



Reading "Finnegans Wake" Genetically

Author(s): Sam Slote

Source: *Text*, Vol. 13 (2000), pp. 203-220

Published by: [Indiana University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30227767>

Accessed: 24-11-2015 00:53 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Text*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Reading
Finnegans Wake
Genetically

SAM SLOTE

THE IMMEDIATE CHALLENGE IN READING *Finnegans Wake* is still perhaps the most enduring: how to wrest some semblance of sense out of the welter of its multilinguistically polyvalent word-plays. The usual response to this challenge is to translate the *Wake* into something a bit more normal by mapping out the referential vectors suggested in its Babelian puns. Much impressive research has been done on this front: many reference works have been compiled that treat all sorts of allusions, be they literary, musical, linguistic, or geographic, and so on. But how important is the accumulation of such information to the *Wake*? One might agree with James S. Atherton that “until all the quotations, allusions and parodies in *Finnegans Wake* have been elucidated the complete meaning of the whole work must escape us.”¹ The problem, then, would be how to delimit the myriad suggestions posited in the *Wake* in order to articulate precisely the recondite references and meanings.² Genetically informed interpretation is one means of reining in the mass of free associations that so-often bedevils readers

¹ *The Books at the Wake* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1959), 20.

² Clive Hart has recently characterized those early, heady days of *Wake* criticism: “we were all working not only in a state of anxiety as to how best approach the book, but also with assumptions deriving in large part from our experience of *Ulysses*. . . . The procedure was quasi-scientific: looking at the general picture before we imagined a possible model of how best to grasp its nature and then began to examine the detail

of the *Wake*. As early as 1963, Jack Dalton pleaded that critics turn to the drafts as a means of verifying the presence of arcane languages in the *Wake*.³ In the introduction to his *Annotations to "Finnegans Wake,"* Roland McHugh endorses this view: "All readings that can be confirmed by reference to the manuscripts are acceptable."⁴

Is there more to the archive of Joyce's notes and drafts than such a Manichæan economy of verification and falsification? Are notes and drafts merely potential jurors for arbitrating annotation? Something to help "Wipe your glosses with what you know"?⁵ The positivistic stance towards genetic criticism essentially maintains the proposition that *Finnegans Wake* is a denotational work, that the words, distorted as they may be, mean something. These referents can then be adequately decoded by a properly astute critic armed with the manuscripts and a very large reference library. As productive as such an approach may be, it reduces *Finnegans Wake* to the world's most elaborate Pig Latin. Denotative readings reduce *Finnegans Wake* to the level of information.

Rather than strive to decode what may turn out to be a non-existent meaning, the hermeneutic task with *Finnegans Wake* might be to describe the ways in which the language is encoded. This is where a genetic approach can be useful: rather than act as a hermeneutic arbitrator and fix reference in a positivistic manner (i.e., "this means that"), a genetic approach can illustrate the ways in which reference and denotation are corrupted beyond repair in Joyce's "ersebest idiom" (FW: 253.1). The encryption is what is important, not what may or may not lie encrypted. A genetic corollary to this proposition is: *in modifying a passage, Joyce reveals something about its sense*. To add a bit of rigor to this seemingly useless and trivial statement, one needs to define "sense" and "modification."

Ezra Pound's tripartite division of poetic sense—phanopoeia, melopoeia, and logopoeia—can be useful for this. Pound formulated these

to see if it could be understood in ways coherent with the theory" ("Fritz in the Early Awning," *A Collideorscape of Joyce*, ed. Ruth Frehner and Ursula Zeller, Dublin: Lilliput, 1998. 4–10.5).

³ Jack P. Dalton. "Re 'Kiswahili words in *Finnegans Wake*' by Philipp Wolff." *A Wake Newsletter*, old series, 12 (1963), 6–10. See also Roland McHugh, *The "Finnegans Wake" Experience* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981), 71–72; and Laurent Milesi. "L'idiome babélien de *Finnegans Wake*," *Genèse de Babel*, ed. Claude Jacquet (Paris: CNRS, 1985), 155–213, esp. 171.

⁴ Revised edition (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1991), vii. See also R. J. Schork "By Jingo: Genetic Criticism of *Finnegans Wake*," *Joyce Studies Annual* 5 (1994): 104–27; and Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon, *Understanding "Finnegans Wake"* (New York: Garland, 1982), xiii–xiv.

⁵ James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (New York: Viking, 1939 and 1958), 304.F3. Hereafter abbreviated as FW.

categories as a means of discussing poetry and poetic effects without reference to denotation and semantic value. Phanopoeia is imagistic and tends towards precision in the visual evocation of an object upon the imagination (pictographic languages are thus inherently phanopoeic). Melopoeia concerns the sound or musicality of a word or phrase and thus detracts from eidetic precision in favor of subliminal sound effects.⁶

While phanopoeia and melopoeia respectively activate the visual and auditory faculties, logopoeia, in its most basic form, plays upon the conceptual or intellectual faculties. "Logopoeia, 'the dance of the intellect among words,' that is to say, it employs words not only for their direct meaning, but it takes into account in a special way of habits of usage, of the context we *expect* to find with the word, its usual concomitants, of its known acceptances, and of ironical play."⁷ Logopoeia is thus not purely denotative, but rather it is connotative.⁸ Pound states that logopoeia does not translate some previous writing, rather it evokes some manner of that writing (Pound 1935, 25).

