Finnegans Wake as a System of Knowledge Without Primitive Terms:

A Proposal Against the Paradigm of Competence in the So-called Joyce Industry.

vorgelegt von

Krzysztof Bartnicki, M.A.

geboren am 7 V 1971 in Opole, Polen

CONTENTS

Introduction

Many decades after the first book with the title *Finnegans Wake* (FW) and James Joyce's name on the cover was published in 1939, followed by a number of post-Joyce variants, "FW" today is a name affected by an epistemic impasse. The impasse consists in that the more claims about FW are made, the more the reference of FW is unfixed, but in order to fix it one needs to make even more claims. As a result of the growing number of claims, FW has become an irreducibly polyreferential name.

There is no coherently justified hermeneutical competence to assert that FW as a text in literature (in a conventional sense of the term) is a more privileged referent than other referents. There is no coherently justified hermeneutical competence to call the optimal referent among the source texts (i.e. the 1939 prototext and its variants). There is no coherently justified hermeneutical competence to rank claims, e.g., indicate misinterpretations. In sum, there are no consistent criteria for establishing a hierarchy of interpretive competence about FW as, primarily, a literary text. The existing models of competence are *extraliterary* (not concerned primarily with FW as a literary text) and/or *inconsistent*. Among the inconsistent models are those that rely on various appeals, e.g., to common sense, knowledge, authorial intention, majority. Other inconsistent models use ergometrics (ranking claims by the work-time input), intellectual aesthetics (e.g., ranking claims by their style), formal markers (e.g., ranking claims by the proponent's academic degree), but they do not explain how one: (i) adjudicates conflicts between exegetes on the same level in a hierarchy, (ii) categorises claims which (in addition to their initial vagueness) are not conflicted, (iii) categorises (apparently) equivalent claims made with different means, and (iv) categorises (apparently) different claims made with equivalent means.

However, this vision that claims about FW (whose sum is, henceforth, "the volume of FW exegesis") cannot be ranked defies the paradigmatic approach to competence adopted in the so-called Joyce industry, including the community of academics engaged in the professional (i.e. paid) study of FW. The industry prescribes that academic competence is, on average, superior. While one of its tenets is that FW is a text in English, the industry has made various efforts to reconcile it with the usual experience of incomprehension. They are outlined below (with points open for debate in the parentheses):

(i)   The text of FW is incomprehensible to an unaided reader, but understanding can be ensured by the exegete. Also, one can read FW by reading *about* FW. (If so, the exegete should be called the author, and the exegete's work should be the referent of "the text of FW".)

(ii)   One can read FW by reading a *sample* of the text. (But there is no agreement on the size of the adequate sample, and whether it can include any incomprehensible elements or not. What is comprehension anyway? One might call, e.g., this line from FW, "Bubabipibambuli, I can do as I like with what's me own. Nyamnyam" comprehensible despite that it is not all lexical English, and might call it incomprehensible as well.

The editor of a post-Joyce variant of the 1939 text has always been concerned with details in the text. Genetic scholars have discussed details too, such as that an early variant of "bubabipibambuli" is "bupabepibambuli" (Henkes 2013: 16-17). What they thus imply is that no element in FW is omissible, redundant. Arguably, there is not a superfluous syllable, not a word too many in FW (see Dettmar 1996: 216). But if so, it is unclear which of the source texts is FW. The opposite position, to wit, there are omissible elements in FW, raises another question: how should one call the entire text when a text with omitted elements is called FW?)

(iii)   An awareness of ignorance is a legitimate result of reading. (But how does one distinguish a non-understanding reader of the entire text from a non-understanding reader of but a sample and from a non-reader, also such a non-reader who announces some kind of understanding of FW?)

(iv)   English does not have to be comprehensible. (But how can one define English?)

Considering whether the difference between FW and other texts is "in degree, not in kind" (Attridge 1992: 79) or whether it became a new quality, the latter seems more probable. Whereas the Postmodern signifier cannot be controlled, resists all closure, and falls under the rule of EME: 'everything means everything', the signifier in the epistemological system of FW is more like an absence insofar as it cannot be pinned down. Most terms concerning FW, or perhaps all of them, starting with those as frequent as the term "FW" itself, are unfixed in their reference and meaning. Clive Hart's claim that "simple certainties" are "wholly lacking" in large parts of FW (1992: 30) is initially uncertain as

we do not know Hart's definitions of "simple", "certainties", "wholly", and "lacking". Finn Fordham's "foremost piece of advice to those coming to *Finnegans Wake* for the first time: read a page out loud" (2007: 6) uses tacit assumptions (FW exists, it has pages, can be read out loud) and words ("foremost", "coming", "first time", "read") whose tacit meaning one does not know. Claims (or statements, assertions, contentions, and so on) about FW are indistinguishable from conjectures (or speculations, assumptions, guesses) about their meaning. A hierarchy of hermeneutical competence is initially debatable then, because if we are not certain what a claim is saying, we should perhaps refrain from evaluating it (e.g., calling it a misinterpretation).

The initial uncertainty concerns not just more openly subjective statements about FW, but also such claims that strive to appear more scholarly, empirical, and express accordance with facts or reality. But again, no matter how much a claim may appear to resemble a falsifiable statement, e.g., the claim that 'all editions of FW have the same number of pages' (Fordham 2007: 2, J. McCourt 2009: xix), its truth value cannot be assessed due to the unclear terms it employs ("all", "editions", "FW", "have", "the same", "number of pages"). FW radicalises the Postmodern tenet of EME into the rule of NMA: 'nothing means anything'.[1]

In the case of more orthodox texts, simplifying a claim by having the definitions of its words tacit and outside the claim, is welcome for it gives the claim a cognitively perceivable length, while its recipient can rely on some terms, usually intuitive, that do not require defining. They are 'primitive terms (or) notions' "that seem to us to be immediately understandable" (Tarski 1994: 110). But in the epistemological system of FW intuition has become inapplicable. This is represented by conflicts of intuition vs. counterintuition in the volume of FW exegesis. Several examples are outlined below:

- According to an initial intuition, the language of FW is English, but it becomes challenged as one's reading continues. A rival intuition may arise that the language is strange, but in order to preserve their English competence, the reader makes an effort to uphold the first intuition by insisting, sometimes counterintuitively, that the language is English.

---

[1] The rule of NMA seems to contradict itself—it *is*, after all, something meaningful that one can say about FW. On the other hand, the rule confirms itself—since its terms ('nothing', 'means', 'anything') are tacitly defined, the rule does not express itself otherwise than as a nontestable conjecture about its content.

- The source text requires glosses ("Erklärungen, die nötig sind", Senn 2011), "some prior framework, derived from critics or from Joyce himself" (Attridge 2001: 149), to dismiss the intuition that FW is nonsense. This requirement is against the intuition typical of such traditional models in which one can rely on their own competence to read texts in a language that one knows. Combining the source text with commentary upsets intuitions which try to point at that text in which meaning originates. If FW is "what we do with it" (Fritz Senn in Fordham 2007: 1), our commentary (especially as it precedes, accompanies, and often displaces the source text) is, perhaps counterintuitively, a better referent of FW than the source text.

- The sense of helplessness persists despite taking recourse to exegetical epitexts, and against the intuition that they will help. Disappointment is only exacerbated upon one's learning more about the size of the volume, which is, counterintuitively, counterproductively large.

- Intuition may suggest Joyce as a privileged, omniscient interpreter, still many of his hints were contradictory. E.g., Joyce's calling FW "pure music" (qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 703) goes against the intuition that FW is literature, whereas the metaphoricity of his language is not always obvious.

- The more a section of the text is nontrivial, the more its reader's ability to absorb the data[2] is impaired. This disagrees with the intuition that the more context is available, the more comprehensible a text will be. It is also counterintuitive to see that the post-Joyce variants of the source text do not improve comprehensibility.

- The scholar's failure to explicate the text is against the intuition that an expert knows better. There are academics who write texts about FW but are unable to spell the title.[3] While in many other texts, the title is a paratext

---

[2] Possibly, "data" should be replaced by "information". Neither word is a primitive term about FW.

[3] Despite taking a seminar on FW for a full semester (Cook-Degan 1990: 879, see Kirkland and Kirkland 1991: 283). The most common misspelling, "still-chronic" (Kostelanetz 1991: 127) consists in adding an apostrophe. Saying that the apostrophe "insists on being seen" (Sh. Benstock 1991: 95) may be true, still it does not excuse the mistake in PhD-level texts (e.g., Abel 2018: 84, Calvert 2009: 64, Simmons 2014: 2, *passim*). The misspelling in claims makes them initially flimsy, unconvincing: "*Finnegan's Wake*, perhaps the single greatest narrative monument of the twentieth century" (Brink

that one can omit, the title of FW is counterintuitively important where it marks the end of one's reading. If the title is everything that someone assumed from the text, then its misspelling goes against the intuition that the text reduced to two words can be assumed without an error.

Without common intuitions, the epistemological system of FW cannot have primitive terms. Simplification of a claim cannot use a primitive term as the point of departure. De-simplification cannot have a primitive term as the terminus. The exegete cannot establish any terms in context (for a vague term can hardly become clear when it is described by means of vague terms described by means of other vague terms). Since, what has been assumed here, the primitive terms disappeared due to the excess of claims, they were not always absent in the system of FW studies. They disappeared in the aftermath of the 1939 text having been miscategorised as English. This miscategorisation was the initial reason for the epistemic impasse, as the linguistic concerns pushed the exegete to expand the volume of claims counterproductively, beyond the point of testability or cataloguability of data. The 1939 text was misconceived as a kind of Rosetta Stone (see Kitcher 2007: xix), which can be decrypted over time, while it is more akin to the cryptic *Voynich Manuscript* (Illingworth 2017). Since the growth of the volume of FW exegesis was incremental, the exegete may have been unaware that fewer and fewer primitive terms remained in their lexicon. The miscategorization allowed for a possibility to call FW unique. If the language had not been widely established as English, its effects could be described today as typical of an unknown language. This is, FW is a text which gained its peculiarity unnecessarily. This ties in with the fact that FW had been established as a work of high value owing to Joyce's marketing skills which he used to promote the text before publication. Later on, the miscategorization was not rectified in the Joyce industry, possibly because FW as a unique

---

1998: 2), "*Finnegan's Wake* is the ultimate linguistic experience" (Daily 1977: 303), "*Finnegan's Wake* acts out on a grand cultural scale" (Herr 2005: 150), "*Finnegan's Wake* as a linguistic object" (Innis 1982: 51), "the linguistic relations in *Finnegan's Wake* take control over virtually all the data of experience" (Izzo 2011: 134), "Joyce's masterpiece of modernist fiction, *Finnegan's Wake*" (Jeyifo 2000: 72), "*Finnegan's Wake* is more difficult to read than *Ulysses*" (McCawley 1987: 462), "masterpieces like *Finnegan's Wake*" (Smolin 1997: 233), "I've read *Ulysses* and *Finnegan's Wake*" (Wasserstein 2005: 50-51). Other variations on the misspellings are: "Finegans Wake" (Beach 2012: 223), "*Finnnegans Wake*" (De la Durantaye 2016: 74, McGee 2011: 130), "*Finneggans Wake*" (Balcerzan 1984: 64), "Finegans wage" (Thomas Merton qtd. in Biddle 2001: 39), "Finnigan's Wake" (Mushtrieva 2018: 38, 64) "Finnegan's Wake" (R. O'Brien 2017), "*Finneganns Wake*" (found in Rabaté 1993: 154).

text is more useful for it than FW as an ordinary text. In consequence, FW is unique and ordinary, depending on the system in which it is regarded—the uniquely miscategorised text is just a commodity in Capitalism; the literary exceptionality is a selling point for the regular forces of advertising.

Though many people have called FW a unique achievement (e.g., Gibson 2006: 157), they have been unable to single out its salient characteristics. Some have called FW uniquely (un)readable (see Franck Bauchard in Wuetcher 2017), which verdict is questionable to others (Dettmar 1996: 216, Nash 1996: 169). Joyce's wordplay may have been quite avant-garde—but only until it became avant-garde to write a 19th c. style novel (Banville 2007). Some argue that the language of the text is unique, but it is not unique if it is just an expansion of Lewis Carroll's *Jabberwocky* (Burgess 1987: 20, see J. S. Atherton 1974: 124, Tanselle 2014: 506). There is even no consensus about FW as a "sort of limit-case of literary interpretation" (Lernout 2006: 79, cf. Crowe 2012, Loxterman 1992: 125, Senn 1971: 46). It may be "difficult to imagine a more stunningly original work" (Eagleton 2013: 179) and a more unoriginal one (Levine 1979: 113, M. Norris 1976: 131). Various labels used to describe FW, such as "the most unreadable book in history" (Hayes 2019), "the most unread book in literature" (S. D. G. Knowles 2008: 106), "the most spectacular unintelligibility in all literature" (Weigel 1959: 172), "the most difficult book in the English language" (Eriksson 2012: 28) can as well be attached to other texts. For example, FW was called the "most misunderstood book of all time" (Rose and O'Hanlon 1982: vii), but the same phrase was also applied to the Bible (R. Jones 2011).

Since many have tried to pinpoint the trademark feature of FW (a literary text), arguing either for or against its uniqueness, this itself may be a unique effect of FW. One is perhaps right to think that FW is unique in that it invites verdicts of unreadability (more readily than other literary texts), and untranslatability (despite that this is a common feature of all texts),[4] and encourages resemiotisation (more often than other texts do). A somewhat evasive proposition would be that FW is unique in a way that cannot be characterised. Another proposition is this: FW is unique in that its uniqueness can be neither denied nor confirmed. Finally, in a less evasive attempt, it is a combination of several features that makes FW unique:

---

[4] Or a peculiar kind of translatability where "[n]ormal criteria" "no longer apply" (Senn 2013: 871).

1. James Joyce, the nominal author of the 1939 text, <u>originated</u> the volume of FW exegesis by leaving his interpretive clues that became the starting points for other exegetes' work.[5]

2. Joyce's exegesis, his own or presented by his associates acting at his behest under his supervision, <u>preceded</u> the 1939 text.[6]

3. The volume stores data organised as knowledge: e.g., our knowledge of the word "riverrun" in FW includes associations such as the words *rire-vers-l'un* (Harari 2002: 359), *contrive* (Newmark 2001: 143), *err* (Senn 1982a: 231), other associations of the word, e.g., with urination (Bristow 2013), "a Heraclitean reminder that *panta rhei*", with a "hint of German *Erinnerung*" (P. O'Neill 2013: 35, see also Knauth 2009: 54), "riverrun, = 8πG/c4 * T(2)" (Maher 2014), credit-giving (McShane 2010: 164), the languages of British Celts (Seamus Heaney qtd. in Panzera 2016: 203), the flow of truth (Sławek 2013). If we describe our understanding as a synthesis of knowledge displaying semantic coherence, then FW <u>cannot become understandable</u>. Or, more precisely, FW can provide its reader with an understanding characteristic of more orthodox literature—but only in a trivial sample, whose ability to be a referent of FW is most problematic. The longer the sample, the less understandable. Two people with no exegetical guidance and no prior knowledge of FW, asked to read a long part of the text, share only a feeling of

---

[5] Several examples of writers who tried to preset the interpretation of their texts are: James Macpherson, promoting the belief in the authenticity of Ossian (1760), Stanisława Przybyszewska who aimed to control the interpretation of her *Sprawa Dantona* (1929), and Harold Bloom as the interpreter of *The Book of J.* (1990).

[6] It was "paradoxical indeed" (Rabaté 1998-1999: 250) that FW could be discussed in a 1929 volume of essays. That said, while the commentary before the text may have been a rare thing until the 19th century (Young 1810: 11-12), the modern dynamics of text reception involves 'preemptive' promotion. Examples include: Witold Gombrowicz's *Kronos* (Głowiński 2013); *Duke Nukem Forever* (2011), a computer game promoted in 1997-1998, *The Blair Witch Project* (1999), made a cult film before its release. Also, one will consider: (i) the instrument of literary manifesto; (ii) F. D. E. Schleiermacher's "pre-understanding" (Henebury 2015, see Labron 2011: 60), (iii) metaphorical concepts (see, e.g., Pilshchikov et al. 2015: 14, Sherwin 1997: 49); (iv) the possibility that a text is the Word of God (Erickson 2006: 56; McFall 1991: 269), (v) the idea that an oeuvre is a continuum where early texts comment on a successor: e.g., Nietzsche's *Morgenröthe* (1881) and *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* (1882) acted as "the commentary before the text" (W. Klein 1997: 36) of his *Also sprach Zarathustra* (1883-1885).

incomprehension; and even when they communicate their problems and pool their competence, they are not be able to dismiss the feeling. If

> "the cognitive value of literature lies less in the works providing their readers with new knowledge than in their operating on and enhancing the knowledge which readers already possess" (Mikkonen 2018: 10),

FW is peculiar in that it 'provides' its readers with incomprehension and self-doubt, which is the type of knowledge they did not necessarily already possess and which they might not wish to enhance.

4. What speaks for the above assumption is that the Joyce industry failed to elucidate the 1939 text in a satisfying manner. In an optimist scenario, about 20 percent of the text cannot be transformed into "synthetic lucidity" while our "recourse to thousands of extant notes" raises "an aesthetic argument against the book" (Senn 2002a; see Eco 1989b: 156). The plethora of glosses is clearly not the same as understanding (Fordham 2007: 31, Sam Slote in Hamada 2013: 116). The "total silence of saying too much" can be as frustrating as "the total silence of not saying anything" (Renggli 2018: 50). A canon of FW exegesis cannot be indicated; lists of recommended reading are random and disjunctive. It suffices to look at the resources of the James Joyce Checklist to realise how "the Joyce criticism or even Joyce criticism related to any one work is beyond the ability of an individual" (Brockman 2016b; see Benstock 1977c: 335-336, Senn 1978-1979).

5. Attempts to find primitive terms in the epistemology of FW fail, unable to instate intuition to found them. As has been indicated, in the volume of FW exegesis there are some initial conflicts of intuition vs. counterintuition. Since counterintuition can be turned into intuition by an extended effort of the mind,[7] one might assume that such conflicts can be resolved by the duality of two intuitions, one instinctive (lay), the other developed (expert), or corresponding to the duality of fast/slow thinking (Kahneman 2011: 20-21). However, an intuition-based expertise about FW cannot be established.[8] Even from an individual perspective, the decades of examination of

---

[7] For examples in science see Susskind and Friedman 2014: xix-xx, 51-52, Bernstein and Friedman 2009, see also S. Harris 2010: 36.

[8] The meaning of "expertise" is hardly clarified in the general debate on the relations between intuition and expertise (Kahneman and Klein 2009), deliberation and knowledge (Harteis and Billett 2013: 148-150), emotion and analysis in literature (C. Atherton 2005: 88, 119, 149), evaluations of thinking in literature vs. philosophy (Nanay 2013) and science (Mizrahi 2017), and the so-called expertise defence

FW suggest a duality of *incompetence* instead, the one more immediate, the other at the end of a longer effort to deny it.

6. Readers and non-readers of FW are not distinguishable.

7. Some scholars changed their mind about the availability of a "complete exegesis" (McHugh 1980, 1991: v) and the passage of time exposed the failure of the self-appointed to "discuss *Finnegans Wake* with scholarly pretense" (Senn 1984: xi). If the interpreter's approach is to "keep piling up information" (John S. Gordon in Hamada 2013: 41) without a plan when to stop, it is teleologically indeterminate.

8. There exists no "common center to which to relate ideas generated by *Finnegans Wake*" (C. Hart 1966a: 144, 1992: 15). The volume of exegesis is a nonhierarchical pool of verbal and non-verbal reactions to FW (with any referent), and reactions to these reactions, and so on (here indiscriminately called exegetical). Some wish to separate exegesis from hermeneutics, annotation from interpretation (W. van Mierlo 2020), more subjective criticism from scholarship as "objective research and facts" (id. 2002: 35), specialists from ordinary readers (e.g., Burgess 1965) or common readers (e.g., Bishop 1999: viii, see Brannon 2003), and so on, yet every approach to FW is equally subject to the rule of NMA.

The volume of FW exegesis can be described as the multitudes of claims which are uncertain [simplified by the tacitly defined terms, and undergoing the process of conjecturing which tentatively arranges their meaning], among which there are uncertain claims (appearing to be) unambiguous, clear. The Joyce industry has suggested a number of unambiguous tenets about FW, including these: (i) There are primitive terms in the epistemological system of FW. (ii) There exists an intuitive or default referent of FW. (iii) One can misinterpret (misread, misunderstand) FW.

Other claims which have had support in the industry are: (iv) One can extrapolate the data from a processed sample of the text to make claims about the entire text. (v) The effects of refraining from interpreting is somehow hermeneutically inferior to the effects of making an interpretive effort. Also, the industry has frequently suggested that (vi) there is a canon of knowledge about FW (oft associated with the academic's knowledge about FW) or there even exists a mainstream understanding of FW.

(with its troubles; see, e.g., Horvath and Wiegmann 2016: 2722, Mizrahi 2015: 62).

These points relate to the industry's 3 crucial principles. The *literary text principle*, illustrated with this quotation: "Joyce's baffling final book defies description" (O'Shea 1989: 78), says that FW is a well-identifiable prosaic text, a work of literature. The *author principle*, signalled in the same example, says that the text is Joyce's work. The *language principle* says that the language (hereafter: Wakese), used in the prototext and other source texts, is English. As this thesis tries to disprove them all, the question why the industry has abode by its paradigm of competence, using the aura of its better competence to promote these principles, will be addressed in a hypothesis-like proposal. This proposal concerns the paradigm of competence at (i) the level of literary examination and (ii) the *extraliterary* level:

1) <u>The Joyce industry imposes, without justification, literary authority over interpretation</u>.

At the level of its engagement with FW as a literary text, the industry imposes interpretive limits, e.g., indicating misinterpretations. It will be argued, however, that the concept of misinterpretation of FW cannot be applied with non-dogmatic consistency.

Initially, FW cannot be misinterpreted since—under the rule of NMA—it cannot be interpreted, since all claims about FW use vague terms in their tacit definitions (here: "all", "claims", "about", "FW", "use", "vague", "terms", "tacit", "definitions").

Secondly, given various claims about FW whose meaning is established by means of conjecturing, no one can say with any consistently privileged competence that one claim is better than another. If every claim answers some 'good faith' interpretive demand in the mind of an exegete, the claim may be validated by the fact of its emergence, being equal as long as we do not ascribe different values to that demand.[9] If so, then a claim (if it existed) "FW is a book" and a claim (if it existed) "FW is a zebra" are equal in their validity (or else in their invalidity). The word "equal" does not mean to say that the two would have the same chances to appear and be considered equally productive, sensible etc. Still, given that appeals to common sense and intuition are ineffective about FW, and arguments from statistics are, first, unavailable (the volume of FW exegesis is too large to permit statistical tests of its data), secondly, fallible (it is not always so that a majority knows better, but we do not know when it does), the absence of misinterpretations in the volume of FW exegesis should be understood as the absence of any consistently justified authority to indicate misinterpretations.

---

[9] Obviously, one could argue that some claims are invented in 'bad faith', with an agenda to obstruct discussion. Still, we have no unchallenged mechanisms for distinguishing 'good-faith' from 'bad-faith'.

Thirdly, FW cannot be misinterpreted if one cannot misinterpret incomprehension, which is the usual result of processing FW. It is perhaps useful with other texts to tell experts who "know when they don't know" from nonexperts who "do not know when they don't know" (Kahneman and Klein 2009: 524); in the case of FW, however, the idea that academics are more competent than other exegetes because some of the former announce their semantic despair *later* than some of the latter do is not enough to justify a hierarchy of competence. (In fact, if this hierarchy were established, then the scholars, as they take more time to realise their interpretive helplessness, would be *less* competent than any such people who followed their intuition to come earlier to the equivalent epistemic conclusion.)

In wishing to appear (more) competent, the Joyce industry resembles the "literary institution" (Newton 1986: 8) to which it belongs.[10] There seem to be no models in the institution which explain in a consistent, non-dogmatic manner why "a literary work" cannot have "just any meaning" (Jonathan Culler qtd. in ibid., 2). Regarding FW, the Postmodern condition of EME disqualifies the option that the interpreter "clarifies the *potential* of the text" (Wolfgang Iser qtd. in ibid., 3). The unavailability of understanding disqualifies the criterion for validity that is called comprehensiveness (ibid., 18-19). Nor can one say "something new or different or corrective" (Stanley Fish qtd. in ibid., 16)[11] about FW due to our inability to reveal what is new and old in the volume of FW exegesis (and establish what is different among claims). There is no coherently justified reason for prescribing any limits such as "intention and historical context" (Newton 1982: 104), for appeals to triviality, taste, common sense (see ibid., 106), for appeals to "original readers' expectations, genre" (id. 1985: 211), or "completeness, correctness, comprehensiveness, consistency, and discrimination" (Stein Haugom Olsen in ibid., 208).

Hermeneutical competence is not correlated with formal markers of competence (the number of publications, academic degrees, years of work).[12] Observing the volume of

---

[10] Even if it is vaguely described. E.g., it is "very loosely structured" (ibid.), and yet centralised enough so that there can be "tension" against it (ibid., 227) and "support" can be gained from it (ibid., 17).

[11] Incidentally, Fish is wrong to speculate that without saying that certain 'something' there would be no reason for a critic to write (see ibid.). One obvious reason could be economic.

[12] If a degree should make its holder more competent, this might explain paying less attention to some non-academic work, but not paying less attention to some academic work (see de Climont 2016). Also, as one juxtaposes Adam Wiśniewski-Snerg (especially as the author of his text of 2003) and Stanisław Lem, two comparably incompetent writers as far as their academic status is concerned (Keller 2019: 14, 30), their work received unequal treatment in academia—due to economic factors (and personal ones,

FW exegesis, one could assume that the industry has not established coherent mechanisms for rating *equivalent claims* made with different means (e.g., appeals to Joyce, knowledge, historicity, common sense), for rating different claims made with *equivalent means*, and adjudicating conflicts between exegetes on the same level in a hierarchy. Moreover, some Wakean scholars did admit incompetence. Some others disqualify themselves with internal contradictions. For example, if FW "mocks the notion of expertise and authority" (Israel 2019), this claim makes an unjustified exception not to mock the authority which makes this claim. And if the claim is true, it speaks against privileging academic authority.

But perhaps there is a value of academic authority that could justify the paradigm in the industry *despite* its inconsistencies? If one could identify a value relevant to the study of literature (and specifically to the literary FW) ensured by the use of authoritative control by the literary institution (and specifically by the Joyce industry), then the paradigm of competence could be upheld. Where such a general value is suggested in the discussion of the literary institution, it is described too vaguely. K. M. Newton, for one, seems to have such a value in mind, but his reluctance to bring his argument to its conclusion is quite frustrating. For instance, if an authority is necessary to prevent that "all readings should be regarded as equal" lest it should "make interpretation pointless" (2006: 480), the 'point' of interpretation is not specified, nor is the reason for not being pointless. If "the point of the [interpretive] activity is the contest itself" (1986: 39), Newton is not revealing why the contest should be taking place under the aegis of the institution. Why should the institution monopolise a "desire to interpret" (ibid., 6, *passim*)? An appeal to "the need or desire to survive in the world or to order the world for human benefit" (ibid., 10) fails to name the survivors and describe the benefit. Arguments that the study of literature without some institutional support may look futile (ibid., 223) are meaningless as long as they do not define futility and list its disadvantages in contrast to the alternative. Last but not least, even if an "authority to impose limits" (ibid., 219) is required, it is not said who will authorise that authority, or who will watch the watchers.

Taking this into consideration, it will be assumed that the value does not really exist (which can also mean that it exists in too vague descriptions). Taking Newton's discourse of "struggle for power" (ibid., 40, 43, 193) a step further, the proposal will be made here that the literary institution, and the Joyce industry in it, wants power not in order to hold

---

see Kukulak 2018: 41).

literary interpretation as the guarantee of a humanist condition, not primarily at least, but to maintain its operation.

2) <u>At the system level (of the entire literary institution/Joyce industry), imposing authority is economically motivated.</u>

The proposal goes on to say that the primary motivation of the literary institution, and so, of the Joyce industry too, is professional, i.e. economic, in the neocolonial capitalism in the WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) economies. The industry needs to appear competent in order to advertise its product convincingly. It needs to propagate the idea that FW is in English and Joyce's work in order to better control the market. It needs consumer optimism, thus it calls FW readable, prescribes the ludic side of reading, inspirits the customer with clichés like: "[k]nowledge about *Finnegans Wake*" "makes its world grow and live" (Fordham 2008: 316). Phrases such as "Pandora's box of inquiry" (Deppman 2008: 314) in the exegesis are given positive resonance. Where Clive Hart's view on the lack of certainties is called "pessimistic" (Fagan 2015: 186), one is led to believe that pessimism can and should be replaced with an anarchist satisfaction from "dismantling the rhetorical strategies of authority" (ibid.)—although anarchism is not the philosophy of the Joyce industry, which seeks advantage from *not* dismantling its own strategies of authority.

The extraliterary criterion for evaluation of claims at the system level seems much more consistent: 'more acceptable' is 'more profitable to the industry'. Contemporary critics purport to advocate the idea that *anyone* is free to interpret literature, however, if that freedom is not just a right to say things, but is a right to say things which are not stigmatized (e.g., by being called absurd), then the institution restricts that freedom where it remains committed to the category of misinterpretation. As they strive to uphold the status privilege, academics are more willing to review and promote texts with titles suggesting a conceptual guide (Begnal and Senn 1974), a genetic guide (Crispi and Slote 2007), a reader's guide (Tindall 1996), a student's guide (Hodgart 1978, see V. Mahon 1980: 378) but not an idiot's guide (Brazier 2018). As some critics call truth "alien to the activity of literary interpretation" (Newton 2006: 480), this can be a market manoeuvre to help the authors to remain unaccountable for the alethic quality of their texts.

The emotions that one calls "the bread and butter of literature" (Nanay 2013: 351) are not, as such, important at the system level. Production of FW exegesis can be

dispassionate. FW may (even should) be replaced with another text if the profit and loss account so instructed. That said, the economic objective is not seldom in symbiosis with the emotional factor in the disillusioned enthusiast who opts for what their psychological self-defence says, which is the second part of the following alternative—(i) to sum up their work on FW as failure or (ii) redefine failure and not let oneself grow embittered, e.g., by "having misspent" "youth in [Joyce's] labyrinth" (G. Carey 2018). The psychological criterion for evaluation of claims can be coherent too: 'more acceptable' stands for 'more appeasing our *epistemic autoimmunity*' (see Arfini 2019: 39-49). There can be given other examples of psychological factors affecting interpretation. Regarding Wakese as a variety of English may be an example of *satisficing* (Simon 1997: 118) preferred to the pursuit of the optimal answer. The assumption that FW is a text of high value may be, at least in part, due to a kind of *anchoring effect* (Mussweiler and Strack 2000: 1038) as the expectations from FW assimilated the previously considered, high standard of Joyce's writing. A psychological reason also explains why many Wakeans would claim knowledge rather than ignorance—if "intuitively, ignorance" is "less useful than knowledge" (Arfini 2019: 11), they wish to think that their work is more useful.

One can also assume that the economic motivation is influenced by ideological factors, especially when one agrees with that literature is "inevitably ideological" (Solecki 1993: 559, see Eagleton 1978: 56-57, Newton 1985: 217-219). The difference between the two motivations is that the psychological factor dictates a hermeneutical approach in individuals who process FW, while ideologies, as they operate inter- and supersystemically in relation to the academic industry, are concerned with FW as one text among many.

Discussing these issues, the thesis will be structured as follows.

Against the literary text and author principles, Chapter 1 presents FW as a polytextual, polyauthorial text. The name "FW" refers to the "multitude of variants which share the same title" (Bartnicki 2014a: 373), i.e. the source texts including the 1939 prototext and a number of its post-Joyce variants, none privileged. *The* definitive variant has not appeared. It if never does, this may be in accord with assertions that FW does not exist.[13] But "FW" also stands for the macrotext—i.e. a source text with its pre-texts and post-texts. It can also refer to FW+E polytexts made up of a source text and its exegetical co-text—and to other, even nonliterary, texts. If many interpreters are less interested in

---

[13] Admittedly, that non-existence has been understood differently: Senn 1992b: 215, Van Hulle 2000: 221, W. Van Mierlo 2012, iAhuasca 2016 after Ph. K. Dick 2011b: 612.

what the source text says, and more in how it works—one of the available referents of FW points to that extratextual experience. Another referent of FW is the volume of FW exegesis. Correspondingly, Chapter 1 shows that Joyce is not the sole author of the prototext; he is even less the sole author of a post-Joyce source text; he is a co-author of a FW+E polytext; and a minor contributor to the volume of FW exegesis.

Set against the language principle, Chapter 2 promotes as optimal the proposition that the language of the prototext (or any of its variants) is unknown.

Discussing the paradigm of competence in the academic industry, Chapter 3 indicates that the assumption of superior academic competence cannot be justified on the merits of the epistemic result of processing FW as a literary text. It proposes that the reason why the paradigm has nonetheless been promoted is extraliterary. The Chapter calls to uphold the paradigm by naming the value of submitting interpretation to academic control or to revise it (urging the industry to restore consistency by admitting its primary extraliterary motivation). The thesis closes with some case studies in the Supplements and the Bibliography.

Chapter 1 – The Referents of the Text of *Finnegans Wake*

The position in this chapter opposes the idea prevalent in the Joyce industry that FW has this natural referent: a book, or, a prosaic text in the domain of literature, written by James Joyce, an element in the set that includes the 1939 prototext and its later variants ('source texts'). The purpose of this chapter is to give an idea about how polyreferential the name *Finnegans Wake* ("FW") is, in order to promote the proposition that it is not a primitive notion. Every claim such as "I didn't like *Finnegans Wake*" (T. Williams 1978: 294) is initially vague due to its tacitly assumed referent of the name. It is not possible to prioritize a referent with privileged competence, which privilege would follow from coherent criteria for literary study. Even where a referent of FW is less vague thanks to context or a deictic definition, its proponent cannot present a justified source of competence to assert that their referent is better (standard, more default). The polyreferential FW is polyauthorial—which is against the author principle that names Joyce as the author of FW.

Let us start with the source texts. As the prototext was challenged by its post-Joyce variants aiming to be *the* text of FW (or, at least, a "more corrected" text of FW, Henkes and Bindervoet 2004a), not one of them is definitive. Assuming that *the* definitive variant has not been published so far, one may argue that the text of FW has not even appeared. And even if the definitive variant has been produced, one does not have a reliable criterion for locating it among the contestants for the title.

Since what distinguishes one source variant from another is a number of details, the importance of the detail in FW has been crucial. Still, given the proposed modes of reading FW: one, taking on FW "in the large" with "neglect of the details", the other "in the small" (Kitcher 2009: 198) with neglect of the whole, the former contests our emphasis on the detail. Also, it is puzzling how a suggestion that the revisions in a source text are "minor yet crucial" (Rose and O'Hanlon 2010, see eidem 2012a: ix, Joyce 2010b: back cover) is not oxymoronic. If the *number* of such minor revisions were the main criterion in the competition of the variants, one could argue against it that no amount of revisions has made any variant a more understandable FW: any two source texts present the same kind of inscrutability. If the main criterion were fidelity to Joyce's intention, one could argue against it that the more revisions a variant has, the more it represents the editor's intention, "taking over an author's responsibilities" (C. Hart 1966b: 79), not Joyce's. Moreover, there

is a practical aspect of the detail: if no more than a few paragraphs can be held in mental focus (Clive Hart in Magee 2017: 365), details in that dosage are forgotten once the reader moves to another paragraph—no attempt to merge more paragraphs can rely on memory.[14]

Problematically for the proposition that there exists an intuitive referent of FW, the name "FW" does not even abbreviate the phrase "the source text of FW". People who think that "the final text of *Finnegans Wake* so self-consciously refers to its own production" (Crispi, Slote, and Van Hulle 2007: 3) may use the title "FW" for a source text combined with its pre-texts. "FW" can be interchangeable with the *Work in Progress* ["FWP"] (see Van Hulle 2000: 232, 2005: 141, 2016), the working title of a set of pre-texts dispersed over the span of seventeen years between the publication of *Ulysses* in 1922 and the 1939 prototext of FW.[15] The name also refers to various post-texts, e.g., translations—although, according to some, translations are equivalent texts of FW, according to others—they are not.[16] This does not depend on how abridged a translation is, e.g., "less than half of the

---

[14] Repetitions do not help if in *every* reading it is "hopeless to build up, piece by piece" a "larger whole" (Kitcher 2007: xix). Finn Fordham calls this hopelessness arrogant (2008: 315) but is just as arrogant in his assumption of being more competent (op. cit., 315-316). Anyway, Fordham sends mixed signals—attentive to the detail in the variant of FW that he co-authored (Joyce 2012b), he is also able to analyse FW on the basis of "less than ten pages of the *Wake*'s total" (Hopper 2009: 306).

[15] Or not even this span is certain. The closing year is not fixed if there exist post-Joyce texts attributed to Joyce which can be regarded as pre-texts of FW. Regarding the initial year, Robbert-Jan Henkes nominated Joyce's notebook of April-May 1924 as "the first that can be honestly called a *Work in Progress* one", but he also mentioned "*Work in Progress* before it became *Work in Progress*" (2009). Symbolically, if "the working title did not originate with Joyce" (Simpkins 1990: 740), Joyce was not its author.

[16] If a translation is "continuation and extension of the original text" (P. O'Neill 2005: 13), then it is an epitext rather than a referent of FW. O'Neill's selection of literature on FW in translation (2013: 3) is Blumenbach 1990, 1998, Bollettieri Bosinelli 1999, 2001, Eco 1978, 1996b, L. Knuth 1972, Milesi 1985, 1996, 2003b, 2004, G. Parks 1992, Senn 1967b, 1984, 1998, Topia 1990, and Versteegen 1998. As O'Neill discusses literary translations (2019), he implicitly denies intersemiotic translatability (2013: 6). Discussion of the subject of FW in translation has revealed conflicts and contradictions: FW is "both infinitely translatable and absolutely untranslatable" (Leslie Hill 2007: 98-98), FW is "untranslatable, or even illegible" (Jorge Luis Borges in Waisman 2007: 192-193), FW is anti-translatable (Baydere 2018). Fritz Senn asserts that FW is "far too" easily provable non-translatable (1967a: 163), but if so, he should not have praised Maciej Słomczyński's attempt at "translating the whole of the Wake" (1967b: 229). As Słomczyński translated one chapter and a few additional pages, he proved Senn wrong—either a partial translation counts as that of FW (and then FW is translatable) or a partial translation does not determine

work" in Spanish was not enough to make a FW (Harari 2002: 138-139), whereas a third in Chinese was (Kaiman 2013). An adaptation distilling a source text into an hour of performance was called FW (Cooper 2014), and a film "roughly equivalent to 32 pages" (Gliński 2016b) was called a translation of FW, whereas an unabridged literary translation was called less—an adaptation (Słodownik 2017).

