Spring 1986): 345–50.
- Becker-Leckrone, Megan. "The Static Genesis in *Finnegans Wake*." *In-Between* 12 1&2 (2003): 181-192.
- Begnal, Michael H. "The Fables of Finnegans Wake." *James Joyce Quarterly* 6.4 (Summer 1969): 357–367.
- Begnal, M. H. and Grace Eckley. *Narrator and Character*. Bucknell UP, 1975.
- Bell, David F. "Infinite Archives." *SubStance* 33.3 (2004): 148–161.
- Beja, Morris. *James Joyce: A Literary Life*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992.
- Beja, Morris and David Norris eds. *Joyce in the Hibernian Metropolis: Essays*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1996.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1986.
- . *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writing*. New York: Schocken Books, 1986.

- Benjamin, Roy. "The Stone of Stumbling in Finnegans Wake." *Journal of Modern Literature* 31, no. 2 (2008): 66–78.
- Benstock, Bernard ed. International James Joyce Symposium. *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth: Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium*, Frankfurt, 1984. 1st ed. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse UP, 1988.
- Benstock, Bernard. "The Unresolved Person/ality of Anna Livia." *James Joyce Literary Supplement* 15.2 (Fall 2001): 15–16.
- Benstock, Shari. "At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text." *PMLA* 98.2 (March 1983): 204.
- . "The Letter of the Law: *La Carte Postale* in Finnegans Wake." *Philological Quarterly* 63.2 (1984): 163–185.
- Bishop, John. *Joyce's Book of the Dark, Finnegans Wake*. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1986.
- Black, Alistair and Peter Hoare eds. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Blouin Jr. Francis X and William G. Rosenberg. *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 2006.
- Booker, M. Keith. *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition: Toward a Comparative Cultural Poetics*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1995.
- Bowker, Gordon. "James Joyce's Grandson Stephen and Literature's Most Tyrannical Estate." *The Daily Beast*, June 14, 2012.  
<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/06/14/james-joyce-s-grandson-stephen-and-literature-s-most-tyrannical-estate.html>. 31 Aug 2012.

- Boyce, David George and Alan O'Day eds. *Ireland in Transition, 1867-1921*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Brivic, Sheldon. *Joyce's Waking Women: An Introduction to Finnegans Wake*. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1995.
- Budgen, Frank Spencer Curtis. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1960.
- Burton, Antoinette. *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*. Durham: Duke UP, 2005.
- Cadbury, Bill. "Thoughts on the Necessity of Redoing the Archive." *Genetic Joyce Studies*. Special JJA (Summer 2002). <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Calahan, James. "Dear Reader and Drear Writer: Joyce's Direct Addresses to His Readers in Finnegans Wake." *Twentieth* 41.3 (Autumn 1995): 306–318.
- Campbell, Joseph. *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake*. New York: Viking Press, 1961.
- Cape, Jonathan. *The Portable James Joyce*. NY: Viking, 1947.
- . *The Essential James Joyce*. London, 1948.
- Casteleyn, Mary. *A History of Literacy and Libraries in Ireland: The Longtraced Pedigree. A Grafton Book*. Brookfield: Gower, 1984.
- Cheng, Vincent John. *Inauthentic: The Anxiety over Culture and Identity*. Rutgers UP, 2004.
- . *Shakespeare and Joyce: A Study of Finnegans Wake*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1984.
- Cohn, Alan M. "Douglas Hyde in Ulysses." *English Studies* 43 (1962): 255–256.
- Copyright Law of the United States: And Related Laws Contained in Title 17 of the United States Code*. <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/>

