Late Joyce and His Legacies: Teaching
Finnegans Wake and Its Aftertale

Paul K. Saint-Amour
Pomona College

Describing *Finnegans Wake*, Martin Amis recalls the warning "tell a dream, lose a reader," then marvels at the fact that Joyce devoted an entire book to dream-telling, undeterred by the number of readers he might thereby lose.[1] Writing about teaching is a little like relating a dream: you hold your reader hostage to your account of a fleeting experience, one whose immediacy has long faded even for yourself. Your presumption of the reader's willingness to draw near to your vanished experience is the dreamer's presumption in retelling the dream. To write about teaching *Finnegans Wake*, then, should be doubly interdicted. It is like telling a dream within a dream: you risk compensating for the listener's double removal from the event by resorting to raw hyperbole, the mode of the hustler and mountebank. You would be better off selling twice-chewed gum.

But it would not be quite accurate to say Joyce "told" a dream in the *Wake* the same way we relay the fragments of our own dreams to some trapped listener who feigns interest. However much it succeeds in inflicting on its reader a dreamlike dislocation of the familiar, the *Wake* was composed with awful deliberateness and powers of attention; if it demands an "ideal insomnia" of its reader (*FW* 120.14), it seems also to have resulted more from its writer's wakefulness than from his passive rendezvous with his own dreamwork. The *Wake*, we might say, is the sand that precipitated out of Joyce's sleepless eyes; cast in the eyes of the reader, it brings more irritation than sleep. What is more, our readerly engagements with the *Wake*'s dreamlike attributes are at least partly repeatable and transferable in a way dreams themselves are not. We cannot decide to re-dream the dreams of others, or even our own dreams, but we can reopen the *Wake*. These traits of partial repeatability, shared attentiveness, and deliberateness within limits are also exhibited by the scene of teaching. This should give us hope: we might talk about teaching the *Wake* with an eye not only for singular and irrecuperable past encounters with it but for the futurity of its teaching and for what might be transmissible to that future. One encounter might communicate its particular insomnia to another.

123

The course I have been asked to write about here is an advanced undergraduate seminar I have now taught twice at Pomona College. The course meets once a week for three hours and is entitled "Late Joyce and his Legacies," a name I owe to Victor Luftig, whose senior seminar "Late Joyce and his Legacy" I took as an undergraduate at Yale University in 1991. In that seminar, we read most of *Finnegans Wake* along with Samuel Beckett's *Ohio Impromptu*, Flann O'Brien's *At Swim-Two-Birds*, and poems by Seamus Heaney and Eavan Boland. Luftig's course constructed an Irish literary legacy for the *Wake* while also introducing students to Joyce's book—a worthy and admirably difficult project for a semester. But in my own subsequent thinking about the *Wake* and the problem of its legacy, I found Luftig's course had led me to ask additional questions: might the *Wake*'s legacy be more multiple? What other national or supra-national legacies could one locate with respect to Joyce's book? What non-literary work had it inspired, soured, influenced, or made necessary? Might one read the *Wake*, the work of a self-styled "outlex" (*FW* 169.03), as interrogating the conventional concept of a legacy rather than encouraging its replication? And how might one connect lateness, in its dual senses of decease and untimeliness, to the concept of a legacy?

These questions about lateness and legacy were revived for me when I read George Steiner's kakangelical 1961 essay "The Retreat from the Word."[2] There Steiner laments "the fact that the image of the world is receding from the communicative grasp of the word" with the result that "the instrument available to the modern writer is threatened by restriction from without and decay from within" (25, 27). Mobilizing an extended military metaphor, Steiner goes on to cite Joyce's work as the first example of "a number of brilliant rearguard actions" fought against the invasion of the word's former turf by "such non-verbal languages as mathematics, symbolic logic, and formulas of chemical or electronic relation" (31, 24):