The name FW is even more polyreferential when we allow for Gérard Genette's categories of textuality (1991, 1997), borrowing his concept of the paratext, i.e. "peritext + epitext" (1991: 264). What is the referent of "FW" in a text with peritexts? E.g., where is "FW" in the variant Joyce 2012b, whose text proper is preceded by the texts Fordham 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, Henkes and Bindervoet 2012b, J. Johnson 2012, and followed by Henkes and Bindervoet 2012a—or in the variant Joyce 2012c, whose text proper is preceded by S. Deane 2012, Rose and O'Hanlon 2012b, and followed by Gabler 2012, Greetham 2012, Rose and O'Hanlon 2012a? Perhaps a peritext belongs to *the text of FW*, but not to *FW*—or perhaps it is the other way round. Also, "FW" in polytexts that combine a source text with some exegetical paratext may stand for either component (or both). A number of options follow an anecdote told by Samuel Beckett, and re-told by Richard Ellmann, about how once "the spirit of language" (J. S. Atherton 1974: 15) made Joyce say "Come in" once, which words Beckett, taking dictation of a FWP text, included in the transcript, and which words, some intuit, found their place in the prototext, turned into "Sammy, call on" (Staples 1971: 421). Now, one can say that: (i) The words were transmitted into the prototext, and therefore are part of FW. (ii) They are part of FWP, but not of FW. (iii) They are in FW, but not in the text of FW. (iv) They are neither in FW nor in the text of FW—especially if the anecdote is fake (Slote 2015: 9, see Lernout 1993). But if one cannot say what "the text" is, one cannot tell its peritext from epitext, the former "not materially appended to the text" (Genette 1997: 344). If the 1939 prototext is 'the text' of FW, its later variants are its post-texts. If a post-Joyce variant is 'the text' of FW, then the 1939 prototext is its pre-text. If 'the text' is where our knowledge is found, it may be the volume of FW exegesis. If 'the text' is where our understanding is found, it may not exist—in which case, the volume of FW exegesis is, one may say, nothing but paratext. Attempting to embrace "the open totality of all the texts that can be grouped together

---

whether the whole text is translatable (and then Senn's proof accounting for the whole text cannot be "far too easy"). Joyce himself claimed: "There is nothing that cannot be translated" (qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 632; cf. Libera 2020: 76), but his opinion may be seen as his joke (Sandulescu and Vianu 2015c: Press Release). For my take on the subject of FW in translation see Bartnicki 2012c.

around that name" (Armand 2002a), discussed below are the following referents or groups of referents:

(1) FW as the set of texts recognisable as FW;

(2) FW as the 1939 prototext, representing the set of source texts;

(3) FW as the model source text;

(4) FW as the macrotext, made up of the source text, with its pre-text and post-text;

(5) FW as the FW+E polytext combined of a source text and its exegetical co-text;

all comprised in the multilingual, multimodal, polyauthorial volume of FW exegesis—one more referent of either *FW* or *the text of FW* or both.

1.1. *Finnegans Wake* as the Set of Texts Recognisable as *Finnegans Wake*

In one possibility, FW is the set of texts attributed to Joyce and associated with the words (the title) *Finnegans Wake*. This set can be divided into subsets:

(i)   Standalone book variants with an unabridged original source text; usually under the title FW; always with some paratext. The indicated author is James Joyce; the secondary author is the provider of a non-Joyce's paratext.

(ii)   Extended book variants which combine an unabridged original source text with other texts by Joyce; often with the title that is not FW, yet which may include the words FW. The indicated author is, usually, Joyce; the secondary author is the provider of a non-Joyce's paratext.

(iii)   Standalone literary translations of an unabridged original source text. It will be argued that the main author of such a text is the translator; James Joyce is the secondary author; the provider of an additional paratext is another co-author.

(iv)   Extended literary translations of an unabridged original source text: bilingual editions with an unabridged source text and its translation. It will be argued that the main author of such a text is Joyce; the secondary author is the translator; and the provider of a non-Joyce's paratext (other than the translation) is another co-author.

(v)   <u>Internet publications</u> of an unabridged original source text—oft with extensive annotations. A subcategory is the set of the online publications of a translated source text.

(vi)   <u>Intersemiotic translations of an unabridged source text</u>, e.g., into audiobook, sound, film, performance. Cross-subset translations are available, e.g., online audiobooks with music (Pyle 2015b, 2016b), online art derived from a literary translation (Szmandra 2012).

(vii)   <u>Abridged variants</u> of texts in the previous subsets.

The set contains *texts recognisable as FW*, but there are false negatives (*FWs not recognised as FW*) and false positives (*non-FWs recognised as FW*). An example of the former might be abridgements which (in an arbitrary assessment) are excessive, still they carry the title FW (e.g., Joyce 2016a) and are discussed as if they were unabridged (Kaiman 2013, Pedone and Terrinoni 2017a). Among the latter might be intersemiotic translations which (in an arbitrary assessment) do not represent FW.

If one would assume that a text is recognisable as FW if it exhibits these *distinguishing features*: (i) the title (FW), (ii) the author (James Joyce), (iii) the language (Wakese), and (iv) the length (not too abridged), it should be said that they do not work particularly well.

    (i) Regarding the title. A text is initially recognised as FW if it displays the title, and yet one can envisage a FW without the title (e.g., a book stripped of its cover, with the introductory pages torn out) that remains recognisable as FW. Included in the set of FWs is the variant 2012c whose title on the cover is *The Restored Finnegans Wake* (but the title FW appears in the early note on the edition and on the page preceding the text proper). Possibly recognisable as FW are various polytexts with a different title (e.g., *Finnegans Web...*: Joyce 2002b) if they include FW in the subtitle or another paratext. Non-Joyce's texts whose titles can be mistaken for the FW title (e.g., 19th c. song *Finnegan's Wake*; Goldschmidt 2015) are potential false positives. Other false positives (even more likely if they bear Joyce's name) are excessive abridgements suggested to be an unabridged FW (e.g., Joyce 2014c). A FW+E polytext is *more recognisable* as FW if its source component (a source text of FW) is dominant, and *less recognisable* if it is not. As an example may serve *Finnegans Wake Extensible Elucidation Treasury* (Joyce 2005) whose key objective is not to present a text of FW (Slepon 2006). The presence of the words FW in the title of a collection, e.g., *Finnegans Wake and Exiles* (Joyce 2016b), unlike, e.g., in *The Complete*

Novels of James Joyce (Joyce 2012a), can make one think about the collection as of a text of FW. Last but not least, one should consider translations. It has been a matter of debates whether they are source texts of FW (and whether the title in translation is equivalent to the original title). Their recognisability is local, and not necessarily dependent on the translator's skills: there are translations with the words *Finnegans Wake* in the title because the words were the target language's equivalent (as is the case of Bindervoet and Henkes's Dutch translation, Joyce 2002a) and translations with the original words in lieu of any attempted equivalent in the target language (Lavergne 1982). A translation whose title in the target language does not resemble the original title (e.g., Bartnicki 2012b, Joyce 2012d) is probably less likely to be recognised as a FW, at least initially.

(ii) While Joyce's authorship of FW is symbolically confirmed in most texts in the set, it makes a text more effectively recognisable as FW where the name is displayed in a writing system similar to the original one. In translations, Joyce's name is either well exposed (where the translator wants to add the authority of Joyce's name to the translation) or more hidden (where the translator wants to separate their text from Joyce's original).

(iii) The Wakese language is the main distinguishing feature if a text recognisable as FW has to reveal inscrutability. This inscrutability has been confirmed even by readers who believe FW is comprehensible—even if FW is "a recognisable and consistent whole" (C. Hart 1962: 160), the newcomer is "aware of little more than a sea of vague and dream-like symbols" (ibid., 146). This trademark effect is manifest in an unabridged FW and a non-excessive abridgement—a sample that is understandable may be nonrepresentative. One can assume that Wakese reveals itself in a literary translation where the target text is appropriately inscrutable. Inscrutability can be detected in audiobooks, films, video clips and other audiovisual texts which use the language, yet is not so obvious in translations into music, image—one cannot say whether inscrutability there is typical for all texts in the semiotic code or it reflects the original's individual semantic challenge. The assumption of literariness weighs on that literary translations are recognisable as referents of FW more than nonliterary translations. It is so without prejudice to the length of the translation and the translator's intention to diminish, preserve, or even augment inscrutability. A literary translation, even a partial one, and of the explanatory kind (see P. O'Neill 2013: 289), is more likely to be called FW than an intersemiotic attempt whose creator did "devour the

whole text instead of tasting savory bits only" (Rademacher 1993: 482) and chose the target code because of its defiance of comfort in interpretation.[17]

(iv) The feature called the length (the size) is challenged by abridged source texts with so much paratext that together they are larger than an unabridged text proper, such as a third of Chinese FW (Dai 2013), which has 800 pages. It is also problematic to apply the feature as characteristic of FW, given that there is a subset of some (but not all) abridged literary texts recognised as FW and a subset of some (but not all) unabridged literary texts (translations) not recognised as FW. If an abridgement could pass as a referent of FW regardless of how extensive its reduction of the source text is, the set of FWs would then include a lot of fiction and nonfiction with a quotation from FW (being an abridged text of FW). One example would be *The Campus Trilogy* by David Lodge, due to an epigraph from the source text in it (and translations of Lodge's text with the epigraph would be texts of FW as well). The set would also include the 10 Irish Pound note (1939-1999), various clocks, toys, mugs, beermats, photos, posters, caps, jerseys, t-shirts, graffiti, tattoos with a quotation from FW, also quoting a non-verbal element (see, e.g., a thong with an image from FW: CafePress, product 75702332). A wallet with a stave from *Finnegan's Wake* (CafePress, product 647725763), if mistakable for a stave in FW, would be a false positive. The words "Finnegan's Wake" written on a piece of paper could be a false positive too, as well as could be a *false* false positive to people who know that in FW there are these words "Finnegan's Wake". Extreme cases would be quotations (or 'quotations') in as unorthodox codes as garden (Tschumi 1976) and rose (Kordes 1985).

Devised to demonstrate that the distinguishing features do not quite work was the text Joyce 2014a, which is in the form of a book, with James Joyce's name on the cover, the title not identical to FW, but close enough (closer than the titles of many translations), and whose size of the text proper differs from that in a source text variant by less than 1%. That text was called Joyce's (*Przewodnik bibliograficzny…* 2014: 76) and non-Joyce's (Brockman and Cohn 1963-2008), an unorthodox, yet acceptable variant of FW (Henkes

---

[17] An example of an intersemiotic translation planned to be as challenging as the text of FW is Bartnicki and Szmandra 2015; see also Wróblewski 2016: 17. Of course, there also exist intersemiotic translations which bypass or alleviate the task of reading; e.g., M. E. Bute's 1965 film which "helps break down the doors" (Coulthart 2008) or an online audiobook with music to "make the book more accessible" (Bausells 2016). Released from the "pernickety burden of faithful adaptation" (S. Boland 2014 on Fouéré's 2013), they clearly de-emphasize the detail which is so important to the editor of a post-Joyce source variant.

2014) and a new title (Jakubowiak 2015, see Kearns 2017a). It is the final example here to contest the idea that the set of texts recognisable as FW can be a source of an intuitive referent of the name.

1.2. *Finnegans Wake* as the 1939 Prototext

A popular referent of the name FW is the prototext of FW. Parsing an available definition of the prototext, "a unique and historically specific original work" (P. O'Neill 2013: 6), "unique" will be taken to mean a single text; "historically specific"—a temporal point (the publication date); "original" will imply a single creator; "work"—a tangible output (rather than a process). This tangibility, it will be said, is marked with the title (in its final version) chosen by the creator, and confirmed when the creator declares that the text is complete, a new declaration superseding the previous ones. The prototext is not synonymised with the ur-text, or the "hypothetical 'best' version of a lost literary text" (Wheeler 2016).

Considering the above, there are four candidates for the role of the prototext of FW:

  i.　The text completed "in mid-November, 1938" (Herbert Gorman qtd. in Spielberg 1962: 98), on "13 November 1938" (Spinks 2009: 42), "[o]n the evening of 13 November 1938" ("On This Day…", 2013b), 14 November 1938 (Norburn 2004: 184; "On This Day…", 2014a). In November 1938, Joyce "pronounced the work finished" (Herbert 2009: 14) or he "began to pronounce the book finished" (Crispi, Slote, and Van Hulle, 30), making one announcement on the 13th, and another one on the 18th November (ibid., 44; footnote 68); if so, "the book was finished" at the later date, "[b]y November 18th, 1938" (Hutchins 2016: 189);

 ii.　The unbound copy of the first edition in dust jacket, of 30 January 1939, with "pp. 627-628 missing" (Spielberg 1962: 150);

iii.　The bound advance copy of the first edition (Rose 1995: 135) or a bound set of proofs ("On This Day…", 2014a), displayed at "the birthday party of Joyce, on February, 2, 1939" (Hamada 2013: 268; see Spielberg 1962: 98);

 iv.　The edition for official publication on 4 May 1939.

The text of November 1938 will be rejected here because its title was kept secret (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 93), so its bearing of the title is problematic. The text of January 1939 will be rejected since it was not complete: in it, Joyce "continued to make alterations" (Pilling 2006: 82). Joyce may have "made it quite clear that the text that was published on 2 February 1939 was the final version" (Lernout 1996b: 34), still he "had some remaining revisions to attend to" (Crispi, Slote, and Van Hulle, 30). Since the fourth text (Joyce 1939) seems to be with the fewest reservations, it will be accepted as *the prototext* of FW.

One has to note that after the publication, Joyce wanted to revise the prototext. As the publisher sent Joyce an unbound copy of 30 Aug. 1939 to "help him with the task of correction" (Rose, ibid.; see "On This Day…", 2013a), it will be argued that it is not a better variant of the prototext. This is claimed against various scholars, including Clive Hart, seeing the copy of August 1939 as "Joyce's last bout with his book as a whole" (1966b: 83). As Hart confronts it with a "typescript (with carbon copy) of the corrections" (80), he admits that the two are different in "important respects" (ibid.). He also admits "the loss of the last two pages" (82)—the copy is incomplete. Also, it was influenced by strangers, including the printer (80, 83), but Hart as well—where Hart speculates, Joyce's word becomes Hart's.[18]

Of course, the choice of the 1939 prototext made here may be called prescriptive. In fact, people have raised arguments against this source text, saying that it is not Joyce's last word on FW. They would argue that the 1939 prototext is deficient without James Joyce's revisions (published after his death in 1945), and is not the optimal source text. Whatever is said about the prototext, the fact of discussing it supports these points: (a) the prototext has no intuitive referent, (b) the intuitive referent of the source text is even more debatable, (c) the intuitive referent of the text of FW is unavailable.

1.2.1. The Prototext and its Errata of 1945

Many have said that the 1939 prototext should be considered one with James Joyce's errata posthumously published as "Corrections of Misprints in *Finnegans Wake*" (1945), which prove that Joyce saw the prototext as deficient. Initially, this argument can be opposed, if

---

[18] Consider Hart's "there is no evidence", "what we might reasonably accept" (80), "remain in doubt" (82), "leaves the slight chance that" and "It is possible that Joyce" (83)

just slightly, with a technicality—is the errata text "a 14 page notebook" which "contains around 816 corrections" (Navarrete Franco 2011-2012: 378), or rather "a sixteen-page booklet listing 628 misprints" (Bowker 2012b: 508), or perhaps with 867 corrections [my count: KB]? Another counterargument might be that incorporating the revisions reduces Joyce's presence in the text of FW (quantitatively—the incorporated corrections signal his presence less than the sum of Joyce's errors + Joyce's corrections).

A more important argument against viewing the 1945 errata as part of the prototext is informed by what is said in the assumed definition of the prototext—it is a *single* text. One may not fetishize the "book-as-a-whole" (Slote 2002, see C. Hart 1966b: 83), still one should appreciate the concreteness of a title. Otherwise, one would be free to say, e.g., that "Joyce's last book is both "Work in Progress" **and** *Finnegans Wake*" (Van Hulle 2000: 232; emphasis original) or any other union of texts justified by the proponent's idea about Joyce's intent. Now, the errata are a distinct publication with its own title. One can read the 1939 prototext without knowing (about) those revisions. One can even translate only the revisions (Bartnicki 2012a). A variant without the revisions can be recommended as the source text of FW (see Attridge 2007: x).

Moreover, one may argue that the text Joyce 1945 does not even serve the purpose of errata, which is to "correct errors" which "may influence the interpretation of the work" (Hames 2007: 193). This has support in the sceptic's idea that "error cannot be eliminated systematically or in principle" (Ross 1996: 165),[19] i.e., errata are impractical or impossible:

> "There is nothing like an errata sheet to prompt the reader to seek out yet more errata – that is, nothing like the admission of *some* errors to provoke us to believe that the work is just *full* of errors" (Lerer 2003: 42).

Granted, the definitions of 'correction' vary, and in some the stress is on one's awareness of errors instead of the impact on interpretation. Yet, errors are inherent in every text, more so in texts such as FW, especially if Joyce was not too meticulous (C. Hart, op. cit., 79, see Slote 2004b: 38). Even if the sceptic looks "implausible in supposing" that the "unavoidability of error somehow defeats understanding" (Ross 1996: 193), the 1939 prototext challenges such epistemological pragmatism, as our understanding of FW is not altered by whether a source text of FW is with or without the errata.

---

[19] This kind of scepticism is evident in Bartnicki 2010b, a text in which errors were planned ahead of print.

The final argument concerns posthumous texts. To maintain that the text of 1945 is Joyce's is to say that his death did not void his theretofore unenforced authorial decisions. Even if one would condone "taking over an author's responsibilities" (C. Hart, ibid.; cf. Van Hulle 2000) by the post-Joyce editor, the prototext may never appear as Joyce's final word on it would dwell in the future of the next and next would-be definitive versions.[20]

1.2.2. The Prototext's Post-Joyce Literary Variants

A number of source variants of FW were published death in 1941, their editor guided by the ambition to "recreate and recover the text precisely as James Joyce wrote it" (Rose and O'Hanlon 2012b: ix), set up a text of FW that rectifies the "corruptions" (Van Hulle 2000: 224, 228), "discrepancies" (Kitcher 2007: xiii), "errors" (Slote 2011: 147), "oversights" (McHugh 1981: 77), "transmissional departures" (Henkes and Bindervoet 2012b: xlviii) found in preceding variants. The indefinite article in "a genetic edition" (Van Hulle 2000), "an accurate text" (V. Deane 1985: 1), "a corrected" FW (Slote 2001), "a restoration" (Van Hulle 2009: 114), "an emended text" (Fordham, Henkes and Bindervoet 2015: 96) etc.—instead of the definite one (see Dalton 1965, Henkes and Bindervoet 2004a, Higginson 1956)—makes one think that *the* text will "remain forever in a state of perpetual signifying and discursive suspension" (Daniel Ferrer qtd. in Lernout 2002: 70).[21] Against people who think it prudent to abandon the quest for the definitive FW (Slote 2001, see Henkes and Bindervoet 2004a, W. Van Mierlo 2012), there are many those who continue the pursuit.

Regarding the number of literary source texts. The 1939 prototext was followed by the booklet of 1945; and the corrigenda were allowed for in a 1950 Faber edition, wherein further room for rectification was suggested. They were also incorporated in a revised FW published by Viking in 1958, followed up with a FW in 1959. Faber issued a new FW in 1964, including the revisions of the 1950 text, and another one in 1975, revising the 1964 edition. Penguin published a FW in 1976, which respected the first Viking release, and a second FW in 1982, which resurrected the prototext.[22] Some more recent source variants

---

[20] David Greetham maintains that "no fixed-print edition of the novel is a proper representation" of FW, and he awaits a "digital edition" (2012: 513)—not *the* digital edition though.

[21] Similarly to *the* text of *Ulysses* (John Banville in Ruane 2000; Slote 2004b: 1).

[22] See Rosenbloom (n.d.) for the "primary editions of *Finnegans Wake*" in 1939-2012.

are: Joyce 2010b, 2012b, 2012c, 2014b. Another was due in 2019 (Kosters, Conley, and de Voogd 2016: ix, Sartor 2018: 8).

Regarding the number of revisions other than those in the text Joyce 1945. A list of 29 emendations was drawn up in 1956, and slightly revised (Higginson 1956, 1972, see C. Hart 1960). Later, FW was found in need of 7000 emendations (Dalton 1965, see Blish 1972).[23] Bindervoet and Henkes listed "1293 transmissional departures" (2003).[24] Rose and O'Hanlon incorporated "some 9000 minor yet crucial corrections and amendments" (2010, see eidem 2012a: ix, Joyce 2010b: back cover) in a 493-page variant, i.e., statistically, over 18 revisions a page—in contrast to that, an infringing use of 1/1000th of words of a text is enough to enjoin an edition (Saint-Amour 2003: 259). Confusingly, a variant which alters the text too much should not be called its edition (see Slote 2004b: 35), for a new edition means copies "without substantial change" (Carter and Barker 2004: 87) or indeed a "new edition means that there has been substantial change" ("FAQs: Publication Formats…", 2014). With regard to FW, decisions whether a variant constitutes an edition (and a text) of FW are arbitrary (see Brockman 2014 re Joyce 2014a). The concept of a substantial change is unusually problematic in the case of FW as one recalls the oxymoron "minor yet crucial". If the revisions that alter the prototext are *crucial*, then if the prototext is FW, its later variants, crucially distant from it, *are not* FW. If someone says that the prototext *is not* FW, they imply that the prototext submitted by Joyce is less of FW than a post-Joyce variant that Joyce neither wrote nor endorsed. On the other hand, if the revisions are *minor*, they do not change the prototext substantially, and probably should not be called editions (which is why the word preferred in this thesis is 'variant').

There are some options to accommodate these concerns:

(1) The post-Joyce variants are different to an extent that makes them texts distinct from the prototext, which is FW. (Their titles on the covers are misleading.) They are co-authored by James Joyce and his post-Joyce collaborator. They have their own pre-texts and have or may have their post-texts. E.g., a text of FW announced by Fordham, Henkes and Bindervoet is a combination of several post-texts of the prototext: it is a post-text of the 1975 text called FW (2015: 96) and the 2010 text

---

[23] Or was it in 1966 (Van Hulle 2009: 114) or in 1967 ("45 years ago", W. Van Mierlo 2012), or was it about 6000 emendations in 1963 (Henkes and Bindervoet 2003)?

[24] Or did they exhibit "1334 examples" selected from the total of 2235 mistakes (2012b: xlviii) or 2228 mistakes (2004a, see W. Van Mierlo 2012)?

called FW (ibid., 100) and the Dutch translation of yet another text called FW (ibid., 113).

(2) The post-Joyce variants are different from the prototext (which is Joyce's FW), still the difference does not invalidate their being Joyce's FW. FW is then the name of a set of texts represented by any one of them. Aspiring variants (but also published variants, retroactively) can be arbitrarily removed from the set. The text deserving the label "Joyce's FW" the most is either (i) the prototext, or (ii) an existing post-Joyce variant, or (iii) a future variant. If the prototext is the best Joyce's FW, a later variant is its post-text, and an inferior FW. If a later variant is the best Joyce's FW, the 1939 prototext is its pre-text, and an inferior FW. If a future variant is the best Joyce's FW, every variant presented thus far is a pre-text, and an inferior FW.

(3) The post-Joyce variants may be equally recognisable as FW, but are not equally *Joyce's*. The 1939 prototext is the text of FW in which Joyce's presence is maximal and its later variants are less Joyce's. The later variants would like to be regarded as (equally) Joyce's FW, but this is possible largely due to copyright laws establishing a certain legal fiction by demanding Joyce's name, and his alone, on the cover.

The position here is closest to (3): If the 1939 prototext is FW, then its post-Joyce literary variants in original Wakese are post-texts of FW, recognisable as Joyce's FW. Translations of the prototext are post-texts of FW. Translations which used a post-1941 variant as the source text are post-texts of a post-text of FW. Joyce's name on the cover of a post-text does not agree with the actual authorship. An important co-author of each variant is the post-Joyce editor, "taking over an author's responsibilities" (C. Hart 1966b: 79).

1.2.3. Joyce's Co-Authors of the Prototext

This section means to defy the legal fiction that Joyce is the (sole) author of the prototext, with his single "onymity" (Genette 1997: 39) overshadowing the onymity of the editor, the translator, the authors of other non-Joyce's paratexts. This refusal to accept Joyce's (sole) authorship goes against the tendency to assume that he authored texts that he did not write: various paratexts, including translations, or even texts without his nominal authorship, such as the 1929 volume of FOE written by "Joyce's puppets" (McHugh 1981: 48).

Putting aside all those exegetes who are co-authors of FW+E polytexts, there are (i) Joyce's co-authors more *sensu stricto*, who might have been aware of their impact on the source text, and (ii) the authors of various content that Joyce intercepted, some people he had "met or known" (R. Ellmann 1982: 6, Hassan 1975: 81).

In the example below, FW is a polyauthorial polytextuality:

> "The text used is that of the first trade edition, emended according to the "Corrections of Misprints in *Finnegans Wake*" (New York and London, 1945), after the latter had itself been emended by collation with the typescript (and carbon) of the corrections and with the unbound copy of the first edition (lacking pp. 627 and 628) on which Joyce, with the assistance of Paul Léon, drew up the original list of errata" (C. Hart 1974: n.pag.).

It is linked to various texts (first trade edition, corrections, misprints, typescript, unbound copy, errata) and people, e.g., Paul Léon. His share in the prototext found recognition in the descriptions of items VI.I.45.a [VI.H.4.a], VI.1I.45.b.2 (Spielberg and Crispi 2010), in the phrase "Joyce/Léon revisions" (Henkes and Bindervoet 2003) and other texts (see, e.g., "Archiving the Ephemeral", 2000; Navarrete Franco 2011-2012: 371, 376). Other co-authors *sensu stricto* are Samuel Beckett—whom Joyce would hand "a book from time to time" "to have a look at it and pick out passages" for FW (Letter to Hans Neumann, 17 Feb. 1954 in Beckett 2011: 162), Nora Joyce *née* Barnacle (Slote 2004-2006: 24, 29), as well as people charged with the task to transfer Joyce's decisions into print, but who failed to complete it faithfully, thereby revising the text. Among them, one France Raphael, who "has made numerous errors in her transcriptions" (Spielberg 1962: 131) and whose authorship is more openly confirmed by Danis Rose (1995: 176-177, 179).

Talking about the other group, the 'unaware' co-authors, it may be useful to see in which phase of prototext-making James Joyce appears in the authorial role:

SOURCE
↓
NOTEBOOK
↓
TRANSCRIPTION
↓
WORKSHEET
↓
DRAFT
↓
TEXT (ibid., 172; for description: 169-181; see Crispi and Slote 2007).

As the word *source* refers to Joyce's reading material authored by other people (the said co-authors), and *notebook* is short for Joyce's notebooks, then one might say that Joyce's earliest material appears in the notebook phase. But this assumption can be qualified by the vagueness of the difference between Joyce's reading and Joyce's writing (see Gabler 1990: 213). Since James Joyce would put to the notebooks what he just read (Crispi 2016: 76), a reservation might also need to be made that a stranger's text (*source*) becomes Joyce's text (*notebook*) by the act of rewriting. This might set up a need to reduce Joyce's texts to what appeared *in Joyce's hand*—but then the typescripts and manuscripts would belong to the people who transcribed or copied them; neither printed copies of FW would be Joyce's texts. Not to allow that, another reservation would be necessary then: Joyce's reproduction of a stranger's text makes it Joyce's, whereas a stranger's reproduction of a text by Joyce does not make it non-Joyce's.

If the quality of autograph were to be disregarded for its pertaining to *writership*, rather than *authorship*, that would pose some next questions: whether Joyce wrote texts he did not author and authored texts that he did not write. It would not help one to answer these questions that relevant theoretical models abound, including (1) the *post-structuralist* approach—the writer (scriptor) composes a text from prior texts; the author lost control over the meaning of his work (Barthés 1977), (2) the *originality* approach—authors develop their own ideas while writers write about other people's ideas (Storey 2013),[25] (3) the *status* approach—authors write "the highest literary form"; writers belong to "the next echelon" (Hise 2012); (4) the *genre* approach—writers for journals are different from authors of books;[26] (5) the *action* approach—writers are 'busy', completing texts; authors are 'idle', behind completed texts (D. W. Smith 2012);[27] (6) the *legal* approach stemming from that the "system of ownership and strict copyright rules" was central in the rise of the author (Foucault 1977: 125), turning Joyce into an agent of legal ownership—who may never have sought licences (Spoo 2011: 61), yet stood for "the market value" of his name

---

[25] Joyce may then be a writer who appropriated other people's texts but also the author of the (original) idea to mashup ready-made inputs, who might have other writers "get the machine going" (Henkes and Bindervoet 2004b). In 1927, Joyce suggested a James Stephens should be his stand-in to finish FW; the "collaboration would result in the letters JJ & S beneath the title" (Fennell 2011: 183).

[26] If we distinguish Joyce's temporalities of a writer for literary journals and an author of the prototext, then he had written texts (the instalments of FWP) he later did not author in the book (the prototext).

[27] If so, Joyce became the author for he finished his writing. Then, if a person "becomes an author when coinciding with writing" (Gagliardi 2011: 297), Joyce was an author only when he was writing his text.

(Fisk 2011: 189); (7) the *copyright* approach—Joyce writes after death, which is signalled by his name on various translations of FW.

But Joyce's authorship is problematic even more due to "his literary appropriation" (Culleton 1994: 13, see Cahalan 1999: 88, T. Conley 2001: 55). A good example of that is the so-called Quinet quotation, or, a passage from *Idées sur la philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité*, Edgar Quinet's French translation of Johann Gottfried von Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, introduced into the 1939 prototext, and quite literally (Navarrete Franco 2009: 55), but crediting neither. Joyce would be unrebuked for that theft, called quotation (J. S. Atherton 1974: 34, 63, 243, 276), his method described as "imaginative absorption of stray material" (R. Ellmann 1982: 250, see Knowlton 1998: 36-37, Ramey 2012a: 27). Other claims in his defence are that the theft was *necessitated* by narrative preconditions (Lashomb 2008: 160) and that without "the borrowings" FW would be "a very lean book" (John Garvin qtd. in ibid., 17). Knowing T. S. Eliot's position on good and mature poets (in Culleton 1994: 13) and Steve Jobs quoting Picasso on great artists (in Linzmayer 2004: 173), one might guess that James Joyce reserved for himself the genius's right to steal. Still, this would disagree with the anti-theft ambition of the same copyright law that grants his single authorial role.

Clearly, not only is James Joyce's authorship hanging on the assumption that other people's texts became Joyce's the moment he wrote them down (also in plagiarising), but this relation is non-reciprocal. E.g., Joyce's prototext does not become the translator's text as a result of rewriting it through translation. On the contrary, the translator's name is often moved to a secondary position; and so are the editor's, illustrator's, annotator's names; the instances of the opposite (see Joyce 2016a) are rare. An idea to signal the polyauthorship of FW more fairly might not find support in the industry if the text is better advertisable as Joyce's alone. Even so, the legal-economic fiction does not change the fact that Joyce has co-authors in the 1939 prototext (and he has them even more visibly in a post-1941 variant).

1.3. *Finnegans Wake* as the Model Source Text

Not often have scholars revealed the criteria for selecting such and such post-Joyce variant. One wonders, for example, if the reason for choosing "*Finnegans Wake* (London: Penguin,

1999)" (J. McCourt 2009: xix) was the value of the introduction (Bishop 1999) or anything else. Presenting the variant Joyce 2012b:

> "This text follows the first edition of *Finnegans Wake*, published on 4 May 1939 by Faber & Faber in London and The Viking Press in New York. It incorporates Joyce's posthumously published corrections, and has been entirely reset retaining the original number of pages and lines on a page, from the bilingual edition of our 2002 Dutch translation" (Henkes and Bindervoet 2012b: xlvi),

the editors did not care to explain why a rival variant should be less adequate.

On the Internet, however, one can find the "trifecta" (taogoat 2013, xooxanthellae 2014) ensuring that a variant of FW is recommendable: (i) *Layout*: FW has 628 pages; (ii) *Readability*: FW has a readable size, and font; (iii) *Corrigenda*: FW incorporates the errata of 1945. Putting the last issue aside (already discussed), the differences between the model text and other variants come down to certain visual elements (font, size, pagination). The first two elements are discussed immediately below, and then the prescription of 628 pages is addressed in a separate item.

If a variant can be disqualified for not being in a "good readable size" (taogoat 2013), and the "font choice" is a revision advertised by the publisher (Rose and O'Hanlon 2010), discussed in reviews (Steve 2012, W. Van Mierlo 2011), the visual aspect of FW is apparently not trivial. One may even be led to think that it co-creates the story. If, say, the colour of the 1939 prototext's cover reminds one of the river Liffey or a red-haired lady (Quadrino 2014c), the black calfskin in Joyce 2010 may be a polemic revision. If the same variant replaces the original typeface, Fournier or Lydian (Coles 2015), with Dante, maybe the role of Dante Alighieri becomes emphasised. In any case, such revisions challenge the assumption that the prototext should be observed as Joyce's last word on the paratext in FW, and blindly (because if we cannot be certain which paratexts Joyce did design, which not, we should better be on the side of caution). The editor whose authorial intention does not compete with Joyce's should not revise anything in the prototext, not a punctuation mark, not a hyphenation, not the typeface, colour, size. The price,[28] 25 shillings a copy ("On This Day…", 2014b) should not be revised either, or only in this way that the editor, knowing that Joyce called the 1939 price of FW "completely crazy" (1966b, vol. III: 452),

---

[28] The price, as the example of Bartnicki 2010b shows, can be under some authorial control. In general, the price can *diminish* readability, e.g., the price for a *de luxe* variant of FW had this deterrent effect that the variant may have passed by "almost unnoticed" (W. Van Mierlo 2011). See Conley 2010-2011 for more on the price of FW and price comparisons.

chooses a diachronic method to translate it into a price equally "crazy" in the editor's world. Either way, if one has no coherent criteria for prioritizing some paratexts over others, it is inconsistent to preserve some original paratexts, but not all.

An explanation why the paratext has become non-trivial points at economy. Since FW, whatever its variant, is equally inscrutable, the professional trying to sell it can make it advertisable only by praising revisions of the paratext. Joyce 2014b, an illustrated variant of FW, for example, called a "beautiful, clean version" (T. Staley 2015: 429), a "gorgeous new edition" (Meier 2014), able to "have you hearing and seeing Joyce's language more clearly" (Duggan 2014), "make more sense than the original" (McQuade 2014), makes one wonder what 'sense' the reviewer has in mind—and in any case suggests that the illustrator is a co-author of this particular FW.

1.3.1. The Pagination of the Model Source Text

Regardless of whether the industry has or has not dogmatised more formally 628 pages as the length of the model source text, many scholars have expressed the relevant prescription and more seem to have accepted it as a given.[29] It will be argued that since (i) no reason for that prescription is demanded by the prototext, and (ii) an analysis of the paratext in the prototext (and, even more easily, in any post-Joyce variant) proves the prescription to be incoherent, then (iii) a 628-page-long text is at best an ideal, never attainable as an artefact (printed book), and so, (iv) the professional either accepts the prescription without thinking about it or decides not to call it in question since, by adhering to the standard, the working-time economy improves, because, thanks to the standard, the source text is easily matched up with the exegetical texts that quote from it.

Among the Wakean scholars who make the layout prescription openly is Katarzyna Bazarnik (2006, 2007b, 2007c). Bazarnik argues that 628 is the best or the only admissible number of pages in FW, and that the pagination, or broadly the layout, carries paraverbal meaning which serves our understanding of FW. Applauded by many (e.g., Graff, 2012: 127), Bazarnik's propositions deserve attention because she calls a variant which does not

---

[29] See the value of "99.5%" in Fordham, Henkes, and Bindervoet (2015: 95). The standard will be in use in this thesis as well. Quotations from FW (the 1939 prototext wherever possible) will be in the format: a page number followed by a dot and a line number (e.g., "Y?" comes from FW 477.31).

adhere to the prescription useless and unreadable (2007b), and because she moves on from a position in maths, whereby she may be suggesting a scientific truth in her claims.

Bazarnik does not make the mistake of others (Attridge 2001: xi, Fordham 2007: 2, J. McCourt 2009: xix, P. Mahon 2009: 149) by saying that all FW variants carry the same pagination. What she says instead is that the non-standard variants are "very few" (2007b). It is unclear to what percentage this translates, but is likely meant to convince one that the standard has been almost uncontested. The standard is absent, e.g., in the variants Joyce 1959, 2004, 2010b, 2012c, 2014b, and the bilingual editions Joyce 1993 (1250 pages) and 2002a (1300 pages), as well as in unabridged translations, e.g., a French FW (926 pages in Lavergne 1982), a 453 pages long Latin FW (see A. Roberts 2019a), an Italian FW in 6 volumes (392+462+532+532+420+768 pages: Schenoni 1982, 2001, 2004, 2011, Terrinoni and Pedone 2017, 2019), a Japanese FW in 3 volumes (408+416+488 pages: Yanase 2004). It is neglected in abridgements that carry the name FW, in original Wakese (e.g., Joyce 1966a) and in translation (e.g., Bíró 1992). Despite Joyce being "extremely aware" of the print medium (Spodaryk 2015: 107), online variants (e.g., Joyce 2002b, 2005, 2006) are popular source texts too.