- Crispi, Luca. "The James Joyce Archive from an Archival Perspective." *Genetic Joyce Studies, Special JJA* (Summer 2002). <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- . "Genetic Approaches to *Ulysses*." Dublin James Joyce Summer School. National Library of Ireland. 6 July 2010. Workshop.
- Crispi, Luca and Sam Slote Eds. *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Wisconsin UP, 2007.
- Day, Robert Adams. "How Stephen Wrote His Vampire Poem." *James Joyce Quarterly* 17.2 (Winter 1980): 183–197.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. 1st ed. Minnesota UP, 1987.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Copy, Archive, Signature: a Conversation on Photography*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford UP, 2010.
- Derrida, Jacques and Eric Prenowitz. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. 1st ed. Chicago UP, 1998.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce." *Acts of Literature*. Derek Attridge. Trans. Taylor & Francis Group, 1992.
- Derrida, Jacques and Alan Bass. *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. Chicago: UP, 1987.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Jeffrey Mehlman. "Freud and the Scene of Writing." *Yale French Studies*, 48 (1972): 74–117.
- Domino, George, and ebrary, Inc. *Psychological Testing an Introduction*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. <http://www.library.unlv.edu/help/remote.html>.
- Dunbar, Robin. *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*. Harvard: Harvard UP, 1998.

- Eckley, Grace. “‘Petween Peas Like Ourselves’: The Folklore of the Prankquean.” *James Joyce Quarterly* 9.2 (Winter 1971): 177–187.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Revised. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- ed. *Letters of James Joyce* Vol II New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- Epstein, William H. *Contesting the Subject: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Criticism*. Theory and Practice of Biographical Criticism. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 1991.
- Esdale, Arundell James Kennedy. *The British Museum Library*. London: G. Allen & Unwin ltd, 1946.
- Fahy, Catherine. *The James Joyce-Paul Léon Papers in the National Library of Ireland: A Catalogue*. Dublin: The Library, 1992.
- Finch, Elsie and Paul Conway eds. *Advocating Archives: An Introduction to Public Relations for Archivists*. Metuchen, N.J: The Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, 1994.
- Folsom, Ed. “Database as Genre: The Epic Transformation of Archives.” *PMLA* 122, no. 5 (October 2007): 1571–1579.
- Fordham, Finn. *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unravelling Universals*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. Vintage, 1982.
- Foucault, Michel, and Paul Rabinow. *Power*. Edited by James D. Faubion. Translated by Robert Hurley. 1st ed. New Press, 2001.
- Freshwater, Helen. “The Allure of the Archive.” *Poetics Today* 24.4 (2003): 729–758.

- Gabler, Hans Walter. "The James Joyce Archive: A Publisher's Gift to Joyce Studies." *Genetic Joyce Studies Special JJA* (Summer 2002). <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Gass, William H. *Habitations of the Word: Essays*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. "The Proustian Paratexte." *SubStance* 17.2 (1988): 63–77.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Stages V. 8. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1997.
- Gifford, Don. "James Joyce and Myth." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*. 8.1 (Spring 2002): 123-29.
- . *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for Joyce's Ulysses*. 2nd ed., rev. and enlarged. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Gilbert, Stuart. *James Joyce's Ulysses: a Study*. 2d ed., rev. New York: Knopf, 1952.
- . *Letters of James Joyce*. Vol 1 New York: Viking Press, 1957.
- Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "'Prying into the Family Life of a Great Man': A Survey of the Joyce/Léon Papers at the National Library of Ireland." *James Joyce Quarterly* 30.2 (1993): 277–294.
- Glass, Loren Daniel. *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980*. New York: New York UP, 2004.
- Gold, Moshe. "A Proverbial Tale of Tree or Stone: Joyce's Rewriting of Plato's Reminders." *Joyce Studies Annual* 11 (Summer 2000): 66-101.
- Gordon, Jan B. *Gossip and Subversion in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction*. Echo's Economies Series. Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- Grigely, Joseph. *Textualterity: Art, Theory and Textual Criticism*. Editorial Theory and Literary Criticism. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1995.