So, in modifying a passage in a draft, Joyce alters either the phanopoeia, melopoeia, or logopoeia, or some combination of these three. For Joyce, modification almost invariably means addition or substitution. As a writer, he is exceedingly parsimonious and practically never deliberately excises text inherited from previous drafts.

There are three general types of modification he produces: 1) enhancing a phanopoeic, melopoeic, or logopoeic aspect of the text already present; 2) creating an entirely new effect; or 3) distorting an existing effect. The earliest portions of the *Wake* to be written were composed in something that approximates conventional English. The *Wakean* punplays were then added in subsequent drafts. As Joyce

⁶ I have synthesized Pound's definitions of these terms from his *ABC of Reading* (New York: New Directions, 1934), 63, and "How to Read" (*Literary Essays*, ed. T. S. Eliot [New York: New Directions, 1935], 15–40, esp. 25–31). See also "How to Write," *Machine Art and Other Writings*, ed. Maria Luisa Arduzone (Durham: Duke UP, 1996), 87–109, esp. 91–94.

⁷ Pound 1935, 25; see also 33. See also Pound 1934, 63.

⁸ "While his earliest theories of poetic language focused on its musical qualities (his study of Provençal poetry) and on its visual qualities (his study of Chinese poetry), logopoeia liberated him from the constricting notion that poetic language can operate only through auditory or visual representation. Reading Laforgue allowed Pound to recognize and later produce poetry constructed almost exclusively from other literary and nonliterary texts; it freed him from the fear that language which refers as much to other language as to sound or image must be necessarily arbitrary or unoriginal. His work on Laforgue and logopoeia greatly expanded the subject matter, diction, and tone he deemed admissible to poetry, and in important ways made the Cantos possible" (Jane Hoogstraal, "'Akin to Nothing but Language': Pound, Laforgue, and Logopoeia," *ELH* 55.1 [Spring 1988], 259–85, esp. 259).

grew more proficient in his gibberish, he began to write directly in his Bellsybabble.⁹ Of course, further obfuscations were introduced even in passages initially written in an obscure style.

So far, my categories of modifications omit transmission error. There are many demonstrable instances where a transmissional departure is not sanctioned by Joyce. Sometimes Joyce will enhance this inadvertent departure for some phanopoeic, melopoeic, or logopoeic effect, but this is usually not the norm. This raises questions about editing *Finnegans Wake*, and of producing, perhaps, a corrected edition. A prospective editor needs some sensitivity to logopoeia, phanopoeia, and melopoeia as well as a cogent understanding of the manuscript status. I will discuss this in more detail shortly.

Brief examples of the types of modification I have proposed follow. As an example of a phanopoeic modification, in the second draft of I.5, Joyce added the unit: “the fretful eff (used as a revise mark) stalks all over the page, broods amid the verbiage, gaunt, stands in the window margin, paces jerkily to & fro, flinging phrases here, there, or returns with some half-suggestion, dragging its shoestring.”¹⁰ The “fretful eff” describes the “F” mark which Joyce frequently, but not exclusively, used in his manuscripts as an insertion pointer. Joyce is here describing his own addition-mark. In subsequent drafts, Joyce enhanced the description of the “fretful eff” until, in the revisions of the *Criterion* pages undertaken prior to publication in *transition* 5, Joyce actually added two inverted Fs to this passage (JJA 46: 426). So, a passage that started by describing the morphology of a “fretful eff” now includes a pair of fretful effs, thereby enhancing the image.¹¹

Melopoeia is a crucial component of *Wakean* writing. In a letter to his daughter Lucia, Joyce wrote: “Lord knows what my prose means. In a word, it is pleasing to the ear.”¹² Joyce would often choose words for purely aural considerations. For example, the fair copy of a passage in II.1 reads: “The yennng frilles-in-pleyurs” (JJA 51: 17; FDV: 131; FW: 224.22). This line already alludes to Proust’s *A l’ombre des jeunes filles*

⁹ See David Hayman, *A First-Draft Version of “Finnegans Wake”* (Austin: U of Texas P, 1963), 8–12. Hereafter abbreviated as FDV.

¹⁰ Michael Groden, general editor, *The James Joyce Archive*, eds. Hans Walter Gabler, David Hayman, A. Walton Litz, and Danis Rose (New York: Garland, 1978). Volume 46, 310. Hereafter abbreviated as JJA. In transcriptions of drafts, deletions are indicated with strike-outs and additions are placed within bold-faced pointed brackets.

¹¹ See FW: 120.33–121.13; and see my essay, “Imposture Book Through the Ages,” *Genitricksling Joyce*, ed. Sam Slote and Wim Van Mierlo (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), 97–114.

¹² Stuart Gilbert ed., *Letters of James Joyce* (New York: Viking, 1957), 341. For similar comments by Joyce on the phonic quality of *Finnegans Wake*, see Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, revised edition (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982), 702–3.

en fleurs. On the subsequent draft, the first typescript, Joyce replaced the strident-sounding “yennng” with a more mellifluous collocation: “The ~~yennng~~ <youngly delightsome> frilles-in-pleyurs” (JJA 51: 32). Joyce thus intensifies the alliteration of the “l” sound, an alliteration present in the earlier draft but occluded under the weight of “yennng.” The allusion to Proust is still present but is now enhanced through alliteration. Indeed, Joyce’s pun “frilles”—by condensing the French words *filles* and *fleurs*—misses the slight alliteration of Proust’s title, and his addition restores it.