> No doubt the most exuberant counterattack any modern writer has launched against the diminution of language is that of James Joyce. After Shakespeare and Burton, literature has known no greater gourmand of words. As if aware of the fact that science had torn from language many of its former possessions and outer provinces, Joyce chose to annex a new kingdom below ground. *Ulysses* caught in its bright net the live tangle of subconscious life; *Finnegans Wake* mines the bastions of sleep. Joyce's work, more than any since Milton, recalls to the English ear the wide magnificence of its legacy. It marshals great battalions of words, calling back to the ranks words long asleep or rusted, and recruiting new ones by stress of imaginative need.
>
> Yet when we look back on the battle so decisively won, we can attribute to it little positive consequence, and scarcely any wider richen-

ing. There have been no genuine successors to Joyce in English; perhaps there can be none to a talent so exhaustive of its own potential. What counts more: the treasures which Joyce brought back to language from his wide-ranging forays remain piled glitteringly around his labors. They have not passed into currency. They have caused none of that general quickening of the spirit of speech which follows on Spenser and Marlowe. I do not know why. Perhaps the action was fought too late; or perhaps the privacies and parts of incoherence in *Finnegans Wake* have proved too obtrusive. As it stands, Joyce's performance is a monument rather than a living force. (31-32)

The passage crystallizes a familiar view of the *Wake*, in particular: that it is not the way forward but an engrossingly dead end; that it is a brilliant and even necessary failure, a beautiful corpse. Steiner has trouble accounting for what he sees as the *Wake*'s fascinating sterility. Perhaps Joyce's "rearguard action" was fought too late to win back any of the territory language had ceded to science, or it might simply have been too obscure to win subsequent practitioners to its methods. Either way, the book is, in Steiner's view, essentially without a legacy or legatees; having produced "little positive consequence" and "scarcely any wider richening," it is fundamentally barren. One might point out that Steiner, writing over forty years ago, turned in his verdict before certain key moments in the *Wake*'s critical reception and evaluation. He could not have predicted its celebration by post-structuralist critics, beginning in the late 1960s, nor the demilitarization of the relationship between literary language and science by New Historicism. Nor could he have foreseen the range of experimental imaginative writers, such as those collected in David Hayman and Elliott Anderson's 1978 compilation *In the Wake of the "Wake,"* who would constitute part of the book's creative legacy, along with the numerous composers who would find the book a source both of inspiration and of texts to set to music.[3] But even today, outside its devout but circumscribed academic readership, the *Wake* largely retains a reputation like the one Steiner gives it: as an unreadable and unrepeatable work of genius, as a beloved and precocious child that produced no issue of its own.

Most first-time readers of *Finnegans Wake*, I find, have been pulled into the force field of the book's complex reputation before they ever lay eyes on page 3. For them, the *Wake* already has the glamour or stigma of an extreme case. It is either a messiah-text (generous, *scriptible, aperta,* revolutionary, emancipatory) or a pariah-text (solipsistic, self-regarding, elitist, unreadable, alienating). As a result, my course has in its short life acquired a similarly polarized reputation: students seem to regard it as offering a model of reading as extreme sport and enroll prepared either to advocate this model or to contest

it energetically. In order to dispel this *agon*—or at least to defer it until it can be met more productively—I read my students Steiner's evaluation at the beginning of the course. I do this neither to affirm nor to refute it, but to give a name to the problem of reading a book whose reputation is so extreme that it seems to compel one to *decide on* the book, as well as on the course in which it is read, before one has really begun wrestling with the text. I suggest to them that we will need to avoid spending all semester making decisive pronouncements about what the *Wake* is or what it is worth and instead do our best to *read* the thing, letting genuflection or execration wait until our encounters with the text have at least partly taken the place of preconception.

One might think that the most effective way to "just read" Joyce's book would be to devote an entire semester to the *Wake* alone, or to lightly supplement a reading of the *Wake* with excerpts from tributary texts such as *The Book of the Dead*, the Bible and the Koran, works by Giambattista Vico and Giordano Bruno and Jonathan Swift and Lewis Carroll. Surely even a whole semester with the *Wake* as sole or primary text is barely enough to introduce students to the book's chief methods and preoccupations; surely we owe the *Wake* at least that amount of attentiveness and our students that degree of immersion. My course, however, proceeds from the observation that spending an entire semester on the *Wake* alone at this level can exhaust and overwhelm first-time readers, particularly during the final third of the course when, as one student put it, "the initial freak-value interest wears off, since so many of the chapters seem so similar." Instead, I begin with the hypothesis that a livelier and more enduring kind of attention can be paid to the *Wake* by looking frequently away from it toward other objects of scrutiny, and then returning to gaze on the *Wake* with a refreshed critical vision. Instead of accomplishing this by excerpting the *Wake*, though, I teach what amounts to a portmanteau course: two senior seminars—one on the *Wake* and the other on predominantly post-Joycean "collateral" works—collapsed into the space and time of a single semester (see the syllabus—p. 134). Such excess sounds as if it would only overwhelm students further, but so far I have found that, in the skewed pedagogical economy produced by Joyce's book, only too much is enough.