- Groden, Michael. "Perplex in the Pen: and in the Pixels." *Joyce and the Joyceans*. 2002. 32-50.
- . "The National Library of Ireland's New Joyce Manuscripts: A Narrative and Document Summaries." *Journal of Modern Literature* 26, no. 1 (March 16, 2004): 1–16.
- . *Ulysses in Progress*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977.
- Hamilton, Carolyn, Verne Harris, Michèle Pickover, Graeme Reid, Razia Saleh, and Jane Taylor. *Refiguring the Archive*. 1st ed. Springer, 2002.
- Hamilton, Ian. *Keepers of the Flame: Literary Estates and the Rise of Biography from Shakespeare to Plath*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.
- Harris, Verne. "On Archival Odyssey(s)." *Archivaria* 51: 1–13.
- Hart, Clive. *A Concordance to Finnegans Wake*. Corr. ed. Mamaroneck, N.Y: P.P. Appel, 1974.
- Hart, Clive and Leo Knuth. *A Topographical Guide to James Joyce's Ulysses*. California: Univ of California: A Wake Newslitter Press, 1975.
- Hayman, David. *The "Wake" in Transit*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell UP, 1990.
- . "Bringing Out the Archive: Memories." *Genetic Joyce Studies Special Issue JJA*, (Summer 2002). <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Herr, Cheryl. "Irish Censorship and 'The Pleasure of the Text': The 'Aeolus' Episode of Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Irish Renaissance Annual* 3. Newark: Delaware UP, 1982. 141–179.
- Herring, Phillip F. *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from the Buffalo Collection*. Virginia UP, 1977.
- Hirsch, Edward. "The Imaginary Peasant." *PMLA* 106, no. 5 (October 1991): 1116–1133.
- Holquist, Michael ed. *The Dialogic Imagination by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Texas UP: 1994

Homer. *The Odyssey: The Fitzgerald Translation*. Translated by Robert Fitzgerald. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.

“Home Fweet Home.” *Finnegans Wake Extensible Elucidation Treasury*. <http://www.fweet.org/>.  
2 Dec 2011.

Hutton, Clare. “James Joyce, the Library Episode, and the Institutions of Revivalism.” *Joyce, Ireland, Britain* (2006): 122–138.

Huyssen, Andreas, and ebrary, Inc. *Present Pasts Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2003.

“Ireland at the Bar.” *JJQ*, n.d. <http://jjqblog.wordpress.com/2012/04/27/ireland-at-the-bar/>.  
5/4/2012.

“James Joyce Moves into the Public Domain, Mostly.” *Jacket Copy: Books, Authors, and All Things Bookish* January 12, 2012  
<http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/jacketcopy/2012/01/james-joyce-moves-into-the-public-domain-mostly.html>.

Jaffe, Aaron. *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Jolas, Maria MacDonald. *Pasttimes of James Joyce*. Gotham Book Mart, 1941.

———. Ed. *A James Joyce Yearbook*. 1st ed. Transition Press, 1949.

“Joyce & Copyright” *International James Joyce Foundation: FAQ* April 2012.  
<https://joycefoundation.osu.edu/joyce-copyright/fair-use-and-permissions/about-law/public-domain>.

Joyce, James. *Critical Writings*. New York: Viking Press, 1959.

———. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.

———. *Scribbledehobble: the Ur-Workbook for Finnegans Wake*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1961.

———. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. New York: Viking Press, 1975.

———. *Ulysses*. Gabler ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Joyce, Stanislaus. *The Complete Dublin Diary of Stanislaus Joyce*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1971.

Joyce, Stephen James. "The Private Lives of Writers - New York Times." *New York Times*, 31 Dec 1989 <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/12/31/books/1-the-private-lives-of-writers-464589.html>. 6/10/2009.

Kaufmann, Michael. *Textual Bodies: Modernism, Postmodernism, and Print*. Lewisburg. Bucknell UP, 1994.

Keane, Damien D. "When Readers' Ears Are Uncircumcised: Joyce and Audio." Dublin James Joyce Summer School, University College Dublin, 7 July 2010. Lecture.

Keen, Suzanne. *Romances of the Archive in Contemporary British Fiction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Kelly, Thomas, and Library Association. *Early Public Libraries: A History of Public Libraries in Great Britain Before 1850*. London: Library Association, 1966.