In *Finnegans Wake*, melopoeic modalities are often at odds with the phanopoeic. Many puns are produced through discrepancies between how the word is written and how it is pronounced. Joyce plays with the “sound sense sympol” (FW: 612.29); indeed, on the page, the word “sympol” resembles “symbol,” but spoken it is “simple.”¹³ As Joyce wrote in I.3, “Television kills telephony” (FW: 52.18). Usually, phonotextual puns are created when the word was initially drafted, but on occasion Joyce would distort an existing word to generate such an effect. For example, on the first set of galleys for I.3, Joyce changed the word “holidays”: “zimmer ~~holidays~~ <holedigs>” (JJA 49: 93; FW: 69.32–33).¹⁴

Finally, as an example of logopoeia, I take the introduction to “Haveth Childers Everywhere” from III.3. As the draft history here is complex, I will focus on a very small swath of text. In notebook VI.B. 1 there is an early proto-draft for the opening of the “Haveth Childers Everywhere” passage: “Your H is not a / warlike man / I am brought up / under an old act / of EDW III” (VI.B. 1: 114).¹⁵ The earliest actual draft of “Haveth Childers Everywhere”—November–December 1924—does not incorporate this text: “Sir, to you? I am known throughout the world as a cleanliving man . . .” (FDV: 245; JJA 57: 55). The redrafted version of this passage does include a modified version of the VI.B. 1 entry: “—Sir, to you! I am brought under an old act of Edward the First, but I am known throughout the world wherever good English is spoken as a cleanliving man” (FDV: 245; JJA 57: 76–77). To go upstream through the archive is also, apparently, to go downstream through the Edwardian lineage, from Edward the Third to Edward the First.

¹³ See Peter Myers, *The Sound of “Finnegans Wake”* (London: Macmillan, 1992), 20–44; and Garrett Stewart, *Reading Voices: Literature and the Phonotext* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1990), 232–58.

¹⁴ This would also be an example of a trans-linguistic pun since “dag” is Dutch for “day,” so the distortion “rearrives” at its original sense.

¹⁵ I am grateful to David Hayman for providing a preliminary transcription of this notebook.

In the third draft, the Edwardian reference is excised: “Sir to you. I am brought up under an ~~old~~ <camel> act of ~~Edward the First~~ <Sitric Silkenbeard and of his dynasty now out of print> but I am known throughout the world wherever good English is spoken” (JJA 58: 95). Sitric Silkenbeard led the Danes to an ignominious defeat at the battle of Clontarf in 1014. But the passage has not just been invaded by a Dane, it has also been invaded by the Danish language: gammel is Danish for “old.” The word “camel” is thus a logopoeic enhancement of this freshly installed Danish occupation.

So far, Joyce has retained the phrase “wherever good English is spoken”; this made sense in conjunction with the English Edward but is at odds with the Danish Sitric. On the second typescript, Joyce replaced “English” with “Allenglisch” (JJA 58: 267). And on a later typescript, he expanded this to “Allenglisches Angleslachsen” (JJA 58: 394), that is, Anglo-Saxon, the language preparatory to English. English is named Germanically—a germane effect for a Danish invader such as Sitric. So the logopoeic effect of suggesting a Danish word is here enhanced by this Saxonate terminology. This example is also melopoeic since the heavy guttural sounds of “Allenglisches Angleslachsen” suggest an Anglo-Saxon phrase.

Having elaborated my criteria, I would now like to turn to the introduction of II.1 (FW: 219.1-222.21) as a fuller illustration of these principles. This opening section is a *dramatis personæ* of various characters involved with a production at the “Feenichts Playhouse” (FW: 219.2). This was a late addition to II.1 and was one of the last components of this chapter to be drafted. The first draft is quite short: a brief elaboration of nine characters followed by a paragraph concerning the staff involved with the technical aspects of the theatrical production. The section ends with the line “An argument follows” (JJA 51: 8; FDV: 130; FW: 222.21), an appropriate segue into the children’s games of this chapter.

Glug	: the bad <black> boy of the storybook who has been sent into disgrace by	Mr Shemus Pannem
The Floras	: a bunch of pretty maidens who form a the guard of honour of the beautiful bl	(S. Bride’s Girl Scouts School)
Izod	a beautiful blonde (approached in loveliness only by her <sister> reflection in a mirror), who having jilted Glugg is now fascinated by	Miss Herself
Chuff	, the fairhaired who wrestles with the bad black boy about caps or something till the shadows make a pattern of somebody or other after which they they are both <well> scrubbed by	
Ann	, their poor little old mother-in-lieu who is the wife of	

Hump , the cause of all the trouble at present
engaged in entertaining <in his
customhouse>

The Customers , a bunch of representatives who are
served by

Saunderson , a spoilcurate, butt of

Kate , cook-and-general.

with battlepictures worked up by Messrs Blood and Thunder, costumes designed by Madame Delamonde, dances arranged by Harley Quin and Coulmn Bin, songs, jokes and properties for the wake supplied by Mr Timothy Finnegan, the whole to be wound up with a wound up with [sic] a magnificent transformation scene showing the Wedding of Night and Morning and the Dawn of Peace waking the Weary of the World.

An argument follows. (JJA 51: 6–8; FDV: 129–30; FW: 219.1–222.21)

By the time Joyce wrote this passage, he had his cast of characters well established and so was able to produce such a list with minimal effort. This first draft is almost completely untainted by corrections and revisions and, except for the terminal paragraph (also bereft of revision), it is written in ink in a hand almost as neat as a fair copy (the final paragraph is written in pencil). Also atypical for first drafts at this late stage (1931–32), this draft is written for the most part in English. This looks like something written quickly in the knowledge that it would be revised extensively. At the first draft level, there is nothing remarkable about this passage, save for some motival references which help to graft this episode into the chapter and into the *Wake* as a whole.