Of course, such an approach entails sacrifices. For example, asking students to read Christine Brooke-Rose's experimental novel *Amalgamemnon* and Hélène Cixous's essay "The Laugh of the Medusa" alongside "Anna Livia Plurabelle" reduces the raw number of hours available for discussing the Joyce text, at least if one takes the time to meet the collateral texts on their own terms and not in a merely ancillary relation to the *Wake*.[4] But having read both a theoretical

manifesto on *écriture féminine* and a fictional work whose portmanteau words ("mimagree," "diregnosis," "dehauntological"—16, 18, 128) are part of the spurned Cassandra's "utterly other discourses" (143), students are more richly equipped to consider both the *Wake*'s relation to a feminine writing and the ways in which later writers interested in the project of a counterpatriarchal literature have adopted, modified, and rejected Joyce's methods. Encountered in this way, the *Wake* unfolds simultaneously in its openness toward future writing and in its uses and limitations from the vantage of that future writing.

The list of collateral texts that I have paired with various *Wake* chapters is offered here not as a foolproof recipe nor, to be sure, as an exhaustive list of the primary and secondary texts that matter in respect to the *Wake*. As with any living syllabus, it remains a work in progress and changes substantially from year to year. What I have found most valuable is the simple underlying concept that the *Wake*'s idiosyncratic and conventional traits become dramatically visible when they are set off against, and also set in harmony with, other works of imaginative literature, including imaginative theory. The reverse is also true: that the *Wake* acts, reciprocally, as a foil to the collateral texts whose eccentricities the pairing foregrounds. So, for example, the found-object manipulation of Tom Phillips's *A Humument: A Treated Victorian Novel* points up the collage-work and radical intertextuality of the *Wake*'s "Shem the Penman" chapter.[5] At the same time, "Shem," with its obsessive self-representational and historicizing drives, brings subtle aspects of Phillips's book into greater relief, particularly the ways in which *A Humument* works all at once as autobiography, diary, and history of the twentieth century. Yet the two books achieve their status as portable infinities, as world-containers, in wildly different ways, and the discussion of these differences can lead us back to both with renewed curiosity.

David Ives's "The Universal Language" and Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, texts whose language descends undeniably from the *Wake*, depict the teaching of language as a scene of initiation—into erotic social relations in Ives's play and ultraviolent ones in Burgess's novel.[6] Paired with "Night Lessons," *A Clockwork Orange* prompts one to consider what sociopolitical, historical, ideological, and institutional ends are served by the twins' induction into the topographic mysteries of ALP's body and by the induction of the reader—that permanent neophyte—into the *Wake*'s language. Discussions of the erotics and violence of pedagogy have a way of rounding on the class itself in ways that can be uncomfortably productive, leading us to ask how a course like this might exhibit the lineaments of both a seduction narrative and a cult initiation, helping us talk about what might

127

be erogenous and/or coercive in the *Wake*'s redisciplining of its readers.

Stuart Moulthrop's marvelous hypertext novel *Victory Garden* continues the thread of reader-reprogramming, this time in relation to a changed technological interface.[7] It helps us enter the formalist conversation about whether the *Wake* is in some way a precursor of hypertext—is already, in fact, hypertextual—or whether the differences between codex and hypertext have been exaggerated by theorists and enthusiasts of the latter. More interestingly, its ergodic treatment of the Gulf War raises the question of how innovations in narrative form might alter the conventions of historiography, conventions the *Wake* also distorts and renovates through its own formal ruptures. With its seemingly inexhaustible lexia and its multiple endings, *Victory Garden* asks, too, what kind of community might be formed by readers who have read *in* the same text but have seen different parts of it, or have encountered the same parts in a different sequence—a question clearly germane to readers of the *Wake*.