In the core of Bazarnik's argumentation is the assumption that the flow of the text is circular—FW 'opens' with the word "riverrun" (FW 3.1) and 'closes' with the words "a long the" (FW 628.16) in an ouroboros-like sentence, which explains why the 'opening' word is in lowercase and the 'closing' words are without a full stop. The reason for that circularity intended by Joyce, says Bazarnik, is mathematical-geodetic.[30] We should imagine the book as a model of the globe (i.e. the Earth) where the circle of the book is two semicircles, the Prime Meridian and the 180th Meridian. As 628 is the circumference of the circle, the radius of the book is 100 (if $2\pi R=628$, then $R=100$), "a number which does not seem accidental at all" (2006: 179). One can detect this structure in Joyce's references to the North polar region around pages 628-3, the South polar region around

---

[30] Circularity has earned rival explanations. Joyce signals a Möbius strip (Bristow 2014: 91, Shlain 2007: 304); FW demonstrates "an upward DNA spiral rising to the stars" (Leary 1993: 31); the "wyrm-edened book" is a "short-circuit of all myth" (Random Cloud qtd. in T. Fitch 2016: 210); FW is a text that "resists the emphatic closure" (Sherman 2011: 85); it "embodies the effect of entropic erosion resulting from the unending repetition" (Ferrer 1996: 211); it defies that "we can step in the same river but once (Bartnicki 2010a: 22); its "narrative architecture" "can be understood in terms of spectrality" (Schultz 2012: 282). It is possible as well that FW makes "not a circle but a pendulum" (Ktownkemist 2019).

pages 314-315 (2007c: 204); "the Equator should be located on pp. 157-8 and 471-2, whereas the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn on pp. 115-117 and 511-513, and 197-9 and 429-431 respectively" (ibid.). Joyce's intention is more obvious if we recall that already in *Ulysses* there is "an elaborate symbolism keyed to the sequence of page numbers" (McGann 1991: 79; see Bazarnik 2009: n.pag. [6]).

Confusingly though, Bazarnik discusses the circle, but also the sphere ("a circle and sphere", 2007c: 204, "Shapesphere", 2007b). Furthermore, if, in her model, Joyce draws the circumference of a circle *c*, turned into the great circle of a sphere *C*, the centres of *c* and *C* are outside FW—which is against the claims that FW does include its middle point[31] and that "*Finnegans Wake* is a book without a center" (Attridge 2004a: 217). Besides, the circumference of a circle is not $2\pi R$ in non-Euclidean geometry (for which, see Clements 2015, Dettmar 1996: 139, C. Hart 1962: 64, MacDuff 2020: 170 [f. 7], Rice 1997: 63-65), symbolised by the tesseract on FW page 100, representing "a 4D universe" (James Joyce qtd. in McMorran 2016: 201).

More principally, Bazarnik's ideas can be charged with intentionalism. One doubts whether Joyce had the time, means, and ability to be that punctilious (see C. Hart 1966b: 79, Kurnick 2015). If Joyce had been so precise, one might say as well, e.g., that the Euler number $e \approx 2.71828$ is highlighted in FW (because in line 271.8, the 28th character is "e").

A specific objection concerns the importance of 628. Let's take 493 [the number of pages of the text proper in Joyce 2012c] instead of 628, then if 493 is $2\pi^2 R^3$ [the hyperarea of a glome of radius R], the value of R^3 is 25; if 493 is $\frac{1}{2}\pi^2 R^4$ [the hypervolume of a glome of radius R], the value of R^3 is as neatly: 100. There are so many numbers except for 100 in Joyce's private numerology[32] that they make it easy to use them in mathematical operations that produce an eisegetically preconceived result.

---

[31] Which, "the book's formal centre", is on FW page 293 (John Gordon qtd. in Benjamin 2010: 111, see "Thunderwords", 2016). In the variant Joyce 2012c, the centre is on FW page 237 (Rose 1995: 120).

[32] 0, as well "other prominent *Wakean* numbers such as 2, 3, 4, 12, 29, 111, 1132" (Fuse 2007: 117), "one, two, three, four, and ten" (DiBernard 1980: 60), "all the numbers up to seven" (C. Hart 1962: 186), and 8 (Quadrino 2014b), "12 embracing 13" (Rasch and O'Donnell 1993: 145), 7, 12, 29, 111, 432, 566, 1132 (T. Finnegan 2013), 28 and 32 (McCreedy 2016: 14), 101 (Chrisp 2014), 111 (znore 2012), 1001 and 1132 (Feshbach 1991: 285), 1132 (Burgess 1968: 192, see J. Campbell 1991: 144-145, Sterling 2000). Possibly there are more; consider, e.g., "fourty-four names" (Fowler 2012: 224).

One detects Bazarnik's eisegetic intent in her *circulus in demonstrando*: she selects a variant of FW to find support to be used as evidence to justify the selection. She cherry-picks support, e.g., she sees some references to "polar expedition vessels: the Fram (312.7, 313.27, 315.30 (?), 317.9, Pourquoi Pas, Le France (315.34-6) and the Belgica (316.15-9)" (2007b), but omits "fram" (FW 596.7), "The *Pourquoi Pas*" (FW 479.28-29), "a bulgic" (FW 204.9). She proposes that the Equator is represented "on pp. 157-8 and 471-2", yet does not mention the "equator" in FW 131.32, 435.13. She argues that page 3 represents the North polar region, yet she does not comment on the possible references to Dublin, America, Europe, Asia Minor, Georgia on the same page.

Crucially, Bazarnik's—or indeed anyone's—prescription of 628 is inconsistent if we allow for paratexts, and regardless whether they "belong to the text or not" (Genette 1991: 261). In the former case, the text does not open with the word "riverrun",[33] but with the title on page 1, or perhaps on the front cover.[34] Nor does FW end with "a long the" (FW 628.16)—these words are followed by "PARIS" and "1928-1939.", FW 628.17-18 (Crispi, Slote, and Van Hulle 2007: 3, see Bartnicki 2010a: 22, Radak 2009: 56-57), called "the other, sadder ending" (S. Deane 1992: xxxix),[35] but not even they make the true ending, followed by more paratexts (at least 2 back-cover pages). Also, it is typical of a post-1941 variant that the count of 628 is ruined by non-Joyce's prefaces, afterwords, and such. This applies even to the variants that imitate the 1939 prototext, e.g., Joyce 1992 has 688 pages, therein 43 pages of Seamus Deane's text (1992), and 4 cover pages.

If paratexts *do not* belong to the text, the text (proper) of FW is not 628 pages long either. A more probable count, excluding the title leaf (FW 1-2), 3 intertitle pages (FW 217, 401, 591) and 4 adjacent blank pages (FW 218, 400, 402, 592), is 619. In fact, *not even one* source text of Joyce's FW has ever had right 628 pages. If "the paratext is what enables a text to become a book" (Genette 1997: 1), the prescribed pagination, together with the feature of circularity, may belong in an ideal text, but cannot appear in print (which agrees with the idea that the definitive text will not arise). The promotion of the 628 standard is

---

[33] See Rose 2010 on "riverrun" changed to "Riverrun". Also, as the word "riverrun" goes after an extra spacing in Joyce 2012c, see W. Van Mierlo 2012 on Joyce-MacLehose co-authorship of that spacing.

[34] See that the word "riverrun" is in "Joyce 1939: 1" (Cronin 2013: 75). As Bazarnik notices the "white expanse of page 628 and blank pages 1 and 2, which we should consider as belonging to the book" (2011: 171) and recognises the role of the covers too (ibid., 165, see Starakiewicz 2017: 70), it is not at all clear how she could come up with 628 as the number of pages.

[35] By misaligning them to centre instead of the original left, Deane shows disregard for the paratext.

symptomatic of that FW exegesis is inseparable from the source text, in whose polytext, against the author principle, the exegete's presence is augmented, and Joyce's is reduced.

1.4. *Finnegans Wake* as the Macrotext

Another known referent of FW is the *macrotext*. The term means a central text surrounded with its pre- and post-texts, its "extensions backwards and forwards in time" (P. O'Neill 2013: 6, see id. 2005: 5-16). However, what has already been noted, the central text is not fixed—if it is the 1939 prototext, the post-Joyce variants are its post-texts. If it is a post-Joyce variant, the 1939 variant is a pre-text. If the central text is an ideal, then any artefact trying to be that ideal is its pre-text (and there will never appear post-texts). An unabridged literary translation may be viewed as a post-text of the central text in another language; an intersemiotic translation is more problematic if its being a translation (and a referent) of the name is more controversial. This section will not sort out these problems by outlining any taxonomy. On the contrary, it may add to the confusion by arguing that the pre-text and post-text of FW are vaguely distinct sets.

One cannot distinguish the central text from the pre-text and post-text by observing the indications on the cover, for they are inconsistent in suggesting the main author. On the cover of the text Joyce 1966a (which may or may not be considered a FW) there are two names: James Joyce's and the post-Joyce editor's; then the editor's name, without Joyce's, is distinguished in Joyce 1963 (which may be a pre-text or a post-text); while the editor's name is absent on the cover of the source variant Joyce 2012b.[36]

An attempt to identify the set of pre-texts by enumerating its subsets will fail since their number is not clear. In one proposition, these subsets are "notebooks, manuscripts, typescripts, prepublication extracts, and the like" (P. O'Neill 2013: 6). Elsewhere they are called: letters, diaries, notebooks, proofs, manuscripts (Lemos 2009: 266). Two subsets are "drafts and notebooks" (Lernout 2002: 72), also described as *manuscripts*, including drafts, and *notebooks* (Hayman 1990: 2-3), while the *manuscripts* can be described as:

---

[36] The decision what name will appear on the cover may be affected by an aesthetic reason (suspected behind the decision to leave the covers of Joyce 2010b, 2012c without any name) and a ploy to feature the marketable name (suspected in Szczerbowski 2000, an academic text released under the title "*Anna Livia Plurabelle* in Polish: James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, Book I, Chapter 8" [my translation from Polish: KB].

"the manuscripts proper, the *drafts*, which comprise handwritten drafts, typescripts, proofs and marked-up copies of the interim publication of sections of the book in *transition* magazine and elsewhere; and the *notebooks*, a sequence of 'textual diaries' in which, in the form of long lists of words and phrases, we find the accumulated gatherings of Joyce's reading over the entire period of the writing of his book" (Rose and O'Hanlon 2012a: 515-516).

Hans Walter Gabler mentions "notes, sketches, drafts, fair-copies, typescripts, and proofs" (1990: 214) and "the mass of notebooks" (233), but the pre-text in his definition may also include "[t]he author's life" (219) and texts "from within his own *oeuvre*" (218). If so, then *Ulysses* (with its pre-texts) may be a pre-text of FW, especially since FW uses quotations from *Ulysses* and contains unused *Ulysses* notes (Crispi 2016: 76 [f. 5], R. Crowley 2006, "On This Day…", 2014a).

In an attempt to agree the above ideas, the pre-text of FW is a set with the initial minimum of Joyce's *manuscripts* (sketches, notes, drafts) and his *notebooks*. It may grow to contain *proofs*, typescripts, fair-copies, as well as letters, diaries, and other biographic material, as well as Joyce's pre-FW texts. Extensively, if "[a]ll Joyce's works are mentioned in the *Wake*" (J. S. Atherton 1974: 259), the pre-text includes everything Joyce wrote prior to the 1939 prototext.

If the post-text is similarly inclusive, it contains everything Joyce wrote after the 1939 prototext. Naturally, this would need the assumption that one is able to define Joyce's writing (e.g., if it is just his autograph material, and what he rewrote, or it is also what was taken down from his dictation) and address the problem that the writer and the author are not the same person. The set would include non-literary texts (for the question whether a post-text can only be literary will be answered in the negative). If there should be no minimal content of the source text to underlie a post-text, then post-texts could be founded on single words. The word *quark*, for instance, which Murray Gell-Mann took from FW to name a particle in his model of quantum physics, would be a post-text of FW.[37] Since Gell-Mann had "the sound first, without the spelling, which could have been kwork" (1994: 180) and "had to find an excuse" to pronounce *quark* as kwork (ibid., see Angier 2008: 99), one might say that its post-textuality is dependent on the medium (oral or written). It might also depend on knowledge, e.g., people who know that *quark* is "one of the very few early loan words in Old German taken from a Western Slavic language" (Gliński 2016a) would not think of it as Joyce's; and other people might think that *quark* is Gell-Mann's

---

[37] Provided that Gell-Mann found the word in the prototext (see Hansen 2014: 5, Petrov 2015: 174). Otherwise, his one-word post-text would be a post-text of a post-text.

word, not Joyce's. Similarly, the word *monomyth* (FW 581.24) may be considered Joseph Campbell's word (see 2004: 28), not Joyce's, and its post-texts (e.g., *The Elder Scrolls Wiki*. s.v. "The Monomyth", Stojković 2016: n.pag. [5]) would be ones of Campbell's text. Problematising this user-dependent post-textuality further is the question of our awareness whether a post-text was even intended. Let us consider this text: "*Finnegan's Wake* was a very early influence. I remember when it was published in 1939" (Weinzweig 1992: 12). One possibility is that it includes a revision of the title FW by means of an apostrophe, and so it is a post-text of the title (and of the text of FW which contains it). Since Weinzweig had spoken his words that were (mis)transcribed later, this would leave one with the task to determine if the post-text is Weinzweig's or the transcriber's. Alternately, the misspelled title does not refer to FW (=Weinzweig did not see a published *Finnegan's Wake* in 1939). One may also propose that the reference to the title was not cancelled by the misspelling, especially if we are aware of it.

Recapitulating the difficulties in separating pre-text from post-text, they draw from: (i) the unfixed reference of the central text, (ii) the openness of either set to include more and more elements; (iii) the unresolved question of the minimal (as well as the maximal) content of the central text that founds either of them; (iv) the user-dependent actuality of either of them; (v) the question of intentionality in the formation of either of them, and its recognisability in the role, in particular where pre- and post-texts create their own post-texts.

The temporal divider does not separate the sets well since our understanding of a sequence of events may be different, depending on whether we prioritize *consecutiveness* or *consequentiality*,[38] that is, on whether our approach arranges texts by the time stamps or prioritises the reason for writing them. If the prototext is what propelled the study of its pre-texts (which would not have come under scrutiny, had the prototext been more lucid), then the pre-texts, chronologically earlier, are consequentially later than the prototext.

The exegete's work on sources which are chronologically earlier than the prototext can concretize itself as post-text. Two examples are Joyce 1963 ("FDV") edited by David

---

[38] Imagine a dead star whose light is still travelling. If *consecutiveness* is prioritized, the death of the star is prior to the light it emitted. If the death of the star is established *in consequence* of the light ceasing at one point to remain observable, then the death of the star is subsequent to the light. One may consider Friedrich Nietzsche's concept here, *die chronologische Umdrehung* (van Tongeren, Schank, and Siemens 2005: 342), i.e. the chronological reversal (Chia 1996: 198).

Hayman, and Joyce 2013 ("FH") edited by Danis Rose. When the caesura of chronology is used, both, published after 1939, are post-texts. Calling FDV a paratext (W. Van Mierlo 2002: 44, N. Morris 2008: 26) suggests post-textuality. But if FDV is an abstract of Joyce's pre-textual "nine thousand pages of holograph, typescripts and revised proof" (Hayman 1963: 3), and FH arranges Joyce's material composed in 1923, intuition reclassifies them as pre-texts. An initial understanding of their relation toward the central text is affected by paratexts: the cover of FDV is without Joyce's name, yet with the title suggesting a pre-text of FW. Still, Joyce never established a FDV, so, the editor may be seen as the author (see Brockman and Cohn 1963-2008, C. Hart 1964, Slote 2002). The other example, FH is a text with Joyce's name on the cover, and the title that does not refer to FW. Whether Joyce wrote FH is a matter of controversy (Duncan 2013, Kelley 2013). Even if Joyce wrote it, Rose may be the main author because Rose made the crucial authorial decision to see FH in print. Alternately, allowing for the institution of the title, *the text of FH*, at least its large part, was published by Joyce prior to FW, whereas the idea to publish it under the title FH was not Joyce's, therefore, *the text of FH under the title FH* is post-Joyce's (see Jarniewicz 2015b: 70-71). By analogy, *the text of FDV* is Joyce's, but *the text of FDV under the title FDV* is not.[39]

Prioritizing *consecutiveness*, FDV is Joyce's pre-text of FW ("Joyce's" meaning the writer, not the author). Prioritizing *consequentiality*, FDV is a post-text of some pre-text (not directly of FW), Hayman being the only author and a minor co-writer. In the case of FH, prioritizing *consecutiveness*, it is either Joyce's pre-FW text or his pre-text of FW ("Joyce's" meaning the writer, and possibly, but not necessarily, the author). Prioritizing *consequentiality*, FH is a post-text of this pre-FW text or this pre-text, Joyce being the main writer and a minor or no author, and Rose being a minor writer and the first or sole author. FH is more likely recognisable as a post-text of FW due to its post-Joyce life, but it is a pre-text if stylometry can decide about that (J. O'Sulivan 2014). Asked if FH is a pre-textual version of FW, the publisher said: "Not really" ("Finn's Hotel FAQ…", 2013).

Another reason why it is difficult to rely on the temporal division is that the post-Joyce agent decided to release texts in Joyce's name. In the rhetoric enabled by copyright law (Saint-Amour 2003: 121-158, 2011: 21, Stanford 2011), Joyce is an undead writer with the right to announce his authorial intention after 1941, and to block unwanted texts from emergence (Marsh 2015, Max 2006, Rimmer 205: 402-415, Saint-Amour 2003: 157, 2011:

---

[39] To make the issue even more complex, FH may be a remake of FDV (see Kidd 1997).

35). As copyright law would "bar the way to dialogue with the dead" (Spoo 2011: 41), the dialogue with the writer was restricted to his successors, notably his grandson Stephen J. Joyce. Not a usual heir, Stephen did not speak *for* James; rather, James spoke *through* Stephen, the two conferring in Zurich (Saint-Amour 2003: 158).

The temporal division is also confined by that James Joyce had charted a number of interpretive avenues before the 1939 prototext was released. His commentary is a pre-textual paratext of FW, unlike the exegesis made after the prototext, which is a post-textual paratext. If the exegesis is the text of FW, then the 1939 prototext is in part its pre-text, in part its post-text.

1.5. *Finnegans Wake* as the Polytext of Source Text-*cum*-Exegesis

Claims such as that FW gets "noticeably easier the further one reads" (Dettmar 1996: 210) must be called incorrect if they imply that one can process the source text alone. As the source text (FW) has always been with a non-empty volume of the exegetical paratext (E), the referent of FW that recognises this union is the FW+E polytext. (The symbol 'FW+E' is not meant to replace 'FW', but merely to indicate that there are two components). The FW+E union is confirmed more patently where the exegetical component is a peritext, not an epitext, e.g., in bilingual editions or in a French rendition of a source text of FW with "three notes to every two pages" (T. Conley 2012: 22). Some exegetical texts which "create a version of the *Wake* that is accessible to newcomers" (Pyle 2015a) may even try to substitute the literary original. Where Joyce's presence in a polytext decreases due to the source text having been abridged (as in Joyce 1966a, to help "those who wish to read and enjoy Joyce", "*'Wake' Shortened*…, 1967: 33), the editor's authorial presence grows more obvious. FW+E polytexts neither need to take the book form (Joyce 2005, 2006) nor share one semiotic code. E.g., Joyce 2010a is a comic book that ensures "a form to assimilate" a source text of FW (Fritz Senn qtd. in "Finnegans Wake, The Final Chapter…", 2012).

Below is considered a selection of FW+E polytexts:

(1) FW and the exegesis-before-FW either nominally Joyce's (*Work in Progress*) or non-Joyce's (*Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*);

(2) FW and the mock source text component (*Annotations to Finnegans Wake*: McHugh 1980, 1991, 2006, 2016);

(3) The mock polytext, e.g., a FW with a *Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake* (Campbell and Robinson 1976), and a FW with a *Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake* (Tindall 1996).

One can find the selected titles on many lists of recommended exegesis (e.g.: Gioia 2013, Groden 2013b, Lisa Hill 2017, Kitcher 2007: 303-304, T. McCarthy 2015b, Quadrino 2013b, J. Staley 2013), albeit some authors in this selection would not recommend some others (see McHugh 1991: v; 2016: xix, Tindall 1996: 25). Anyway, the selection is not to meant to imply that there exist some texts better suited to explain FW. Other texts could as well be recommended, such as Gordon 1986 (see Hamada 2013: 37, cf. McHugh in ibid., 78); McHugh 1981 (see Joe Schork in Hamada, 111); Rose and O'Hanlon 1982 (see Fritz Senn in Hamada, 12); C. Hart 1974 (see B. Benstock 1976: 128).

1.5.1. The Polytext with the Exegesis-Before-the-Text

The first example of the FW+E polytext combines the source text with the exegesis-before-the-text which is, nominally, either Joyce's (*Work in Progress*, 1922-1939?: "FWP") or non-Joyce's (*Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*, 1929: "FOE").

If FWP, called "the unfinished *Finnegans Wake*" (M. Norris 2004: 149), "the early version of *Finnegans Wake*" (Salgado 2001: 132), is part of the source text, the polytext consists mostly of the source component. Trying to distinguish FW from FWP, one may argue that the prototext (as an example of the source text), as a book, is more concrete than FWP being "pre-book publications of *Finnegans Wake* fragments" (Van Hulle 2016) dispersed in "various journals and small-press books 1924-1937" (Groden 2013a). However, others may argue that the book form does not separate FW and FWP, or even may call FW and FWP together "Joyce's last book" (Van Hulle 2000: 242, see 2005: 141). Instead of the book-form differentiator, one should perhaps rely on the linguistic one if FW is well-known for "its unintelligibility, its neologismical language, and its logopoetic self-referentiality" (Margot Norris qtd. in Dettmar 1996: 210), whereas the language in FWP, away "from the sleepwakean" (Henkes 2012), ranging from "basically English" to "the

convolute Wakean form" (Slote 2002), is not Wakese. If FWP is used to elucidate FW, not the other way round, the exegetic role of FWP becomes more obvious.

Another example of the exegesis-before-the-text is FOE, or the "first book-length work of literary criticism devoted to the *Wake*" which "appeared ten years" before FW "was published in 1939" (Nash 1996: 3). If Joyce's involvement in FOE could only have been surpassed by Joyce taking up the pen himself (see Beach 1961: vii, Burgess 1968: 9, Fordham 2012b: xxxi-xxxii, McHugh 1981: 48, M. Norris 2004: 161), and FOE is Joyce's for all practical purposes, albeit not nominally, this complicates the question of authorship.

It seems that FOE had two objectives: (i) advertise FWP (and, by extension, FW), maybe even develop a bias that FWP (and FW) is worthy of attention, against any intuition to the contrary;[40] and (ii) be a source of clues "indispensable to readers of *Finnegans Wake*" (Beach 1961: vii, see ead. 2012: 223), supplementing FWP and Joyce's letters (Kitcher 2007: xviii, Siedenbiedel 2002: 170). FOE's present effectiveness may be under debate (see T. Conley 2010), but it is probably true that FOE "did much to set the means" by which FW "could be read and promoted" (Nash 2009: 50).

As a promotional text outsourced by James Joyce, FOE announces an Einstein-scale discovery (Brion 1961: 33) by the maker of *Ulysses*, and makes snob appeals to the erudition of its readers (Llona 1961: 99-100). The curious reader is forewarned about some difficulties ahead (Gilbert 1961: 50), some fragments "sealed up" "to even the erudite reader" (Sage 1961: 169), and an unorthodox treatment of plot (Paul 1961), which are offset, however, with playability, letters offering "a host of associations" (Budgen 1961: 39), sense that "is dancing" (Beckett, ibid.), "an Irish Word Ballet" (McAlmon 1961: 103) by "James Joyce the musician" (McGreevy 1961: 124). A critic dissuading aspirant readers is dismissed (Sage, op. cit., 167, W. C. Williams 1961: 182-183). Trying to preempt or disengage negative criticism, FOE presents two "letters of protest", alleged protest, one by a V. Dixon (1961), whose play on Joyce's language is a sign of appreciation (see Senn 2010a: 146), and the other by G. V. L. Slingsby who, having shown reverence for Joyce, promotes the text by hinting "obscenity" (1961: 191; Vanderham 1998: 57, see Fordham 2010: 128-129).

---

[40] Some critics had a "premonition" about FW being Joyce's "artistic climax" (Van Herbruggen 2004), a "work of value, without quite knowing why" (Nash 2002: 128), "never readable" yet "overpoweringly worthy" (Gilbert Highet qtd. in ibid., 129). Such "plaudits publicly offered on its behalf invite the charge that they are vague puffery" (Kitcher 2007: xix).

As a source of interpretive clues, FOE agrees with the industrial principle that FW is Joyce's literary text. FOE makes appeals to Joyce and promotes biographism, e.g., where it mentions *Ulysses* again and again, or asks one to regard his oeuvre as "an indivisible whole" (Sage, op. cit., 149). The pre-Wakese language of FWP is addressed from the positions of (i) mysticism, (ii) somnology, and (iii) linguistics:

(i)   Finding support in the religious feeling of a "purgatorial aspect of the work" (McGreevy 1961: 124), the mystical view is expressed by Samuel Beckett: Joyce's "writing is not *not about* something; *it is that something itself*" (1961: 14, see Geert Lernout in Hamada 2013: 65).

(ii)   The somnologist believes in "dream's own purpose and logic" as "the key to the understanding" (Budgen 1961: 45). Readers may lose "their way in the dark of this night piece" (Beach 1961: viii) because when "the sense is sleep, the words go to sleep" (Beckett, ibid.). As "we do not use the same words while asleep as those we employ when awake" (Jolas 1961: 91), Joyce's imagery needs to be "disordered, illogical" (Llona, 101) or "a-logical" (Jolas, ibid.).

(iii)   The linguist upholds the assumption of Englishness. A rare voice of dissent, saying that, to Joyce, "language does not mean the English language" (McAlmon, 106), is lost among others. Even though Joyce's language springs "from more than a dozen foreign languages" (Jolas, 90) or "seventeen tongues" (Llona, 99) or "half the languages known to mankind" (McGreevy, 124), its English "sentence structure and the syntax generally will offer no obstacles" (Paul 1961: 136). Amalgamating the languages in the "so-called English-speaking world" (Jolas, 82) or creating "a terminology of his own" (Sage, 166), Joyce does simply what English does, "a notorious borrower and manufacturer" (ibid.). If "Joyce has created his language" (Brion 1961: 29), it disciplines English (ibid.) or revitalises English (Rodker 1961: 145). In sum, the language is English, or at least English enough, "bordering upon English" (Paul, 131).

1.5.2. The Polytext with the Mock Source Text Component

Participating in the polytext of FW and Roland McHugh's *Annotations to Finnegans Wake* (editions 1980, 1991, 2006, 2016), McHugh provides an example of the mock source text component. Openly calling to see his *Annotations* together with the source text (1991: v, 2016: ix, xiii), he wants his exegesis to seem indispensable, integral with the source text. The "necessity of Roland McHugh's *Annotations*" (Harry Burrell in Hamada 2013: 160) has been confirmed in many sources (Tim Horvath, ibid., 48, Joe Schork, ibid., 107, García Tortosa 2011-2012: 338, Kiberd 1981, Killeen 1997),[41] and McHugh himself has been confident about the quality of his text, a milestone in the history of exegesis (2006: vii), condensing "the cream of all available exegesis" (1991: vi).

As McHugh advises caution against competition (1980: v, 2006: xiii), in an idiom of superiority (1981: 69), he possibly wishes to make the *Annotations* associable with FW. This may be due to the fact that McHugh's text does not make a lot of sense in separation from the source text. Besides, if FW, "despite the libraries of exegesis that have been erected, remains literally a closed book" (Burgess 1975: 177), then McHugh may wish to distance himself from that apparent futility. He is aware though that the 'libraries' grow—the growth reflects in his acknowledgments: In the 1991 edition (viii-ix), he acknowledges 53 collaborators, 24 titles, 44 a *Wake Newslitter* (AWN) articles; in the 2006 edition (viii-x), he mentions 70 collaborators, 43 titles and the AWN articles; in the 2016 edition (xix-xxiii), he acknowledges 81 collaborators, 53 titles and the AWN articles, but also takes account of the revisions in Joyce 2002a and 2012c, and recognizes vast online resources: Joyce 2005, *Genetic Joyce Studies*, and *James Joyce Online Notes*.

It is interesting to note McHugh's change of mind about the exegesis of FW. In the early editions, he asks: "How much closer are we now to a 'complete exegesis'?" (1980, 1991: v); in the third edition, his text "does not aspire to completeness" (2006: xiii), and the word "exegesis", used early in the preface, is put in historical context (vii); finally, in the fourth edition, the word is moved deeper in the preface, and its meaning is implicitly negative, by association with "the guesswork which characterizes much FW exegesis" (2016: xvi).

---

[41] For less favourable reviews see B. Benstock 1980, Mink 1980, M. P. Gillespie 1982, T. Conley 2007.

1.5.3. The Mock Polytext

In another FW+E polytext, the exegetical component is *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake* by Campbell and Robinson (1976; first published in 1944), perhaps the oldest post-Joyce book-length commentary on FW in English, offering itself as a key to the source text as early as in the title. Unlike McHugh's mock source text component which is dependent on FW, *A Skeleton Key* has a potential to displace the source text. Incorporating quotations from FW, *A Skeleton Key* makes itself a 'mock polytext', as if with a FW (in Campbell and Robinson's English translation)[42] and their commentary on it.

Then a book that "carries on where Campbell and Robinson's *Skeleton Key* left off" (Kaleva 2017), *A Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake* by William Tindall (1996; first published in 1969) is another text with a potential to substitute FW. In comparison with *A Skeleton Key* which reads more smoothly, Tindall's "Guide might be even more daunting that the Wake itself" (W. Harris 2002). If Tindall's style "can induce vertigo" and "lose his reader" (Goldman 1971: 106, cf. Lyngstad 1969: 604), the reader may need to go (back) to the source text of FW in order to 'reverse engineer' what Tindall has in mind. Wherever this return takes place, Joyce's authorial presence is (re)enhanced.

1.5.4. The Key-Oriented Polytext

Another category of FW+E polytext is the polytext whose exegetical component is organised around a key to FW meant as a selection of texts (instead of a single title like *A Skeleton Key*). For example, the polytext admitting "the thunders as a key" (E. McLuhan 1997: 238) is likely to include a source text of FW and texts on the thunders in FW. Such selections may seem to be limited, but only prima facie. Even where a key mentions one text ("*Finnegans Wake* is about *Finnegans Wake*", Tindall 1959: 237), it soon demands many more. It is very common that a key develops subkeys and sub-subkeys, on more and more specific subjects. For example, the key of global literature in FW (suggested in J. S. Atherton 1974) has the subkey of texts on Joyce in relation to Shakespeare (see Cheng

---

[42] Against the view that a *Skeleton Key* is not "a trot, a paraphrase, or a substitute" (Begnal 1991: 37).

1984, J. McCourt 2016b, M. Ellmann 2003, Pelaschiar 2015) or even Shakespeare's single titles, e.g., *Hamlet* (see R. F. Peterson 1990, Restine 2014).

The industry may have grown an aversion to the word "key", given that it promises the unlocking of a more concrete kind of sense, which is a commitment a professional Wakean would like to avoid. Also, there is a peculiar key that wants FW to remain cryptic or paradoxical—if the key to FW is "the continual process of discovery" (Armstrong 1989: 357), or FW is realisation of Flaubert's book about nothing (Bruns 2018: 117), or a "text to be read as a game without clear rules" (Zimmerlich 2016: 40), "bigger than all of our attempts to reduce it" (Borodin 1991: 151) and so on.

As the word "key" has been in use beside understandings, perspectives, approaches, paradigms, narratives, guides, discourses, principles, themes, motifs, contexts, concepts, fields, areas, idioms, subjects, devices, methods, interests, modes, codes, aspects, summaries, allusions, overtones, patterns, elements, etc.—many of these words, if not all, are synonymous enough. Fordham's *approaches* (2007: 7), for instance, could be called keys, and so could *contexts*, whose names use the pattern "'Joyce and *X*' or '*Finnegans Wake* and Y'" (ibid., 34; see J. McCourt 2009: v-vii). The work of C. G. Sandulescu in the linguistic key, including the lexicons in Romanian (2011), German (republished text of Bonheim 1967), Scandinavian (2012a) and other languages (2012c) is accompanied by his work suggestive of various other keys: literary allusions (2012d), musical allusions (2013abc), allusions and motifs (2012b), 633 motifs (2012efg), grouped into set-phrases, clichés, religious phrases, Bible quotations, onomatopoeia, interjections, acronyms, modern language foreignisms, Latinisms, Irishisms, and others (2012e: 26-28).

Some have accepted that there is "no single key to unlock *Finnegans Wake*" (Fordham 2007: 34, see Rosenbloom 2005: 6), but it is not clear if there exists an optimum combination. A very large number of keys is suggested where "the conscientious reader" is expected "not only to recognize about one thousand leit-motifs (out of a rough total of 3,377 FW tokens), but also to bear in mind their level of importance" (Sandulescu 2012e: 29). A reader shown a thousand directions cannot see the destination, but if their journey matters more than the destination, then the keys do not really need a hierarchy—as long as one's reading lasts, it does not matter which aspects are inspected first, which later, which more, which less. Prioritizing, say, the key with some texts about Giambattista Vico (who is of "profound importance in the writing of *Finnegans Wake*", MacCabe 1991: 26) or the dream key (since FW "is a puzzle because dreams are puzzles" and "the key to the puzzle

is the puzzle", M. Norris 1976: 5) over, say, dancing (see Nényei 2002: 10) or Humpty Dumpty, would be unjustified. It will be argued that a reading that admits Vico but omits dancing leads as inefficiently to an understanding of the entire text as that which admits dancing but omits Vico. Similarly, "the reader unfamiliar with 'Humpty Dumpty' loses as much as the reader unfamiliar with the *Scienza Nuova*" (Attridge 2001: 32), that is, they lose equally nothing since neither acknowledging nor dismissing a key can affect the concluding experience of incomprehension.

The quantitative criterion—such one key is more important than another key to which more texts have referred—could not be applied due to our inability to inspect the volume of FW exegesis. For the same reason, one cannot say what "new and used perspectives on *Finnegans Wake*" (O'Shea 1989) are. Several untestable assumptions have been underlined in the example below:

> "Many scholars of *Finnegans Wake* have long suspected that a key to the *Wake* lay deep within the core of Irish myth. George Gibson proposes a new interpretation of the novel, based upon a previously unrecognized paradigm from Irish mythology underlying the entirety of the work." ("Overview", 2005).

If Joyce's writing can "pre-empt its own metadiscourse and thereby thwart any possibility of saying something *about* it that is not already *in* it" (Vichnar 2008: 5, see Borodin 1991: 151, J. Derrida in Abblitt 2010: 55), then all aspects of FW are same-aged—there are just different time-points in which they become exposed. Even if it were possible to indicate which aspects are more current, which less, their chronology could not set up a hierarchy, for one man's obsolete approach is another man's novelty. Though Henkes and Bindervoet believe: "Fear of oversystematizing some Wakeologists know not" (2004b), it should be said that the exegesis of FW cannot be oversystematised because it cannot be *systematised*, not even at the stage of systematising the definitions of systematisation.

1.6. *Finnegans Wake* as the Text in a Model of Reading

In theory, one can form a ranking of models of reading and then use the best model. In theory, such an attempt makes it possible to read the source text with an empty exegetical component. In practice, the exegetical co-text is never empty—at the very least, it includes such texts that prescribe and describe the best model of reading. From the presentation of

the psychological, emotional, perceptional, and reactive models below it should become clear that their outcome of reading (or "reading") is not literary—unless one has a most liberal definition of literature. In the two other models—religious and nonsense-reading— the result of reading (or "reading") appears to be literary, but it is not so. As in the religious model Joyce's authorial intention becomes sacred and the source text of FW is the Divine Word, the followers of the model face the problem of James Joyce's divinely true remarks against the literariness of FW, such as that FW is "pure music" (qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 703). Then the nonsense-reading model requires a bias to call FW literary. (In an unbiased approach one tests whether nonsensicality disappears on suspending the literary principle.) Also, one of the model's assumptions is that FW is readable because it can be experienced, but surely, not every experience is literary. Instead of redefining literature so that it should contain any kind of experience, the semiotic affiliation of an artefact associated with the name FW should be best indicated by its use. For example, an artefact sold as a book with the text of FW, but used as a paperweight—is a paperweight, in which case the literary text principle and the English language principle become irrelevant.

It should also be clear that every attempt to find the best model is initially thwarted by that "no one type of reading gives us the whole book" (Borodin 1991: 162; see M. P. Gillespie in Hamada 2013: 33, Ch. Van Mierlo 2017: 142). If one wanted to compare the hermeneutic success among different groups of readers, it would soon be evident that they are interested in incommensurable, incomparable aspects of reading. The selection of the types of readers [whose names are mine: KB] below aims to illustrate their diversity:

- *author*-oriented readers vs. *text*-oriented readers (C. George Sandulescu in Hamada 2013: 87), *language*-oriented readers vs. *thematic* readers, e.g. feminists (ibid., 91);

- *radicals* vs. *conservatists*; the former maintaining that FW "subverts (…) the literary status quo", the latter believing that "the work contains fixed points of reference in the manner of the traditional novel" (M. Norris 1976: 1, see ead. 1974: 130); also: the *novelists* who assert that FW shares characteristics of the traditional novel (discussed in ead. 1976: 10-22) vs. such people who assess that FW does not have enough features of a novel (even though their list is incomplete and open-ended, Kivy 1973: 54-55), possibly including such readers who "treat incoherence as fundamentally integral to the text and textuality of *Finnegans Wake*" (Slote 1994b: 148);

- *chaos*-bound readers, including those people who think that the chaotic text reflects Joyce's anti-poststructuralist *realism* and *objectivism* to reject indeterminism (Rice 1997: ix-xi, see M. P. Gillespie 1998-1999: 361) or, with a casual understanding of the word 'chaos', those people who see FW as some kind of semantic confusion or, alternately, as some meaning *in potentia* to be established by the demiurge reader; the group possibly including *intuitionists* "legitimating the reader's intuition" (Rice, op. cit. 88);

- *intentionalists* who see "the author's intention as a regulative principle" (Mink 1978: xxvi, see Bulson 2006: 94), with *hypothesists* who arrive at that intention via speculation; with *reconstructionists* (see Hayman 1963: 3) who imagine the *ideal* reader, summon the *genetic* reader (Rabaté 2001: 196) to study the macrotext, and use a "genetic approach" (Hayman 1990: 14) or "genetic approaches" (Fordham 2012b: xxiii), setting up a "mode of theological hermeneutics" (Deppman 2006);

- *integrationists* who admit "a symbiotic interpretive relationship between the *Wake* and the fictions that preceded it" (Devlin 1991: x) and advise one to read the whole oeuvre;

- observers of FW's *unreadability*, including any *would-be readers* who abandoned the source text, and *non-readers*, including *snobbish* non-readers, fewer in number than what is sometimes reported in the media (see Xue 2017), vs. any such readers who do not connect *readability* with intelligibility, but, e.g., with *perceptibility* (see Reynes-Delobel 2015: 4), *experiencing*, *apprehending* (Crowe 2015), and so on;

- *exchangists* who believe that the reader of FW is affected by the source text and vice versa, including *non-finitists* who think this interchange is "endless" (Attridge 2004b: 10) and that "the reader is obliged to become the act of deciphering which will never be total and definitive" (Sollers 1983: 197) and *collectivists* who say that reading is "hypertextual and collective" (Reynes-Delobel, op. cit., 13), vs. *finitists*, knowing that every reading eventually ends, either *positively* (with a perception, an experience) or *negatively* (since every non-ideal reader is mortal).