This passage is quite literally the set-up for a dramatic situation. The list of characters, inherently a paratactic form, is made hypotactic through the consistent use of prepositions such as “by,” “of,” and “for.” This is not just a simple list of characters, but an indication of how they interact. The list is made to seem dynamic through the use of hypotaxis. This account of their interactions is compatible with the action of this chapter at this stage of its drafting. The passage suggests the taunting and victimization of Glugg by the pretty maidens who are led by Izod. The girls have rebuffed Glugg in favor of Chuff, but these games end when they are all called in by their mother. This action is expressed through a delineation of the characters’ roles and functions.

Four years before Joyce began writing II.1, he wrote a one page plan of Book II, with II.1 receiving the most emphasis (JJA 51: 3). On this page he had conceived of Book II as evolving out of the interactions of various combinations of sigla, the extended “Doodles family” (FW: 299.F4). The sigla had become by this time relatively discrete entities—a convenient shorthand for notes and drafts—which could be combined and manipulated to generate new narrational possibilities.¹⁶

¹⁶ Jean-Michel Rabaté notes that Joyce continued to experiment with the sigla, pro-

Chapter II.1 had begun life as a product of the interrelation of *Wakean* characters and now, with the introduction, this dynamic is explicitly reinserted back into the text with the cast of characters. Daniel Ferrer calls this phenomenon “contextual memory”: a text bears some trace of or reference to some element that had existed in a previous draft but which has since been excised.¹⁷ This would be a subset of logopoeia: an allusion to something within the text’s archive that is not directly present in the text itself.

Further notable about this first draft is the mention of “songs, jokes and properties for the *Wake* supplied by Mr Timothy Finnegan.” This obviously alludes to the title of Joyce’s work derived from the Irish-American ballad “Finnegan’s *Wake*.” At this time, Joyce kept the title secret to all except for Nora. In 1927 he set up a little contest to guess the title of his Work in Progress, but no one figured out the actual title until August 1938, by which time Joyce had dropped so many hints to his friends as to make their ascertaining the correct answer all but inevitable.¹⁸ This was not the first reference to the title to be worked into the text; the first to be entered was “Fillagain’s chrissormiss wake” (FW: 6.14–15), added in October–November 1926 to the text of I.1 (JJA 44: 51).¹⁹

The following draft stage, the Fair Copy, is missing, but the two successive drafts, both typescripts, survive. The changes Joyce had made on the Fair Copy are inferable from the first typescript. For example, Joyce added parenthetical names after every character’s name, thereby more closely approximating the style of a theater program—a logopoeic effect. Most of the names Joyce had given to the characters in the first draft are recognizable as *Wakean* personæ, such as Hump (HCE), Ann (Anna Livia Plurabelle), Izod, Saunderson, and Kate. However, Glugg and Chuff are not immediately identifiable on the basis of their names. To be sure, they must be Shem and Shaun, but which is which? So, on the Fair Copy, expanding on the marginal note in the first draft, Joyce assigned “Mr Seumas Quillad”—i.e., Shem the Penman—to Glugg and “Mr Sean O’Mailey”—i.e., Shaun the Postman—to Chuff (JJA 51: 9). Shem and Shaun’s names appear

ducing all sorts of iconic variations, even after they had become relatively systemized. *Joyce Upon the Void* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991), 85–88.

¹⁷ “Clementis’ Cap,” trans. Marlina G. Corcoran, *Drafts, Yale French Studies* 89, ed. Michel Contat, Denis Hollier, and Jacques Neefs (1996), 223–36, esp. 231–36.

¹⁸ See Ellmann, 543, 597, and 708.

¹⁹ In the paper “Mapping Echoland,” delivered at the conference “Genetic Networks” (University of Antwerp, 10–11 December, 1998), Finn Fordham listed the allusions to the title in chronological order of their draft insertion. Although he missed this example, he lists five instances that had entered the text before this passage was written in 1931/32.

as actors, whereas the other figures' names appear as the characters they play.

On this draft Glug is not just "sent into disgrace"; instead, he is "divorced into the disgrace court." The scenario of Glugg's shame is now more specific and humorous than it had been in the first draft.

The name of the actor assigned to Hump is "Mr Makeall Gonne." This name, suggesting universal disappearance, is appropriate to the character HCE, who is, as we are told here, "the cause of all the confusion." This name thus neatly encapsulates what David Hayman calls the "male plot" of *Finnegans Wake*, the crime and disappearance of HCE.²⁰

However, not everything has gone: recognizable within the name "Makeall Gonne" is Michael Gunn, the manager of the Gaiety Theatre in Dublin in the late nineteenth century. Gunn is mentioned frequently in *Finnegans Wake*, usually in consociation with HCE, and occasionally with Maud Gonne.²¹ His citation here is appropriate because of his theatrical background. His conflation with HCE throughout the book suggests the difficulties attendant upon the male plot: HCE may be *all gone*, but his disappearance is variously re-enacted by different characters under different names. The fact that Michael Gunn's name, too, is mixed with others suggests the perpetual difficulty of reference: Hump is not Michael Gunn, and within the name they are both gone: "Pastimes are past times. Now let bygones be bei Gunne's" (FW: 263.17–18).