Killeen, Terence. "Life, Death and the Washerwomen." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies* 9, no. 1 (2008). [http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/main/hjs.php?page=index\\_page](http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/main/hjs.php?page=index_page).

———. "Joyce Children's Story Published in Dublin to Dismay in Zürich." *The Irish Times*, Feb. 8, 2012. <http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/frontpage/2012/0208/1224311465140.html>.

———. "Rose Still a Thorn in the Side of the Academic World." *The Irish Times*, Apr 12, 2012. [http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/ireland/2012/0412/1224314641130\\_pf.html](http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/ireland/2012/0412/1224314641130_pf.html)

- . “Issues Linked to Joyce Publications Condemned.” *The Irish Times*, Apr 21, 2012.  
[http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/ireland/2012/0412/1224314641130\\_pf.html](http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/ireland/2012/0412/1224314641130_pf.html)
- . “Joycean Joy After Library Says ‘Yes’.” *The Irish Times*, May 07, 2012.  
<http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/features/2012/0507/1224315686035.html>.
- Kitcher, Philip. *Joyce’s Kaleidoscope: An Invitation to Finnegans Wake*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Lassman, Eli Z. “‘Scribbled Words’: The Usage of the *Ulysses* Notebooks in ‘Proteus’ and ‘Aeolus’.” *James Joyce Quarterly* 45.2 (Winter 2008): 301–322.
- Leslie, Esther and Ursula Marx eds. *Walter Benjamin’s Archive: Images, Texts, Signs*. London: Verso, 2007.
- Levy, Neil. “History as Struggle: Foucault’s Genealogy of Genealogy.” *History of the Human Sciences* 11.4 (November 1, 1998): 159–170.
- Luing, Sean. “Richard Irvine Best: Librarian and Celtic Scholar.” *Zeitschrift Fuer Celtische Philologie* 49-50 (1997): 682–697.
- Lund, Steven. *James Joyce: Letters, Manuscripts, and Photographs at Southern Illinois University*. The Whitston Publishing Company, Troy (1983).
- Lyster, Thomas W. “The National Library.” *Hibernia: A Monthly Popular Review* 1 (March 1, 1882): 33–49.
- Max, D. T. “The Injustice Collector.” *The New Yorker*, June 19, 2006.  
[http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/06/19/060619fa\\_fact](http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/06/19/060619fa_fact). 8 Jun 2009.
- MacCabe, Colin. *James Joyce: New Perspectives*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1982.
- . *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word*. 2nd ed. Language, Discourse, Society. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.

- Magee, William Kirkpatrick. *Irish Literary Portraits*. Essay Index Reprint Series. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1967.
- Maguire, Peter A. "Language and Landscape in the Connemara Gaeltacht." *Journal of Modern Literature* XXVI.1 (Fall 2002): 99–107.
- Manoff, Marlene. "Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4.1 (2004): 9–25.
- Marx, Ursula *et al.* Eds. *Walter Benjamin's Archive: Images, Texts, Signs*. Verso, 2007.
- Maynard, James, ed. *Discovering James Joyce: The University At Buffalo Collection*. Poetry Collection, University At Buffalo, 2009.
- McAteer, Michael. *Standish O'Grady, AE and Yeats: History, Politics, Culture*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2002.
- McCarthy, Patrick A. ed. *Critical Essays on James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. Critical Essays on British Literature. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1992.
- McGann, Jerome J. *Radiant Textuality: Literature After the World Wide Web*. 1st ed. New York, N.Y: Palgrave, 2001.
- . "Ulysses as Postmodern Text: The Gabler Edition." *Criticism* 27.3 (Summer 1985): 283–.
- McGee, Patrick. "Machines, Empire, and the Wise Virgins: Cultural Revolution in 'Aeolus'." In *Ulysses—En-Gendered Perspectives: Eighteen New Essays on the Episodes*, 86–99. *Cultural Frames, Framing Culture* Eds. Kimberly J. Devlin and Marilyn Reizbaum. Columbia: South Carolina UP, 1999.
- McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006.