In addition, one can distinguish:

- the *individual* reader, who is with "the task of finding a consistent perspective that reconciles his or her impressions" (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 91) as FW "impels the individual reader to create a text" (M. P. Gillespie 1988: 230), "morphing with

every individual reader's experience" (Rocco 2016: n.pag. [1]). If James Joyce had envisioned FW "being read by a single reader", the "sole participant at a wake" should be "the corpse itself" (Borodin 1991: 154)—alternately, the single reader was Joyce himself, reading the prototext when he was writing it;

- the *re-reader* whose understanding of FW changes (either improves or deteriorates) on every retake of the text (see Canty 2017);

- the linguistically *privileged* reader, usually: English-speaking Irish readers, but also others, e.g., the Japanese (H. Y. Jung 1986: 348, see Okuhara 2000: 4);

- the *translator*, who is a privileged reader, but hardly an individual (Bartnicki 2004-2005b: 184, see Bazarnik 2010: 567); but possibly chosen by the text itself (Zanotti 2006); also the *retranslator*—if FW is in permanent self-translation (Topia 1990);

- the privileged/target *male* reader—see: "my reader (…) he should devote his whole life to reading my works" (James Joyce qtd. in Max Eastman 1931 [Deming 2005: 417], see Louis Gillet qtd. in Edna O'Brien 1999: 165; Thurston 2004: 169). Still, a character in the text, "Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker is Everyman–with *generic* universality, i.e, the name includes every*woman* too" (H. S. Harris 1987: 72); see Lawrence 2010: 90-91, see also McKenna 1999: 55, Wales 1992: 163-164 on the female exegete;

- the *paradigmatic* reader in the Joyce industry—the *specialist* reader different from *ordinary* readers (Burgess 1965), or, *common* readers (Bishop 1999: viii, Brannon 2003); sometimes with a third group in between (Schwarz 2015). The specialists are a very non-homogeneous group, in conflict, in "a competition that is at the heart of the *Wake*'s notorious difficulty" (Colangelo 2014: 14);

- the *model*, or, *theoretical* reader, devised by scholars (e.g., Attridge 2004b, 2007). In a proposition, the complete exegesis of FW belongs to an ideally insomniac Irish compulsory writer (Garvin 1976: 3);

- the *eisegetic* reader who introduces their own presuppositions into the process of reading, including the *post-Joyce* reader, whose reading reveals elements which did not exist in Joyce's timespace.

1.6.1. The Nonsense-Reading Model

The volume of FW exegesis contains claims in which the nonsense of the text is called a "coherent nonsense" (Bishop 1986: 27), a nonsense dependent "on which definition of nonsense is being used" (H. Palmer 2014: 58), "nonsense, or rather the limit between nonsense and sense" (Bourbon 2004: 150), a "lack of sense" meant to test "how we, individually and collectively, construct sense" (Watson 2014: 267), and so on. This model relates to claims as diverse as those that FW is "nonsense masquerading as literature" (J. Davenport 2007: 255), that to read FW means to move from nonsense toward sense (Lewandowska 2016: 532), that FW is "a mix of recognisable sense and incomprehensible nonsense" (Fordham 2007: 6), or that "FW contains no nonsense" (C. Hart 1963: 8). These assertions may be in no conflict given that no definition of nonsense has been agreed on while the intuitive understanding of adjective-free nonsense has been lost to the exegete. And yet, there seems to be this conviction among the professionals—a bias—that even if FW is nonsense, this nonsense is *literary*. Accordingly, FW represents nonsense writing (J. Williams 2008), and not, say, nonsense gardening; also, a good translation that strives to "let nonsense be nonsense" (Zabaloy 2015b) is literary; also, since FW serves a dictionary definition of nonsense, it is to be found in a dictionary of literary terms (see Cuddon 2013: 475), not, say, genetic terms. Apart from the text principle, in the nonsense-reading model safe are the author principle (nonsense is attributed to Joyce)[43] and the language principle (nonsense is in English).

As the vague term of nonsense has been linked to unreadability, the latter term has also become vague. Apparently, what one knows more confidently about the unreadability of FW would be that it is literary (so "unreadability" is a word apter than "uncookability" or "undancability"). However, if not much more can be said about it, then conflicts of view on this unreadability cannot be surprising: "The first thing to say about *Finnegans Wake* is that it is, in an important sense, unreadable" (S. Deane 1992: vii), "most of us would agree" that "*Finnegans Wake* is simply unreadable" (Pierce 2013: 301), and yet the answer "in a word" to whether FW is unreadable is "no" (Tahourdin 2014, see Mills 2017). It must be more difficult for an exegete to declare unreadability than readability since it takes *one* reader's success to maintain that FW is readable, but it takes *every* reader's failure to

---

[43] Joyce may even have his own style of nonsense, similar to Lewis Caroll's, although less radical than Antonin Artaud's (Deleuze 1990: 343).

maintain that it is not. This may be the reason why the exegetes who dared to call FW unreadable would prop their claims with safety words such as Deane's "important sense", with appeals to vague collectives such as Pierce's "most of us" above or Paula Gillespie's "many" (put against "some") in this example:

> "The initial critical response to *Finnegans Wake* was harsh and negative. Some allowed that in time it would emerge as a work of genius, but many dismissed it as unreadable" (1997: 136),

which is in contrast to how positive one can be about the readability of FW (see, e.g., "In Memoriam", 2020: 9, see also "patently" in Nash 1996: 310). Readability is announced despite that reading can be slow-paced, prone to interruptions and demanding resumptions:

- "The *Wake* is not, like a novel, to be read all at one go" (E. McLuhan 1997: xiii);

- "only six people have ever read it all the way through in one sitting" (Krauth 2016: 69);

- "*Finnegans Wake* simply defeats him [Guillermo Cabrera Infante: KB] and he can only read two or three pages of that hermetic work in a sitting" (Souza 1996: 99);

- "few prospective readers actually sustain their curiosity for a page or two" (McHugh 1981: 1);

- "Complete understanding [of FW] is not to be snatched at greedily in one sitting (or in fifty)" (Joseph Campbell qtd. in T. McKenna 1995).

Unreadability must have been reported less frequently than readability since people who abandon FW early on detecting nonsense make fewer exegetic reports than people who do not abandon it too early. In the latter group there are professional readers interested in promoting readability, suggesting they can make a "recommendation for making sense of Joyce's work" (McHugh 2006: xiii) or even remove nonsense. The professional has been trying to replace the idea that {FW is unreadable *because* it is nonsense} with that {FW is readable *despite* being nonsense} or that {FW is readable *in* its nonsense}. Regularly, this kind of thinking results in disobeying the law of excluded middle: "nothing in *Finnegans Wake* is nonsense, yet it is probably equally true that it is all pure nonsense" (B. Benstock 1985: 144, qtd. in P. O'Neill 2013: 8).

One can imagine FW as a great paradox of liars (for the "liars" see Fritz Senn in T. Conley 2002: 235). Paradoxes await, e.g., in the conclusions that FW is able to communicate to us that it "takes language beyond any boundary of communicability" (Eco 1989a: 61) and that we have anything more final to say about "a world that doesn't make sense to begin with" (Beitchman 1988: 136) and that we can see in the daytime how FW "makes sense only in much the same way that "everynight life" does" (Bishop 1986: 27) and that we recognise

sense in FW that simulates a world that defies recognizable sense, and that FW "contains no nonsense, yet is finally beyond explication" (Owens 2010: 2460), etc. Such paradoxes would prompt a tetralemma:

(i)   FW is readable and makes sense,

(ii)   FW is readable but does not make sense,

(iii)   FW is unreadable but makes sense,

(iv)   FW is unreadable and does not make sense.[44]

The nonsense-reading model accommodates all these positions except (i):

-    position {FW is unreadable *because* it is nonsense} is equivalent to (iv);

-    position {FW is readable *despite* being nonsense} is close to (ii),

-    position {FW is readable *as* nonsense} is close to (iii).

Given the many types of readability promoted in the industry (the text is readable when it is "interpretable", "performable" (Fordham 2014), enjoyable, discussable, experienceable), it is not surprising that the times to read FW can be quite varied:

-    "a couple of hours a day (…), over a period of about three months" (P. Byrne 1964: 76);

-    "the first reading of the book took almost a year and the subsequent re-readings expanded over several years" (García Tortosa 2011-2012: 334);

-    "I've read *Finnegans Wake*, that's if anyone can read *Finnegans Wake*. I've spent seven years with the damn book" (F. McCourt 1999: 260).

Still, if the proper time to read FW is "lifetime" (Mink 1992: 35, Rich 2016), it is curious why anyone would call FW readable anywhere else than on their deathbed—earlier, it is impossible to have read FW, and calling it readable is premature. Jacques Derrida, "going on for twenty-five or thirty years" (1984: 148), was right to find it impossible to finish "a reading of the *Wake*" (Roughley 1999: xvii)—but wrong in calling his effort 'reading' while it was unfinished. Guilty of a premature judgement are also the exegetes who argue

---

[44] Discerning causation and correlation, it can expand into eight possibilities: (v) FW is readable because it makes sense; (vi) FW is readable because it does not make sense, (vii) FW is unreadable because it makes sense, (viii) FW is unreadable because it does not make sense, and then (ix) FW makes sense because it readable; (x) FW does not make sense because it is readable; (xi) FW makes sense because it is unreadable; (xii) FW does not make sense because it is unreadable. If (vii) and (ix) had so far been options absent in the volume of exegesis, they would be in it now.

for readability when they are still in the course of reading (or what they assume is reading) or who think that re-taking the text in more repetitions than the number they managed will not change their mind on its readability:

- "He's been reading *Finnegans Wake* for about ten years, and hopes to stop in 2008" (about Finn Fordham in Hamada 2013: 32);

- "reading *Finnegans Wake* for twenty-seven years" and still finding "new jokes and subtleties" (R. A. Wilson 1996: 18);

- "*Finnegans Wake* was first published in 1939, and I have been reading it for more than fifty years" (Burrell 1996: xi).

Guilty of the same are also those exegetes who called FW *unreadable* on reading a sample (e.g., Temple 2012) despite that their processing of the entire text might reveal readability. Apparently, the model is not affected by such reservations, and it welcomes people who read FW, and not just once, still with "no idea what it is meant to be about" (West 2015) and people like John Cage who never read FW (Silverman 2012: 292), still could call it nonsense, albeit one that "can make a multiplicity of sense" (in Roussin 2018: 46).

1.6.2. The Religious Model

In the religious model, the text of FW is sacred, containing the divine word of God, Joyce being either an agent of God or God himself.[45] Suiting his high self-esteem (Levitt 2002: xi), Joyce would be called an archpriest or high priest (Herbert Read qtd. in Hassan 1975: 80, Likides 2002: 17, Mamigonian 2007: 81), God's prophet (Ratcliff 2002: 182), a god of men (N. Fitch 1965: 203, Gillet 1958: 103), God the Father (Gluck 1979: 32), 'God' (Pearson 2007: 415), Joyce-God (Bartnicki 2010a: 24), God-author (Manganaro 2002: 140), the god James Joyce (Harryman 2012: 140), the Master (B. Benstock 1966: 211, Spivey 1997: 155), Joyce the Creator (Brivic 1985).

---

[45] Or FW is the word of Antigod, Joyce's *non serviam* against the norms of language, society, history, religion. FW annihilates communication "in true Satanic fashion" (Vintage Bracketologist 2016); see "Satanic rebellion" in Joyce (Levin 1946: 127), and Satan (or Joyce) as the 'master of veiling' (Sławek 2001a: 336). Adaline Glasheen calls Joyce's imitation of God "vainglorious" (1977: vii).

The similar rhetoric has also been applied to FW, "a sacred text" (Brownstein 1989: 94),[46] in "the Apostolic Church of James Joyce the Redeemer" (Doyle 2012, see Kellman 2009), "not a work of art but a work of theology" (Bourbon 2002: 217), "to be honored but not approached" (Beja and Benstock 1989: xiii), "conceived of, modeled on, and developed as a kind of surrogate for the sacred scripture" (Borodin 1991: 151, see Jasper 2018: 288), which "intends to embody mythical and sacred traditions from the world as a whole" (Altizer 1985: 220). FW is Biblical in magnitude (see J. S. Atherton 1974: 73), "one of the greatest of all intertextual biblical 'readings'" (Jasper 2003: 29), "the rewritten Bible" (Burrell 1996: 15), "the academic's version of the Bible" (M. P. Gillespie 2003: 30). Its Biblical gravity is carried by the words *exegesis, exegete* and so on (Attridge 2001: xvi, 88, 187, B. Benstock 1965: 37 and *passim*, Bishop 1981: v and *passim*, 1986: 337, Fordham 2007: 7, 28, 2012b: xxxii, G. Gillespie 2006: 299, M. P. Gillespie 1998-1999: 363, C. Hart 1962: 15, 1963: 1, *passim*, Jolas 2009b: 405, McHugh 1976: 1 and *passim*, 1980: x, vi, ix, 1981: 39 and *passim*, 1991: v, vi, 2006: vii, 2016: xvi, E. McLuhan 1997: xi and *passim*, Milesi 1990: 95, Mink 1978: xii, xiv, P. O'Neill 2013: 4, Parrinder 1984: 213 and *passim*, Platt 2011: *passim*, Rabaté 2014: 171, Shovlin 2012: 36, Todd 1987: 130). Another religious connotation possibly resonates in the word *lay*—lay people (Brannon 2003: 51, Levitt 2002: xi), lay reader (Bishop 1986: 25, Fodaski Black 1995: xiii, 23). Repetitions in FW (see Fagan 2010: 88) resemble Rosary-like prayers (see Franke 2006; see also "vain repetitions", J. S. Atherton 1974: 182) or a sacred charm to be incanted.[47]

In Joyce's "celebration of the secularization of the sacred" (Donald Theall in Hamada 2013: 124), FW has become "a new scripture" (Jameson 2011: 204) of the secular culture. Intercepting "the jargon of theology" (Franke 2009b: 105), "an evangelical vein" (Dabney 2007: 155), "a subsumation of the religious in the aesthetic" (Dettmar 1992: 34), FW is "analogous to the bread of the eucharist" (Ph. Carey 1993: 87) and is Joyce's "last blessing on mankind" (J. P. Anderson 2009: 334)", "apocalyptic" (Boheemen-Saaf 1999: 158). Instead of origins, FW has its "genesis" (B. Benstock 1965: 40, Lernout 1994: 122, 124, Litz 1953, Prescott 1954), in the register fitting James Joyce's "exodus out of Ireland" (Schlossman 1985: 183) that may have lacked "the theophany at Sinai", "none the less created Joyce's texts" (Nadel 1989: 16). FW is "a literary text" spoken of "in terms of

---

[46] And more specifically sacred. See, for example, a "sacred book of the night" (J. S. Atherton 1974: 28), "a sacred text to Cage" (Albright 2009: 154), "sacred in the Viconian sense" (Sailer 1993: 122).

[47] But also legal doublets (such as aid and abet, cease and desist) which need an expert to explain if they are pleonastic redundancies.

sacredness" (K. Hart 1991: 315 on Derrida in A. P. Wilson 2007: 148), graced with the "minute attention which had previously been devoted only to sacred texts" (Vance 2014: 153).

With "blessings that service in Joyce's church bestows" (Best 1979: 222), "the gospel according to Joyce" (Y. Healy 2000), "the Joycean creed" (B. Benstock 1977a: xxi, see Goldman 1979), a "Joycean orthodoxy" (B. Benstock 1988: 4) opposite some "Joycean heresy" (Burrell 1996: 14), some of his followers are devotees of Joyce (Bowen 1987: 157, Daniel 1984: 35, Ford 1998: x, see Rebecca West 1928 qtd. in Deming 2005: 433), Joyce's acolytes (K. Williams 1991: 173), "the master's assembled acolytes" (Pearson 2007: 415), orthodox believers (B. Benstock 1988: 4), "the disciples who sat at the Master's feet" (B. Benstock 1966: 211), "12 apostles of Joyce" (Galloway 1976: 130), the "apostles of a new Joycean creed" (Rabaté 2001: 1).

Obviously, this sacredness can also be figurative, fictional (Piglia 2000: 110, see Elgue-Martini 2008: 72), challenged (Knight 2003: 220, see Anthony Burgess "criticising the very cult [of Joyce] whose initiation he himself had had a share in" (Farkas 2002: 31)). The exegete in a debate who considers FW sacred (Fajfer 2015, cf. Bartnicki 2016a) may be given sarcastic names: a high priest, a member of the Inner Circle, the *pontifex maximus* (Poprawa and Jarniewicz 2016). Many have said that FW is pseudosacred, or that it barely "holds out the illusion of being a sacred text for 'highbrows'" (Bishop 1986: 309). FW is not equivalent of the Koran (N. Brown 1991: 89). FW is nihilistically atheist (Altizer 1990: 25, see Rieff 1991: 330-332). Umberto Eco employed a conditional: "If *Finnegans Wake* is a sacred book" (1989a: 87, see id. 1998: 190-191, S. S. Friedman 1998: 116, Edna O'Brien 1999: 165).

However, arguing whether the overt veneration of Joyce belongs in the past of the 1970-1980s (see Johnson-Roullier 2000: 91-92) would be beside the point if FW is sacred covertly, notably, to the genetic critics focused on Joyce's word, who "restrict themselves to a mode of theological hermeneutics" (Deppman 2006) and the exegetes with a religious yearning for a cognitively unavailable truth (Graff 2002: 10). The model embraces these patterns of behaviour:

(1) The reader is exempt from having to say anything concrete about the divine text, but at the same time is required to study it. Even if "*Finnegans Wake* is the only work in which Joyce chose to address his readers directly" (Cahalan 1995:

307), Joyce's Word is precious in any source thereof; hence various demands that one reads more than just the source text. If God "lies in the detail" (George Steiner qtd. in T. Conley 2001: 82), learning the larger text of FW in detail is impossible—the Word of God remains outside apprehension. Against claims that Joyce's clues were vague or contradictory, the religious reader can reply that they are still the Word of God, which is why they should be venerated even if they may not look coherent in the eye of a mortal.

(2) The Word is incomprehensible in whole, but some elements are understandable. This assumption founds the basis for separating exoteric knowledge from esoteric knowledge, "the uninitiated" from "the adept" (Staples 1965: 168-169), the novice (newcomer, initiate) from the priest (Joycean scholar, Wakean academic), who is closer to the "text's holy body [which] is hidden" (Roraback 2017: 161).

Regarding Joyce's take on these different types of knowledge, he juxtaposes the *plain* reader and the *ideal* one, the latter "suffering from an ideal insomnia" (FW 120.13-14), approached uniquely by Joyce himself (Grasso 1982: 21), so, possibly, "if such a reader ever existed, he died" (Lernout 1989b: 187). But for a non-masochist newcomer to realise that the ideal reader is either dead or has to suffer must be to face a strong psychological deterrent, in addition to another one, "the sheer mass of *Wake* studies" (P. A. McCarthy 1984: 626). However, the "industry of academics, who dedicate their lives, with other people's money" (Rich 2016), needs the cult ranks to grow. It needs junior scholars, driven by the vision that if they endure apprenticeship, they will become "an elitist audience" in a "private enclave" (P. A. McCarthy, ibid.), "priests who guard the church's holy texts" (Doyle 2012; see McWilliams 2015: 73-74) and, obviously, it needs customers to purchase texts from the priests. In order not to scare the customer away, at least not too early, such deterrents are passed over in silence. The industry is not likely to advertise that James Joyce demanded *less* from his professional critic than from his reader—or that professional writing about FW is easier than reading FW.[48] The industry makes Joyce look benevolent, not intimidating. Joyce's demand that his readers work on FW for as long as he did appears less cruel when one says that James Joyce made it "nonchalantly" (Ronald Stevenson qtd.

---

[48] If Joyce would keep "the critics busy for three hundred years" (qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 703), yet the reader should "devote his whole life" to his work (ibid., see Caramello 1983: 37), the multigenerational collective has it is easier than a solitary reader sentenced to life.

in MacDiarmid 1967: 58) or "wryly" (Cahalan 1988: 149). His demand that one devotes life to FW was made "with a disarming smile", his "approval" for the reader's suffering being "humorous" (R. Ellmann 1982: 703). Joyce "boasted of" (not: complained about) the years to write FW and "expected" (not: demanded) the same from the reader (Welsh and Whaley 2013: 38). Umberto Eco, knowing that the reader is "obliged to suffer" (1990: 49), replaced Joyce's "suffering from" with his "affected by" (1984: 9; 1990: 143, 146, 148). One can even be "blessed with" suffering (Nash 2002: 139, 2006: 119). Suffering ensures a "divine enjoyment" (Rabaté 1988: 130).

Besides, Joyce may have "joked" about it (Segall 1993: 187). His "wish that the reader spend time beyond forever with the *Wake* is not unkind" (Farbman 2008: 91). It is "undermined" by a "humorous collocation" (Pierce 1988: 368). His laughter is "sneering", but also "welcoming" (Mitchell and Slote 2013: 3, see Kitcher 2007: 161). In general, FW is "fun! Hilarious! Full of laughter!" (Rogers 1991: 190) and Joyce makes us "laugh for over 600 pages" (Cahalan 2005: 390).

It seems that a prerequisite in the religious model is the cult-oriented mindset with some naïve obedience and patient fortitude.—A novice enters their first interpretive paths on trust in their teacher's guidance, and is expected to read without scepticism and to self-censor their own observations (see Senn 2002a). The religious model does not explain how one individually handles the instances of misreported facts (see, e.g., "Lacan says that he met Joyce when Lacan was seventeen", Brivic 2008: 12) or that Joyce's word differs in too many reports: (i) Joyce wanted to keep "the critics busy for three hundred years" (qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 703); (ii) or the professors, for "centuries" (ibid., 521), or (iii) "a hundred years" (Harbison 2015: 144), or (iv) "a thousand years" (J. M. Morse 1974: 16), or (v) "the next thousand years" (R. A. Wilson 2012: 31), or wished to (vi) "keep armies of professors busy for several millennia to come" (P. Mahon 2012: 116), or (vii) "the academics" "for two hundred years" (Holzbauer 2000: 11), or (viii) "literary historians" "for the next 400 years" (Žižek 1997), or (ix) "scholars" for "three hundred years" (Kauffman 1992: 100), or (x) "readers" "for two hundred years" (Geist 1985: 50), or (xi) "the professors" for "the next hundred years", which was said about *Ulysses* anyway (Lodge 2011: 131)—but it is also (xii) "very likely, that Joyce never said this" (Slote 2015: 6).

1.6.3. The Psychological Model

The *psychological* model embraces scenarios in which FW grants a certain psychological or psychiatric meaning or effect, also a therapeutic one, e.g., "to slow down the effects of neurological deterioration" (Lopez 2019), provide distraction ("Ablenkung", Senn 2018), help one through difficult times ("über schwierige Zeiten", ibid.).[49] As such effects place FW among therapeutic narratives, the 'darker side' of the model is such scenarios in which the reader, who is not in a "corps of masochists" (McNally 2020), admits that their reading ended in some kind of disappointment or frustration, "semantic despair" (Fritz Senn qtd. in Ch. O'Neill 2007: 34, 271; in Hamada 2013: 16), which is then countered by psychological self-defence mechanisms. The negative feelings are due to the cognitive dissonance that certain preconceptions about FW have become inconsistent with the conclusion that FW is "impossible to read, literally so" (Senn 1990b: 78). Its incomprehensibility must disconcert every English reader who assumed that the text would be understandable.

Observing the Joyce industry, a brief, thus, simplified summary of its expectations is this: In the 1960s, the scholar was hopeful that they had "arrived at a half-way house" (Epstein 1966: 252). In the 1970s, the hope was gone. FW meant "mostly new frustrations" (B. Benstock 1977b: 238, see id. 1977c: 333). In the late 1980s, the frustrating issues of linguistics and semantics were replaced with openly ideological concerns (MacCabe 1989). FW studies underwent pop-culturalization (Senn 1990a). In the 2000s, the genetic analysis came in focus, though the study of FW had still not reached "the stage where interpretation really becomes possible" (Lernout 2006: 85). Later, it would become more fashionable for scholars (with grants) to see FW relocated into the Digital Age. One can detect a certain defence mechanism in all these shifts: as long as the industry keeps reading FW, its final failure cannot become obvious. Therefore, one should not be surprised with remarks that negotiate the time or accuracy of one's reading, such as that "readers of *Finnegans Wake* constantly miss and omit important aspects of what they read" (Hayman 1991: 174). In what is a splendid example of reader-blaming (Clarke 2019), Hayman implies that a reader who did not understand FW must have overlooked some crucial aspects, and so re-reading

---

[49] Also, one translator's work on *Ulysses* was "protecting health" (Greaves 2014). Joyce may have intended FW, or the process of writing it, as escape from his own anxieties (see Vincenti 2018: 141). On readings of Joyce as a self-help author see Tim Conley (2017b: 139), making comparison there of the publication chronologies of "popular guides to Joyce and self-help books" (ibid., 42).

is in order. However, even a re-reading may fail those who are not "a few readers, a select few, [who] find *Finnegans Wake* worth the work" (J. P. Anderson 2008: 13).[50]

Another defence mechanism prompts one to deny ignorance.—Rather than say that FW "has too much *terra incognita*" (Senn 1992b: 218), the industry is likelier to advertise FW as quite pleasurable. "It's only a great deal of detail that is still blurred", still, "one can get pleasure out of that detail" (R. Ellmann 1989: 46). Psychological self-defence in many scholars acts against their having to admit otherwise that their long work has been in vain. When they promote communal reading, social interactions, etc., they perform subconscious rationalisation in the conditions of their cognitive crisis management (='shared despair is less acute') or some more conscious optimisation strategy in accordance with game theory.

1.6.4. The Emotional Model

In the *emotional* model, the reader's effort applied to FW is primarily accounted not for the quality of meaning of the literary text, but for the emotion linked to the process or result of one's reading.[51] The emotion can be negative (frustration), but also positive (pleasure, fun) where FW is "not necessarily understood, but at least enjoyed" (Senn 2002a), or "all the ill-contrived reading" of FW, "impossible to read", is "immense fun" (id. 1990b: 78). The model could be endorsed by Joyce as he saw FW as "love itself" (Boysen 2014).

Following from the last section, it is assumed that the positive emotion is calculated by the self-serving professional—though, granted, one cannot test the sincerity of another man's feelings and is limited even in testing one's own feelings. Still, a certain ingenuity is detected where a goal of reading for pleasure is to "support a large publishing industry" (Nell 1988: 6). Good faith will also be denied this method of teaching students to enjoy FW, advertised as "liberating their efforts of inquiry" (Manista and Gillespie 2011: 93), yet restrictive if it "does not mean giving over to undirected activity or solipsistic indulgences" (ibid., 88). The industry may have organised a policy of positivism, with FW envisaged as

---

[50] Parsing literally, the reward for the select few is that their work will be *worth* it, not necessarily *pleasant*. Similarly, the word "lot" in the promise: "you get a lot out of *Finnegans Wake* without really understanding it" (R. Ellmann 1989: 46) does not have to mean a lot of *positivity*—it can be a lot of *despair* as well.

[51] Or the main emotion in a mixture of emotions. For examples of mixed emotions see Kitcher 2007: 261, Nemerov 1975: 653, Tindall 1996: 23.

a source of fun, and rejecting the "negative responses" to FW (Fordham 2017: 312) and antipathies to Joyce (see Lawrence 2010: 91). Saying that FW is "humorous" in "attention-seeking destructiveness" (West 2019) is an Orwellian statement similar to that "ignorance is strength" and "ignorance is bliss". Accordingly, even a feeling of futility can be playful (Cahalan 1995: 307), a lesson in futility can be "most delightful" (Attridge 2004b: 10). The reader can never become Barthesianly blissfully bored (Selden, Widdowson and Brooker 2005: 151). Our attempts at "reading Joyce" are "comical" (Derrida 1984: 148), while FW tries to make us laugh at ourselves (Dettmar 1996: 211).

But obviously, FW can induce negative reactions. It "often makes people angry" (Herr 2003: 129), it can irritate (Grudnik 2019). It can be hated even by non-readers (Hadley 2014). It demands the "abandonment of much that is comforting and familiar" (Hofheinz 1995: 19). "Joyce was sent not to delight us but to put the fear of God into our hearts" (Edmund Wilson in Dabney 2007: 155). FW expresses the fear of textbook knowledge (Spodaryk 2013: 71). It is "the most terrifying document of formal instability and semantic ambiguity that we possess" (Eco 1989a: 61), one that may have frightened Samuel Beckett "right out of English" (De la Durantaye 2016: 73). It means to spread "a sense of intimidation" (Attridge 2004b: 9), "intimidation and humiliation of the common reader" (M. Norris 2004: 162). Horror is "not an unusual reaction" on one's first reading FW (D. Jones 2015: 146). Reading FW can almost be traumatic (Colangelo 2018: xlix).

One can correlate both positive and negative emotions with how much time, work, money one invested in the text. In a zero-sum game between Joyce and the reader (Cronin 2001: 92),[52] the latter loses if he or she chooses to play this "tedious game" (Patell 1984: 69), whereas Joyce is likely to lose if the opponent has not entered the game, not falling for his "hoax" (Fagan 2014: 19). A rival scenario which has it that "no literary game is zero-sum" (Edna Longley qtd. in J. McCourt 2016a: 350), and FW is literature, is more biased. One should not apriorize Joyce's good intentions. "Joyce is having a lengthy laugh at his reader's expense" (T. Conley 2002: 246). To learn that Joyce "makes fun of the reader", but still assert that he "does so only within a comic world in which author and characters are similarly mocked" (Cahalan 1995: 307) is to applaud epicaricacy. Anyway, the reader's

---

[52] Assuming that there are no more participants, e.g., the anthropomorphic *text* which "takes pleasure" in "comic inventions" and "asks the reader" to join in (Potter 2012: 70). For game theory in the context of reading FW see Bartnicki 2012c, Parikh 2010: 197, 229, Theall 1999; see also Latham 2015.

gain is reduced by every prerequisite and condition, e.g., by that reading "with ease and pleasure" takes learning (R. A. Wilson 2012: 32) since "the real, nutritious, hard-won pleasure" should be "wrested from the *Wake*" (Chabon 2012).

In order to see whether the "correlation between work and pleasure" is "negative" (Diepeveen 2003: 160), one should need to define pleasure first. However, no definition reconciles too many reports, some as unhelpful as this: "*Finnegans Wake* isn't a book that one is meant to enjoy in the way one enjoys something frothy" (Hadley 2016). Where FW is promised to combine "the pleasures of puzzling some things out", "pleasures of texture, feeling, and tone", and of "shape, wit, and playing with words" (Tindall 1996: 23), the beneficiary is not named. Some exegetes imagine that readers take "a great deal of pleasure from reading *Finnegans Wake*", even though they are unsure how they themselves "benefit from reading" (M. P. Gillespie in Hamada 2013: 34). The test, to "ask a child to read aloud a random passage and chances are they will burst out into laughter" (Aida Yared in Hamada 2013: 133), is hypothetical,[53] and in any case challenged by this:

> "No defense of Joyce's aesthetic methods will make a first reading of *Finnegans Wake* less tortuous and frustrating than it may perhaps be: it is humiliating" (Bishop 1986: 214).

Bishop does not explain how the frustration of a re-reader is not *more* humiliating. If "all first, second, or third timers should approach" FW with "a sense of humour" (Bulson 2006: 91), it seems odd that Joyce might need to *demand* laughter, in FW "meant to make you laugh" (qtd. in E. McLuhan 1997: 14). Prescriptivism is shown by his exegetes too, visible, e.g., in "the critical need" "to penetrate into the text" "while remembering that this is a very funny book" (Begnal 1988: xiv-xv) or in that the "reader's activity" "meant to be playful" (Cahalan 1995: 311). If the "humour of the *Wake*" is "irrepressible" (Kitcher 2007: 262), one wonders why it would be emphasized and explained so regularly (e.g., Attridge 2004b: 2, 2007: 84, Auden, Burzun and Trilling 2001: 274, Booth 1983: 301, Bowen 1987: 157, Cliett 2011, Fordham 2007, Frye 2014: 37, Groden 2012). Why would one make appeals to authority to confirm it—"Columbia professor William York Tindall has called *Finnegans Wake* the funniest and dirtiest book ever written" (Quadrino 2011)?[54] Why such people promote "a very funny book called *Finnegan's Wake*" (Scott 1954: 101) who do not even know its title? Is the critic "murdering humour to dissect it" (Polhemus

---

[53] FW may be James Joyce's way of handling his guilt and confusion of a replacement child (Mary Adams 2018).

[54] Actually, Tindall contented himself "with calling the Wake a very funny book" (1996: 20).

1980: 333)? Surely, the humour is not always impressive (see A. A. Hill 1939) and to everybody's liking.

An obvious fact might perhaps need to be recalled at this point: Joyce is dead, so the game between him and the reader of FW is just metaphorical. The *actual* game takes place in the Joyce industry. "Not everyone can play *Finnegans Wake*. But professors can." (N. Brown 1991: 21). The professors need to assure their customers of the positivity of FW against its negativity, despite that the negative element seems to be more genuine, as it does not need to be worked out and anyhow advertised.

1.6.5. The Perceptional Model

In the *perceptional* model, the reader's effort applied to the text yields a contemplative or meditative awareness of either the text or the process of reading it, which may be called a "Zen experience" (J. P. Anderson 2008: 13, see Cheu 1997), a feeling of "radiance" and "spiritual balance and spiritual harmony" (Joseph Campbell qtd. in ibid.). To attain it, the reader may find it useful to be acquainted with Oriental systems of meditative cognition, such as Buddhism, which interested Joyce and influenced FW (Ito 2004a). FW has also been linked to the Zen contemplation technique of koan (Zeller 2015: 67, see Frumkin 1992-1993) and yoga (O'Rourke and Shaw 2018, Shaw 2019). Perceptional reading may result in a sensation typical of the emotional model, but the perceptional result of reading often contains an additional component: the reader's verbalised thoughts on their "exercise of thorough self-examination" (Kitcher 2015), an awareness of ignorance, inapplicability of common logic, helplessness against aporias.

One may argue that the model was implicitly encouraged by Joyce as one recalls his ambition that Wakese should verbalize "a state of mind not yet fully understood or a complex physiological experience" (Burgess 1968: 265), a "new state of wakefulness" in which "you enter into an almost hallucinatory state" (Ambrose 2014). The discussion of Joyce's process of writing in terms of his mental and physical health (see Ferris 2010: 94, Sollers 1974: 96) includes Joyce's "auditory hallucinations" (Briggs 2012-2013: 472).

The reader in the perceptional model prefers "observation to analysis" (S. W. Klein 1999: 156) and may need to accept that their reading will be incomplete, and yielding a "befuddlement, interspersed with moments of clarity" (O'Riordan 2014), and to prioritize

69

interpretive comments that "pay attention but stop short of explanation" (Cage 1983: 53). Where one's meditative reading is so deep that it ends in a hypnotic, parahypnotic, trance-like, ecstatic state, the result is *quasi*-drug-induced. Therefore, the model might be called *physiological* as well since the result of a "hallucinatory conceptual reorientation" (J. P. Anderson, ibid.) is physiologically equivalent to the results of drug-taking. For instance, when the language of the text makes the reader distracted, and the mind escapes the text, a paraphysiological effect of reading is cognitive procrastination (M. Wood 2009). If FW can be read "night after night" "to sleep" (Ali 2009: 36), the result of going through its "hypnotically powerful linguistic units" (Roraback 2017: 164, see Lane 1998) resembles the sedative effect of soporifics.

Of course, to a number of exegetes the physiological resemblance between FW and drugs is figurative, some examples being that constructions in Wakese "display" a "hallucinatory quality" in their "ability to singularly present multiple meaning at once" (Bristow 2014: 75) and that reading is, from a perspective, "provoking visions" (Fordham 2012b: xxix). Thornton Wilder called his obsession with FW a "narcotic" (in Feshbach 1994: 507). Still, other exegetes have implied non-figurative drug-like effects, such as hallucinations. Derek Pyle wrote on a "trippy take on the *Wake*" (2016a). To Edoardo Camurri, the most interesting aspect of FW is the psychedelic one, relating to LSD, peyote, lysergine (2016a: 75). To Marshall McLuhan, "LSD may just be the lazy man's form of *Finnegans Wake*" (in C. Anton 2012: 49). R. A. Wilson suggested that reading Joyce was the next best equivalent of having a psychedelic (qtd. in B. Campbell 2015). Terrence McKenna made a psychedelic analysis of FW (1995).

If narcotics facilitate an understanding of Joycean aesthetics (McLuhan in Ciaccio 2016: 12), they may need to be on the list of the required tools for reading. With alcohol, if FW's "hallmark", its "ephemeral quality of hallucinatory perception" (Ciaccio, op. cit., 108) is linked to drunkenness, "the *Wake*'s principal modality of intoxication" (ibid., 118).

1.6.6. The Reactive Model

The *reactive* model embraces such reading scenarios in which the exegete makes an artistic text in response to FW after it is acknowledged as too difficult to allow a more traditional reading. The input in Wakese can be transformed into a more gratifying, approachable text.