Toward the end of the semester, both O'Brien's *The Third Policeman* and Beckett's *Ohio Impromptu* return us to the Irish literary itineraries of Joyce's legacy while also enacting their own ineluctable cycles in tandem with the *Wake*'s.[8] The "Tiers, tiers and tiers. Rounds" (*FW* 590.30) that end book 3 of the *Wake* chime with the infernal concentrisms of O'Brien's novel about the afterlife, whereas the interminability of the scene of reading—and of reading Joyce—in Beckett's play is more ambiguous, offering possibilities of consolation through a shared encounter with an impossible textual object. Together, the Beckett and O'Brien texts turn two facets of Joyce's book to the light: the *Wake* as hell and the *Wake* as limbo.

In several cases, the main collateral text is accompanied by a theoretical essay. Week four of the course brings together the "Questions and Answers" chapter of the *Wake* with Arthur Conan Doyle's "A Case of Identity" and Slavoj Žižek's "Two Ways to Avoid the Real of Desire," an essay that explores the relations between detective and analyst and the differences between classical and hardboiled detective fiction.[9] The Doyle story, which relates a case of quasi-incestuous seduction as a way of exploring the vulnerability of identity to mimicry and writing, is alluded to in the chapter of the *Wake* with which it is paired: "I should like to ask that Shedlock Homes person who is out for removing the roofs of our criminal classics by what *deductio ad domunum* he hopes *de tacto* to detect anything unless he happens of himself, *movibile tectu*, to have have a slade off" (*FW* 165.32-36).[10] The Žižek essay performs a double gesture in relation to the day's primary texts. On the one hand, it makes strange a familiar genre—the detective story—by turning it into a parable about epistemology and

desire; on the other, it brings the *Wake* within the orbit of the familiar by permitting us to ask what energies Joyce's book might share with detective fiction, particularly given that its interrogative "Questions and Answers" chapter seems to identify Doyle as a patron. To what "lust for enjoyment," in Žižek's words (66), might the *Wake* give rise or tempt its readers to give way? And how might one begin to locate the death drive within the book? A later meeting takes up one apocalyptic response to this question: reading the "Scene in the Pub" alongside Jacques Derrida's "No Apocalypse, Not Now" and Russell Hoban's *Riddley Walker*,[11] it poses the question of how *Finnegans Wake* might be considered a nuclear text, one whose self-described "*abnihilisation of the etym*" (FW 353.22) might respond, at least proleptically, to the possibility of "a total and remainderless destruction of the archive," as Derrida characterizes the nuclear catastrophe (27). Having tackled Hoban's linguistically contortionist novel set in a postapocalyptic future, students are prepared to wrestle with Derrida's preposterous and haunting contention that "the nuclear epoch is dealt with more 'seriously' in texts by Mallarmé, or Kafka, or Joyce, for example, than in present-day novels that would offer direct and realistic descriptions of a 'real' nuclear catastrophe" (27-28).[12] This cluster of readings also offers a specific example of the *Wake*'s gift for uncanny premonition, its weird state of seeming pocked with the shrapnel of the future.

The works of imaginative literature and general literary theory I have discussed so far are not, of course, the only kinds of writing to emerge in the wake of the *Wake*. Joyce's book has given rise to at least one specific subgenre of critical writing: *Finnegans Wake* criticism. Considered alongside experimental fiction among the course's collateral texts, readings in *Wake* scholarship by Joyceans such as Derek Attridge, John Bishop, Vincent Cheng, Christine Froula, Margot Norris, and Robert Polhemus assert, in part, that the so-called secondary literature on the *Wake* is one of its legacies—that is, one of the many kinds of hubbub the book has helped catalyze.[13] These readings in *Wake* criticism accompany the sections of the book to which they seem most relevant, but their function is illustrative as well as analytical. As students face the daunting prospect of writing about the *Wake* for the first time, they are introduced to the wide range of ways Joyceans have addressed the problems attendant on writing about the *Wake*. The scholarly texts provide embodied responses to questions already on students' minds: what is the most effective scale at which to approach the text or the best critical resolution at which to view it? Must one write differently about the *Wake*? Does Joyce's book afford one the opportunity, if not the necessity, of producing a different sort of critical discourse? Such questions, and the student papers they

help shape, make these first-time readers of the *Wake* its legatees as well, while also encouraging their circumspection about what such an identity entails.