- Mikics, David. "History and the Rhetoric of the Artist in *Aeolus*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 27.3 (Spring 1990): 533–558.
- Mikhail, E. H. ed. *James Joyce, Interviews and Recollections*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Miller, Nicholas Andrew. *Modernism, Ireland and the Erotics of Memory*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Milligan, Jennifer S. "'What Is an Archive': In the History of Modern France." In *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*. Durham: Duke UP, 2005.
- Murphy, Michael. "Parable and Politics: The 'Aeolus' Episode of Joyce's '*Ulysses*'." *Irish Studies Review*, no. 17 (Winter 1996): 31–34.
- Murphy, Niall, and National Library of Ireland. *A Bloomsday Postcard*. Dublin: Lilliput Press in association with the National Library of Ireland, 2004.
- Murphy, Sean. "Irish Historical Mysteries: The Trade in Joyce Manuscripts." *Irish Historical Mysteries*, June 16, 2003. <http://homepage.eircom.net/~seanjmurphy/irhismys/joyce.htm>.
- Myerson, George. "The Electronic Archive." *History of the Human Sciences* 11, no. 4 (November 1, 1998): 85–101.
- Nadel, Ira B. "Joyce and Blackmail." *Journal of Modern Literature* 22.2 (Winter, 1998): 215–223.
- Nash, John. *James Joyce and the Act of Reception: Reading, Ireland, Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- nli. "National Library of Ireland - Homepage", n.d. <http://www.nli.ie/en/homepage.aspx>.
- Noël, Lucie. *James Joyce and Paul L. Léon: The Story of a Friendship*. New York: Gotham Book Mart, 1950.

- Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux De Mémoire*." *Representations*, no. 26 (Spring 1989): 7–24.
- Norris, Margot. "The Function of Mythic Repetition in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 11.4 (Summer 1974): 343–354.
- O'Connell, Mark. "Has James Joyce Been Set Free." *The New Yorker*, January 11, 2012.  
<http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/books/2012/01/james-joyce-public-domain.html>.
- O'Flaherty, Colette, and Katherine McSharry. *The National Library of Ireland: One Hundred and Twenty Five Years*. Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 2002.
- Olson, Charles. *Selected Letters*. Berkeley: California UP, 2000.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Second edition, 1989; online version June 2012.  
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/80197>; accessed 07 July 2012. Earlier version first published in *New English Dictionary*, 1900.
- Pasco, Allan H. "Literature as Historical Archive." *New Literary History* 35.3 (2004): 373–394.
- Peterson, Richard F. *James Joyce Revisited*. Twayne's English Authors Series TEAS 490. New York: Twayne, 1992.
- Pierce, David. *James Joyce's Ireland*. New Haven, Conn: Yale UP, 1992.  
———. *Reading Joyce*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2008.
- Phillips, Susan E. *Transforming Talk: The Problem with Gossip in Late Medieval England*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2007.
- Platt, Len. "Pisgah Sights: The National Press and the Catholic Middle Class in 'Aeolus'." *James Joyce Quarterly*. Tulsa.

- Rapaport, Herman. "Archive Trauma." *Diacritics* 28.4 (December 1, 1998): 68–81.
- Reynolds, Mary T. ed. *James Joyce: A Collection of Critical Essays*. New Century Views. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- Richards, Thomas. "Archive and Utopia." *Representations*, no. 37 (Winter 1992): 104–135.
- . *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Rickard, John S. *Joyce's Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of Ulysses*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.
- Ricœur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2004.
- Rimmer, Matthew. "Bloomsday: Copyright Estates and Cultural Festivals." *Script-ed* (December 2005): 383-428.
- Rodgers, W. R. ed. *Irish Literary Portraits: W.B. Yeats, James Joyce, George Moore, J.M. Synge, George Bernard Shaw, Oliver St. John Gogarty, F.R. Higgins, AE (George Russell)*. New York: Taplinger, 1973.
- Roughley, Alan. *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce*. The Florida James Joyce Series. Gainesville: Florida UP, 1999.
- Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. *Understanding Finnegans Wake*. 1st ed. Garland, 1982.
- Rudd, Benjamin W. "Notable Dates in American Copyright 1763-1969."  
<http://www.docstoc.com/docs/97243984/Notable-Dates-in-American-Copyright.1763-1969>
- Russell, George William. *Letters from AE*. London: Abelard-Schuman, 1962.
- Saint-Amour, Paul K. *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003.
- . *Modernism and Copyright*. Modernist Literature and Culture. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.