Typically, reactive text mark their departure from the source text with their own titles, e.g.: *Finnegans Meet* (Bartnicki and Szmandra 2015), *James Joyce Goes Star Wars* (Bartnicki 2014b), *Mouths Making Water* (see Cleverality 2018), *Regain Wakes* (see Hui 2011), *Lots of Fun with Finnegans Wake* (P. O'Brien 2018a), *Art of the Wake* (Wade 2019). Distinct from most academic texts about FW, a reactive text aims to substitute FW, not to explain it. The question whether the resemiotisation of FW in a reactive text avoids a competent reading or constitutes "a competent reading of *Finnegans Wake*" (Evans 2016: 9) is open. Also, it is open to debate if such a text counts as a reactive one which does not admit being inspired by FW, yet it captures the spirit of FW, as is in the case of Richard Kraft's *Here Comes Kitty*, "a plotless opera" of "order and chaos, reality and dream, sense and nonsense" and "language at play" (Mihaly 2015).

1.6.7. The Social Model

The word *social* is with different connotations in the volume of FW exegesis.—A "social component" is in the language games (Lerm Hayes 2018: 164). The meaning is political where FW is "a socially destabilizing book" (C. Clark 2018) or with no "social or political message" (Joe Schork in Hamada, 111). FW's "social impact" (Patrick McCarthy qtd. in Hamada 2013: 70) and its "socially meaningful way" to explicate "the realities of intellectual and societal isolation" (Pyle 2014) have also been noticed. In connection with these last uses, the *social* model of reading embraces such scenarios in which the process of reading is performed by a *group* working together (excluding the figurative sense that a reader always collaborates with the nominal author of the text). If FW "induces collective reading" (Senn 1990b: 63), groups may be favoured over individuals. A more peculiar type of the group reader, existing thanks to the Internet, is the multiplayer-like group of real and virtual participants interconnected online (Navarro 2019, see O'Kelly 1998, Zirzotti 2012: 134), a human version of the ideal reader in "a computer of some kind" (Slote 2009: 69). Another one is the "committee of scholars" (Bonheim 1967: 5), reading their "academic social text" (P. Mahon 2012: 116-118).

It is not certain what social interactions constitute reading, where they take place, how long they last, and to what end. In a theoretical model, "*Finnegans Wake* responds superbly to group readings" (Attridge 2004b: 10), but in reality a group's ability to process

the text is questionable. Regarding their relevance, signalled by the number of participants, that number depends on where a group convenes. In 2016, the Finnegans Wake Society of New York listed about 30 groups worldwide ("Directory of *Finnegans Wake* Reading Groups"), most of them in large academic cities, which are likelier than other locations to ensure the presence of Joyceans in the vicinity, willing to discuss FW. Not looking for outsiders though ("About…", 2006). Availability of such group reading is to be doubted if "many of the search links for 'Finnegans Wake reading groups' result in closed-down webpages, sites that have not been updated, empty links or abandoned groups" (Stockwell 2009: 67). Then, regarding efficiency, a few real-life examples of the time of reading FW in face-to-face group interaction are 11 years to "finish a run of the novel" (Muñoz-Alonso 2014), 13 years (MacLaughlin 2015), 22 years, reading in progress (Reyes 2017), 30 years, reading in progress (García and Schuster 2013, see García 2013). After such a long time, groups become hermetic, "sentenced to read *Finnegans Wake* forever" (Chrisp 2015) or till some of its members die. However, if the text "is impossible to read both singly and in groups" (Senn 1990b: 78), FW *per se* cannot be the objective of group reading. It becomes "a living organism of people" (Denizen 2013) where "the user is the content" (Reyes 2017). Groups "take on social functions" and turn into "therapy groups" (Fritz Senn in Hamada 2013: 16). If so, then a group of Joyceans attending a conference, who decide to go to pub instead of listening to a lecture on FW, prove the text in its social use, and read it socially—against the text, language, and author principles. This reorientation of the function may result from their inability to complete their reading in a traditional way, but it is also possible that the social mode is prioritized in advance in the groups which "don't really care about the book" (Pyle 2017a: 10).

1.7. *Finnegans Wake* as the Volume of Exegesis

Of the referents of FW discussed so far: (i) the texts recognisable as FW, their set burdened with false positives and negatives, in which Joyce's authorship is problematic, notably in translations; (ii) the 1939 prototext, which is polyauthorial and polytextual despite Joyce's solitary authorship prescribed by copyright law; (iii) the model source text, an abstract text, the pursuit of which has resulted in many post-Joyce variants, the more polyauthorial and polytextual, the more post-Joyce peritexts they contain; (iv) the macrotext, or, the sum of

the source text, its pre-text and post-text, which sets are not efficiently distinguishable, but certainly are polyauthorial and polytextual, and (v) the polytextual, polyauthorial FW+E polytext—none is a referent of the phrase "James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*". Referents that point at James Joyce appear only in ideal, abstract models, in legal fiction, and industrial prescriptions, but not even there the source text is assumed without a non-empty co-text of exegesis.[55] To imagine the size of the exegetical volume, one will consider several facts and numbers:

(1) Finn Fordham's advice how to approach FW is:

> "Get a very rough overview from introductions to any of the guides (Campbell and Robinson, Tindall, Begnal, Glasheen, Bishop), then look at one or two pages in intense detail, using Roland McHugh's *Annotations*, dictionaries, the Internet" (qtd. in Hamada 2013: 31).

Modest as it seems, the list is nonspecifically long due to its inclusion of unnamed dictionaries and Internet resources. Concerning the latter, Mikhail Shishkin asserts that FW became available to all ("доступен каждому") after there had appeared 80.000 annotations on the Internet (2019: 41).

(2) The "survival tools for *Finnegans Wake*" according to Ted Gioia (2013) are 8 titles: Tindall 1996, Bishop 1986, R. Ellmann 1982, Campbell and Robinson 1976, Vico's *The New Science*, McHugh 2006, *The Egyptian Book of the Dead (The Papyrus of Ani)*, and Thornton Wilder's *The Skin of Our Teeth*. They make about 3.600 pages of reading matter.

(3) Michael Groden's list of 8 titles for the participants of a course involving "a concentrated reading" of FW (2013b) is: Campbell and Robinson 1976, Crispi and Slote 2007, Epstein 2009, Gordon 1986, Joyce 1963, Rose and O'Hanlon 1982, Tindall 1996, and, as an option, McHugh 2006. They make 3.200 pages of reading matter. "A Selective *Finnegans Wake* Bibliography" (Groden 2013a; emphasis original) includes about 100 titles.

(4) The Finnegans Wake Society of New York recommends the 16 books which make the *James Joyce Scholars' Collection* (Hayman 2001), 12 other books, 1 periodical, but also "*The Bible, Oxford Dictionary of the English Language, The Koran, The Book of the Dead, Book of Kells, Writings of Giordano Bruno of Nola*, plays of

---

[55] In literary fiction, *Gigamesh*, a nonexisting book mimicking FW, is preliminarily unreadable due to its author's Joyce-like ambitions, but as it comes with the exegetical co-text (Lem 1999: 30, see Skiba 2018: 93), *Gigamesh* becomes 'secondarily' unreadable due to the size of that co-text.

Henrik Ibsen, *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.), *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable* etc." ("Reading *Finnegans Wake…*", 2006). The Society's "Annotated Bibliography of Major Criticism" (J. Staley 2013) has some 60 books and articles, and 5 periodicals.

(5) For people interested in textual genetics, a "Bibliography of Genetic Joyce" (Slote, Van Mierlo, Crowley, et al. 2008) has ca. 900 entries, with 650 in the FW section.

(6) There are 1.434 James Joyce-related titles, with 250 titles in the FW section, given in an 56 years old list (Deming 1964: 136-163). A complementary compilation of *James Joyce Quarterly* publications in the years 1963-2008 is some 250 pages long ("Fifty-Year Index", 2008).

(7) Th. J. Rice's guide to Joyce research, "necessarily" "selective" (2016: x), published first in 1982, catalogues "almost 2,000 entries from the factory" of the "Joyce Industry" (Warner 1986: 109), yet omits "4,000 plus works on Joyce" (ibid., 112), if in a failed "attempt to overcome American scholasticentrism (academic colonialism)" (ibid., 110-111).

(8) The James Joyce Checklist (Brockman and Cohn 1963-2008), covering the wide range of interests in Joyce studies, had "a total of over eighteen thousand items" in 2007 (Brockman, 47), "19,000 citations" in 2008 ("New Online…"), and passed "the 30,000 item count" in 2016 (Brockman 2016a), but still excluding "many thousands of stray articles" (ibid.), "a number of articles from the 1940s and 1950s" (Brockman 2016b) and other texts.

The volume of FW exegesis is thus a very large polyauthorial, polytextual polymodality. A rough overview of its properties follows:

1. *Existence of the originator*, or the person who set the system in semiotic motion; the historical author of the founding text (qv.).

2. *Existence of the founding text*, or the (initially) central text around which the system has grown—the 1939 prototext of FW. Over time, its centrality has become only historical. It is already impossible to non-prescriptively delimit the reference of the founding text. This is demonstrated in the treatment of the title—FW may replace FWP (or vice versa), and a source text of FW can have a revised title (Joyce 2012c), and the title may be carried by an abridged text, and so on.

3. *Existence of the larger text*. A referent of the name FW is the larger text including the pre- and post-texts of the founding text, i.a.: FDV, FH, and the 63 volumes of *The James Joyce Archive* (Joyce 1977-1980) to "give us a clue" (Steinberg 2006; see Crispi 2002), also Joyce's whole oeuvre for "Joyce's prose is developmental; consequently, with Joyce one should look at the end of his work to find the whole" (Burke 1981: vii, on Joyce's earlier texts as 'preambles' to FW see C. F. Miller 2009: 48-49, 61-62). An even larger text would contain Joyce's epistolography moved posthumously to his oeuvre (Joyce 2010c), but also nonexclusively Joyce's texts posthumously attributed to him (=translations) and even his nonexistent texts (see DeLillo 1991: 180-181, 2005: 62, Kimmel 1998: 154, S. Joyce 1941: 514) in addition to "[e]verything Joyce read" (Henkes 2012). The larger the text, the weaker the founding text's central role within it (see 5 below).

4. *Anonymisation of the author [resisted by the professional in the industry]*: As already discussed, Joyce can and should be questioned as the exclusive (or any) author of the prototext, the post-Joyce variants, FW+E polytexts and other referents of FW. Obviously, the author of the volume of FW exegesis is a collective. But the professional Wakean who chose to follow *authorial* intention needs to overlook the polyauthorial FW in order not to have to deal with the resultant of the authorial intentions of Joyce "plus friends, spouses, ghosts, agents, editors, transcribers, translators, publishers, censors, printers" (Stillinger 1999: 8), its readers, including would-be readers, non-readers, and people experiencing FW beyond the regimes of literature. Instead of that, the intentionalist relies on the legal fiction that the author of FW is an individual writer.[56]

5. *Decentralisation*, or absence of a centre that can be regarded as the source of main, 'core' message of FW. Lots of texts have accreted around the founding text but also around other texts that replace the prototext as a starting point of accretion. This system is *not distributed*, i.e. no networked or quasi-networked components cross-communicate their messages or coordinate their semiotic functions. The knowledge in the system is *dispersed*, i.e. no single agent has information as to the factors that influence the emergence of exegetical claims and location of their sources.

   Franchise terminology (Henry 2008, Jolin 2010) can be used to describe many texts in the system: (i) the prototext is the original; (ii) its later variants are its sidequels

---

[56] This fiction is a product of Western Capitalism. For Orient alternative(s), see M. Zhang 2018.

or remakes; (iii) translations are its reimaginings; (iv) back-translations (see Altena 1998) display the quality of a retcon; (v) *Finn's Hotel* (Joyce 2013) is a paraquel or a cross-over; (vi) Hayman-edited *FDV* (Joyce 1963) is a prequel; (vii) Anthony Burgess's text of Joyce 1966a is a reimagining; (viii) FWP publications in journals are installments of prequels; (ix) texts such as Dixon 1961, Joyce 2010c are spin-offs with content to "enhance *Finnegans Wake*" (Lewis 1992: 805); (x) the volume of FW exegesis, since it precedes and follows the original, displays the quality of a circumquel.[57] Other spin-offs may be texts which employ a character from FW— e.g., Persse O'Reilly, found in David Lodge's *Small World* (Tymicka 2006: 200), Earwicker, in Thornton Wilder's *The Skin of Our Teeth* (M. E. Williams 1971: 131-133, E. Wilson 1943). Kline, Coma, Xero (in Ballard 1990) are "developments of the handling of characterization in *Finnegans Wake*" (R. Brown 2016: 80). Other potential spin-offs are texts which employ a *feature*—linguistic (Delany 2001: 732, see FW 301.20-21), structural (Delany 2001: 1, 801), or mixed, such as spin-offs of the initials HCE (see John Barth qtd. in Lee 1968, Davis 2016, Delany: 2003: 13 and *passim*, Douglas R. Hofstadter in A. A. Mullin 1982).

A text not in Wakese, but combined with a text in Wakese (e.g., a bilingual edition of FW or McHugh's *Annotations*) may count as a linguistic crossover of FW. Arno Schmidt's *Zettel's Traum* serves as an example of both a crossover and a spin-off. One may argue that nonexistent texts (fictitious or unrevealed), such as J. G. Ballard's "completely unreadable pastiche of *Finnegan's Wake* and *The Adventures of Engelbrecht*" (Ted Carnell qtd. in Pringle 1993), "a transliteration of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in terms of a Hellenic Greek setting" (Ballard 2001: 224), or a review of FW written in 2067 (Claes 2008: 123-124), are crossovers.

6. *Self-referentiality*. FW is self-referent (autothematic, self-reflexive, metafictional, Zangouei 2013: 69-70, self-aware, McFeaters 2003: 4) if its narrative discusses itself (Loxterman 1991: 125) and its theme is the language metathematising itself (Takács 2005).

7. *Self-citing and cross-citing*. Self-citation was Joyce's mode of writing.[58]

8. *Noncataloguability*. The system is so large that it is not possible to catalogue all its elements. Even approximations require collaboration of many people. In 2017, the

---

[57] Clearly, franchise terms apply differently when it is not the prototext that is the original in the centre.

[58] On self-citation as a "matter of scholarly esteem" to Joycean scholar, see Hepburn 2001: 162.

online database in Joyce 2006 had over 84.000 notes on the source text, and listed 50 collaborators. The idea to "gather *all* of the available scholarship on *Finnegans Wake* and to connect it to a digital text of the book" (Barlow 2018; emphasis added) rests on debatable terms (e.g., "the book", see Armand 2003: 31-32, "available", "scholarship") but also does not concern the *unavailable* scholarship, the *unknown* exegesis, and the *known* exegesis that resists digitization and/or whose publication infringes on copyrights (see Hawthorne 2005: 15-16).

9. *Multi- and intermediality*. The system has texts in other codes than the historical initial code of the founding text. Its non-hierarchical data exhibit "a rhizomatic relationship" (Eugene O'Brien 1988: 195), albeit only if the poststructuralist term *rhizomatic* (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) does not impose literariness. It is also a *nonlinear* system, but only if the words *reader* and *narrative* (as in Larocca 2015: 74-75) do not impose literariness.

10. *Dynamism*. The system is *dynamic* when one observes its changes, yet it is *not* dynamic if dynamism should entail "constant anticipation of forthcoming elements" (Benjamin Harshav in Mariusz Pisarski 2011: 313)—one cannot anticipate in what directions the FW system will develop on the level of interpretation of literature. On the extraliterary level, one can anticipate new and new texts in the industry. In a book aimed to say "why read Joyce in the 21st century" (Ruggieri and Terrinoni 2012), the floor given to 16 academics, there is only one text which places FW outside academia in remix culture and neglects Joyce's intention (Fagan 2012: 50). The book opens with a text welcoming the "ascendency of genetic criticism" (Thompson 2012: 17), focused on Joyce's intention and observing the dogmas.

While no referent of FW is intuitive, the "volume of FW exegesis" may be distinguished as *the* referent of FW (though not of "James Joyce's FW"), to take account of that the volume contains all other referents of the name.

Chapter 2 – Wakese and the Language Principle

The purpose of this chapter is to promote the position that the language of the source text (i.e. the prototext or any of its post-1941 variants), which language is called *Wakese* here, is unknown. This position does not agree with the language principle popular in the Joyce industry, saying that Wakese is English.

It will be argued that the proposition that Wakese is unknown is, by Occam's law of parsimony, better than the language principle at explaining the linguistic effects of FW. If Wakese is unknown, it is clear why the prevalent aspect that the source text grants its would-be reader for inspecting is visual—this is a typical feature of every (written) text in a language beyond our competence. On the other hand, the language principle makes more assumptions where it redefines the concept of "English" in order to explain that an English text is nonsense to competent users of English, as well as the meaning of "understanding" and "reading".

Let us clarify what the word "unknown" means here. Initially, it is a synonym for "non-specific" (notably "non-English", but also "non-French", "non-German" and so on). In other words, Wakese is Joyce's "largely private language" (Killeen 2010). The word "private" may be more apt than "constructed", "planned", "artificial" if (i) every language is constructed in the sense that no language is innate; (ii) one cannot say to what extent Wakese corresponds to James Joyce's plan, and (iii) the term "artificial language" refers frequently to a computer programming language, which Wakese is not (or, more precisely, is not assumed to be). The term "private language" here is not in the sense in which it was used by Wittgenstein (see Munz 1987: 55). Instead it indicates Joyce's more single-handed role in establishing Wakese.

The unknown language position observes the following dichotomy: any language is either communicative (conversational in Gricean sense) or noncommunicative. It is communicative to 'insiders', and it is noncommunicative to "other men" that it sends into "zones of silence" (Steiner 1975: 56). The dichotomy does not agree with the concept that the two extremes of the linguistic continuum are communication and art (see Fimi 2018: 2), because there can be artful texts that are communicative as well as non-communicative texts that are not art.

The feeling of inscrutability that has been common for decades among the readers of the source text will be taken as evidencing that Wakese is noncommunicative. Wakese is with no competent user after Joyce, "inherently unco-operative" in Gricean sense (Black 2006: 156, see Herman 1994) and (what makes it different from many private languages such as Tolkien's Elvish) without enough material in the authorial comments or other texts to enable comparative analyses. Its ineluctably incompetent users can be positive about the meaning of a word (or some other unit of meaning), still, no two users can pass the test of communication. That is: any two people asked to read a source text will either (i) announce an understanding of a fragment of the text (but if that fragment is FW, another one is not; lest there should be lots of FW's in one source text) or (ii) agree to call it nonsense, or (iii) share an understanding, but on the condition that they read about it first in the exegetical paratext (and then the language of FW is understandable, but one may have to choose the exegetical paratext, not the source text, as the referent of FW). So, the word "unknown" can also be taken to signal that one does not know anything or a lot about the meaning communicated in Wakese. If James Joyce was a competent user of Wakese (which, by the way, does not need to be taken for granted), Wakese may have been communicative to him. In Joyce's lifetime, it may have been more reasonable to ponder whether Wakese is noncommunicative in *English* or is an *unknown* language.[59] After his death, however, one should assume that Wakese communicates with no one, and there is no unbiased reason to say that its inability to communicate is English. The fact that Wakese is a *posteriori* language which borrowed a lot from English (which is not too obvious either, pending the definition of "a lot"), is not enough to call it English—similarly, it is not enough to call Sindarin—Welsh, Quenya—Finnish, or English—German.

Still, if Wakese has become—as if in retroaction or retrospect—less qualifying or less probable as English, i.e. has grown *more* unknown, one might accept this idea that the language will have grown more unknown over time, eventually becoming so unknown that *nothing* certain can be said about it. If so, then claims such as that FW is among the texts "governed by entirely artificial principles, and cannot be seen as developments of natural language" (Fabb 2010: 1224) and "no linguistic principles underlie the formation of the words" (Barbara McMahon in ibid.) would exhibit a bias. An unbiased observer should not assume what principles govern Wakese or if it forms words. If Wakese were truly "clearly an un-English" (Crawford 1993: 137), one could not know that it contains "Irish speech

---

[59] The option that Wakese is a noncommunicative *known* language that is not English (e.g., it is French or German) is not taken into consideration.

patterns" (ibid.). To use the parable of the blind men who examine an elephant, a "common metaphor used by the *Wake*'s readers" (Rice 1997: 113), the bias would consist in that the blind men make claims about an *elephant* (English) only after they had been told that they were going to touch an elephant, but unbiased, they would set out to examine an *unknown* entity. Indeed, if Wakese were truly unknown, one could not know that it is a language—it may be, in some sense or every sense, "not a language at all" (Takács 2005: 3).

That being said, in order to limit the scope of this Chapter's argument against the language principle, the idea of total inaccessibility is suspended to the extent indicated by the following assumptions. First, it is assumed that Wakese is a language, and a single one. Specifically, it is not a dual language—English in some parts of the text, and non-English in others.[60] Secondly, it is assumed that Wakese is equally present in every source text: any two source texts reveal the same "inherent obscurity" (Senn 2002a). While this Chapter will refrain from considering translations, it should be clear that a successful translation of a source text in unknown Wakese should not appear in a known language. Furthermore, it is assumed that Wakese is distinct from the "normal enough" (A. A. Hill 1939) language of FWP. The latter is "bordering upon English" (Paul 1961: 129), whereas Wakese is beyond the border. Typically, a unit of meaning in Wakese is unknown (not confirmed in any lexicography), visible (available to the eye), and not articulable (in accordance with the phonetic system of Wakese, which is unknown).

More knowledge is permitted under the language principle. Some of its followers argue that Wakese is communicative. For instance, FW communicates to its reader a message about the futility of understanding, the impossibility to communicate. Accommodating these ideas and many others, the language principle has kept inflating the meaning of "English". The English of FW is, i.a., mainly or basically English, an English with a qualifier, or a mix of languages which is English due to its dominant ingredient. That proliferation of propositions about the sense of nonsense in FW, the readability of its unreadability, the Englishness of its strange language is a transgression against Occam's law of parsimony, one that the unknown language position does not commit.

---

[60] An idea about the dual language is detected between the lines of Umberto Eco's hesitation: "*Finnegans Wake* is not written in English, but in 'Finneganian,' which some have defined as an invented language. In reality, it is not an invented language like Chlebnikov's transmental language (…). *Finnegans Wake* is more of a plurilingual text. (…) The fact remains that *Finnegans Wake* is not even a plurilingual text: or, rather, it is, but from the standpoint of the English language." (2008b: 108).

It seems that the unknown language position has never been too popular, i.e. not many exegetes seem to have opposed statements such as that "James Joyce wrote English" (Taplin 1947, cf. R. E. de Campos 2018) *in clear terms and making relevant conclusions*. An early reviewer of the prototext wondered if "a new language may have been born" ("Sixteen Years Work by James Joyce", 1939) but passed no verdict. Another person who said that Joyce "attempts to create a new language" (Montesi 1991: 106) did not say whether the attempt was successful. We read that Joyce "made his readers learn a new language" (John S. Gordon in Hamada 2013: 37), but we are not told if and how Joyce and his students could be competent. We read that "one starts reading *Finnegans Wake* in much the same way as one learns a foreign language" (Rabaté 1986: 31), but we do not get to know the name of the language at the end of the learning process. We read that Joyce did "expand the English language" (Begnal 1974: ix), but we are not told if the expansion remained in English. We read that FW is in a "new language" (Kitcher 2007: xix, Mamigonian 2007: 93), and yet the language is discussed as if it were English.

The categorization of Wakese should have been performed in a linguistic analysis. According to Paul Fagan, not one has been produced in the academic industry (2010: 1-2) before Fagan set out to repair the deficit. The prototext was 70 years old in that time. The assumption of English in the text of FW being uncontested for so many decades has given the advocate of the language principle an undeserved argument that Wakese is English by commonsensical, commonplace intuition. In part, the assumption of Englishness could be due to that the dominant language of FW exegesis has probably been English, reinforcing the semiconscious association that the analysed text is English too. Still, as more and more English readers become frustrated in their attempts to understand FW, and the hope in a forthcoming dictionary of FW English (see Carver 1980) may have been lost, one can expect that time works against the language principle. In fact, the appearance of Fagan's text in 2010 can be a signal that the academic system can no longer rely on the assumption that the language principle is indisputable (although, unfortunately, in his analysis Fagan swiftly discards the option that Wakese is a new language, 2010: 14-15).

In the sections below one will find some arguments concerning Wakese, sometimes overlapping, which are meant for one's assessment whether they support more the English language principle or the unknown language proposition.

2.1. The Argument from Appearances

One of the arguments in favour of the language principle uses appeals to appearances (and common sense to confirm them). What becomes evident on anyone's opening a source text of FW, the argument goes, is that it "looks very much like" an English text (Takács 2005: 4). Allegedly, English is detected in most of its words and its grammar (syntax).[61] Sometimes, the argument from appearances is said to have support in that the sound of the text is English as well, or, the "basic ground beat is still predominantly English" (Senn 2009: 67). However, the arguments from sound (prosody, diction) should not be taken into consideration because any instruction that FW "should be read aloud" (Nash 2006: 126) is fallacious and biased—viz. an assumption that FW can be read in English follows the assumption that it looks English.[62]

There seems to be, or to have been, a consensus in the industry that the grammar is more stably English than the vocabulary is. "Formal English syntax is maintained", still, FW "disturbs" our "expectations as to meaning" (Parrinder 1984: 219) as the "greatest distortions of language occur in Joyce's use of the word" (W. I. Thompson 1964: 82, see Attridge 2004b: 11, Parandowski 1976: 227, Quatermain 1992: 114-116, S. Thomspon 2007: 11-12). John Cage argues that the reliable syntax poses a double threat: it lends a compass in the labyrinth of meaning and it promises Joyce's authorised key to the text (in Kutnik 1997: 196, see Kołodziej 2011: 118). However, even where "English syntax retains its hegemony", there are "conspicuous exceptions" (Pickett 2008: 335) and "subject, verb, genitive or whatever are not always obvious" (Senn 2012: 240). Other examples are the passage FW 54.7-19 (Epstein 2009: 15), the so-called thunderwords (Feshbach 1991: 286), onomatopoeia, especially nonlexical (Attridge 2009b: 473-474), possibly a message in the Morse code (Škrabánek 2003) too. Crucially, even if the syntax is more stably English, it

---

[61] English bias is obvious where preferred to the words 'English grammar' (see Hall 1980, Purdy 1972) are the words 'English syntax' (see Calvo 2018), which usually minimise the role of morphology, of little concern to an analytic (uninflected) language such as English.

[62] Joyce's "Gee each owe tea eye smells fish" (FW 299) as a textual reference to 'ghoti' (Nuessel 2015: 296-297) reminds one of the ineffectiveness of pronunciation choices *even* if FW were English, and serves as an example of syntactic unpredictability. But one would not need to read that in English: all these words (*gee*, *each*, *owe*, *tea*, *eye*, *smells*, *fish*) are also found in Scots, and besides, *each* is an Irish word ('a horse'), *owe* is a Polish word ('those'), *tea* is a Spanish word ('a torch'), *eye* is a Middle English word ('awe').

does not mean that it is stably English. Its logic is blurred ("zatarta", Strzetelski 1975: 31). Time may have been against claims such as that "nearly every *Finnegans Wake* sentence observes the formalities of English syntax" (McHugh 1980: v)—the assertion is not found in the later editions of McHugh's book. The "sentence patterns" in FW "diverge from those in any natural language grammar" (Sukanya 2012: 3). In one of the source texts, the editor's "greater task" was "emendation of the *syntactical coherence*" (Rose and O'Hanlon 2012a: 522, see Tanselle 2014: 507). Perhaps "contrary to popular opinion", "the syntax of the *Wake* is not the same as that of ordinary English" (Wales 1992: 166, endnote 5).

Where Paul Fagan discusses how "the *Wake* sentences" are "*syntactically predictable*" (2010: 18), his approach can be criticised initially on these two points: (i) not providing a definition of English whose syntax he analyses, and (ii) relying on a sample without discussing its adequacy to represent the entire text. While Fagan mentions the SVO word order, pre-noun adjective, "distinction between modal and main verbs" as the "factors result[ing] in a significant degree of *semantic predictability* in English sentences" (ibid., 17), they are not uniquely English, so finding them in a text does not automatically make it English. In fact, one can hardly think of a unique syntactic feature of English; in addition, FW seems to be challenging some of its non-unique features (e.g., the fixed word order, ellipsis, inconsistencies in spelling vs. pronunciation). The stylometrists who have regarded FW as a singularity (Drożdż et al. 2016, Hiatt 1993: 118, J. O'Sullivan 2014: 6) seem to have taken it for granted that FW is in English, but what they should have done instead is, first of all, exploring the option(s) that FW is in a language similar to English (Afrikaans, Dutch, Frisian, Scots), then, exploring the option that Wakese and English are separate languages that share their *quiddity* (whatness), still not all, yet whose *haecceities* (thisnesses) are distinct, as the non-English element in FW makes Wakese discernible.[63]

---

[63] As Fagan writes that FW performs "engagements" with English, "emulate[s] and take[s] advantage of the rules of the English language" (2010: 133), his choice of words suggests that he is more willing to say that Wakese is *like* English than that Wakese *is* English. Wakese that resembles English may bring to mind Chinese Hanzi confused with Japanese Kanji or Slovak mistaken for Czech. One may also consider the examples of Dovazhul (communicative to Thu'um users, but dragon's roaring to others) and Parseltongue (communicative to some people, serpent hisses to others). A piece of circumstantial or indirect evidence for that Wakese and English are separate languages might be an observation that "the English reader has to engage with an internal translational effort" (Marino 2020: 64) which effort is not necessarily intralingual.

But even if the syntax were obviously English, it would not be enough to identify FW as a text in English if we agree that languages are recognised more on the basis of how their *words* look (which is supported by that Friedrich Hölderlin's translations of Greek texts, for example, are recognised as German despite their heavy use of Greek syntax). If Walter Taplin's claim that "[t]he overwhelming majority of the words in *Finnegans Wake* are English words" (1947) represents the popular opinion, one can expect many followers of the language principle to be surprised to learn that only "fifty per cent of the semantic units are built up out of English materials" (C. Hart 1974, "Introduction"). "Of all the different words that occur in *Finnegans Wake* only 32.5% of those words are plain English!"; "only 66% of the words in *Finnegans Wake* are valid (in the dictionary) English words" (S. Hitchcock 2015, see Butor 1970: 161). The miniscule number of FW citations in a dictionary of English (Chenier 2014: 30-32, see Simpson 2016: 60) and the fact that a dictionary of English is of little use to would-be users of Wakese (Jarniewicz 2004: 276, see id. 2011: 28) can be more circumstantial evidence against the language principle. One expects that many units in the text of FW are miscategorised, e.g., when on seeing a proper noun (such as "Mookse", see Bartnicki 2004-2005a: 172-173), a *hapax legomenon*, or a word with an unknown or not just English meaning (e.g., "To pan!", FW 466.1-2; see Bartnicki 2004-2005b: 185 about "I"), the reader assumes it to be English by association with the English or English-looking words in its vicinity. At a metalevel, if "we can never read Joyce's works for the first time", "the ubiquity of his influence" (Attridge 2004b: 2) translates into the ubiquity of Anglophone annotators of FW.

At the scale of the entire text, Wakese is unintelligible to English users. The mix of top-down and bottom-up reading processes is not enough ("nao é suficiente", Nodari 2018: 187). Where the "easiness with which one can find English referents for each *wakean* neologism*" (Lemos 2012: 85) does not facilitate the process of understanding, it turns into associative hyperinventiveness—even a word that does look English invites the exegete to find some non-English meaning in it. Importantly, the exegete does not explain why these or those associations were made, and not some others. This is seen in the example of "he war" (Derrida 1984: 155) in which Derrida saw German words, but not, say, Arabic *hiwar* [dialogue] or Hebrew *haver* [friend]. The similarly selective annotator of "pftjschute" (FW 3.19) noticed French *chute* (Joyce 2005), but not, say, Spanish *chute* or German *Schute*. Importantly, even with such a selective approach, usually so much knowledge is produced that one fails to synthesise it into understanding. "Every gloss tends to be too much and yet

not enough" (Senn 1989: 168). There is no coherent synthesis of the propositions that *pftjs* (in "pftjschute") is "the hissing rush of a falling meteor—Lucifer falling into Hell" (Campbell and Robinson 1976: 34), "onomatopoeic elaboration of the initial consonant" (Franke 2009a: 647), "air going down a chute" (Kostelanetz 1989: 275), "an exclamation of contempt or disgust" (Ursul 2014: 334), all in a shart or "fart-tunnel" (Maimon 2017).

Let's take "Y?" (FW 477.31) for another example. A symbol, a letter, a word, a sentence, it can be read as English "why" (with the possibilities in French, Polish, Portuguese, Russian neglected then), and even developed into "Why did you give birth to a woman?" asked from "the Adam of Gen. 2.21" (Burrell 1996: 85), but it also represents a character named Yawn (Gottfried 2011: 45) and "Y-girl, Issy" (Gordon 1986: 238), and can also be said to resemble the Old English letter thorn, the Old Norse rune Kenaz, a divining rod, a wye fitting, a lightning fork, a wailing woman, Moses praying against the Amalekites, and more, too much to synthesize it with any clarity. Wakese as an unknown language cannot provide that clarity either but then our not understanding Wakese is more natural and thus less time-consuming.

2.2. The Argument from Competence

One of the arguments in favour of the language principle is from Joyce's competence. As Joyce left his commentary-before-the-text,[64] one can conclude from some of his comments or instructions that the language is English. Joyce's recording of several passages from FW might suggest that the text is subject to the rules of English pronunciation. Joyce said that he was not going to destroy English "for good" in FW, but was going to "give" it "back" (qtd. in Eastman 1931 [Deming 2002: 418]).

Two immediate arguments against accepting Joyce as a competent user of Wakese are the principal objections to authorial intention and the fact that his "own explanations of the *Wake*" "seem to be self-contradictory" (Atherton 1974: 18). Moreover, one should not take it for granted that Joyce was a competent authority in the language he designed. Joyce himself questioned his competence, aware that with time he would not be "encore capable" (Schaeffer 2016: 105). It is unlikely that "Joyce *spoke* Wakese at home" (Cixous 2006: 65). In fact, it is certain that he did not—if we acknowledge "the impossibility of reading

---

[64] See, e.g., his "seven explanations of nine words" in R. Ellmann (1982: 594).

Finnegans Wake aloud" (Lernout 1990: 65). What the extant recordings of Joyce reciting passages show us then is that he was once able to process a sample of the text, which he may or may not have read in Wakese. An unbiased observer should not rule out the option that Joyce was not a competent user of Wakese, nor should one take for granted that Joyce was the only competent user (see Parandowski 2015: 141).

Since some competence in a language can be obtained through imitation, one might take a look at texts imitating Joyce language. Possibly the most famous one is "A Litter to Mr. James Joyce" by Vladimir Dixon, appended to the 1929 volume of FOE, which made people suspect Dixon was Joyce (Goldwasser 1979: 219). In the text, assessed to be "able mimicry" (Whittier-Ferguson 1992: 528) but also as lacking in Wakean complexity (Senn 2010a), the language Dixon imitated in 1929 was not as complex as Wakese. Since Dixon saw himself "unable to combprehen" (1961: 194) the English of FWP, one should not expect that he would be able to comprehend Wakese later.

Still, one could also consider the option that texts such as FWP, FDV can provide comparative material for one to draw out equivalents between FW and its:

> "earliest drafts (from 1923-24) [which] are written in a basically English style with few linguistic distortions and almost no foreign elements" and its "later first drafts (especially from the 1930s) [which] were already initially drafted in the convolute *Wakean* form" (Slote 2002),

based on which one would find the basis for language acquisition in self-study. In practice, it does not take much time to see how impractical discovering equivalents by collating is, e.g., of "answered" (FDV 46) and "bellowsed" (FW 3.9). Equivalents cannot be validated by context since context varies from reading to reading, reader to reader (see James Joyce in Mercanton 1963: 97), and is dispersed throughout the text.

Regarding yet another platform for comparative linguistics, which is translation, let us see the example of Joyce's self-translation of a FWP text into Italian, assessed as "no pursuit of hypothetical equivalents of the original text" but "a more daring variation" (Jacqueline Risset qtd. in Grutman 2001: 19). If the translator "should change as little as possible" and should "not translate freely" if there is a pedantic way (Rathjen 1999: 907), then Joyce, too creative, was not a competent translator from FWP English. If finding equivalents is more difficult than being creative (and more useful for one's acquisition of a foreign language), then a French team that translated the same text with "fidelity and uninventiveness" (ibid.) should be called more competent. Yet the "public's preference" (Grutman, ibid.) would still be for Joyce's text, leading to this conclusion that the French

were *less* competent for drawing the text closer to an understandability whereas Joyce was *more* competent for drawing it away from it. This in turn would suggest that a *sine qua non* property of Wakese is <u>inscrutability</u>. If so, texts trying to imitate FW fail if they are quite understandable (see, e.g., Jolley 1997). Comparing AI generators charged with the task to imitate the style of FW (*write in Wakese*) and AI readers trying to parse a FW-like inscrutability (*read in Wakese*), the task for the reader is more difficult since FW does not reveal a good degree of syntactic-semantic predictability (Burrows 2019, see Kolakowski 2019), whereas there have already appeared AI generators capable of mimicking Wakese (M. 2016, see M. Byrne 2015, Kurt 2015, *Now Playing...* 2019: 6, Wang and GPT-2 2020).

This makes one think whether the inscrutability in Wakese is different from other kinds of inscrutability. (If not, then there are other people than James Joyce who have some Wakese competence, or at least enough of it to write in Wakese). One will recall that Wakese has oft been regarded as paying tribute to, even if outmatching the challenges of Lewis Carroll's *Alice* dilogy. James Clarence Mangan is another forerunner of the Joyce of FW (Ryder 2004: 2). Allegedly comparable are "the writings of James Joyce or Gertrude Stein" (cryptographer William F. Friedman in Sheldon 2014: 10). In an assessment, FW is as "outright unreadable" as four other texts (Grunbaum 2012), including Jacques Derrida's *On Grammatology*. The "Joycean pun and paragram" are just an element of possibly more complex *Poetamenos* by Augusto de Campos (Perloff 2010: 68). Possibly, FW is not as difficult as Martin Heidegger's *Being & Time* (Wilkinson and Hallberg 2012).