So, with the addition of this name, Joyce has installed a motival link to a broader scene of *Wakean* action (or inaction). This broadening of reference is also evinced by the addition of the phrase "a recent impeachment <due to egg everlasting>." This egg impeachment enhances the association between HCE/Hump and Humpty Dumpty—Lewis Carroll's progenitor of "portmanteau priamed full potatowards" (FW: 240.36–241.1)—an association made elsewhere in the text.

This broadening of reference is also present in the elaborations given to the other characters. Ann is played by Miss Corrie Correndo, a name that suggests the Spanish word *corriente*, running—an appropriate name for a river such as ALP. Joyce fills in his description of the Floras by adding a reference to the fact that they number 28; they are now "a <month's> bunch of pretty maidens." He also reinforced his account of Issy's bifurcation; her rival is not just her reflection, it is her "sister reflection." Note that Joyce omitted the marginal description of Izod from the first draft as "Miss Herself," a name which would imply both an auto-equivalent identity (she is Miss, that is Mlle., Herself) as well as inequality (she *misses*, that is, loses, herself).

²⁰ David Hayman, *The "Wake" in Transit* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990), 109–10.

²¹ Adaline Glasheen, *Third Census of "Finnegans Wake"* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1977), 113.

There are numerous interesting modifications wrought at this level. While the passage is still mostly written in standard expository English, Joyce is slowly introducing some rudimentary *Wakean* wordplay. The phrase “Blood and Thunder” becomes “Thud and Blunder.” Also, the phrase “until their shadows make” has now become the more evocative “until they shadowshow.” Joyce also adds the word “geminally”—a condensation of generally and Gemini—an appropriate portmanteau for the description of the fraternal couple Shem and Shaun.

The concluding paragraph has now more clearly taken on the tone of a hyperbolic theatrical advertisement or promotion. The first draft was too brief and prosaically expository to sustain such a tone. But here the rampant capitalization as well the subtle but telling substitution of “Dresses tastefully designed” for “Costumes specially designed” all suggest that we are decamped in the province of hype. This hyperbole tends to ironically deflate the semblance of action fostered through the hypotactic interactions of the character list, especially since we are promised, for the grand finale, “a Magnificent Transformation Scene showing the Radium Wedding of Night and Morning <, arranged as the daughter of Tyre and the son of Ausonius,> and the Dawn of Peace, Pure, Perfect and Perpetual Waking the Weary of the World.”

This typescript is also marked by error. The typist was apparently quite clumsy and, even in the absence of a Fair Copy, there are numerous small, demonstrable mistakes. The typist failed to consistently capitalize the characters’ names and mistyped Kate’s role: “Varianoekeland” instead of “(Varian)cook and.” However, in the absence of the preceding draft, there are a few departures that are impossible to unequivocally gauge. Joyce’s “approached” from the first draft now appears as “appreached,” certainly a plausible pun but also a possible typo. In any case, the typist for the next typescript, which also contains numerous departures, missed this word (JJA 51: 11) and so it remained as “approached” through the final text.

GLUG; (Mr Seumas <Mac>Quillad), the <bold> bad black boy of the storybooks, who has been ~~sent~~ <disgraced> into <the> disgrace <court> by

THE FLORAS; (Girl Scouts from ~~S. bride's~~ <St Bride's> Finishing Establishment), a <month's> bunch of pretty maidens who <while they pick at her> form the guard for

IZOD <IZOD>; (Miss Butys Pott), a bewitching blonde <who dimples delightfully and is> appreached in loveliness only by her grateful <sister> reflection in a mirror, <the pearl of the opal,> who, having jilted ~~g~~<G>lug, is being fatally fascinated by

Chuff; (Mr Sean O'Mailey), the <fine> fairhaired fellow <of the fairy tales> who wrestles with the <bad> bold black boy<,> Glug<,> ~~all the time~~ <geminally> about caps or something until their<y> shadowshow

<shadowshow> a pattern of somebody ~~or other~~ <elseorother>, after which they are both brought home <with their polls apart> to be ~~well scrubbed~~ <soundly> <soaped, sponged and scrubbed again> by ANN; (Miss Corrie Correndo), their poor old mother-in-lieu, who is woman of the house to

HUMP; (Mr Makeall Gonne), the cause of all the confusion, who, having partially recovered from a recent impeachment, <due to egg everlasting,> is engaged in entertaining in his customhouse

THE CUSTOMERS; (Components of the Afterhours Courses at S. Laurence O'Toole's Academy for Grownup [sic] Gentlemen) a <a dronghahoarse> bundle of representatives <civics, each of whom in a jactitative,> who are sloppily served by

Saunderson; (Mr Knut Oelsvinger), a spoilcurate and butt of

KATE; (Miss Rachel Lea Varianøke<) cook->and-general.

With battle pictures and the Pageant of History worked up by Messrs ~~Blood~~ <Thud> and ~~Thunder~~ <Blunder>. ~~Costumes specially~~ <Dresses tastefully> designed by Madame <Berthe> Delamode<,> Dances arranged by Harley Quinn and Coldlimbeina. Jest, jokes, songs and music for the *Wake* < > lent from the properties of Mr Timothy Finnegan R.I.P. The whole whirligig to be wound up by a Magnificent Transformation Scene showing the Radium Wedding of Night and Morning <, arranged as the daughter of Tyre and the son of Ausonius,> and the Dawn of Peace, Pure, Perfect and Perpetual Waking the Weary of the World.