Earlier, I mentioned the nonliterary work that existed in some relation of continuity or even filiation with the *Wake*. Along these lines, the course touches on the *Wake*'s musical legacy, which is remarkably varied and extensive.[14] Two giants of the postwar avant-garde, Pierre Boulez and György Ligeti, claim to have been influenced conceptually by Joyce's book, and composers Stephen Albert, Samuel Barber, Fred Lerdahl, Tod Machover, and Richard Marsh are among those who have set texts from the *Wake* to music. Toru Takemitsu wrote four major works whose titles were taken from the last and first pages of the *Wake*. Among these, *riverrun* for piano and orchestra uses a motif akin to the *Wake*'s three-letter formulas, deploying the notes S-E-A (e-flat, e, a) as an initial theme and generative device. But because a crash-course in musicology would be necessary for students to grapple with the above-mentioned pieces in any save the most cursory way, I have instead selected John Cage's *Roaratorio: An Irish Circus on "Finnegans Wake,"* a piece whose compositional methods are better approached through the history of the literary avant-garde than through conventional musicological analysis.[15] The backbone of the piece is the text to Cage's *Writing for the Second Time through "Finnegans Wake,"* which he carved out of the *Wake* using a combination of mesostics, aleatory selection, and aesthetic choice. Read by Cage onto a tape in a variety of vocal modes and registers, the text is accompanied by traditional Irish music and liberally punctuated by recorded sounds from places named in the *Wake* and keyed to the corresponding moment in the libretto. *Roaratorio* is in some ways more deeply indebted to the *Wake* than any other work on the syllabus, using Joyce's book as the source from which it quarries both its text and its sequence of found-sound locales. But if Cage's composition takes up residence in the *Wake*, it does so partly in order to discompose and even decompose Joyce's book from within, spatializing and sensualizing a text it has made unrecognizable according to its own immanent logic and sense of play. *Roaratorio* suggests the inadequacy of the term "legacy" to describe work that is in dialogue with the *Wake*. Something is transmitted from Joyce's book to Cage's piece, but *Roaratorio* seems less concerned to receive Joyce's difficult signal intact—whatever that would entail—than to transform it into a generative form of noise. Of all the works on the course syllabus, the one that most openly affiliates itself with the *Wake* bears, paradoxically, the least resemblance to its stated precursor.

The model of literary legacy with which we began—the kind that Steiner allows Edmund Spenser, Christopher Marlowe, and John

Milton but denies Joyce—operates as a closed economy: its "genuine successors" would carry off the treasure Joyce had amassed and put it into circulation as a "general quickening of the spirit of speech"; or, alternately, they would inhabit and defend the territory Joyce had "so decisively won" from science, mathematics, and the culture of the pure unparaphrasable image. Treasure and territory are both metaphors that imagine a literary legacy circulating like property—as fixed, scarce, and strangely alienable from its original possessor. There is no such Wakean school—not even in Joyce scholarship—that has inherited Joyce's legacy intact, no one who has responded to the *Wake* as T. S. Eliot predicted writers must respond to *Ulysses*,[16] pursuing its methods after Joyce. And it would be too much to say that the English language has experienced a "general quickening of the spirit of speech" as a result of the *Wake*. But perhaps the absence of slavish imitators—of mere disciples or practitioners of its methods—is, in fact, a sign of the health of the *Wake*'s legacy. As most of the collateral texts in this course illustrate, there is no shortage of imaginative work flourishing in various relations of filiation, appropriation, and contention with Joyce's book. That these works and their creators have been inspired by the *Wake* without needing to replicate it is a sign that Joyce's talent has not, *pace* Steiner, proved "exhaustive of its own potential" but has instead provoked both fresh creation and fresh critique. And where Steiner describes the *Wake* as "a monument rather than a living force," the richly varied works that exist in conversation with the *Wake* attest to a force Steiner does not consider: the vitality of monuments. Even for artists whose work does not resemble or revisit the *Wake*, Joyce's book exerts a lively effect on fresh creation by embodying a set of extremes. Holding the borders of the possible more widely open, it has helped produce a space within which subsequent writers and composers and critics have been free to adapt, condemn, or ignore it in the pursuit of their own aims and extremes. It is even possible that the *Wake* contains, in its pages, a countermodel to the calcified notion of "legacy" by which it has been dismissed and stigmatized.