A selection of other FW comparees in literature includes: Brian Aldiss's *Barefoot In The Head*, "in a dense, punning style reminiscent of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*" (Clute and Pringle 2011, see Barthelmess 1987: 15-16, Stockwell 2014: 42), James Graham Ballard's "unreadable pastiche of *Finnegans Wake* and *The Adventures of Engelbrecht*" (R. Brown 2016: 81), Carlos Fuentes's *Terra Nostra*, which is "a Mexican *Finnegans Wake*" (Fraser and Altamiranda 2010: 1667), Sasha Sokolov's *Между собакой и волком*, "a Russian *Finnegans Wake*" (D. B. Johnson 1989: 163, see Borden 1999: 329, 389), Sydney Goodsir Smith's "Scottish *Finnegans Wake*" (Rosko 2018), Thomas Pynchon's *Gravity Rainbow* (Barciński 2017: 64), Velimir Khlebnikov'z poetry in Zaum language (Fimi 2018: 19), Krzysztof Bartnicki's *Prospekt emisyjny* (Sendecki 2010: 49). Given that the SF genre is well represented on lists of literature in unorthodox languages, with Iain M. Banks's *Feersum Endjinn*, James Blish's *Common Time*, Anthony Burgess's

Clockwork Orange, Samuel R. Delany's *Babel-17*, *Time Considered as a Helix of Semi-Precious Stones*, Hal Duncan's *Vellum*, Philip Jose Farmer's *Riders of the Purple Wage*, Kirk Hampton's *The Moonhare*, Russell Hoban's *Riddley Walker*, Daniel Keyes's *Flowers for Algernon*, Mirosław Jabłoński's *Duch czasu*, Norman Spinrad's *Bug Jack Barron*, Janusz Zajdel's *Paradyzja*, and many others, then possibly "the Joycean method, especially in *Finnegans Wake*" is "science fictional" (Freedman 2000: 90; see Westfahl 1998: 6).

But examples of Wakean-like inscrutability have also been found outside literature. The 'semantic burden' ("obciążenie semantyczne", Morawiec and Madeyski 1974: 36) in Józef Szajna's performance *Faust* can be compared to that in FW as well as Bruegel's *Big Fish Eat the Little Fish* (ibid.). Pavel Tchelitchev's *Hide and Seek* is "a pictorial equivalent of the method of *Finnegans Wake*" (G. Davenport 2013: 248). Giuseppe Arcimboldo does "justice to the wealth" in FW (Paris 2012: 236). FW is as unreadable as Jean-Luc Godard's *Histoire(s) du cinéma* is unwatchable or unlistenable (Rosenbaum 2009: 4), and they share complexity with Stravinsky, Eliot, Picasso (O'Donoghue 2012: 58), and Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz (Curyłło-Klag 2014: 71-72, 78). Some think that FW is an "unfilmable work of word art" (Winthrop-Young 2011: 63), yet others say that it is translatable into film (see Movin 2007). Ryan Trecartin's film *The Re'Search* (2009-2010) compares with FW, owing to wordplays (Wójtowicz 2014: 15); Richard Linklater's *Waking Life* (2001) is equivalent to FW due to its complexity, obscurity (Nebnos 2015).

However, Joyce's inventions would also be compared to Goethe's German words as regular as *Glanzgewimmel* and *Flügelflatterschlagen*. Joyce would even be called less of a language rebel than Goethe (and Rainer Maria Rilke) who dared to break the constraints of syntax (Wallis 1975: 165). Seeing FW compared to Tymoteusz Karpowicz's regular poetry (Jerzy Pilch qtd. in Kokoszka 2006: 158), Jeffrey Archer's bestseller, *Best Kept Secret* (Bradford 2015: 253) and other less challenging texts (see Bazarnik 2018: 79, J. M. Davies 2015), one is reminded of that Joyce and FW have become brands that one can use as a "most extravagant praise" (D. E. Morse 2009: 100, about Stanley Schatt calling *Slaughterhouse-Five* "Vonnegut's version of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*", qtd. in ibid.). Such comparisons overstate the association with FW for the blurb's sake or mean to discourage people from approaching the comparee (Dukaj 2003: 93).

Opinions vary on whether Wakese *should* be imitated. Quite symbolically, if FW was "designed on the principle of the Anglo-Saxon riddle: the more difficult to guess the meaning the better" (H. Read 1969: 44), then FW is an imitation itself. One reads that its

"influence has been disastrous", its imitations showing "a simple failure to communicate any meaning but the meaninglessness of all forms of communication" (ibid.). Nabokov's puns in *Ada* may be Joycean, still Nabokov "spoke disparagingly of the excess of pun" in FW (Kager 2013: 87). "[A]ny new attempt to produce "Wakespeak" would fail" (Gordin and Katz 2018: 81). Arno Schmidt may be a writer who 'creatively misread' FW (Rathjen 1993: 101). Some think that FW does not need to be—or even "heaven forbid that it should be imitated" (Scott-James 1939: 265). On the other hand, some praise, e.g., its stimulating poetical experiments (Borowski 2012: 94). In sum, a Wakese sort of competence to present an inscrutable text can be looked for in authors of texts with complex wordplay, stylistic opacity, challenging syntax, multitude of characters. If Wakese competence should be associated with incomprehension, not with lucidity, the English language principle must be undermined by every incomprehensibility in FW which is not easily attributed to English.

2.3. The Argument from Multilinguality

The argument from multilinguality follows the assumption that the text of FW "can't be all in one language" (Ezra Pound qtd. in Sabatini 2008). As "a composite tongue" (Burgess 1968: 29), Wakese intertwines English with many other languages (Strzetelski 1973: 55). To use the linguistic key to the text means to apply English competence to understand that better part of it which is English, and then use knowledge of all the other languages to understand the non-English remainder. The argument agrees with "the assumption that if one knew all the languages that Joyce knew, *Finnegans Wake* would become readable" (B. Benstock 1976: 128) and "to anyone with the time and the space for the *Wake* dictionaries, all the linguistic problems of that book will be solved" (Burgess 1975: 178).

Still, it would be against the language principle to claim that Joyce used language after language to present the same message, replaying one "basic story" (Edmund Epstein qtd. in Letzler 2014: 76),[65] for if it had been so, that story of FW would be available to anyone knowing *any* of the constituent languages, which would mean that Wakese is not English, but English is just one ingredient of Wakese.

---

[65] This is how Harry Levin's claim that Wakese is only seemingly difficult was relayed by Zygmunt Kałużyński. Kałużyński praised Levin's position on the dispensability of a complete understanding of FW as *most* correct (1998: 22). In a later revision of his text, Kałużyński called it correct (2004: 61).

Anyway, it is impossible to list all the languages worked into FW. Joyce mentioned 40 languages (see Van Hulle 2007: 457, n. 13, but see also Lernout 1989a: 399-400): 1. English, 2. Irish, 3. Norwegian, 4. Latin, 5. Greek, 6. Chinese, 7. Japanese, 8. Esperanto, 9. Volapuk, 10. Novial, 11. Flemish, 12. French, 13. Italian, 14. Burmese, 15. Basque, 16. Welsh, 17. Romansch, 18. Dutch, 19. German, 20. Russian, 21. Breton, 22. Hebrew, 23. Sanskrit, 24. Kisuaheli, 25. Swedish, 26. Spanish, 27. Persian, 28. Rumanian, 29. Lithuanian, 30. Malay, 31. Finnish, 32. Albanian, 33. Icelandic, 34. Arabic, 35. Portuguese, 36. Czech, 37. Turkish, 38. Polish, 39. Ruthenian, and 40. Hungarian. Numerous discrepancies appear when one compares this list to others, such as the one with Armenian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Danish, Gypsy, Ido, Hindustani, Latvian, Old Norse, Polynesian, Provençal, Samoan, Serbian, Shelta, Slovak, excluding Flemish, Italian, Novial (and English?) (Szczerbowski 2000: 49) or to the list of 20 languages, including English, Gaelic/Irish, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Spanish, Finnish, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Malay, and unspecified dialects of primitive peoples (Naganowski 1997: 166). The numbers vary a lot, ranging from a few languages (Parandowski 1976: 227), through 16 agglutinated languages (Berman 2000: 296), and about 20 languages (T. N. Hudes in Kurowska 1987: 232), "29 (?) of the world's languages" (Hassan 1975: 89), over 40 languages (Pyzik 2008: 18), 42 languages (Alford 2015), over 50 languages, therein 20 major ones (Rene 2016d), the "echoes of almost 50 languages" (D. Norris 2000: 150), 50 languages (T. Crowley 1996: 58), around 60 languages or dialects (Pascual 2007: 99), "over 60 languages" (Harbison 2015: 136), 62 languages (McHugh 2016: xxviii-xxx), "between sixty and seventy" (Bishop 1999: xi), "seventy-plus" (Milesi 2003a: 3), 77 languages (P. Škrabánek in Paszek 2016: 41, see Škrabánek 2003), over 80 languages (Joyce 2005), to 100 languages (Cixous 2011: 82, Mirkowicz 1982b: 342, Simpkins 2001: 157). There are instances where one person suggests more than one number, see, e.g., nearly 100 languages (Bazarnik 1999a: 109) but over 100 languages (ead. 1998: 4). Some exegetes neglect languages on Joyce's list (e.g., the Polish tag is overlooked in McHugh's *Annotations*). Some promote languages not listed by Joyce, e.g., Tibetan (Helsztyński 1976: 85).[66]

---

[66] It is not clear if Helsztyński's "Tibetan" is Sino-Tibetan, Bodish or Tibetic [see Majewicz 1989: 69-76 for classification]. Some notice a cultural (not linguistic) impression of Tibet on FW: Campbell and Robinson mention Tibetan mandalas (1976: 44), Frumkin speaks of Tibetan Buddhism (1994), McHugh mentions the Tibetan Book of the Dead (1974: 21), and others overlook that influence. Symbolically, Atherton does not mention the Tibetan Book of the Dead, only the Egyptian one (1974: 191-200).

An attempt to divide the languages of FW into major and minor ones is almost impossible due to that various languages which (apparently) are lexically underrepresented can be prioritised, especially locally, due to an extralinguistic reason. Examples include: Russian (Cornwell 1992: 49),[67] Egyptian (Gołąb 2010; Słomczyński 1973b, Troy 1976, see Bishop 1989: 456-457), Welsh, where FW demonstrates the "strong liking for alliteration on the Welsh pattern" (Visser 1963: 312), Italian, being "the first language of the Joyce family" (Burgess 1975: 177), and Polish (Bazarnik 2000). Africa plays an important role where Joyce "portrays the creative members of the *Wake* family as African" (Brivic 2008: 182) and there also are passages which are "preposterously Asia-centric" (ibid., 200).

Since English competence alone is not enough (Darasz 2000: 382) because there are non-English languages in FW, still no reader, not even a team of readers, is competent in 100+ languages, the key must be unsuccessful, unable to expose the semantic meaning of the *entire* text of FW, or at least, its non-English meaning. In an attempt to protect the key, the focus may be on English alone, as if on the main dish without foreign spices and sauces. However, the English element in FW has never been in splendid isolation, but has been put together with other languages, e.g., Irish, becoming then an "English, read with an Irish accent" (Boheemen 1998: 24, Melchiori 1992: 12), "English with foreign touches and a strong Irish accent" (Brenda Maddox qtd. in A. Gibson 2006: 167).[68] At the same time Wakese is anti-English and anti-Irish—as tradition finds Joyce's ancestors to be Normans ennobled by William the Conqueror (Weaver 2013), one can imagine that FW imitates an invasion of England and Ireland, and that Wakese mimics the confusion of tongues after Viking raids (see Armintor 2018). English has also been linked to the broader Celtic world, including druidic Ireland (G. C. Gibson 2001), Scotland (Barlow 2017ab), Wales (Weaver 2009: 189), and less broadly, to Gaelic/Erse (Milesi 1993: 98), Irish English, Anglo-Irish (Wall 1986), Dublin English, being either a language or a dialect (Sandulescu 2012i: 8), "the Hiberno-English slang of the city of Dublin" (Maguire 2002: 114), all in complex relationships to English taken as all the languages, dialects, jargons, English-based creoles, "pidgin English and Nippon English" (Budgen 1972: 326), and so

---

[67] Marked with various Russianisms, whose quantity is not fixed (Fomenko 2017b, Rene 2016d) and whose Russian (but not more generally Slavonic) character can be debated (Bartnicki 2019).

[68] Incidentally, if one chose to mimic Joyce's accent, one would need to decide if it was more of "an Irish accent, more particularly a Dublin accent" (Strathern 2005: 80), "an Irish accent, not a Dublin accent" (Pádraig Trehy qtd. in McCracken 2016), or perhaps "the Rathmines accent" looking "toward England" (Linehan 2016).

on, and English taken as its varieties in the colonies, including America (Fox 2014), Australia, New Zealand (Jassy 2015), India (Szczepanik 2014), but also English in opposition to its old enemies such as French, whose rivalry is symbolically represented by the two main protagonists—(more Germanic) Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker, (more Romance) Anna Livia Plurabelle. Such 'referential inflation' of what English is makes English a multilinguality again.

Even where our observations of the text were limited to the most manifest English-looking units, those units would not stand for FW. (If they could be enough, Joyce would have used just them.) Crucially, the languages in the text are not easily separable—in fact, they oft are interconnected, subsumed one by another, underlying, overwriting one another. Ignoring the non-English element can mean writing off its English ingredient, and focusing on English can fail to get rid of some foreign intrusions. As the reader of FW arrives either at an understanding of too little in the text to call it FW or at a non-understanding of FW, the unknown language proposition is more efficient with regard to the second option, since it can evoke an equivalent conclusion in less time.

2.4. The Position of Universality

What will be called here the position of universality is the set of such propositions found in the volume of FW exegesis which mean to say that FW is a text "about everything" (P. A. McCarthy in Hamada 2013: 71, Reyes 2017), "coterminous with the universe" (Eagleton 1978: 157), "a universal culture" (Zarrinjooee 2016), "the book as world" in the Mallarméan sense (Carpenter 1998: 200), enacting "a Darwinian merging of text and world" (Walsh 2010: x), "universaliz[ing] time and setting in support of a fundamental human connection across all cultural, geographic, or temporal boundaries" (Chamberlin 2014: 2), and so on. Ingrained in this is a concept that since FW represents the world, the hermeneutical result of processing FW *should be* incomplete in order to reflect that the world's self-knowledge is incomplete. There is "no evolutionary need for us to understand *Finnegans Wake*" (Eagleton 2008: 8); one may even wonder whether a total decryption is in the reader's interest ("im Interesse des Lesers", as in Senn 2011). The position of universality helps one to downplay the feeling of inscrutability—even helps one to enjoy it.

Yet the reader in the industry does not stop regarding English as the main language in which the text of FW with the ambition for universality is delivered. But the position of universality and the language principle do not agree since "English" and "universal" are not synonyms. If FW is universal, then it is not English, and if it is English, then it is not universal. Even putting aside the fallacy of anthropocentrism, the world according to Joyce is too Joyce's to be everybody's. Even if it is mimetically correct that not all our questions about FW can find their answers just like not all our questions about the world can find theirs, it is still unjustified to assume that Joyce can ask questions on behalf of us all.[69] If Joyce wanted to write a history of time, and "Time is the real hero of his final masterpiece" (Borg 2007a: 1), his text failed as it could not include the future. Even if time moves in a loop, so the future is accessible to some extent (see, e.g., Zarrinjooee 2013: 19), FW is not universal where it neglects *other* concepts of time, e.g., the world without time (Rovelli 2018). Or even if FW *could be* about the future, the language of FW could not be English insofar as future is not English (nor is the past).

A similar objection concerns the text in Wakese presented as an "infinite variety" (Levin 1941: 178), "infinitely open to languages" (Schlossman 1985: 174), "infinitely suggestive" (Beitchman 1998: 28), "whose ambiguities open the text infinitely" (Hélène Cixous in Nash 1996: 146), with an "infinite series of substitutions and juxtapositions" (MacCabe 1991: 26), with "endless", "limitless semantic possibilities" (C. Hart 1992: 24): the words "infinite" and "English" are not synonyms. Besides, most of these infinities are not real, e.g., there is no "infinite circle of a book" (Conger 2011)—the circumference is a finite number, and it remains finite even if we would multiply it by the number of all our readings, future readings included. Even if "infinity" is a recklessly used synonym for "a large number", or it means a "virtual infinity" (Rabaté 2016: 34) where "virtual" is short for "for practical purposes", that is to say, even if infinity translates into a certain finiteness on the reader's side, not even that finiteness is simultaneously English *and* characteristic of the finite world. Also, if FW is in a devilish language of "silence, emptiness, and nothing" (Riquelme 1991: 532 re Sandulescu 1987), silence, emptiness, nothingness are not owned

---

[69] Us, humans. Tim Conley sees FW as "a sort of literary Turing Test", "by which humanity, or humanness, can be differentiated from an artificial construct" (2003: 722). This proposition is contestable. First, until the text becomes understandable to AI, the test will not differentiate humanity from AI, both parties being unable to answer the questions asked in FW. Secondly, Conley seemingly implies that the questions in FW can be understood, but in accordance with the unknown language position—they cannot.

by English. If Joyce tries to break out from "language as prison" (Olsson 1979: 300) so that Wakese should gain some ontological autonomy and become a more self-dependent consciousness (see T. Conley 2003: 718-719), free from the users that it locks or used to lock, Wakese is not English if no user remains in the language to observe that.

What persists in the examples of the position of universality is the assumption that the language is sufficiently English to present some questions that readers understand even though they cannot answer them. One is asked to regard FW as "impossible to master or fully grasp" (M. Norris 2004: 157), which impossibility leads readers toward a universal conclusion about the incompleteness of meaning, inaccessibility of sense, unreliability of knowledge, unavailability of truth, and *still* FW is in English there, "apotheosised" to "a universal language capable of absorbing all others" (Burgess 1975: 35). Since Wakese, with "the dream" of becoming a "new super-language that will unite divided humanity" (Attridge 2001: 158), was linked to the Babel myth, one should consider the nature of this ambition.[70] One theoretical possibility is that Joyce designed Wakese to be a post-Babelian "Esperanto English" (Błoński 1965: 163) to overcome the *confusio linguarum* and return to some pre-Babelian, Adamic condition when "the whole earth was of one language" (Gen. 11: 1). However, FW does not provoke glossolalia, and the languages of FW do not "speak to one another lucidly and comprehensibly" (Attridge, ibid.). It is the opposite—the text remains inscrutable, so, the post-Babelian design should be called a failed one. The other option is that Wakese is Babelian, presenting or representing the *confusio linguarum*. The equivocal name "Babel" itself, combining Sumerian *bab-ili* [the gate of God], Hebrew *bilbél* [confuse], *Ba-Bel* [father-god] (Markowski 2003: 311-312), passed as a word into the text (e.g., FW 258.11). In this option, humanity—or this part of it that is aware of FW—can cease to be divided, becoming united in semantic despair and feeling dumb. If this is what Joyce planned, he succeeded.

Whether Joyce meant well but was incompetent or he was an agent of confusion and despair, neither option is very advertisable and marketable, except among snobbish masochists. As the professional motivation of the industry enters these considerations, one can assume that while the industry (i) would not like their consumer base to be narrow, (ii) nor would it give up the image of Joyce as a genius, (iii) nor could it convincingly call FW

---

[70] To avoid ambiguities that may result from calling the language "Babelian (or, rather, post-Babelian)" (Slote 2013: 2), "Babelian" here refers to unintelligibility, while "post-Babelian" relates to that future in which unintelligibility is replaced by a distinct quality. Accordingly, even though we live, in the words of George Steiner, "after Babel", our intercommunication is continually Babelian.

a smooth read, it would need to orient the discussion of FW so that (iv) it remained under the industry's control. It is useful for the Joyce industry to make people assume that FW is English because then it can wield control over the production and marketing of its exegesis more effectively than it could if more people opted for the unknown language position. The explanation for the industry's "resistance to the idea of Joyce as a conlanger" (Michael Adams 2013), an inventor of a new language, is, admittedly, a deficient hypothesis insofar as one can hardly imagine how any hypothesis about FW could be tested, nevertheless, the explanation it provides is coherent. On the other hand, coherence is lacking in the position of universality combined with the language principle.

Sometimes, a partial answer to the question how the *confusio* in FW can be called English tacitly appeals to the tradition of thinking about FW.—Before the publication of the prototext, one could certainly imagine that a new text by Joyce, a recognised writer in English (see Barlow 2017b: 4, Jarniewicz 2018: 186), was going to be another piece of English prose, after *Dubliners*, a *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*, which conviction was not spoilt by the published FWP pre-texts which might seem still English. Still, if the "initial critical response", "harsh and negative" (P. Gillespie 1997: 136), these earliest reactions to the language in FW were as close to an assessment unbiased by any extraliterary or extralinguistic factors as one could get, it was incoherent to act against that intuition. The decision to favour English instead of an unknown language becomes more understandable when one realises that as FW became interesting to academic centres in the USA and Western Europe, its language had to be (called) English in order to qualify for English studies (whose professionalisation was concomitant with Joyce's work, Nash 1996: 14).

There are three main arguments the professional has taken to avoid the charges of incoherence. The first argument uses the already discussed appeal to appearances, saying that English stands out in the midst of the languages in FW. (This is not in line with the story in Genesis if one assumes that when the builders of Babel got scattered and their languages got separated, none of them stood out.) As FW can be either about everything or about English, the unknown language position aligns with the position of universalism much better because it distinguishes no individual language (but itself).

The second argument is that FW is about "everything", but that "everything" still needs a lens, some kind of filter, and the most obvious lens of an English reader is their language. However, anyone who would like to advertise FW as a text which is universal,

transcultural, translingual should do their best to *overcome* their desire to select the most obvious, most available lens. Unless one subscribes to a view that English is the Adamic language in which the post-Babel man is going to be rescued from the *confusio linguarum*, the more prominent the English element is in FW, the less universal its story grows.

The third argument says that there is no good reason to disqualify English from being "the particular [that] contains the universal" (R. Boyle 1972: 53). It will be argued against this, however, that there *is* a good reason to avoid the English-centric bias in its current American version, overlapping with the (prior) Eurocentric bias, covert in claims such as that "[t]here can be no more globa1 work, conceptually speaking, than *Finnegans Wake*" (Damrosch 2003: 289), and overt in such synonyms for Wakese as "pan-European idiom" (Cross 1971: 11) and "Eurolanguage" (C. G. Sandulescu in Sandulescu and Vianu 2015b: 17). The bias will be called neocolonial, as it succeeds the bias of the times of more classical colonialism, when Joyce presented his own Anglocentrism, detected in that he founded Wakese on English despite that he had other options. As Joyce in FW is "making the foreign native" (Eoyang 2019: 17), his nativisation means looting foreign dictionaries, taking them into the empire, much against the assumption that FW was "Joyce's attempt to escape from the echo of colonization embedded in the English language" (Booker 1996: 143, cf. id. 1990: 178). Since the English-speaking exegete today is neocolonial at least in their use of the language privilege (especially where it is possible for one to abandon it by reasonable efforts), it is ironic, and importantly, inconsistent that FW should be associated with "linguistic decolonization" (Milesi 2003a: 6), a "multitudinous plurality of voices" (Franz 2012: 13), a "democratic speech of the multitude" (Paltin 2014: 50) and so on. The neocolonial bias explains the 'thematic' expansionism of the industry searching for new topics, yet disregarding the unknown language position that could harm that search. The industry makes use of that the "totality of the equivocal" that James Joyce "babelizes" is "asymptotic" (Derrida 1984: 149),[71] incomplete (Sławek 1993: 13), continually open to exegetical consideration. Expansionism is detected in assertions such as that Joyce used 60 languages consciously, yet all the languages in the world unknowingly (Bindervoet and Henkes 2004-2005: 202).

---

[71] Misquoted as "asymptomatic" by M. Norris (1996: 179).

2.5. The Position of Encryption

What will be called here the position of encryption is the set of such propositions found in the volume of FW exegesis which agree with the concept that FW is "a book to decipher" (Frye 1964: 103), with "the private, exclusive dimension of an 'anti-language'" (Wales 1992: 156), nevertheless recognisable as an English text, especially if one can see why and how FW is "wilfully obscure" (Bishop 1986: 3). The encryption is as "most deliberately cryptographic" (Gloversmith 1984: 23) as Joyce planned it—or more (C. Hart 1966a: 145, 1992:16). It is efficient if it cuts the unauthorised off. If Wakese is "a 'newspeak' that nobody can speak", "made only to be written" (Gault 2007: 76), oral reading is cut off.

Many have sought the reason for and the roots of the encryption in Joyce's life. Already in the opening line's "past Eve and" (FW 3.1), Joyce supposedly alludes to his "pa" (father) and "Stephen" (his grandson); in "gorgios" (FW 3.8) there is a reference to his son Giorgio; in "nor avoice" (FW 3.9), to his partner Nora Joyce *née* Barnacle. The text makes references to more distant relatives, friends, acquaintances, even people of as minor presence in James Joyce's life as a Mrs. Conway complaining about her back pain (S. Joyce 1971: 10, see FW 213.17). According to Grace Eckley, journalist W. T. Stead is "biographical original of the hero" in FW (2018: xiii). Also Joyce's daughter Lucia may have been a "model" for "the entire book" (Sh. Fogarty 2015, see Fordham 2013b, 2017). Alternately or in addition, FW is James Joyce's hate-song against his brother Stanislaus ("Jimmys Haßgesang", 1960, see Naganowski 1997: 30, Raleigh 1953, cf. Mason 1955: 188). It may also be Nora's biography (Żuławski 1995, see Riquelme 1985: 241 re Gordon 1981), and possibly Joyce used encryption in order to "hide meaning" from her (Feshbach 1994: 503). Moreover, FW may be *polybiographical*, a "product" of the Irish culture Joyce was born into (Splitter 1982: 203-204), a biography of Dublin (Helsztyński 1948: 322) or *pan-biographical*, as a story about the human kind, whose "experiences of birth, guilt, judgment, sexuality, family, social ritual, and death" recur in FW "as they do in human lives" (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 91).

In the following subsections, the reasons for encrypting FW are divided into the personal or taboo ones, like James Joyce's intention to enjoy freedom of expression on sex (C. G. Sandulescu in Hamada 2013: 92, Vanderham 1998: 57-59), and the less personal ones,

notably Joyce's intention to write a text in the language of dreaming, or, as it will be called here, *dreamspeak*.

2.5.1. Taboo Reasons for the Encryption

Discussing theoretical reasons for obscurity in FW, Anthony Burgess wondered if Joyce was (i) incompetent, (ii) demented, or (iii) seeking beyond ordinary language (1968: 265). Burgess categorically dismissed the first possibility and doubted the second one. But other possibilities are available, e.g., the one that Joyce was an impostor—or either an impostor or a psychopath (Costa 2017). As his writing in FW is indicative of a maniere or a mania (Kydryński 1974: 6), some exegetes, unlike Burgess, would link Joyce (and FW) with "madness" (Kaplan 2002) or "disease" (id. 2008). N. J. C. Andreasen, MD, called Joyce a schizoid and his text psychotic (1973: 70). Verdicts were also passed in a non-medical jargon: Joyce may have lost his mind (Grochowski 2000: 180) or he went bonkers ("dostał hyzia", Kałużyński 1988: 225). If "not insane", he was "peculiar" (W. Harris 2006).

Regularly, Joyce's mental health has been discussed with regard to his sexuality and in connection with the health of his daughter. Udo Loll asserts that James's repressed hatred for his father had resulted in his psychosomatic illnesses that led him to incestuous abuse of Lucia that in turn drove her into schizophrenic psychosis (1992, as summarised in Schweizer 1994). FW contains "every so-called perversion" (Hassan 1975: 88). Among its themes are "rape, prostitution, procuring, incest, homosexuality, sodomy, and so forth" (B. Benstock 1965: 80). Even so, the likely first attempt to break the taboo in the form of a non-occasional academic book in English appeared only 30 years after the prototext. It was Margaret Solomon's book on Joyce's psychosexuality (1969) with "a key to a sexual ciphering" in FW (Hervé 2017, see Utell 2010: 160, n. 1, see also R. Brown 1990: 3). The list of psychosexual proclivities found in FW and presumed about Joyce (or vice versa) has grown extensive, including: sadomasochist paraphilias (Baranowska 1964, Kitliński 2002: 144-145), urolagnia and verbal exhibitionism (Maddox 2000: 151-152), voyeurism (Power 1989), neuroticism manifested in cuckolding, and homophobia, fetish, coprophilia (Gross 1973: 97), scatology, eproctophilia, somnophilia (J. M. Knowles 2006: 98), somnophilia, which is "the neurotic equivalent of necrophilia" (Griffiths 2014, see Seidel 2002: 39), candaulist jealousy (Bowker 2012b: 190), cuckoldry (J. M. Morse 1960: 331, f. 12), the

Oedipus complex, possibly ephebiphobic (see M. Norris 2004: 167-168), castration anxiety (Boheemen 1998: 24, Lewiecki-Wilson 1994: 49, 276-277), persecutory and grandiose delusions, extreme egocentricity, in addition to cynophobia and tonitrophobia (Andreasen 1973: 69), incest (Eide 2002: 136-138, Ford 1998: 137-145, Jousni 2013, Donald Theall in Hamada 2013: 123, Promiński 1977: 215, Shelton 2006, C. L. Shloss in Max 2006, Shloss 1998: 101, 2003, *passim*, Tindall 1996: 18, see also Rabaté 2001: 172). In addition, FW "displays stereotypical textbook symptoms of psychosis such as aphasia, paralysis or amnesia" (Radak 2014: 54), reflects impediments of speech (Eagle 2014: 82, Alexandrova 2014: 2); Joyce's own vision impairment matches "invisible disabilities" (Marchisotto 2014: 43) and there is "systematic uncertainty and obscurity" in FW, running "parallel to Joyce's pathology" (van Velze 2010: 8). Some would consider that Joyce's expression was influenced by syphilis (Birmingham 2014ab, Ferris 2010, Schneider 2014, cf. Lyons 1988, see also Tyler 2018: 175) and his aesthetic modes were due to the auditory hallucinations, a side effect of the medications administered in the course of STD treatment.

Other people would protest such calumnies.—FW is not a schizophrenic aberration (Baranowska 1960: 160). Never was Joyce's mind chaotic (F. O'Brien 1984: 196). Never in his life did Joyce make a slightest indication of a minor mental imbalance (Słomczyński 1973b: 17). Some would resort to metonymy—it was not Joyce, but his "imagination" that slid into a catatonia (Promiński 1977: 225); it is not Joyce, but his "writing" one links to schizophasia (Kępiński 2001: 76). At times, the taboo was sublimized: "schizophrenesis" may be an "ironic commentary on the colonial stereotyping of Irishness" (Herr 2003: 117); the "depictions of venereal disease" in FW read "alongside" an "anti-colonial narrative" (Lovejoy 2014: 40). The taboo could also be depersonalized—FW reflects the condition of Dublin, not Joyce's. Collectives such as the Dublin of Joyce even *need* to be "unhealthy" in order to gain on universality (Szymutko 2001: 21; see Sławek 2001b: 12). The "singular mode of paranoia" in the work depicts a general paranoia "resulting from people's mental paralysis caused by a bourgeois scene" (Tsoi Sze Pang 2011: 16). Some exegetes, including Campbell and Robinson, would use understatements about Joyce's schizophrenia (Naganowski 1997: 156). But perhaps unnecessarily so.—If schizophrenia is the price our species pays for language (Crow 1997, 2000), a "consequence of literacy" (M. McLuhan 1962: 22), then James Joyce, "the colossus" transforming "schizophrenic speech" into "creative writing" (McKenna and Oh 2005: 77), in the company of Niżyński, Strindberg, Swedenborg (Kępiński, op. cit., 65-78), Hölderlin (Słonimski 1973: 166) and other artists,

is to be marvelled at for overcoming the limitations of ordinary language (N. Brown in Sławek 1996: 82). "Madness" is "recreated and adopted" in FW (Restine 2014: 88). Joyce in that case is not a patient—in FW, he is a psychoanalyst, getting to "the crime of sexual perversion" "at the heart of psychic life" (Bowring 2009: 12). If Joyce "had a latent disposition to schizophrenia", yet prevented its "precipitation" (Dalzell 2017), then he had the wondrous power to choose whether or not to be disordered.

After Lucia Joyce had been diagnosed with schizophrenia, the diagnosis was rejected by the father, who "consistently refused to acknowledge her increasing insanity" (Fuller Torrey and Miller 2001: 155), understandably so, if he could be called responsible (Rudnicki 2009: 204). While some Wakeans have argued over that diagnosis (see Ku 2019, Vincenti 2018: 139-141), schizophrenia in the daughter could be used, first of all, to stress the artistic affinity between James and Lucia Joyce (in contrast, Nora's sanity means that she is down-to-earth, even vulgar, see Naganowski 1997: 31), secondly, to reaffirm that the father was able to resist what the daughter was not. A side effect of this tactic to praise James Joyce through contrast to his family is that one then hesitates to call Lucia a "fellow artist" (Capili 2017: 56), "a creative collaborator" (C. L. Shloss in O'Hagan 2004, see Sasidharan 2018: 1357-1358), let alone a co-author of FW—just like one disagrees with the theory that Nora Bloom, whose influence on the husband was libidinal (Majewski 2011), could be the *spiritus movens* behind his work (Maddox 2000).

Before anyone considered whether there is English under the encryption in FW, the proponent of the psychosexual motivation should explain why Joyce did not encrypt other texts—for one sees plain "corporeal fascination that underpins Joyce's early work, *Stephen Hero*" (Purcell 2014: 54), a fear of cuckoldry in *Exiles* (Gross 1973: 97, Naganowski 1997: 74), extramarital infidelity in *Giacomo Joyce* (Słomczyński 1970: 103), "sins ranging from fetishism to coprophilia" (Lamos 1998: 150) in *Ulysses*, and a schizophrenic aspect is something that a layperson can notice (C. G. Jung 1981: 469). It is unclear why it would be only in FW where Joyce allegedly "confesses in a foreign language" (Stanislaus Joyce qtd. in Ferris 2010: 36-37), and how the word "confession" applies at all if it implies contrition, yet FW is a display of James Joyce's narcissism, similar to "the masochist's provocative exhibitionism" in his *Ulysses* (Cotter 2003: 144). Claims that Joyce trying "to unburden the heart" (Wilder 1957: 12) is akin to the pop-cultural serial killer who wishes to be caught have no confirmation in psychology (Bonn 2014). Even if he was graphomanic, it does not explain why the impulse to write did not choose a subject that does not need encryption.

One explanation would be that FW conceals a sin graver than those in the earlier texts—e.g., father-daughter and/or brother-sister incest (see Max 2006).

But perhaps Joyce is not confessional or apologetic at all, but is defiant in testing the ways in which one dismisses ethical norms. When Joyce was writing FW, he was also growing older, sexually inactive, closer to the experience of death (Bereza 1996: 97-98), so he may have wanted his final text to grow as bold as possible in its defiance of historicity, corporeality, existentiality, which was effected by its defiance of language and morality. Alternately, his mentality may have grown disordered over time (in ways objectionable to the society), and this found reflection in FW because Joyce was an autobiographical writer (Naganowski 1997: 156)—if so, Wakese was a means of expression rather than confession. The encryption level followed Joyce's internal negotiations between the need for safety (the task was to set up an obscurity that exceeds *Ulysses* for which he had faced obscenity charges, see Birmingham 2014c) and his wish to be understood (which one infers from that had Joyce not wished to be understood, he could have easily invented a more hermetic code). Either way, while attempts to decrypt the text via Joyce's psychosexuality can be charged with biographism (Giczela-Pastwa 2011: 105-106), not even radical biographism renders FW lucid. If so, Joyce's failed to find the equilibrium between encryption and communication. One cannot say how "thick" the "veil of multilingual wordplay", with "a function of camouflage" (Sárdi 2013: 193), is, that is, whether the code works or not in those parts of the text where we understand something. Nor can one find the reason for that part of the code due to which FW "can never be comprehended in its entirety" (Switaj 2016: 121). Nor can one be sure why the code is not ubiquitous (see Staples 1965: 168). What one can say, however, is that if FW means what the *eisegetic* reader thinks that FW means (see Talar 2011: 123), then every disorder and sin found in FW is the reader's.

Whatever our thoughts on this are, a serious argument against the taboo encryption will appeal to a sense of morality. People who think that FW is Joyce's confession have no way of confirming their eligibility as his confessor and confidant. It is unethical of them to prioritise the wish to learn more about Joyce over moral concerns such as those concerning Joyce's letters (2008), too intimate for publication or disclosure (Nicholas Fargnoli in T. F. Staley 1983, cf. Lowery 1983, see S. J. Joyce 1989, D. Norris 1993: 352). People who assume that Joyce was a masochist aroused by the idea that his secrets can be exposed make themselves a party in the sadomasochist venture, one they should leave immediately

when Joyce is no longer able to withdraw his consent. Their insisting that FW is in English means usurpation of confessional eligibility or abuse of a sadomasochist relation.

2.5.2.   Non-Taboo Reasons for the Encryption

Among the ideas about the non-taboo reasons for encrypting is this (para)religious idea that the text is esoteric, or occult, whose meaning should not be available to everyone. The text of FW has been linked to Kabbalah, gematria (J. P. Anderson 2008, 2009, 2010, 2013, Bazarnik 2006: 171-176, Brivic 1983, Crook 2018: 9, Terrinoni 2007: 129-130), Blavatsky's Theosophy (Platt 2008, L. Wilson 2013: 66-67), alchemy (DiBernard 1980, Hegerfeldt and Vanderbeke 2002), spiritism, necromancy (Carver 1978b: 80), divination, bibliomancy (J. A. Snyder 2004, Quadrino 2019), tarot (R. A. Wilson 2000: 73, 201), I Ching (Moore 1980, Quadrino 2014a). In a broader sense, if the meaning in FW is occult, its exegesis is magic, "occult science" (see Hanegraaff 2006: 716). Then a 'wild' claim such as that the ghost of Elvis Presley is spotted in "the king's highway with his hounds" (FW 334.34) (Michael O'Shea in Navarrete Franco 1999: 25) is as magical as whatever likes to be more seriously looking, e.g., that "riverrun" (FW 3.1) echoes Coleridge's "Alph, the sacred river, run" (see Fritz Senn in P. O'Neill 2013: 36). Importantly, a claim that FW is in English is then as occultly insecure as any rival claim, till a privileged agent of occult knowledge deigns to resolve the rivalry. Seeing FW as an esoteric text reduces its potential to be (confirmed as) English. Also, where one's study of the occult text of FW involves gematric-like analyses of individual symbols and their numerical values, FW is not quite in English insofar as symbols and numbers are not English.