An argument follows. (JJA 51: 9-10; slightly simplified)

A more interesting variant is the epithet ascribed to Glug. Twice in the first draft he is called "the bad black boy." On the typescript he is called, first, "the bad black boy," but at the second instance the typist entered "the bold black boy." In the absence of the Fair Copy, it is impossible to determine if Joyce had changed this or if this was a typist's error. However this discrepancy was caused, Joyce works with it by adding in overlay "bold" to the first epithet and "bad" to the second. However, after Joyce's corrections, the epithets are still unmatched: the first now reads "the bold bad black boy" and the second "the bad bold black boy." This may be deliberate or the result of carelessness on Joyce's part. In either case, the typist for the second typescript still missed Joyce's correction and rendered both epithets as "the bold black boy," neither of which were corrected by Joyce at that level (JJA 51: 11). However, Joyce did correct them at a later stage. In *transition* 22, where the chapter was first published in serial form in February 1933, both epithets are identical: "the bold bad black boy."²² In its first draft form, "bad black boy" suggests William Blake's poem "The Little Black

²² James Joyce, "Continuation of a Work in Progress," *transition* 22 (February 1933): 49-76, esp. 50; hereafter abbreviated as *t*.

Boy” from *Songs of Innocence*. This allusion is buttressed by a late modification made when Joyce prepared this chapter for the galleys.²³ Both epithets were changed to “bold bad bleak boy” (JJA 51: 284). The name “Blake” is thus suggested through the vocalic difference between “bleak” and “black” (bleak, Blake, black).

The second typescript contains only four modifications by Joyce as well as one small proofreading correction. It is notable primarily for the number of mistakes it contains. Several of Joyce’s corrections on the preceding typescript were missed. Except for the “bold bad black boy,” almost all the other errors were missed entirely by Joyce in preparing subsequent drafts. Except for “approached,” all the errors at this level involve a failure to decipher Joyce’s overlaid additions on the first typescript. Usually these involve omitting Joyce’s additions, but in one case the typist actually adds a word. On the first typescript, Chuff is described as “the <fine> fairhaired fellow” (JJA 51: 9); the second typescript reads “the fine frank fairhaired fellow” (JJA 51: 11)—the word “frank” appears without prompting and without further comment or correction by Joyce. Although this word may have been gratuitously inserted, it enhances the melopoeic alliteration already present.

This raises the question of “correcting” these transmissional errors. Applying Hans Walter Gabler’s rule of invariant context, the pre-corrupted reading should be restored unless a passage containing a transmissional departure was subsequently modified by Joyce in a substantial way.²⁴ Here is an example of an error that should not be corrected, following from Gabler’s rule: on the first typescript, Joyce added the following qualification to the Customers: “representatives <civics, each of whom is a jacktitative>” (JJA 51: 9). The second typist entered “civics” but left out the rest of this addition, so, at the second typescript level, the phrase reads simply “representative civics.” On multiple subsequent drafts, Joyce modified this line through several discrete additions, so that it ultimately reads “representative locomotive civics, each inn quest of outings” (FW: 221.3–4).²⁵ Clearly, restor-

²³ The second round of corrections to the pages of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*.

²⁴ “Afterword,” James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (New York: Garland, 1984, 1986), 1858–1911, esp. 1895–1900. This is obviously one of the more contentious aspects of Gabler’s editorial procedure.

²⁵ When this passage appeared in *transitton*, it read “representative locomotive civics inn quest of outings” (t: 51). On an overlay to the first set of marked pages of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, Joyce added “each”: “representative locomotive civics inn <each> quest of outings” (JJA 51: 204; the comma after “civics” was added on the typed set of corrections to these pages, JJA 51: 288–89). This word recalls the earlier,

ing the phrase lost on the second typescript would be unacceptable since it would now no longer fit into the sentence.

Another example from the second typescript: the first typescript overlay “with their polls apart” was omitted from the following sentence: “they are both brought home <with their polls apart>.” Since the rest of this sentence was unchanged through the final text (FW: 220.17), one could make a case that the omitted phrase should be restored in some “corrected text.”

A more complex example: on the first typescript, Joyce added an interesting qualification to “the Radium Wedding of Night and Morning <arranged as the daughter of Tyre and the son of Ausonius> and the Dawn of Peace, Pure, Perfect and Perpetual, Waking the Weary of the World” (JJA 51: 10). This overlay was completely overlooked by the typist for the second typescript. This neglected addition subtly reinforces the pretensions of this universal “Pageant of History” by invoking a union between two great rival sea-ports in the Classical world, Tyre and Ausonia. With the exception of two minor melopoeic modifications—“Night” became “Neid” and “Morning” “Moorning”²⁶—this passage was unchanged through the final text (FW: 222.17–20).

Strictly speaking, Gabler’s rule of invariant context would prescribe restoring the missing phrase. But, the context is not invariant here. The missing phrase actually modifies the context in which it was supposed to have appeared. Without this phrase, the passage invokes historical grandeur in the most abstract of terms: “the Dawn of Peace, Pure, Perfect and Perpetual, Waking the Weary of the World.” Although the missing phrase builds upon the pretensions of this phrase, it does so by compromising the generality with historical specificity. Because this phrase changes the logopoeic effect of this passage, restoring it becomes questionable.