- Saunders, David. *Authorship and Copyright*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Schaffer, Talia. "Letters to Biddy: About That Original Hen." *James Joyce Quarterly* 29.3 (1992): 623–642.
- Schork, R. J. "Bucolic Strands in Aeolus." *James Joyce Quarterly*. Vol. 27. Tulsa, 1989.
- . *Greek and Hellenic Culture in Joyce*. The Florida James Joyce Series. Gainesville: Florida UP, 1998.
- . "The First Generation of the JJA." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, Special JJA (Summer 2002) <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Shloss, Carol Loeb. "Joyce's Will." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 29.1 (Autumn 1995): 114–127.
- Senn, Fritz. "Genetic Fascination." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, no. Special Issue (Summer 2002) <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>.
- Shetty, Sandhya, and Elizabeth Jane Bellamy. "Review: Postcolonialism's Archive Fever." *Diacritics* 30.1 (Spring 2000): 25–48.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Edited by Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. W. W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Sheridan, Alan. *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth*. New York: Tavistock, 1980.
- "Shloss V. Estate of Joyce", n.d. <http://cyberlaw.stanford.edu/our-work/cases/shloss-v-estate-joyce>.
- Simcoe, Rebecca Creasy. "John Eglinton." *Modern Irish Writers: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Alexander G. Gonzalez. Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997.
- Smith, Eric D. "How a Great Daily Organ Is Turned Out: 'Aeolus,' Techne, and the Recording of *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 41.3 (Spring 2004): 455–468.

- Spacks, Patricia Ann Meyer. *Gossip*. University of Chicago Press ed. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1986.
- Spangler, Matthew. "Winds of Change: Bloomsday, Immigration, and 'Aeolus' in Street Theater." *James Joyce Quarterly* 45.1 (Fall 2007): 47–67.
- Spieker, Sven. *The Big Archive: Art from Bureaucracy*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008.
- Spoof, Robert E. *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . "Injuries, Remedies, moral Rights, and the Public Domain." *James Joyce Quarterly* 37 (2000): 333-51.
- . "Copyright Law and Archival Research." *Journal of Modern Literature* 24.2 (2000): 205–212.
- . "Copyright Protectionism and Its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's 'Ulysses' in America." *The Yale Law Journal* 108.3 (December 1, 1998): 633–667.
- Spurr, David. *Joyce and the Scene of Modernity*. The Florida James Joyce Series. Gainesville: Florida UP, 2002.
- Staley, Thomas F. "The Winds of Aeolus: In the Heart of the Joyce Metropolis." *Journal of Modern Literature* 22. 2 (Winter 1998): 199–203.
- Steedman, Carolyn. "The Space of Memory: In an Archive." *History of the Human Sciences* 11.4 (November 1, 1998): 65–83.
- Steele, Colin ed. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.
- Stein, Gertrude. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. 1st ed. New York: The Literary Guild, 1933.