In the esoteric text, Joyce leaves shibboleths (see T. Conley 2014: 194-195, Kitcher 2007: 105), words as challenging as "Pthwndxrclzp" (see Bauer 1997: 36), associations as unobvious as "Ireland" and "herring" (Jarniewicz 2015a), and "tea" and "love and sex" (B. Benstock 1965: 9). Still, if FW, unlike a kabbalist text trying to connect with the divine thought, is "the abyss that awaits modern man, who tries to communicate" (Weathers 1964: 108), Joyce's preclusion of communication, his violation of the cooperative principle (Grice 1995: 28-31) can be interpreted as a hostile act against the reader fated "to stand deaf and dumb" (Wheatley 2001: 3). If Joyce "wars on language and reading" (Reisman 2009a), his more immediate objective can be to "pay off all his old grudges" in an "act of

revenge" (Edel 1980: 476), and his long-term goal to occupy people with his biography.[72] However, if Wakese is a code of war (Bartnicki 2012c, see Okulska 2013, 2018), the non-masochist, non-defeatist reader should refuse to call FW English, in a strategic move not to make it any easier for the enemy by accepting his rules of linguistic engagement.

Alternately, by a quite rich tradition, FW is a "book of the dark" (Bishop 1986) and Wakese is "the language of night or of the unconscious" (Rose and O'Hanlon 1982: 7), or, as it will be called: *dreamspeak*. This tradition had "rather humble and apparently singular origins" (Platt 2011: 116, see A. Roberts 2015). The mimesis was advertised by Joyce himself, who spoke of the night's "different stages—conscious, then semi-conscious, then unconscious" (in R. Ellmann 1982: 546). A curious argument in defence of dreamspeak echoes Leibniz: Joyce's way of encoding the night third of human life may be poor, but is the best one of the possible ways (ibid., 703).

An initial difficulty in assessing the mimesis in FW is the problem of the dreamer's identity. One supposition is that the dreamer is Earwicker (Loska 1999: 60) and that FW is a stenographic record of the events he dreamt on a night (Strzetelski 1959b: 60). As he "imagines himself being commented on by other people" (H. Zhang 2009: 81), they should be "people he has known or heard about" (Moffat 1985: 1). If Earwicker is an ordinary man (Gołaszewska 1977: 222), his dream should not reveal any non-ordinary knowledge. Since sometimes he seems to be a man of erudition, the dreamer may be Joyce dreaming 'via' Earwicker (Cieślikowska 1965: 139). The question arises whether Joyce is a diegetic narrator of Earwicker's dream-story or a mimetic narrator using "multi-faceted characters that reflect both Joyce's imagination and represent different facets of his psyche" (Wack and Lutsky 2011: 1) or an extradiegetic proxy in FW being "a roadmap to larger ideas" "in the form of archetypes that connect the personal unconscious with the collective unconscious" (ibid.).

According to Clive Hart, there are three "dream layers" in FW (1962: 84):

(i) "the [intextual] Dreamer's dream about everything that occurs in the book" (85),

(ii) "the Dreamer's dream about [male protagonist] Earwicker's dream" (86), and

---

[72] Incidentally, "war" is one of Derrida's two words for Joyce (1984); *riverrun* became a "sound of war" in Japanese (Ito 2004b). Beckett's Joycean style was 'de-naïvied' by a real war, WW2 (T. Parks 2012).

(iii) "the Dreamer's dream about Earwicker about [his son] Shawn's dream" (87).

Furthermore, the dreamer may be a historical figure (e.g., Vico, see Donald Phillip Verene in Franke 2009b: 109) or Anna Livia, the female protagonist (fundagain 2018a) or a group of people (Naganowski 1997: 164), e.g., gone out on an ocean of sleep in Dublin (Kaczmarek 2014: 108). Some or all merge in or with Earwicker as the narrative permits metamorphoses of a person into people (Bugajski 1986: 59) and Joyce transgresses beyond the individual toward archetypes (Ważyk 1982: 188). If the characters in FW sleep/dream the history of humanity *from start to finish* ("od początku do końca", Gołaszewska 2002: 31, see also Naganowski 1997: 164), it is unclear—the start and finish of what: sleep? dream? history? reading?, but whose then: the reader's? Or the author's, possibly—Joyce's fiction is 24 hours and FW occupies the final hour (Williamson 2015).

What questions the mimetic success is that one cannot really say if FW is a "night-book or sleep-book" or "a dream-book" (M. Norris 2009: 237) and the object or subject of mimesis is elusive among too many possibilities:

(i) *the night*, which does not have to be dark, used for sleeping, and whose time can be measured, against James Joyce's design that "in the night world of the *Wake* all events are contemporary" (Verene 2002: 472);

(ii) *the dark* (Bishop 1986), not necessarily synonymous with the night;

(iii) *the unconscious mind*—however consciousness and sleep are not antonyms;[73]

(iv) *the subconscious mind* (if distinguished from the unconscious one), however, "the subconscious has no language" (E. Wilson 1931: 227);

(v) *sleep*, which may be without dreams recalled by the waking mind (and without dreams in people with brain injuries); consisting of hallucinatory REM sleep and different NREM sleep;

(vi) *falling asleep*, between consciousness and sleep (S. Carey 2011, Moffat 1985: 1, Szczerbowski 1999: 139, 2000: 8); *hypnagogic hallucinations* at onset of sleep are, "in contrast to dreams", "usually rather static" and "without narrative content" (T. Weiss 2005: 101);

---

[73] Marian Promiński's Polish novella *Szczelina* (1935), in a convention similar to Joyce's (Wawrzycka 2004: 232-233), shows consciousness in sleep ("świadomości w czasie snu", Strycka 2012: 241).

(vii)   *language-unrelated sensations*, such as *hypnic jerks,* in the early stage of NREM sleep;

(viii)   *dream* (Naganowski 1997: 143, Wales 1992: 138), the REM sleep vision ending a 90-minute cycle, 4-6 cycles per night; possibly surreal in content, but not obscure in language: "the words and sentences dreamers hear are usually quite normal" (Moffat, op. cit., 7);

(ix)   *waking up*, the hypnopompic state, when "the dreaming psyche attaches items of knowledge or information from the waking consciousness" (M. Norris 1976: 7); the hypnopompic speech is most often confused, nonsensical;

(x)   *sonic-lexical production* of the sleeping mind, since the sleeping mind uses "soundroots" to form names for new phantasmagories (Strzetelski 1975: 32, see Eco 1998: 133, Łuba 2007: 54);

(xi)   *lucid dreaming*; a metacognitive phenomenon of the dreamer remaining aware of dreaming;

(xii)   *dream-like hallucinations*, which may be disease-induced (e.g., by schizophrenia) and drug-induced, experienced in any time of the day;

(xiii)   *dreaming, etc. with a metaphor function*; e.g., FW is "understood as a night journey through a body or an anthropomorphized landscape" (Lerm Hayes 2007: 6);

(xiv)   *being awake*, and able to narrate the dreaming experience, albeit only in a partial, deformed way (Grochowski 2000: 169).

Still more objections can be raised. If dreams occur in one's mother tongue (E. Wilson 1931: 229), how can dreamspeak be foreign (Loska 2000: 107), made up of dozens of languages? Why is it obscure if dreams can be lucid? How can Wakese be dreamspeak if dreams become available only in the reductional language of tale? Should not FW have been written in sleep? Read in sleep? Various people have spoken against Joyce's mimetic design (Attridge 2012-2013: 185, Moffat 1985: 1, 7, Reed 1947: 140). Some have praised the intention, yet criticised the implementation (Prior 2013: 203; see S. Deane 1992: ix), ineffective already in FWP (E. Wilson 1931: 235, see Jolas 1961: 91). Some have thought of a non-mimetic mechanism, e.g., "a suspension of disbelief" (Moffat 1985: 3), a lullaby-machine, "*une machine à provoquer et faciliter mes propres rêves*" (Michel Butor qtd. in

Slote 2004a: 386), "a metalanguage, not a dream" (Hassan 1975: 83). FW may succeed in comparison with more metaphorical than mimetic *Dream of the Red Chamber* (H. Zhang 2009: 2) or Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* (Kuliczkowska 1983: 118), but in its own right, its mimicry fails to serve all levels—where the text of reading should mimic the reader (like FW mimics Joyce), the text made (or dreamt) by the FW characters mimics the past world, which, in turn, mimics the world of the reader (who mimics the author), and so on, in a loop. If Wakese is dreamspeak, Joyce's encryption failed utterly and so discussing its language, English or not, is moot.

2.6. The Argument from Poetry

One of the explanations why FW is opaque, but still is English is that FW is poetry, whose aesthetic-rhythmic qualities replace the more ostensible meaning characteristic of prose. Exegetes have disagreed on the extent of that poeticalness: is the text of FW categorically pure and absolute poetry (Królikowski 1998c: 140), the purest poetry that one imagines (Słomczyński 1975: 153), as non-understandable as the sound of magic (Kuncewiczowa 1984: 199), convoluted poetry (Eustachiewicz 1973: 104), or is it no pure poetry (Bazarnik 1999b: 143), or not quite poetry (Conner 2012: 21-22)? Some have located FW on the prosaic side of literature, closer to "prose" than to "poetry" (Kostelanetz 1977: 66), calling it pure poetry in prose (Strzetelski 1973: 84), "prose aspiring to the condition of poetry" (Tahourdin 2014), a poem in prose (Sommer 2013: 452), a narrative poem in the novel form ("poemat powieścią", Poprawa 2008: 149), a novel-poem-epopee (Bazarnik 1998: 4). FW blurs the boundaries between poetry and prose (Elektorowicz 1966: 47) or removes them (Przyboś 1970b: 385); perhaps it arrives at metapoetry (Eco 2008a: 267; see Łazarczyk 1990: 155) or some new type of literature (T. Świątek 1936: x) whose form may be as nonliterary as that of, say, Arras tapestries (Helsztyński 1976: 84). Yet, if FW only *sometimes* is poetry ("bywa", Grochowski 2000: 155) and is not poetic where its language is not free from grammar (Przyboś 1970a: 150),[74] this could be interpreted as a claim that FW is English where it is poetic, i.e. where its grammar is less obvious and its meaning less lucid. (The question about the language where the text is prosaic would remain open.)

---

[74] The sources in Polish, a highly inflected language, mention FW's *grammar* more often, whereas those in English, an uninflected (analytic) language, speak more often about its *syntax*.

On recalling Coleridge saying that "prose = words in their best order; poetry = the *best* words in their best order" (1835, vol. I: 76), there would arise the question of how one grades lucidity. If FW is more understandable in a theatrical performance than in writing or in an utterance (Bereś and Braun 1993: 128), it is probably because the verbal aesthetic is desophisticated on stage—due to the *articulator effect* (named so by analogy with the observer effect) *collapse of superposition* of meaning occurs (named by analogy with the wave function collapse in quantum measurement). Reading FW aloud can exhibit a more lucid meaning that one recognises as more plainly English, but only because the reading removes multiple complexities which, until read out loud, one recognises as not so English or does not recognise them at all.

Thinking of more non-referential poetry than James Joyce's, the work of Hugo Ball, Velimir Khlebnikov, and Christian Morgenstern comes to mind (Soliński 2004: 263). The last poet, inspired by English nonsense poetry, makes one think of Lewis Carroll, whose *Jabberwocky* is a benchmark if FW is "merely an expansion of the "Jabberwocky" procedure" (Burgess 1987: 20, see Christensen 1991, M. Wood 2010: 12). To discuss the levels of lucidity in FW and Carroll, Joyce's word "overgoat" ("carryin his overgoat", FW 35.13) will be taken for example, and compared to Carroll's "outgrabe" ("the mome raths outgrabe", *Jabberwocky*, l. 4). Joyce's word is an English noun combining "goat" and "overcoat" (Joyce 2005); Carroll's word can be, in theory, much more: an adverb, a verb, a noun, not English, and yet it is regarded as clearly an English verb. This certainty is owed to Carroll's in-text explanation what "outgrabe" means (2000: 216) and a note in his *Stanza of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (1932: 140). So, lucidity is dependent on the author's self-exegesis (Joyce's less helpful than Carroll's) and the general amount of words, especially neologisms (Joyce's much larger than Carroll's). Without enough hints, a Wakean reader trying to establish sense may start questioning grammar even where it seems regular.[75] Also, as the English annotations for a non-trivial section of the text do not expose any lucid synthesis, a "perfectly normal English word" (Hegerfeldt and Vanderbeke 2002: 70) can be viewed as non-English, not just such words that look less 'perfectly normal English', e.g., "six dix" (Harvey 2014) or "ei-thou" (Kędzierski 1982: 84). "[A]ttempting to make sense of the text, especially if they are convinced it can be corrected to produce some deeper

---

[75] Of course, the question of regularity is debatable. The syntax in "And he ankered on his hunkers with the belly belly pressed" can be parsed: "And he *did something* on *his something* with *something*" (Senn 1990b: 70; *prest* misquoted as *pressed*), but also as "he did something *to someone* with something' or "*something* on his something *was somehow*".

meaning" (Letzler 2014: 85), readers accept more and more propositions, which may be as odd as that "overgoat" (and Carroll's "outgrabe" as well, by the way, anagrammatisable to "ubergoat") refers to H. P. Lovecraft's Shub-Niggurath.[76] But as in such pursuit of sense, the reader chooses to see regular (English) elements as irregular, FW becomes more and more non-English, and grows the less lucid, the more annotations have been amassed.

Though the argument from poetry looks initially like the best explanation why FW is incomprehensible but still English, it is inconsistent in disregarding the external features that make FW look like prose, and not poetry. If external features can be disregarded, the argument from poetry comes into insoluble conflict with positions against the language principle (e.g., that the text is a music score).

2.7. The Position of Nonliterariness

What will be called here the position of nonliterariness is the set of such propositions found in the volume of FW exegesis which agree with the proposition that an important aspect of FW is nonliterary. It opposes the inference that if something looks like a book, then it is a book.[77] Instead it proposes that FW is "a novel that doesn't work like a novel" (Shockley 2010: 90). While, in a proposition, James Joyce moves away from the verbal to overcome the constraints of natural languages like English "in expressing perceptions like vision, sound and touch" (McKevitt and Guo 1996: 49), toward a "full reading" which is "simultaneously visual, aural and vocal" (Vichnar 2014: 8; see Theall 1992), the proposition in its radical form says that the principal medium of FW is not verbal. The nonliterary text of FW crosses the boundaries of incomprehensible "[p]oetry" that "stands midway between fiction and music" (Johnson-Laird and Oatley 2016: 82), moving toward another incomprehensibility, typical of music, encouraging exegetes to call FW an atonal symphony (Frank Delaney qtd. in Quadrino 2015a, see also Butor 1971: 295), a concerto

---

[76] This can be supported by the references to Lovecraft's Cthulhu: "ctholy" (416.19), "Culthur's" (523.14), "cuthulic" (603.30, "cholic, High Thats Hight Uberking Leary his" (611.33). For more on Lovecraft-Joyce see Chabon 2012, Costa 2017, Gayford 1989, R. A. Wilson 1990 and Arnott 2014, see also annotations for "Allmaziful" (FW 104.1) and "stock collar" (FW 137.19) in Joyce 2006. Protests that Joyce did not know Lovecraft would concern only dogmatic biographists.

[77] The position here relates to the source text of FW in the codex form. It does not concern any nonliterary post-texts of FW which may be referents of the name FW (e.g., intersemiotic translations).

(Grochowski 2000: 168), a literary sonata (Szczerbowski 2000: 67-70), a suite (Weaver 1988: 4).

Clearly, the position of nonliterariness threatens the text principle which says that FW belongs in literature, as well as the language principle which says that the text is in English. To remove the threat, many exegetes who consider possibilities such as that in FW "Joyce plays endlessly with concepts of text, speech, writing, print, sight, sound" (Theall and Theall 1989: 55) do not resign from the literariness of FW, but think of it as (inter)semiotically complemented (the term as in Kaźmierczak 2017: 30-31). So redefined literariness is then endowed with properties of non-literature in order to help the interpreter facing the text which "pushes to the limit the concept of prose" (Seaman 1999: 216) to remain an interpreter of a literary text. Instead of saying that FW is music or art, one says then something like that its "towering status" "in experimental literature is uncontested", in comparison with other "experiments with English prose" (Gordin and Katz 2018: 82). However, where literature is redefined to be in union with non-literature—similarly to how the English of FW is redefined to be in union with non-English—this new definition of "literature" (or of "English") becomes vague. One can imagine counterdefinitions in which "non-literature" comprises literature (or "non-English" comprises English). It is not certain what should tip the balance of literariness and nonliterariness in favour of the latter, e.g., make one regard FW not as a literary text, but a sound-text, and then not as a sound-text, but a piece of music.

In the way of that, stand—again—appeals to how the text of FW looks. But there are arguments that help one to overcome them. There exist texts in which the letters of FW mean music non-figuratively (Bartnicki 2016b, Joyce 2014a). If primarily or exclusively accessible in FW are its "rhythmic and melodic aspects" "at the level of the sound" (W. Martin 2012: 203), then, for practical purposes, FW is the rhythm, melody, sound. If "few" can "honestly claim to have read" FW (Johnston 1958: vii) whereas nonliterary approaches have turned out to be more rewarding to more people, one may argue against the appeal to appearances that (non)literariness is not a stable *quality*, but a *function* (see Głos 2017: 92-93), and the answer to whether FW is literary depends on its prevalent semiotic impacting. Anyone not persuaded by this should keep in mind that the unknown language proposition, while it does not challenge the text principle, explains better than the language principle does—whence such considerable interest in how FW looks and sounds—these aspects are what is available for experiencing in a text in an unknown language.

While FW has provoked lots of derivative texts and reactions outside literature, below will be discussed the sound text and the visual text of FW, popular in the volume of FW exegesis (Lerm Hayes 2004, Evans, Lerm Hayes and Pyle 2014, 2015, Lerm Hayes and Pyle 2017-2018, Pyle and Bartnicki 2016). These two texts are not easily separable, but it would be more difficult to analyse them in conjunction, especially as sometimes the "force of sound is made so pervasive as to interfere with the processes of visualisation" (Connor 2002: 222-223) and sometimes "the graphic nearly invariably trumps the phonic" (Slote 2014: 39).

2.7.1. The Sound Text

The tradition to regard FW as a sound text has its roots in the historical appeals encouraged by James Joyce to think of FW as of a text whose "real reading" is "inevitably, an oral and communal reading" (Altizer 2016: 161). Another approach to FW as a sound text has drawn force from that, to a number of people, FW is with "a kind of acoustic rather than semantic intelligibility" (Connor 2002: 222). But as meaning or sense has been associated with sound, the specifics of their relation have not become clear in the debate. There are principal differences of view on whether Joyce's attempt at a "fully musicalized language" (Shockley 2016: 17) succeeded to become music. As sounds evoke meanings (Pietrkiewicz 1986: 294), i.e. meaning is released in reading, FW remains literary (Baranowska 1960: 160). One is advised to give in ["poddać się"] to the song of FW, to its lyrics in a hardly known language, in order to start capturing ["wychwytywać"] words which sound understandable (Ćwiąkała-Piątkowska 1973: 276-277). FW has such words, almost utterly unclear ("prawie zupełnie niezrozumiałych", Adamiec 1996: 129), which are enjoyable as sound. In a method Joyce proposed for *Ulysses*, but which can be used for FW too,[78] words which are not understandable should be said over and over till they are learned by heart, and through them 'glimpses of the real world' arise (Bereza 1967: 90). The method is not too effective if the only illuminations are local, epiphanic ("gelegentliche Erhellung", Fritz Senn qtd. in Dapp 2016: 23). Then, where sound prevails over meaning (Drozdowski 1977: 193-194), departing from natural language (Grochowski 1995: 365), FW appears as more radical than whatever one encounters in poetry. It may even be "something beyond word and music" (K. Anton 2009: 38). However, since one cannot be sure about the definitions

---

[78] And is transposable to music (see Gołaszewska 1973: 442).

of "sound", "music", "literature" used here and there, there may or may not be conflict, e.g., between the claims that FW "only goes part of the way towards the ideal of 'pure sound'" (J. R. R. Tolkien in Hiley 2015: 118) and "Joyce's assent to the imperium of sound" "voids the contract of intelligibility" (White 2008: 185) or among the claims that FW "shares far more with music than it does with literature" (Bateman 2005), that FW is more meaningful as music than as literature (Libera 2009), that FW is not a blending of literature and music, but is "pure music" (James Joyce qtd. in R. Ellmann 1982: 703), and that FW "is not a musical work. It is not music" (Harry White qtd. in T. Brown 2015).

An overview of approaches to the role of sound in FW is proposed below:

(i) [Content-specific] *The role of sound is expressed in direct musical information*, especially in what is like the most overtly musical element in the text, "The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" (FW 44-47). A translation of the ballad may change notational elements, e.g., the time signature (Rene 2016bc).

(ii) [Terminological] *The role of sound is emphasized by many music-related terms*, as FW hints at names or lyrics of songs, composers, instruments, etc. (Bowen 1974, Hodgart and Bauerle 1996, Hodgart and Worthington 1959, McCreedy 2008, Sandulescu 2013abc). This emphasis may be characteristic of Joyce's whole oeuvre, thus musical (Bowen 1995, S. D. G. Knowles 1999, Mulliken 2011, Weaver 1988), especially in *Ulysses* (S. Brown 2007, Fischer 1990, Levy 2016, Sanz Gallego 2011, Wiesenmayer 2009, 2011: 39-57, Witen 2010). That emphasis is also found in exegetical texts, e.g., where FW is called an extreme of the polyphonic novel (Loska 2000: 18) or the "most dancing" novel "concerning sound and language" (Nowakowski 2005: n.pag.).

(iii) [Linguistic] *The sound effect is due to multilinguality*. The text is a polyphonic melody of languages (Jasiński 1999: 180) written by a logophilic/logomaniac polyglot (P. O'Neill qtd. in Giczela-Pastwa 2011: 117). This effect is literary, and translatable into literature, though a prerequisite of a correct translation is that the translator's hearing is as fine as Joyce's sense of hearing (Jarniewicz 2005: 12), characteristic of a poet or a musician (Svevo 2005: 63), which grew acute due to Joyce's impaired vision (Promiński 1977: 218). If FW is, unlike polyphonic *Ulysses*, a heterophonic novel, and in it "the multiplicity of voices is never suborned to the authority of a single voice" (White 2008: 184), Wakese is

not suborned to the single authority of English, which is against the language principle.

(iv)   [Poetic-musical] *The sound effect is due to poeticalness*. FW is or resembles poetry, in particular lyric poetry (Delville 2007: 57), using the phonic-rhythmic qualities of language. Joyce was more interested in how words sound than how they are polysemous (Paszek 1976: 131). FW is music in this broad meaning of the word in which the vibrations and tensions of poetic content are music (Grochowski 2000: 168-169). The "moods" in FW "are conveyed by rhythm and cadence" or "are almost identical with the cadences they express, or better yet, incarnate them" (Schavrien 1981: 177).

(v)   [Mimetic-inspirational] *The sound effect owes to mimesis of composer's work, but also to the music compositions it inspires*. In examining the phonic quality of words at the phonetic level, Joyce acts like a composer (Szczerbowski 1998: 48). In his work one detects some blues (Herr 1999), jazz rhythm (Paszek 1974: 27) and jazz improvisation (Weaver 2014). His punning recalls the counterpoint (Clarke 2015: 137). FW is comparable to works of Joyce's contemporaries: Anton Webern (Paniewicz 2004), Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, post-dodecaphonists (Naganowski 1997: 171, see Cummins 2016: 2-4). But FW also inspires musicians. For example, its "technique of distorting the surface of the work" and its use of "apparently meaningless repetition" (Priore 2007: 196) were taken up by Luciano Berio. Joyce's defiance of the orthodox concepts of language brings to mind John Cage's efforts to free himself "from melody, harmony, counterpoint and musical 'theory'" (McNeilly 1995). The cyclicity or spirality of metamorphosing in FW brings to mind Pierre Boulez's *Notations* (Bleek 2018). FW is, like *Opus clavicembalisticum* by Kaikhosru Shapurji Sorabji, "to be studied and admired rather than heard and performed" (P. A. Jones 2016).

(vi)   [Structural] *The role of sound relates to how the text is organised*. The structure of FW is that of the suite (Weaver 1988: 4), or of the four-movement symphony (Corkern 2010: 3), with local characteristic features of the nocturne (Chrisp 2013, Fordham 1999: 100-101), as well as the sonata form (Martis Ross qtd. in Szczerbowski 2000: 67). There exist structural parallels between the work of Joyce and Richard Wagner (T. Martin 2009, see White 2008: 182-185).

(vii)   [Cryptogrammic] *The sound effect results from interpretation of FW as a musical cryptogram*. The option to read letters as music notes (and vice versa) is implied in the BCAD cryptogram (FW 272, see Rene 2016a; see also "the "lines" GBD" "between the "spaces" FACE", Gilbert 1961: 71, "the key of E flat", Weaver 1988: 5). Examples of the texts which turn the entire source text into musical notation are Bartnicki 2012d, 2016b, Joyce 2014a.

The assumption of Englishness has no application in (vi) and (vii), and is limited in (i). One's recognition of Englishness in FW relies on how the verbal element looks or sounds, yet neither visual inspection nor aural performance of FW can be an unbiased source of our knowledge about Wakese. The pro-English reasoning seems circular: FW looks English, therefore it can be read in English, therefore it is English. A warning such as that "reading the Wake as musical code has its pitfalls—it's simply far too easy to find musical clues everywhere" (Shockley 2010: 94) can be paraphrased against the literary text and language principles: Reading FW as literature has its pitfalls—it is far too easy to find words everywhere.

Moreover, the assumption of FW's Englishness needs to answer the dilemma that FW demands silence on the one hand, and performance on the other. Silence is required to not let meaning be lost in oral presentation (for examples see A. A. Hill 1939, Eriksson 2012: 7-8), where superposition of meaning collapses on reading of an English-looking word. A valid argument against silent reading is that silence is always disturbed by subvocalisation, "the experience of hearing a voice in one's head" (Magee 2017: 357), still, the better a reader suppresses subvocalisation, the less constrained their reading. Also, the more one yields to internal speech, the more difficult FW seems (for subvocalisation is correlated with the difficulty of the reading material, Yates 1980: 133-134), and the less one's proficiency can be trusted.

Anyway, if the text is a "libretto" to be performed (see Trehy 2016), the method of its performance is not known. The model performer is also unknown. If FW is (or imitates) a sacred text, whose rhythm is magic (Paszek 1976: 25), its performance may require chanting, singing (which, by the way, Joyce would separate from music, Beja 1992: 104), but only by trained precentors. Reader's recommendations vary—(i) a loud reading is more rewarding (Pióro 2000: 413), (ii) "the sense created by listening may be even greater than that allowed by the printed word" (Elliott 2018: 42, see Attridge 2004b: 11, Żuławski 1995: 123), (iii) a loud reading is less correct than reading it in general (Fordham 1999:

102), whatever this should mean. FW in a private reading is not the same as FW recited for an audience (Jasiński 2000: 74), while it can also be chanted, sung, recited with accompaniment (R. A. Wilson 2014) or with added media (Lacabanne 2006, 2007). Moreover, the reader may distort the flow of the text on purpose (Baars 2011), use the text as an instrument (Zielińska 2009: 92), as a source of an alien sonic message (Kucharczyk 2012), either omit nonlexical units or embrace them as pure phonemes ("czysty fonem", Caballero 2010: 16), arrive at the nonsense quality of lilting or scat, where FW resembles Adriano Celentano's *Prisencolinensinainciusol*, which is not in English but "English-y" (Cory Doctorow in Celentano and Doctorow 2012).

If Wakese is "beyond national language" (Boheemen 1998: 24), and it "allows for a foreign reader, and a foreign voice" (Lanari 2015), but it can be English-*cum*-German (Derrida 1984), Irish as German as Chinese (Cage 1982: 87), or departing "toward a secret, silent language" (Philippe Sollers qtd. in Hollier 2001: 1064) as well, there are two methods for an exegete who still wants to call that strange language English. The first method is to resort to paradoxes to shun the law of excluded middle. For example, Wakese is "English, read with an Irish accent", while questioning "the very principles of language and speech" (Melchiori 1992: 12). The other method is to inflate the definition of English so that it embraces the positions against Englishness, e.g., to say that English demonstrates an absence of referential meaning or is indistinguishable from music. Still, these methods threaten the language principle. If paradoxes are not ruled out, one can as well propose that Wakese looks quite like English, but is not English, or Wakese is non-English and English. If definitions can be liberally inflated, the language of FW grows *undefined*—i.e. Wakese as a liberally defined English can hardly be distinguished from Wakese as another liberally defined language, from liberally defined music or liberally defined visual art. Though our "linguistic competence includes both the observance of rules and the ability to subvert them" (Lemos 2010: 59), and an important ability of English is to generate texts incomprehensible to its users, non-English languages have that ability too, and it remains debatable if a *genuine* incomprehension belongs to one language, not another, only because of whence it came into existence.

2.7.2. The Visual Text

Symbolically, FW is associated with the visual where it is compared to "a kind of linguistic Rorschach ink-blot" (Harvey 2015b, see C. Hart 1962: 29, Colangelo 2016: 69), or where it is "a book which you can't read", still "useful to the eye" (Robert Dobbs in Baldwin and Dobbs 2012), or to "be looked at rather than 'read'" (S. Deane 1992: vii, see Laird 2007a). There are testimonies of enjoying the visual aspect of FW more than (or perhaps instead of) traditional reading (Majcherek 2005, see Goldsmith 1999, Koenders 2015). It was also asserted that only with illustrations can the text ensure the "experience Joyce envisioned originally" (Duggan 2014). The visual in the text is not meant to "showcase any single interpretation" (ibid.); usually it abounds in many a "referential superposition" (Bruneau 2014). As FW requests "reading-through-drawing" (Cahill 2017: 2) or its visualisation (Bartnicki and Szmandra 2015, Jacob Drachler qtd. in Popova 2013b, Holm and Alonso 2013, Szmandra 2012), it does not have to confirm the literariness of the source text—such derivative interactions can be intrasemiotic.

A discussion of the visual aspect should probably start with that FW contains more overtly graphic elements. They do not belong to the English language if one agrees that it is not proper to call, e.g., a five-line staff (FW 44, 272), a diagram (FW 293), or a drawing (FW 308) English. In fact, if one were to name the language of that diagram, it would be Graeco-Roman as it employs Greek and Roman letters (Pickett 2008: 95). If one decided to see it "from three perspectives: geometrical (Euclid), biological (the vulva) and Dantean (the Divine Comedy)" (McCreedy 2011), its language could be Dante's Tuscan Italian, or not a language at all if geometry and biology are nonlinguistic. McCreedy's analysis of another diagram for "a glimpse into the possibility that *Finnegans Wake* could have looked physically very different and more graphic-heavy" (2020: 10) suggests that this different FW would have been even less English. The "dark print of white pages" that befits the "book of the dark" (Lurz 2013: 676) is not English if neither dark nor white is English.

Many exegetes have shown a keen interest in Joyce's use of "ideograms, letters, and alphabetic characters" to which every so often "words give way" (Maharaj 1999: 86, see Baron 2016, Rasula 1997, Reisman 2009b), notably in letters, graphemes (Sandulescu 2014: iii). An assumption that the shapes in FW belong to an alphabetic system—and not, say, to a musical notation (see Joyce 2014a)—is biased. Suspending the assumption of

nonliterariness for a moment, if there are letters in FW, there is no unbiased reason to think that they are English. The alphabet set up for FW is the less English, the more non-English characters it includes, e.g., the diacritics that "add a strikingly alien(ating), non-English" "touch to the text" (Mecsnóber 2014). Other non-English characters are the *sigla* (see, e.g., FW 299 f.5), i.e. the shapes that Joyce devised as notebook shorthand, which "function as elementary plot units" (McCreedy 2013: iii; see Joyce on their symbolism in McHugh 1976: 8), yet do not necessarily carry meaning in English. The letter *ethel* (e.g., in "Blœm", FW 203.10) and the ampersand & (4 occurrences on FW 111) are not uniquely English. "Indo-European roots" (Fomenko 2018: 31) and "Latin alphabet" (ibid., 33), not English, are mentioned in a text on a Cyrillic version of FW. Where a Chinese translator of FW mentions differences between Chinese ideograms and "the twenty-six letter English alphabet" (Dai 2010: 580), she succumbs to the (pro-)English-bias.

If Joyce "moves his primary focus" to "individual words and letters" (Macaffey 1988: 4), a follower of the language principle should be able to confirm that individual letters in FW are English. That person should be able to explain, e.g., how the 3 letters in "war" are English, and not Dutch, German, Kurdish, Polish. It should be noted that some Joyce's words do not even look English, for example: N, Nn, Nnn (FW 16.5-7) in which "the particular emphasis [is] placed on the letter *n*" (Aubert 1984: 72-73). If the visual element is important, the mispunctuation in "nn", "nnn", "nnnn" (C. Conley 2009: 149-155) is critical. If the letter should be granted autonomy, its Englishness is in question, e.g., the "sexual" letter T (Solomon 1969: 61) does not belong to English. Letters in FW carry intertextual messages, e.g., O links FW with B. S. Johnson's *See the Old Lady Decently* (Stamirowska 2008: 201), but such connections can also be made with non-English texts, e.g., H forms a connection between Joyce and J. G. Hamann's "New Apology for the Letter H" (Purdy 2010; original in German: "Neue Apologie des Buchstabens h"). As Joyce's O is linked with boldness (Maddox 2000: 201), is a marker for laughter (Janus 2009: 160), is "suggestive of the female aperture" and "the French 'eau'" (Quadrino 2014b) and more,[79] the connotations are not English—some are not even a matter of linguistics. The examples of S, which is a character in FW (Fredkin 1986), and C, the mark of Cain (Ferris 2010: 18), show that letters can play roles that are not linked to English. The acronymic strings, HCE and ALP, representing the main protagonists, play biological

---

[79] O is the middle letter in the acronym of Generation Operation Destruction (Trela 1989: 77); o "melds the numbers 'two' and 'one'" (Bristow 2018: 11), "oo" resembles "a tubular channel" and takes "the shape of lips" (Alexandrova 2016: 57).

and other extralinguistic roles (B. Benstock 1965: 87-88, Fraser 2011: 183, fundagain 2018b, Heath 1984: 54-55, Henseler 1968, Mays 1998: 33 f. 4, W. L. Miller 1995, K. Palmer 2015: 22-26, Sandulescu 2012h: 17-18), find various references in chemistry ("H2CE3", FW 95.12), physics ("$\alpha = 2\pi e2/hc$", H. Carter 2011, "E faster than lux", Sypek 2010: 64), music (Bartnicki 2014a: 388-389, Burgess 1982: 145), and so on. These acronyms have been so popular that their expansions catch the reader's eye in exegetical epitexts as well: "historical consequence of extratextual" (Attridge 2001: 141), "historico-critical examination" (Rose 1995: 44), "capable of historical extrication" (Senn 2009: 62), "hermeneutically cunning example" (Slote 2009: 68), "Cartesian, holistic emphases" (Lane 1998: 169), "colloquial Hiberno-English" (Wales 1992: 142), "a lavish palette" (Llona 1961: 97). The case of the "heretical combinations of elements" (Sławek 2014b) in the English abstract of a Polish text, but not in the Polish text itself (id. 2014a),[80] suggests that letters and their combinations can be constrained in the ability to transgress English, however, there are other examples to show that their connection to English can be severed—like Italian "attenuarne la perentorietà" (Camurri 2016b), or Polish expansions of HCE and ALP (Bartnicki 2012b). Some expansions, e.g., "Cheryl Herr emphasizes" (Rice 1997: xii), may look more accidental than others, especially if they are written by people not academically engaged in FW, such as John Cage ("a lyrical passage", 1978: 18) or Philip K. Dick ("his entire corpus", 2011a: 9), but on the other hand, many expansions *were* confirmed in their intention to allude to FW (e.g., "Here Comes Everybody", Shirky 2008). If the pre-Joyce example of ALP found in Novalis, "à leur portée" (1984: 296) or his remark, "man is lyrical, woman epic" (1997: 65) that could connect L with the male, E with the female, were to be denied by the criterion of historicity as pertaining to FW, one should remember that historicity and authorial intent can be questioned, i.a., by the vision that FW is a book about everything.

Unsuspending nonliterariness now to let FW leave the realm of graphemes, one can picture the source text as a painting composed of canvases (elsewhere: pages) containing images (elsewhere: words) composed of images (elsewhere: letters) composed of ink dots. It cannot be denied that at a general level of inspection components of the visual text bear the appearance of units of English.[81] However, it is an open question if they look English

---

[80] See also the word *chaosmos* (FW 118.21), which is *haosmos* in Romanian translation (Cârneci 1992).

[81] Assessments such as that in FW "the English language is deformed almost beyond recognition" (Taylor-Batty 2013: 117) or that in FW Joyce's language broke up with English *completely* ("zupełnie", Wojewoda 1962: 107) should probably be called into question.

but are not English in a nonliterary code. One might ask the same about (either verbal or non-verbal) elements "Ceci n'est pas une pipe" on René Magritte's painting, *La trahison des images*—is there a text in French, or is it something in a distinct language of art (which could be French if it were not art)? A similar question can be asked about texts whose verbal elements are made of images (as in the Meroitic alphasyllabary) or whose images are composed of letters (as in Hebrew micrography or ASCII art). To answer the question if art retains the characteristics of a natural language is beyond the scope of this thesis, still, if (non)literariness is not a *quality* but an actual *function*, then FW is visual art where it acts, at least primarily, like visual art. Admittedly, lots of books could be imagined as art with pages called canvases and so on, but FW is unlike most of them in that FW *demands to be* regarded outside literature as a result of its inaccessibility as literature. This demand is what FW shares with texts in unknown languages.