After the second typescript, Joyce left this passage alone until he prepared the chapter as a whole for publication in *transition* 22 (February 1933). After *transition* 22 was published in early 1934, Joyce marked up the *transition* pages to prepare chapter 1 of Book II for separate publication as *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*. Unfortunately, neither set of revisions—pre- or post-*transition*—survives. Collating the second typescript with the published texts of *transition* and *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*, one can see that Joyce had considerably expanded the introduction for *transition* but made very few revisions prior to the publication of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*.

lapsed unit “each of whom is a jacktitative.” The interpolated word “each” makes the pun on “inn quest” and “inquest” less readily apparent.

²⁶ These changes must have been made on the revised transition pages since they do not appear in *transition* (t: 51), but do appear in the set pages for *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies* (JJA 51: 206).

Fortunately, a great deal of extradraft material survives. These notes are contemporaneous with passages first found in *transition* and thus must have been used to prepare for the 1933 publication. The notes vary in length and quality: some are just individual words, others are discretely drafted entries. Generally, notes on any given page wind up inserted into roughly the same area of text, but there are numerous exceptions, and any random page contains apparently unrelated and diverse matter. A good number of these notes are flagged by sigla. This is an interesting and atypical procedure for Joyce at such a late stage. It also recalls the early genesis of this chapter when Joyce prepared his scheme for Book II using sigla (another example of Ferrer's "contextual memory"). Usually, in these extradraft notes, the siglum announces the appurtenance of the note to the text; for example the word "purdah," entered next to the Kate siglum (JJA 51: 147) was inserted into the text in the description of Kate in the introduction (*t*: 51; FW: 221.13). Curiously, many notes for passages outside the introductory cast of characters are likewise flagged by sigla. For example, why would the phrase "The swayful pathways of the dragonfly spider stay still in reedery"—which was inserted into a description of nightfall much later in the chapter (*t*: 66; FW: 244.27–28)—be tagged by the siglum for the Twelve (JJA 51: 148)? Not all the sigla-markers are accurate when compared with the final text. The entry "ask the attendantess for a leaflet" appears next to the HCE siglum (JJA 51: 146) but was inserted into the description of Izod in the cast of characters (*t*: 50; FW: 220.7). Usually though, the notes destined for the cast of characters are flagged by the appropriate sigla.

For publication in *transition*, Joyce made several types of modification to the introduction. He enhanced the *Wakean* feel of the passage's language by inserting more puns and further distorting the overly English feel of the early drafts. In terms of the cast, Joyce elaborated on the parenthetical actors' names. The parenthesis no longer includes merely a name but also some aside seemingly appropriate to that name. For example: "(Mr Seumas McQuillad, hear the riddles between the robot in his dress circular and the gagster in the rogues' gallery)" (*t*: 50).²⁷ Apart from this type of parenthetical addition, most characters' descriptions were not expanded substantially. The exceptions are the Customers, Saunderson, and Kate, each of whom received only a paltry account in the earlier drafts (their descriptions were also expanded further in subsequent drafts). Another exception is Hump: while his description by the second typescript was already generous, it has been expanded greatly here. In the drafts made after *transition*, Hump's

²⁷ This addition was derived from one of the extra-draft notes: "his riddles between the gagster in the rogues' gallery and the robot in the dress circular" (JJA 51: 145). This note is flagged by a "P"

is the only description to be further expanded substantially. Here he is identified as a “cap-a-pipe with watch and topper” (t: 50), which recalls, inevitably, the pipe-wielding cad in I.2 (FW: 35.1–36.34). HCE is again conflated with his accusers.

The concluding paragraph was also substantially augmented. Most importantly, Joyce added an introductory paragraph, rather than starting off immediately with the cast-list. This opening helps set the stage, in more ways than several, for this chapter, and, by extension, to Book II.

Every evening at lighting up o'clock sharp and until further notice in Feenichts Playhouse. (Bar and conveniences always open.) With redistribution of parts and players and daily dubbing of ghosters under the distinguished patronage of their Elsherships the Oldens from the four coroners of Findrias, Murias, Gorias and Falias. Messoirs the Coarb, Clive Sollis, Galorius Kettle, Pobiedo Lancey and Pierre Dusort, while the Caesar-in-Chief looks. On. Sennet. The mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies, featuring: . . . (t: 50)

Like the concluding paragraph of this section, the tone of this paragraph is akin to a theatrical promotion. Here is the earliest drafted instance of the title that this chapter was given: The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies. To anticipate this title, Joyce separately installed references to this title in two chapters in Book I very late, during the corrections to the galleys of Book I.²⁸ This is an odd title since in this chapter Mick, Nick, and the Maggies are called, respectively, Glugg, Chuff, and the Floras. However, such onomastic deviation is only appropriate for a “redistribution of parts and players.” In preparing this passage for publication as *The Mime*, Joyce added the word “nightly redistribution of parts and players” (JJA 51: 201). This addition balances the “daily dubbing of ghosters” already in the passage, but it also enhances several global references to the *Wake* as a whole. This qualification explicitly announces an interchangeability between the characters included in the list and characters mentioned elsewhere in the *Wake*. Indeed, this is not the first such list to appear: chapter I.6 is a list of twelve characters—all of which were flagged by sigla in the first draft (April 1926), although these sigla were removed in subsequent drafts. This introductory paragraph in II.1 thus announces a kind of repetition of the “action” thus far elaborated, but through a redistribution of parts and players. The action may be the same, but the names are different. The eternal recurrence of the same is here

²⁸ These are in I.3, “the mime mumming the mick and his nick miming their maggies” (FW: 048.10–11) and in I.5, “*The Mimic of Meg Neg and the Mackeys*” (FW: 106.10–11). The first was inserted on the third set of corrections to the Book I galleys (JJA 50: 68), and the second was added on the first set of galleys (JJA 49: 146–47).

phrased as continual performance. “The Vico road goes round and round to meet where terms begin” (FW: 452.21–22).