Let me conclude with a few words about the seminar's more practical elements. The major writing assignments for the course are its most conventional aspect: I ask students to submit about twenty-five pages of writing to me by the end of the semester and give them the choice of writing one long term-paper or two shorter papers. The writing must engage the *Wake* and its critical literature, but I also encourage students to write about Joyce's book in circuit with the other texts in the course. I call attention to both the writing process and the collaborative nature of our reading by requiring that all papers undergo at least one round of peer editing before they are sub-

mitted. Partly in recognition of the *Wake's* interest in orality and the voice, the course is speaking-intensive as well as writing-intensive, emphasizing oral and physical communication in addition to multiple draft writing. Each student is responsible for two oral presentations, one on the *Wake* and one on a collateral text, and for facilitating the discussion generated by the presentation. I ask students to stand while delivering their presentations, which must be improvised from notes rather than read verbatim, and I encourage them to be mindful of the dispositions of their bodies in the room and of the full vocal and gestural repertoire they have at their disposal. Both times I have taught the course, students have glossed *Wake* passages of up to one page in length, and have led off by reading the passage aloud before unpacking it. However, having seen both Paul O'Hanrahan and Adam Harvey perform parts of the *Wake* onstage from memory, I have become excited about the book's kinetic possibilities in the classroom and about how new dimensions of both the text and our critical responses to it might be opened up through memorization and performance. The next time I offer the course I plan to stipulate that students gloss only as long a passage as they can memorize and to ask them to perform the passage from memory before they gloss it. Such an assignment might seem to ask that students uncritically venerate the text by reciting it, so I will be careful to insist that by inviting the text into the body we need not relinquish our powers of circumspection, adaptation, or dissent. In fact, a fearless and considered performance might play host to a kind of criticism—and to a kind of radical sympathy not mutually exclusive of criticism—that analytical writing is hard put to welcome or even to recognize.

NOTES

[1] Martin Amis, "The War Against Cliché," review of *"Ulysses": The Corrected Text* in *Atlantic Monthly* (September 1986); reprinted in Amis, *The War Against Cliché: Essays and Reviews, 1971-2000* (New York: Vintage International, 2002), p. 446.

[2] George Steiner, "The Retreat from the Word," *Language & Silence: Essays on Language, Literature and the Inhuman* (1961; New York: Athenaeum, 1976), pp. 12-54. Further references will be cited parenthetically in the text.

[3] David Hayman and Elliott Anderson, eds., *In the Wake of the "Wake"* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1978). The contents of the volume had originally appeared in *TriQuarterly*, 38 (Winter 1977).

[4] Christine Brooke-Rose, *Amalgamemnon* (Manchester: Carcanet, 1984), and Hélène Cixous, "The Laugh of the Medusa," *New French Feminisms: An Anthology*, ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1980), pp. 245-64. Further references to the Brooke-Rose work will be cited parenthetically in the text.

⁵ See Tom Phillips, *A Humument: A Treated Victorian Novel* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1980).

⁶ David Ives, "The Universal Language," *All in the Timing: Fourteen Plays* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), pp. 31-52, and Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange* (London: Heineman, 1962).

⁷ Stuart Moulthrop, *Victory Garden: A Fiction* (Cambridge, Mass.: Eastgate Systems, 1991).

⁸ Flann O'Brien, *The Third Policeman* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1967), and Samuel Beckett, *Three Plays: "Ohio Impromptu," "Catastrophe," "What Where"* (New York: Grove Press, 1984).

⁹ Arthur Conan Doyle, "A Case of Identity," *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993), pp. 30-48, and Slavoj Žižek, "Two Ways to Avoid the Real of Desire," *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*, ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 48-66. Further references to the Žižek essay will be cited parenthetically in the text.