- Taylor, Hugh A. *Imagining Archives: Essays and Reflections by Hugh A. Taylor*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists: 2003.
- Theall, Donald F. *James Joyce's Techno-Poetics*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1997.
- . "Beyond the Orality/Literacy Dichotomy: James Joyce and the Prehistory of Cyberspace." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies* (2010).
- Tonkin, Boyd. "Boyd Tonkin: James Joyce has Escaped From the Copyright Jail. Too Many Others Still Rot There." *The Independent*. 28 Apr 2012.  
<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/features/boyd-tonkin-james-joyce-has-escaped-from-the-copyright-jail-too-many-others-still-rot-there-7682255.html?printService=print> 5/4/2012.
- Tracy, Robert. "Mr. Joker and Dr. Hyde: Joyce's Politic Polyglot Polygraphs." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 1.3 (1990): 151–169.
- Utell, Janine M. "The Archivist, The Archaeologist, and the Amateur: Reading Joyce at the Rosenbach." *Journal of Modern Literature* 31.2 (Winter 2008): 53–65.
- Van Mierlo, Wim. "Reading Joyce in and Out of the Archive." *Joyce Studies Annual* 13.1 (2002): 32–63.
- Wachtel, Albert. *The Cracked Lookingglass: James Joyce and the Nightmare of History*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna UP, 1992.
- Warren, Samuel D and Louis D. Brandeis. "The Right to Privacy." *Harvard Law Review* 4.5 (1890): 193-220.
- Watson, George J. *Irish Identity and the Literary Revival: Synge, Yeats, Joyce and O'Casey*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- White, Edmund. *The Burning Library: Essays*. 1st American ed. New York: Knopf, 1994.

- White, Terence de Vere. "Richard Irvine Best and His Irish Literary Contemporaries." *Irish University Review* 7 (1977): 168–183.
- Wilson, Adrian. "Foucault on the 'Question of the Author': A Critical Exegesis." *The Modern Language Review* 99.2 (April 2004): 339–363.
- Wollaeger, Mark A., Victor Luftig, and Robert E. Spoo. *Joyce and the Subject of History*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1996.
- Wolfshohl, Clarence. "'The Text Is Oozing Out': William H. Gass And Transliteracy." *Studies in Short Fiction* 26.4 (Fall 1989): 497–503.
- Woodmansee, Martha and Peter Jaszi, Eds. *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. Post-contemporary Interventions. Durham: Duke UP, 1994.
- Yen, Alfred C. *Copyright Law: Essential Cases and Materials*. Gale Cengage, 2008.

VITA

Graduate College  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jessica Michelle Lucero

Home Address:

32 West 200 South #141  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Education:

Ph. D., English, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Primary Area: Twentieth-Century British Modernism Secondary Area: Theories of Autobiography and the Archive	Dec 2012
Certificate, James Joyce Summer School, University College Dublin	July 2010
M.A., English, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Primary Area: Twentieth-Century British Literature	May 2005
B.A., English, Mississippi State University Minors in Creative Writing and German	May 2001

Awards:

UNLV Graduate Student Commencement Speaker, 2012  
UNLV Graduate & Professional Student Association Merit Award, 2012  
UNLV Graduate & Professional Student Association Research Forum Winner,  
1<sup>st</sup> place, 2011.  
The Marjorie Barrick Fellowship, 2010-2011  
English Department Nominee for the UNLV President's Fellowship, 2010-2011  
UNLV GPSA Conference Grant Award, July 2010  
International Programs Scholarship, Summer 2010  
UNLV Graduate College Summer Scholarship, 2009  
UNLV GPSA Conference Grant Award, July 2009  
UNLV Graduate College Bookstore Scholarship, 2008-2009  
UNLV Graduate & Professional Student Association (GPSA) Merit Award, 2008-  
2009  
UNLV Access Scholarship, 2008-2009, 2011  
UNLV GPSA Conference Grant Award, July 2008

Publications:

Invited:

“Joycestock’: Report on the Dublin James Joyce Summer School, 4-10 July, 2010.” *Dublin James Joyce Journal*. Vol 3 (2010): pp. 175-79.

“Finding Faulkner: Man and Legend”: Review of *William Faulkner’s Legacy “What Shadow, What Stain, What Mark”* by Margaret Donovan Bauer, *Faulkner the Storyteller* by Blair Labatt and *Faulkner and his Contemporaries* edited by Joseph R. Urgo and Ann J. Abadie. In *The Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 30 No. 4 (Summer 2007): pp. 162-166.