This idea of perpetual iteration had already been suggested by the concluding line of this section, the “Perpetual Waking of the Weary of the World.” This is reinforced by the new opening line, “Every evening at lighting up o’clock sharp and until further notice in Feenichts Playhouse.” Obviously the suggestion of a Phoenix is important here: every night a theatrical performance is born again, born out of the ashes and thunderous applause of the night before.²⁹ Furthermore, the pretense to chronological accuracy so important for a theater program is belied by the vagueness of “o’clock sharp.” This sentence establishes a nondescript performative recurrence.

The opening collocation “Every evening” implies a continual or imperfective action. The imperfectiveness of “Every evening” stands in contrast to the terminal, or perfective, “Night!” (FW: 216.5), at the end of I.8. Book I closed with the final action of nightfall and Book II opens with the account of a process that is ongoing through the nightly redistribution of parts and players. The slow build-up in the drafts to this phrase “nightly redistribution of parts” is another example of contextual memory as it recalls Joyce’s 1926 plan for Book II which begins with “a night!” (JJA 51: 3). ALP’s final night is now itself a nightly redistributed role. Indeed, since the earliest drafts of II.1, that chapter itself closes with its own variation of ALP’s terminal Night: “Mummm” (JJA 51: 140–41; FDV: 141; FW: 259.10). Even the ending is repeated, a *fin* again is pantomimed again. “Hohohoho, Mister Finn, you’re going to be Mister Finnagain! Comeday morm and, O, you’re vine! Sendday’s eve and, ah, you’re vinegar!” (FW: 6.9–11).

The introductory matter has thus been further revised to thematically link with motifs developed elsewhere in the *Wake* by expanding upon the logopoeic associations that stem from the style of a theatrical programme. Joyce expanded this historical synchronicity on the corrections to the corrected pages of *The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies*:

<Time: the pressant>
With <futurist> battle pictures and the Pageant of <Past> History worked
up by Messrs
Thud and blunder [sic] (JJA 51: 204).

Actually, adiachronicity is a more accurate term here than synchronicity. Joyce brings in present, future, and past into a temporally flattened perspective of present performance. By this point in the draft history,

²⁹ The phrase “Feenichts Playhouse” occurs on one of the extra-draft notes for this chapter (JJA 51: 147).

any inchoate action or dynamic that had been suggested in the first draft has been buried under the pressure of the *pressant*.³⁰ The newly installed contextualizing matter has flattened out the “action” into the semblance of a show. As Joyce wrote, in a line inserted at this stage immediately before the passage I have just quoted: “the show must go on” (JJA 51: 204; FW: 221.16). Rather than action, this is a play of stasis.

It was also at this draft level of the corrected *Mime* page that Joyce inserted a line announcing the specific context of the “*pressant*” performance in this chapter, children’s games: “Newly billed for each wickeday perfumance. Somndoze massinees. By arraignment, childream’s hours, expercatered” (JJA 51: 201; FW: 219.4–6). History is flattened out to a children’s game.³¹

On the corrected pages of *The Mime*, Joyce further expanded the introductory and concluding paragraphs of this section, enhancing both the theatrical and the historical references, thereby eliciting a conflation of the two. He made further similar additions on the galleys, but made only one change (and a few corrections) on the final draft stage, the page proofs. The expanded contextualizing matter transforms the cast of characters into a series of archetypes indistinguishable from performers and characters. In the profusion of information, the characters become even less distinct. Their clearest iteration remains limited, for the most part, to the first draft. By the final draft we have more words but less, even less, action; more qualification and less left to qualify. Through the draft evolution of this section, Joyce adds all sorts of references, but, typically, rather than serve as concrete denotational markers (i.e., “HCE is Michael Gunn”), they distort what little reference the passage had to begin with. The references are not important for what they are, for what they refer to, but rather, more simply, for the fact that they are there to perplex us in any number of ways.

In sum, a genetic reading need not be purely fixated on glossing the denotational aspects of Joyce’s language. Rather, by examining the text three-dimensionally through its archive, one can see just how unstable and labile reference is in *Finnegans Wake*. In terms of promoting accessibility to Joyce’s text without resorting to crass simplifications

³⁰ “Le temps de *Finnegans Wake* sera donc très précisément le ‘*pressant*’ (FW: 221.17), non pas un simple présent mais un présent qui se presse, toujours déjà creusé par la marque de ce qui n’est pas lui, le temps de l’espacement des traces dans le mouvement infini des uns aux autres”; Stephen Heath, “‘Ambiviolences’ 2,” *Tel Quel* 51 (Fall 1972), 64–76, esp. 66.

³¹ The contextualization of historical recurrence through children’s games had already been present in the fair copy of the second section (FW: 222.22–236.32)—the earliest extant draft of that passage (October–November 1930)—with the *Quinet* passage.

and generalizations, I think that a genetic edition—something like a hypertext variorum—would be far superior to a series of annotations. Such an edition should not promise to offer a “corrected text,” but rather record the various strata of textual accretion: the verso side of Gabler’s synoptic edition, not the recto. In seeing the evolution of the text, one can see how reference is always subordinated to melopoeic, phanopoeic, and logopoeic effects. *Finnegans Wake* is text. It is not information.