¹⁰ The passage alludes to the famous opening of "A Case of Identity," an early Holmes story in which the great detective tells Dr. Watson,

> We would not dare to conceive the things which are really mere commonplaces of existence. If we could fly out of that window hand in hand, hover over this great city, gently remove the roofs, and peep in at the queer things which are going on, the strange coincidences, the plannings, the cross-purposes, the wonderful chains of events, working through generations, and leading to the most outré results, it would make all fiction with its conventionalities and foreseen conclusions most stale and unprofitable. (p. 30)

¹¹ Jacques Derrida, "No Apocalypse, Not Now (full speed ahead, seven missiles, seven missives)," trans. Catherine Porter and Philip Lewis, *Diacritics*, 14 (Summer 1984), 20-31, and Russell Hoban, *Riddley Walker: A Novel* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1980). Further references to the Derrida essay will be cited parenthetically in the text.

¹² Building on "No Apocalypse," I offer a nuclear reading of *Ulysses* in my "Bombing and the Symptom: Traumatic Earliness and the Nuclear Uncanny," *Diacritics*, 30 (Winter 2000), 59-82.

¹³ See, for instance, John Bishop, "Vico's 'Night of Darkness': The New Science and *Finnegans Wake*," *James Joyce: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Mary T. Reynolds (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1993), pp. 180-95, and Derek Attridge, "Unpacking the Portmanteau, Or, Who's Afraid of *Finnegans Wake*?" *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*, ed. Jonathan Culler (Oxford: Blackwells Publishers, 1988), pp. 40-55.

¹⁴ Allen B. Ruch's Joyce website, The Brazen Head, offers extensive descriptions of classical and popular music indebted to Joyce's work, accompanied by a wealth of resources on these works. See http://www.themodernword.com/joyce/music/chamber_music.html.

¹⁵ John Cage, *"Roaratorio"; "Laughtears"; "Writing for the Second Time Through 'Finnegans Wake'"* (1979; Kew Gardens, N.Y.: Mode Records, 1992).

¹⁶ See T. S. Eliot, "*Ulysses*, Order and Myth," *Dial*, 75 (November 1923), 480-83.

FINNEGANS WAKE	COLLATERAL TEXT(S)
1. Tuning Up and Overture	Lewis Carroll, from *Through the Looking-Glass* (1872)
2. I.i (The Wake; The Giant's Howe)	Susan Stewart, "The Uses of Simultaneity" (1979)
I.ii (The Ballad)	Derek Attridge, "Unpacking the Portmanteau" (1988)
I.iii (Earwicker's Story)	John Bishop, "Vico's 'Night of Darkness'" (1986)
3. I.iv (Internment and Trial)	In-seminar discussion of *The Book of Kells* (CD-ROM)
I.v (The Mamafesta)	Arthur Conan Doyle, "A Case of Identity" (1891)
4. I.vi (Questions & Answers)	Slavoj Žižek, "Two Ways to Avoid the Real of Desire" (1991)
	Tom Phillips, *A Humument* (1970-Present)
5. I.vii (Shem)	Essays on Shem by, for example, Margot Norris, Robert Polhemus, Vincent Cheng, and Christine Froula
6. I.viii (Anna Livia Plurabelle)	Hélène Cixous, "The Laugh of the Medusa" (1971) Christine Brooke-Rose, *Amalgamemnon* (1984)
7. II.i (Mick, Nick, and the Maggies)	David Ives, "The Universal Language" (1993)
8. II.ii (Night Lessons)	Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange* (1962)
9. II.iii (Scene in the Pub)	Russell Hoban, *Riddley Walker* (1980)
	Jacques Derrida, "No Apocalypse, Not Now" (1984)
10. II.iv (Mamalujo; Tristan and Iseult)	Joseph Bédier, *Tristan et Iseult* (1900)
III.i (First Watch of Shaun)	Joyce, early drafts of "Tristan and Isolde" vignette
11. III.ii (Second Watch of Shaun)	Stuart Moulthrop, *Victory Garden* (1991)
12. III.iii (Third Watch of Shaun)	John Cage, *Roaratorio* (1979) text; interview (1978)
13. III.iv (Fourth Watch of Shaun)	Flann O'Brien, *The Third Policeman* (1940/1967)
14. IV (Ricorso)	
15. Armageden: Begin Again	Samuel Beckett, *Ohio Impromptu* (1981)