Conference Presentations:

“Archiving the ‘Gossiple’ of Gossip in *Finnegans Wake*  
XXIII International James Joyce Symposium Dublin, Ireland 2012

“James Joyce’s *Ulysses*: ‘A Transliterate Work of Art’”  
UNLV Graduate & Professional Student Research Forum Las Vegas, NV 2011

UNLV Foundation Luncheon Las Vegas, NV 2011  
Invited speaker

Undergraduate Panel on Graduate Education Las Vegas, NV 2011  
Invited panelist

“Modernism in the Net: Collaboration”  
12<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association Conference Victoria, B.C. 2010

“James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and Transliteracy”  
XXII International James Joyce Symposium Prague, Czech Republic 2010

“Digital Archives, It’s What’s for Dinner”  
11<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association Conference Montreal, Canada 2009

“‘The End of the Line’: Stephen James Joyce versus Scholarship”  
North American James Joyce Conference Buffalo, NY 2009

“‘Like a sigh of O!’: *Agape* in Shakespeare and Joyce”  
XXI<sup>st</sup> International James Joyce Symposium Tours, France 2008

“Anías Nin and Erotic Modernism”  
9<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association Long Beach, CA 2007

“Gertrude Stein’s *Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*: Popularizing Stein and Sensationalizing her Textual Archivization of Modernism”  
8<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association Tulsa, OK 2006

“*The Waste Land* and Figures of the Self”  
7<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association Chicago, IL 2005

“Constructions of Biography in Wolf’s *Flush*”  
6<sup>th</sup> Annual Modernist Studies Association

Vancouver, B.C. 2004

Teaching Experience:

*Graduate Assistant Instructor*

2003-present

Department of English, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
English 101 Composition I  
English 102 Composition I  
English 231 World Literature I  
English 232 World Literature II

Honors College, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Honors 100 Honors Rhetoric  
Honors 110 Perspectives in the Western Experience I  
Honors 115 Perspectives in the Western Experience II

Professional Service:

Assistant Director, Black Mountain Institute at UNLV

2012-present

Coordinates event marketing, budgeting, outreach and administrative affairs for  
Black Mountain Institute (BMI)  
Managing editor of *Witness* magazine, a BMI publication

Interim Assistant Director, Black Mountain Institute at UNLV

2010-2012

Coordinates event marketing, budgeting, outreach and administrative affairs for  
Black Mountain Institute (BMI)  
Managing editor of *Witness* magazine, a BMI publication

Assistant to the Director of General Education

2006-2007

2007 General Education Retreat  
Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Local Service:

*President* (Elected for 2 terms)

2008-2010

Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA)

Board of Regents GPSA Representative

GPSA Ad hoc Awards Committee

GPSA Ad hoc Government Relations Committee

NSHE Tuition and Fees Committee

*Secretary* (Elected)

2006-2008

Graduate and Professional Student Association

Chair of Activities Committee  
Chair of Publications Committee

Campus-wide Committees (Appointed) 2008-2010  
VP of Research & Graduate Dean Search Committee  
Faculty & Graduate Student Issues Committee  
NWCCU Accreditation Steering Committee  
Bookstore Committee  
Faculty Senate Campus Affairs Committee  
Commencement Committee  
Graduate Council Executive Committee  
Intercollegiate Athletic Committee  
President's Advisory Council  
Student Technology Advisory Board  
Ad-hoc Teaching and Learning Center Advisory Council  
Parking Advisory Committee  
Faculty Senate Governance Committee

Las Vegas and Nevada Community Committees (Appointed) 2008-2010  
Midtown UNLV Council  
Multimodal Transportation Council  
Nevada Student Alliance

Professional/Scholarly Associations:

Modernist Studies Association, 2004-present  
Modern Language Association, 2005-present  
Phi Kappa Phi, UNLV Chapter, 2009-present  
Golden Key, UNLV Chapter, 2009-present  
American Association of University Professors, 2011-present