2.8. The *Pars pro Toto* Argument

The *pars pro toto* argument, as it will be called here, comprises such claims about Wakese which are based on the assumption that the entire text of FW can be represented by its *adequate sample*, that can be considered English. Umberto Eco even suggested that FW had never been read "from beginning to end" (in Carrière and Eco 2011: 269). Suggestions have also been made that FW is one of those texts which "are best dipped into, rather than read from beginning to end" (Kostelanetz 1987: 161) or "*should* be dipped into" (id. 1982: 395; emphasis added), read in parts, with no plan (id. 1983: 260-261), albeit this method poses a risk of favouring "myopic esotericism" (Hershman 2018: 401). Anyway, assertions that readers draw attention "to the detail, the part rather than the whole" (Begnal 1974: x) are as contentious as the definitions of "part" and "whole".[82]

The *pars pro toto* model of reading has been informed by the economy of reading, reducing the "complexity" of FW "to a usable size" (Reichert 1988: 88; see Magala 1998: 36-37, Popova 2015, Potkański 2008). While some exegetes asserted that FW had to be

---

[82] While the discussion will concern the adequate *unit*, it should be noted that also adequate *techniques* or *devices* have been proposed, notably the portmanteau, a "privileged" figure or feature (Borg 2007b: 143), also called the pun, wordplay, paronomasia, oneiroparonomastics (Attridge 1988: 148, Burgess 1975: 135, Eco 1990: 140, Paszek 1974: 42-43, 67-68, Roughley 1986: 47-48, Senn 2012: 242-244). Yet, the pun is not unique for English—i.e. finding puns in FW does not alone testify to its Englishness.

"a work of massive proportions" (Attridge 2004b: 26), others found FW to be too long (Linguist-in-Waiting 2016), even by two thirds (Márai 2000, E. Wilson 1941: 265), including "too many pages of immature sexual reference" (Laird 2007b) and so on.[83] Some exegetes were even ready to shorten the text (see, e.g., Joyce 1966a). The model of local reading finds some justification in "the encyclopedic gesture in *Finnegans Wake*" (H. A. Clark 1985: iii; see Mirkowicz 1982b: 342, Orel 2011)—one can agree that encyclopedias are hardly ever read in their entirety. Another reason for the model follows the idea that FW is a *fractal* text: "the whole of the *Wake*" is "contained in each of its self-similar parts" (James Gleick qtd. in Quadrino 2017) and "every part contains the whole" (Rosenbloom 2005: 45). Fractality revealed itself "at many different scales" (Christian 2015: 138), from that of the word (Jack Weaver in Shockley 2016: 125, see Fomenko 2017a) to that of the culture (Jamili 2013: 230). A fractal effect is that the "level of ambiguity remains constant across scales" (Brick 2012: 301). Seamus Deane notes periodic self-similarity: "a single word, or part of a word, can present the reader with a problem", and so can "a sentence, a paragraph, a whole interlude, a section, the relation of one Part to another" (1992: ix). A group of Polish scientists announced *multifractality* in FW (Drożdż et al. 2016) which, owing to certain lexical-structural peculiarities (Kwapień and Drożdż 2012: 187, Grabska-Gradzińska et al. 2012: 4), is uniquely FW's, not shared with other "stream of consciousness" texts (Drożdż 2015). The Poles recognised a self-similarity of words and sentences (Drożdż et al., 38). However, their work can be criticised on several accounts: (i) the Poles do not elaborate on other units, (ii) their referent of FW is prescriptive; (iii) their assumption that Wakese is English is biased; (iv) their definition of the *sentence* as something between full stops (dots, exclamation or question marks) fails to account for the differences in punctuation among the post-Joyce variants. Their reliance on the punctuation did not allow for that Joyce may have put more than one sentence or no sentence between a pair of full stops, or that his punctuation was "both contradictory and inexact" (T. Conley 2014: 206). Even if one can link sentence to structural-grammatical order, Joyce disturbs it by his 'hidden' punctuation, exposed in interpretation; e.g., "past Eve and Adam's" (FW 3.1) can be explained to mean "Pa, Stephen: Adams" (Dehany 2015). It is difficult to make conjectures about grammar and meaning in a sample if the order of letters that one sees is

---

[83] The question of length has appeared in discussions of various elements of FW exegesis, e.g., the text of *Ulysses* (Bulson 2014: 1), a Gaelic lexicon ("too long", C. Hart 1970: 408), a post-text by Cage ("too long", Armand 2007: 292). Some texts on FW, "too long for anyone to publish" (Steven Moore qtd. in Quadrino 2018b) remained unfinished.

not the order suggested by interpreters, e.g., "kates" may ask to be read "steak" (A. A. Hill 1939), or the letters that one sees are not the letters that one thinks of, e.g., the word "back" may ask to be read "Zurich". What further problematises the adequacy of a sample is that FW is not semantically uniform—Wakese blends two languages, traditional and deformed (Chwalewik 1958: 34). "Sometimes Joyce uses regular English words" (Contrada 2015), and he is more intelligible there, but then he is less intelligible where he presents a local noisiness ("punktowa szmerowość mowy", Promiński 1977: 220). The sample could not be adequate if it did not represent both languages, but if it did, it would not be obvious at all that the language in the irregular/less intelligible part is English.

But there are other reasons why a hope in the adequate sample of FW is in vain. Firstly, Wakeans get "so bogged down in the multiple meanings of certain passages" that they do not "convey the sense of the whole" (Richard Kostelanetz in Hamada 2013: 57). Secondly, a reading of FW is inevitably partial where the reader gets but "a fraction of what was in Mr. Joyce's mind" (anon. qtd. in Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 127). If "we can never read Joyce's works for the first time" (Attridge 2004b: 2), there arises the problem of the adequate sample of the exegetical epitext. Importantly, if "an adequate understanding of any given passage" requires "a sound knowledge of the whole" (C. Hart 1962: 16, see ibid., 160; H. Adams 1991: 42-43, Senn 1990b: 69-70), however "details may undermine or be in excess of any overall structuring principle", yet "we cannot read *without* creating structures" (Attridge, op. cit., 20), there is a vicious circle.

Even a casual search in the volume of FW exegesis demonstrates that there is no undisputed length of the sample being as difficult as the entire text. On the one hand, unaided readers give the text up after a few pages (Butor 1971: 292, Toolan 2016: 102) if a word 'opalesces' with 7-8 allusions (Paszek 1974: 67-68, 2016: 41) or one encounters 100 rhetorical devices packed into a page (Sandulescu and Vianu 2015a). A mere line reference guide to FW can be intimidating, its author admits (Harvey 2015a: 8). On the other hand, apparently it can be judged from one word whether FW is "a complete fiasco" (Malcolm Muggeridge qtd. in Chrisp 2016).[84] Some say that the author of *Finnegans Wake in Fifteen Minutes* may have kept the promise "to enlighten the defeated reader" (Keating 2015) and that the Twitter unit of 140 characters encapsulating "half a dozen or more of

---

[84] As Chrisp notes that the incriminated word is "so loved by Wakeans that you can buy t-shirts with it on" or have "part of it tattooed" on the forearm (ibid.), one will note that there is no reason why *pars pro toto* reading should not proceed from as unorthodox a vehicle of text as a piece of clothing or human body.

Joyce's puns, neologisms, and portmanteaux" (Liss Farrell qtd. in Broughton 2017) ensures that the entire text of FW can be read (Smith 2017). Several short samples from few Polish translations were called Polish FW (Grochowski 2000: 155), 22 passages into Brazilian Portuguese might be an equivalent of the original ("um estatuto equivalente", Alves-Bezerra 2018), whereas 16 passages might not be enough ("não eram suficientes", Schüler 2010: 317).

The list of the distinguished units is long, including, but not limited to: the section (Van Hulle 2005), the page (McHugh 1980, see Hornik 1960), the passage (McCreedy 2017: 65-66, P. A. McCarthy 1990: 725), the archetype, the cartouche (Sandulescu 1987, see Wales 1990), the sentence (Drożdż et al. 2016, Purdy 1972), the clause (C. Hart 1962: 31, Magee 2017: 366-367), the line (also the page-and-line in the quotation standard), the word (Cahill 2010, Dobbs 2013, Jarniewicz 2015a, Przyboś 1970a: 150), the syllable (Blades 1996: 154, Culler 1988: 14, Górska-Olesińska 2012: 18, Loxterman 1991: 124-125, Reisman 2009b, Wales 1992: 144-146), strings of letters or other subword units (Bartnicki 2012e, 2016b, Łuba 2008, Whissell 2015), the letter (McGee 1992: 79, Sandulescu 2014), which is "a nodal point between *langue* and *parole*" (Berressem 1990: 147), the symbol, the siglum (McCreedy 2013), the morpheme (Eile 1980: 286). There are discrepancies concerning the names of some units and their quantities, e.g., the text of FW has 17 chapters, or "not seventeen but sixteen" (Roughley 1986: 264), or "*episodes* rather than *chapters*" (Kitcher 2007: xiii), which are put into "three numbered parts" (Genette 1997: 308), or four parts, or four books, or "3+1" books (Fagan 2010: 132, Hermans 2017: 214), or four movements (see Corkern 2010: 10-12).

Of course, selecting a unit usually means downplaying the importance of others.[85] Also, units overlap. These two lines:

"A . . . . !
? . . . . O!" (FW 94.21-22),

for example, possibly sentences, are discussed at the level of the word and that of the letter (Roughley 1986: 161-162). If punctuation in FW is non-trivial (Bonapfel 2019, Chrisp 2020, Sabatini 2014, Slote 2014), and the adequate sample is to be looked for at a subword

---

[85] A praise of a Polish FW for replication of "the page-by-page layout of Joyce's text" (Wawrzycka 2016-2017: 167) advertises the *page* as the best unit, still that unit was chosen by the editors who, due to limitations of the printing process, rejected the translator's decision to observe subtler scales (paragraph, word, hyphenation).

level, FW is misrepresented wherever a quotation contains a punctuation mistake, a typing error, a typographical deviation, e.g., where the 10/9 dots above become 4/4 dots (Mays 1998: 25), 9/9 dots (Kim 2002: 94), 6/5 dots (Joyce 2012c: 75), 12/12 dots (Fordham 2007: 153). Every post-Joyce variant misrepresents the prototext at various subword levels, e.g., Joyce 2012c, in which "thousands of punctuation marks are changed", "some pages have only 39 lines, not 40", and there are "excessive de-capitalisations" (Barger 2013, see T. Conley 2017a, Killeen 2013, Tanselle 2014, W. Van Mierlo 2012). There are dozens and dozens of examples how FW can be neglected at a subword scale, e.g., the line "harry me, marry me, bury me, bind me" (FW 414.31-32) is deprived of its original punctuation in Lars von Trier's script of *Forbrydelsens element* (Badley 2010: 24), or where FW is introduced by "one of the more lucid passages" (Birmingham 2014c: 286), it misquotes 9 lines (FW 278.13-21) as 6 lines, and has one word division and two numbers in superscript fewer.

In theory, either adequacy should not be looked for in small-scale units, because the smaller the unit is, the less certain its function (C. Hart 1962: 65), and if words in FW read like novels ("come un romanzo", Sessa 2019), the input required from 'microscale' readers compares to that demanded from 'macroscale' readers, or, conversely, adequacy should be looked for in small-scale units, because the smaller the unit is "the more precisely its meaning can be determined" (C. Hart 1982: 250). Assuming that the word in FW is definable (see Fagan 2010: 18-22) and that it is at the level of words where FW is initially understandable, this unit might be prioritized. Still, there are many examples of disregard for the word in FW; e.g., a thunderword (FW 3.15-17) is misspelled by Plath (1966: 130) and R. A. Wilson (2000: 88). FW words can be misquoted in a book on literary theory (Culler 2000: 40; cf. FW 152.18-19). Numerous misquotations can be found in the work of Marshall McLuhan (1962: 19, 1970: 48, 200, 214, 1997). Also, "the rite words by the rote order" (FW 167.33), "History as her is harped" (FW 486.6) were misquoted as "History as she is harped. Rite words in rote order" (McLuhan and Fiore 2014: 108-109). Terence McKenna's words "mama matrix most mysterious" (1999: 64) are an example of misassigning words to Joyce (cf. FW 15.32-33).

Since the annotator succeeded "in reading the *Wake* in particles but not as a whole" (Donoghue 2011: 186), the reader often concentrates their efforts on the well-annotated "select passages" (Senn 1984: xi). To identify them, one may see what sections are most often taken up by translators. A selection (!) of partial translations into German (Reichert

and Senn 1989) includes 4 attempts at the opening, 3 translations of chapter 8,[86] 4 sets of the closing pages, then 7 passages from 5 other chapters out of 17. Partial translations into Polish (prior to the complete translation of 2012) were of the opening (Królikowski 1998ab, Malicki 1996: 71, Mirkowicz 1982a), chapter 1 (Bartnicki 2004a), pages 44-47 (Joyce 1999, Strzetelski 1959a: 63-64), chapter 8, or its part (Słomczyński 1973a, 1985, Strzetelski 1959a: 62-63, see Joyce 1997, Szczerbowski 2000), pages 152-159 (Joyce 2004-2005), pages 306-308 (Malicki 1996: 71-72), the last chapter (Bartnicki 2004b), the closing pages (Łuba 2005, Słomczyński 1996, see Grochowski 2000).

Probably the most natural select passage is the opening on page 3. The revision of a word in the opening, turning "commodius" (FW 3.2) into "commodious" in Joyce 2010b, 2012c variants, was among the "most widely publicised" (Killeen 2010) and of interest to reviewers (e.g., Chabon 2012). Page 3 has 10 annotative entries per line (Joyce 2005) and even a book about it (Cliett 2011). After 15 weeks of studying the page, it may show that "the text is terribly *over*determined" (Stefans 2011). If that abundance entices one "into delving deeper" (J. L. Murphy 2012), the reader who "sail[ed] along" past "the first few pages" (Ambrose 2014) will probably be surprised to learn that the following parts are not so richly annotated, their surprise testifying against the representativeness of the opening. A more general rule emerges: no passage is the adequate sample because it is either select, therefore not typical of the non-select material, or vice versa.

Nor could the adequate sample be inferred from an analysis of what is most frequently quoted from FW, as the results would be most inconclusive. The concentration of quotations is probably highest in such texts that narrate or annotate an entire text of FW (e.g., J. S. Atherton 1974, Campbell and Robinson 1976, McHugh 1980, Tindall 1996). In reviews of translation, some actually found numbers are in contrast to the ideal to discuss the text *in extenso* (Tabakowska 2000: 19, see Senn 2010b: 6-7). The numbers vary: 30

---

[86] The so-called *Anna Livia Plurabelle* chapter. As its early FWP variant was selected for translation into C. K. Ogden's Basic English (published in 1932), this was discussed as a transfer of FW on the level of simple English (Sailer 1999). Eventually, Ogden's *pars pro toto* reading-through-translation covered a few pages of the chapter. The announced arrival of a "plain English" translation of FW, 175.000 pages (Tesh 2017) was a fake news.

passages (Bazarnik 2007a),[87] 17 passages (ead. 2010)[88] were used to discuss a Polish translation in progress; *less* material was used to discuss the finished work: 10 examples (Wawrzycka 2016-2017),[89] 7 examples (Barciński 2018),[90] 4-5 words (!) (Lewicki 2012). The numbers found in essays and articles also vary, depending on the topic: quotations were from 1-2 close pages (as in Fordham 2002)[91] and from separate chapters (as in Hassan 1975).[92] A few words from FW were found in a book on Ireland (Bryll and Goraj 2010: 62, see FW 169.8-9) and in an essay on poetry (Heaney 2002: 138, FW 152.16). In biographies one could find, e.g., 8 quotations in Norris and Flint 2000,[93] Maddox 2000,[94] and over 90 in R. Ellmann 1982. This last text looks like a vast repository of FW content, still, it relegates many quotations to epigraphs and footnotes, and is with many errors that suggest disregard for the word and subword scales (letters, letter case, punctuation, italics).[95] What might be

---

[87] In order of appearance: FW 260, 143, 628-3, 383, 196, 215-216, 159, 220, 226, 430, 32, 4-5; 78-79, 35-36, 557-558, 535, 56-57, 48, 420-421, 113-115, 107-108, 219-221, 170-171, 237, 251-252, 359-360, 593, 609-610, 627-628.

[88] FW 18.2, 593.1, 3.3, 4.32, 30.2-3, 33.30, 16.4-5, 17.29-32, 16.5, 16.29, 16.6, 16.14, 16.16, 16.18, 4.26-27, 4.18, 4.27.

[89] FW 115.23, 411.36, 487.20-21, 128.34, 516.1-2, 375.16-17, 118.27-28, 183.13, 183.15, 124.7-8.

[90] FW 83.10-12, 89.2-3, 412.7-8, 626.4-5, 3.1-3, 140.32-33, 499.33-36.

[91] FW 76.33-34, 77.18-19, 77.28-33, 78.1-2, 78.7-13.

[92] FW 215.12, 13.15, 111.15, 419.10, 211.7, 558.33, 295.7, 414.22, 496.36, 189.28, 188.15, 221.17, 18.17, 341.18, 489.35, 538.8, 524.12/36, 242.30, 112.9, 182.4, 275.note 6, 628.14.

[93] FW 178.6-7, 197.2-6, 195.5-6, 202.21-22, 206.29-207.20 (!), 213.18-19, 213.30-33.

[94] FW 619.25-26, 620.1-2, 556.2, 423.30, 148.24, 123.8-10, 628.14-15, 185.35-36 [imprecisely].

[95] FW 423.14-18 (R. Ellmann 1982: 3, epigraph [*hereafter: epg.*]; misquoted [*hereafter: msq.*] as from FW 432); 55.6, 1 word (7); 213.30-33 (11, epg.); 265.1-2 (16, footnote [*hereafter: fn.*]); 236.24-26 (17); 173.21-29 with omissions [*hereafter: w.o.*] (22); 621.29-31 (23, epg.); 35.20, 1 word (32, fn.); 280.32-33 (51, fn.); 143.28, 1 word (53, fn.; "kaleidoscope (collide-escape)" msq. as collideorscape"); 188.9-17 w.o. (57, epg.); 593.13-14 (71, fn.); 171.4-6 (75, epg.); 535.19, 2 words (79); 214.11-16 w.o. (93, fn.); 184.3-7 (98, epg.); 42.15-16 (99, fn.); 211.2, 1 word (101); 200.35 (153; name "MacCarthy" mistook for "McCarthy"); 423.21-424.1 w.o. (183, epg.); 301.16 (195, epg.); 179.32-33 (203, fn.); 237.11-12 (212, epg.); 175.29-30 with insertions [*hereafter: w.i.*] (212); 171.12-18 (224, epg.); 298.32-33 (225); 473.22-24 (243, epg.); 172.24-25 (255; msq. punctuation, msq. letter case); 538.4, 2 words (282, fn.); 219.1-6 (300, epg.; "scrab" msq. as "scarb"); 190.10-191.4 w.o. (318, epg.; "quackfriar" msq. as "quack-friar"; "serendipitist" as "serendipidist"); 417.32-418.1 (339, epg.; msq. as from FW 418; "imago" as "image"); 145.29 (351, fn.); 185.27-186.9 (357, epg.); 107.29-30 (364; msq. letter case, msq. italics); 185.29-36 w.o. (364; msq. as from FW 185-186); 266.6 (368; name "D'Oblong's" mistook for "d'Oblong"); 463.8 (374); 65.16-17 (375; "Mr" msq. as "Mr."); 267.16 (377; "flash" msq.

used against the language principle, the epigraphs and some other quotations were not translated in a Polish version of the biography (R. Ellmann 1984).

A random, brief selection of works of fiction demonstrates that quotations from FW use different samples, e.g., two passages (FW 627.31-32, 627.33-628.1) in Savage (2006: 148), one short passage (FW 573.5-11) in Blish (2000: 4), a longer passage (FW 196.1-10) in Dick (2011a: 8),[96] a sentence (FW 215.34-35) in ibid. (2012: 42), a sentence in the epigraph (FW 244.13) in Delany (1998: 1). Misquotations are quite frequent. E.g., in Tom Robbins's novel (2000) including several quotations (FW 3.16-17, 282.13-14, 607.17, 282.f3), a 3-line-long thunderword (FW 3.16-170) is misdivided (106); the letter-case is changed in a quotation, used twice but once unmarked as from FW (224, 231), and other quotations deviate even more from the source text.

It might seem that the exegetes who promote chance, stichomantic, random modes of reading FW (e.g., Beausang 2014, see S. W. Klein 1999: 151, Valdeira 2015: 94) can bypass the difficulty in establishing the adequate sample. However, since select passages exist, there may be no such thing as an unpremeditated choice of the sample. The choice of the text in FW 620.1 by Derek Attridge (2004a: 199), for one, was not random—this text belongs to a select passage. While Fritz Senn mentioned a "first-comer opening the book at

_____

as "flash"); 4.1-3, 4.7-8 (380, epg.); 176.19-31 w.o. (389, epg.); 10.8-9, 2 words (397, fn.); 353.15-21 (398-399, fn.); 213.12-20 (407, epg.); 179.35-180.4 (410, fn.; "ajustil-loosing" msq. as "adjustiloosing"); 226.12-13 (429, epg.); 171.15-28 (455, fn.); 215.27-28 (464, fn., msq. punctuation); 212.36-36, w.o. (465, fn.; msq. italics); 522.27-36 (466, fn.); 26.25-27 (470, epg.); 155.16-17 (485, epg.); 235.6-236.13 w.o., w.i., 135.6-7 (495, fn.; msq. italics); 179.24-29 (499, epg.); 192.20 w.i. (527, epg.); 214.18 (533); 245.30-33 (536, fn.); 135.31, 1 word (545); 120.9-14 (553, epg.); 383.1-8 (555; msq. italics); 304.22 (556, fn.); 581.22, 2 words (565, fn.); 175.27-28 (573, epg.; msq. italics); 467.29, 2 words (578; msq. letter case); 462.19-20 (579); 422.14-16 w.i. (580, fn.); 421.33, 3 words (590, fn.); 292.15-17 (595); 466.18, 2 words (595, fn.; "Mr" msq. as "Mr."); 419.7-8 (596; msq. italics); 69.5-6 and 95.35-36 (597, fn.); 490.17, 1 word (599, fn.; msq. number); 55.3-5 (610, epg.); 284.18-22 (613, fn.); 550.7 (635); 243.8-14 w.o., w.i. (638, fn.); 556.21 (639); 70.4-9 w.o. (639, fn.); 115.21-36 (647, epg.); 14.35-15.11 (664, fn.); 427.10-13 (665-666, fn.; "shinings" msq. as "shining", msq. punctuation); 413.5-6 (666, fn.; "too" msq. as "to"); 259.7-8 (671); 615.13, 1 word (679; msq. letter case); 121.12-13 (680; fn.; msq. letter case); 307.3-4 (680; fn.); 115.21-23 (680; fn.); 268.f3 (680; fn.); 118.28-31 (687, epg.); 120.13-14 (703); 324.20-21 (707; msq. punctuation); 330.30 (707); see also "Finnegan Wake" in the index (836-837).

[96] The Polish translator asserts that the fraction has its own graspable logic. He turned down requests to translate more, especially the entire text of FW, thinking it not worth the effort (Jęczmyk 2006: 21).

random on" page 423 (1992a: 49) to present his point, had he himself opened the book at a random page, the overwhelming odds are it would not have been page 423. Also, since it is nigh on impossible for a passage to be random-picked *repeatedly*, then random reading disables "perpetual retroactive semantification" (Fritz Senn in Wawrzycka 2009: 6), which develops an interpretive perspective in the course of repetitions. Anyway, putting oneself at the mercy of fate may be viewed as acknowledging that FW is inscrutable and so it does not really matter which part of the text is going to be chosen.

When the reader wants something else from FW than inscrutability, he/she consults the guides. But then the input (random or not) does not generate a random output, a flow of unorganised thought. The output, controlled by a guide, performing the 'reining in' (Slote 2000: 203), 'circumscribing' (Slote and Van Mierlo 1999: 5), dismissing "possible" readings to accept "only mandatory readings" (Nathan Halper in C. Hart 1992: 25), ceases to be random. In this scenario, the adequate sample of FW translates as an adequate portion of FW exegesis found in external sources. If someone who never read *Ulysses* may teach it to students (Carrière and Eco 2011: 270; see Bayard 2007: 11) or James Joyce never read Rabelais (1966b, vol. I: 255), and yet the influence of Rabelais in FW is "widely diffused" (Korg 2002: 59), one can expect that the exegetical epitext can be used without opening the source text. Regarding the sample of the text of FW adequate to the reader as the sample of the volume of FW exegesis adequate to the teacher is not surprising in the system of FW in which the founding text is decentralised. Still, if the name FW refers to a source text, its adequate sample does not exist (or perhaps the only exception from this statement would be that the adequate sample exists as this certain portion of the source text which exposes its trademark inscrutability in Wakese).

2.9. The Language of the Source Text

The fact that for decades the linguistic nature of Wakese has been a point of debate among competent users of English can be explained by that Wakese is not English, or at least: not patently English. Even if one assumed that FW is generally understandable in a language that is basically English, then, as one would recall that the exegete has failed to provide a dictionary for the elements which impede or inhibit a common understanding of FW as

a text in English, one might assume that time works against the language principle. Over time it must have grown more difficult to contend that the language of FW is English.

Even so, as this chapter against the language principle promotes the position that Wakese is unknown, one should not expect that there exists a single, decisive argument in favour of either view. The method in the chapter is a variation on this Holmesian inference: when we have eliminated the hypotheses that favour the text of FW as an English one, then what remains, *however improbable*, should be correct—the language is not English. Since one can hardly make any hypotheses concerning FW, the said variation consists in that this chapter has not 'eliminated' the arguments for the language principle, but rather stressed its weak points, trying to show that the unknown language proposition has fewer weak points. A summary of the discussion in the chapter is this:

(1) Against the argument from appearances, one can say that 'looking English' is a necessary, still not a sufficient condition of English. One can challenge claims that the syntax is English, at least till it is verified that it is not in a syntactically similar language (Afrikaans, Dutch, Frisian, Scots). The vocabulary is even less English-looking than the syntax. In any case, there are syntactically/lexically non-English elements in the source text, but no consistent model of reading has been proposed to clarify which elements of the text can be omitted in reading without detriment to understanding it. The emergence of the post-Joyce source variants focused on the detail disarmed the option to overlook some elements as negligible.

(2) Against the argument from competence, one can say that either there is no competent user of Wakese (and perhaps there never has been one, for even Joyce's competence too can be put into question), in which case there is no one that we could ask to confirm that the language in FW is a variety of English, or Wakese competence boils down to an ability to generate inscrutability; in which case the existence of various texts whose opacity can be compared to Wakese opacity, yet which are *not* in English implies that Wakese is a broader linguistic entity than English.

(3) Against the argument from multilinguality, one can say that the text of FW does not open up to understanding on application of the linguistic key to FW. The key cannot even be properly defined.

(4) The position of universality is more in favour of the unknown language position than in favour of the English language principle, given that "universality" expected of or noticed in FW is not synonymous with "English", that is, unless one takes the (neo)colonial position that the English (Anglophone, Eurocentric, Western-centric) particular does contain the universal.

(5) As the position of encryption comprises a number of explanations why Joyce encrypted FW [confession, sadomasochism, sacred text, war, imitation of dream], (a) it is a defensible claim that Joyce in FW confessed or he encouraged the reader to a sadomasochist relationship, but if so, one might need to abandon reading for ethic reasons; (b) a religious belief that FW is sacred is not open to refutation; besides, one knows Joyce's (divine) word against FW being literary and English; (c) it is a defensible claim that Joyce wages a war against the reader, but then the decision on the side of the non-masochist reader should be to refuse the language principle, in a move against the enemy; (d) the claim that FW presents dreamspeak is not defensible.

(6) Against the argument from poetry, one can say that a claim that FW is a volume of English poetry is internally incoherent—on the one hand, the argument uses the external features of the text (so that they could distinguish that poetry, e.g., from music), but on the other hand, it denies the external features (when they suggest that FW is a volume of prose, not poetry).

(7) The position of nonliterariness that FW is a text that belongs to music, visual art, etc., is against the language principle because music, visual art, etc., are not domains of English. It is against the unknown language position as well, still, the unknown language position explains better the large volume of nonliterary reactions to FW.

(8) Against the *pars pro toto* argument one should say that no generally applicable, fixed adequate sample of the source text can be or has ever been identified.

The evident inability of the Joyce industry to establish the sample that represents the entire source text has far-reaching consequences. The inability can discredit the most effective pro-English argument on the list, to appearances. While English is, without doubt, present in the source text (see, e.g., FW 18.24-28), and in fact, it is the most likely language to be recognised in simple random samples, still it is not always more manifest where languages

are "intertwined and broken" (Senn 2009: 63); and moreover, in samples small enough, the language is not English-looking, but, i.a., Chinese (FW 6.32),[97] Czech (FW 100.5), Danish (FW 50.5), Esperanto (FW 565.26), French (FW 281.4), German (159.17), Greek (FW 293.12), Italian (FW 44.22), Latin (FW 7.22-23), Polish (FW 516.4), Portuguese (FW 180.12), etc. In order to uphold the language principle, its follower needs a larger scale of language analysis. Possibly, the most natural macroscale is that of the entire source text, recommended by those people who agree with that "we can never read FW *in part*, we must always read it *in toto*" (C. G. Sandulescu in Hamada 2013: 95, see Eco 1998: 151, Strzetelski 1973: 83, D. Świątek 2012: 160). However, this scale is also troublesome to the follower of the language principle as it reveals FW's inscrutability *in extenso*, permitting no excuses that a portion of FW was neglected or some context is missing. At this scale, one can no longer delay the thought that "recognition takes the place of understanding" (Senn 2012: 208). Thus, the follower feels insecure about reading at a microscale where English can seem absent or more unobvious, and uncomfortable at the level of the entire text of FW where one cannot postpone incomprehensibility. In addition, the follower needs to assert that translations of FW are either impossible or not intralingual (since intralingual translations might not resemble English at all). Summing up, the follower of the language principle prefers FW in original, between the two extremes of scale, and at a mid-level—Klaus Reichert notes that "Joyceans are so good at explaining single phrases" (1988: 89), but they also manage lines, sentences, passages.

An important argument in favour of the language principle appeals to the majority rule saying: (i) since FW is mostly English, it is all English, and/or (ii) since FW is mostly English, it is an English text more than it is a text in another language—but this argument, just like the one from appearances, is challenged by the lack of the adequate sample. If it is not inadequate to inspect the text at a subtle level, there FW may actually not seem "mostly English" (and then at the macroscale of the entire text, its Englishness is challenged by inscrutability, an absence of coherent significance). But there are other arguments against the quantitative criterion—which Paul Fagan describes as follows:

> "[R]eading *Finnegans Wake* in and as English is the only way in which it can signify (in a way that attempting to parse this or other Wakean sentences according to the rules of French grammar, for example, by and large will not)" (2010: 100-101).

---

[97] And/or Hebrew and/or Egyptian (see Macduff 2020: 178, fn. 19).

One counter-argument dismisses trust in the probability that if FW is *mostly* English, then it is English. It is true that Wakese signifies more as English than as French, still it does not automatically make Wakese English—an observation that Pegasus looks like a zebra more than it looks like a cow does not make Pegasus a zebra. FW disqualifies any linguistic and lexical probability if we agree that probable meanings become certain in communication—but successful communication is exactly what FW denies. Another counter-argument says that even though parsing FW "in and as English" yields quantitatively better results than parsing it in and as French, English is not the language in which parsing of FW is optimal. Parsing FW in and as music is more meaningful: over 96% of the prototext is a musical score (Joyce 2014a, see Bartnicki 2015, Czarnecki 2017: 123-147). Parsing FW as music should even be more *expected* if FW is truly more interesting to musicians that to readers (Bartnicki 2014c). Recalling the example of Marcel Duchamp's *Fountain*, one can argue that the way a text signifies is not prescribed by how it looks but by its function; an artefact sold as a book with FW, but used as, say, a paperweight, is a paperweight, in 100%. If one would like to argue against this by appealing to another majority, of more people using FW as a book than people using FW as a paperweight, the argument might become a double edged-sword if one can assume that there are more people who think that FW is nonsense than people who think it is not, or that there are more people who read *about* FW than people who read FW (which obviously asks one to reconsider the reference of "the text of FW"). The final counter-argument against the quantitative criterion is that if the message that FW conveys is incomprehension, then reading it "in and as English" may be the *least* competent one. As the number of English words in FW is much greater than the number of French words in FW, yet a reading in either language results in the equivalent epistemic experience of incomprehension, then judging by the time- work inputs, French competence is more efficient than English competence. In this respect, understanding FW (that there is not much more to understand) is not "more difficult" (Hamada 2013: 65) for the non-English readers—but *less* difficult.

In sum, the advocates of the language principle present a number of arguments, but without the accepted adequate sample established to support them, they are unable to present a set of coherent criteria for non-dogmatic evaluation of arguments whereby the language principle is better than the unknown language position. Where they resort to appeals to tradition, they expose themselves to the backlash argument that many traditions stored in the volume of FW exegesis have turned out to be conceptually indefensible (e.g.,

dreamspeak) and against the language principle (e.g., FW as a universal text, FW as a nonliterary text). Where they appeal to common sense or intuition, they expose themselves to the argument that the text negates common sense and the system of FW is deprived of intuition.

One will note that the followers of the language principle have hardly ever provided their definition of "English" when they call Wakese English. Instead of such definitions, in the volume of FW exegesis one finds many new names for the language: Finneganian (Eco 2008b: 108, see Soliński 2004: 263, 2006: 197), Wakese (Van Hulle 2002), *Wake* language (Schlossman 2003: 63, see Roughley 1990, *passim*), names found in the text (T. Crowley 1996: 58), e.g., nat language (Bishop 1986: 51, Boldrini 1996: 5 and *passim*), Gnat-language (P. A. McCarthy 1980: 177), Nichtian (Raffan 2014: 212), and names implying a connection with another language: English ("Jinglish", Poprawa 2005: 132, "unglish", E. C. Jones 1989: 181, "Wakenglish", Mezzabotta 2011), Irish ("Eurish", Shockley 2010: 94, see Blish 1984), Esperanto ("desperanto", Cosgrove 2007: 74), Volapük ("Volapucky", Russell 2018: 15), Sanskrit ("Sanscreed", H. de Campos 1978), German ("Djoytsch", Jenkins 1998: 14), and so on, which examples of the symbolic confirmation of Joyce's conlang gesture are *not* followed by a decision to call the language not-English. Not even a rare voice against the "drive" to "monolingualise" it (Alexandrova 2016: 14) denies its Englishness; instead, in a neocolonial spirit, it asks Wakese to make room for some other languages, and more specifically Russian. Gordin and Katz admit that "only Joyce himself commands the idiom", or "Wakespeak" (2018: 81), still they do not hesitate to call FW an "English-language work" (ibid., 84). Sam Slote maintains that a claim that FW is *not* English "would meet little resistance" (2019: 1), yet his own example of the claim falls in terrible vagueness in which Wakese becomes an abstract, a metaphor, a language "that has yet to be" (ibid., 9). With similar vagueness, the language of FW is called re-invented or re-discovered (Bloor 1997: 389). Also, it is "English" in scare-quotes (Merton 1969: 543). It is "basically English" (William D. Jenkins qtd. in Hamada 2013: 180), generally English ("zasadniczo", Bindervoet and Henkes 2004-2005: 202), "English, of a sort" (Donoghue 1988: 96). It is "*Wakean* English" (Slote 1994a), "Joyce's Wakean English" (Senn 2012: 212), the author's English (Hartwig 2002: 156), "Joyce's English" emerging "as a new tongue" (Schlossman 1985: 174), "our own English language" shown "to be quite foreign" (De Meyer 2007: 148), English "stretched to its utmost limits" (Zanotti 2019: 10). It is an English which can be agglutinative (W. I. Thompson 1964: 82-83), yet whose grammar

is "of the best King's English" (Pickett 2008: 630), and still it is "not a standard British English" (Slote 2019: 2). It is an "oneiric English" (Jorge Luis Borges in Waisman 2007: 177). A "drunken and cosmic English" (Derek Pyle qtd. in Meier 2017). A "post-English" (Katz 2007: 86). An "English in future" (Binelli 2012: 214). A "multilingual English" (M. O'Sullivan 2018: 144-146). A "foreign English" (Senn 2002b, 2009), though no method is provided how one tells a foreign English from a non-foreign English from a foreign non-English language from a non-foreign non-English language.

Or where the language of FW is called "more than English" (Wales 1992: 153), one does not see a proposition how much "more than English" would Wakese need to be in order to be called non-English. If Wakese is an English that reminds us that "any English speaker's utterance is only ever 85% English" (Magee 2015), i.e., that some part of English is always non-English, then, with some effort, *anything* can be argued to be English (and in retrospect nothing is non-English). The charge of Anglophone neocolonialism aside, using the same kind of logic, one could claim that anything is non-English or nothing is English. Since the post-1941 source text variants emphasise the non-negligibility of the text detail in FW, but on the other hand, the adequate sample, if it could be established, would not favour any subtle level of the text, lest it should exhibit then that the language at that level is more clearly non-English, it is not surprising then that the language principle is vague, constantly implying that the language is English, just not quite, or "almost, but not quite" (Hays 2008), but reluctant to specify either the meaning of 'English' or the 'not quite' part. The followers of the principle employ paradoxes, oxymorons, use adverbials of probability that make their claims more resistant to immediate rebuttal, as in this example:

> "in *Finnegans Wake*, the normal rules of English grammar are operative, but is this always true? (Certainly it is *sometimes* true.)" (G. Parks 1992: 203).

Since the definition of English in the volume of FW exegesis is so liberally open, one can say things about the language which in the case of other languages would be prohibited by the law of excluded middle, e.g., that there are words in FW, yet in a sense, "there are no words in *Finnegans Wake*" (Colangelo 2018: 176). While phrases such as "in a sense", "from a certain point of view" and the like serve claims that otherwise would be absurd, the liberal definition of English is unproductive. In other words, it is not a proof of excellence of the system of FW exegesis, but rather it is a proof of its failure that a "call of liberation from the hegemony of certainty" that "resonates throughout" FW (Zangouei 2012: 35) found its answer in the rule of NMA.

One can imagine that the unknown language position is not welcome in the Joyce industry since it opposes the language principle which may be an implicit dogma. If, as the saying goes, a language is a dialect with an army and a navy, Wakese may be presented as English by the army of Anglophones who express, imply, or endorse the position—also by taking it for granted—that FW is in English. The word "dogma" is not meant to suggest that the industry bans claims which oppose the language principle; one can see that such claims enter the volume of FW exegesis (albeit it is a different issue if the opposing claims enjoy the same probability, *ceteris paribus*, of entering the academic volume). Instead, the word "dogma" means an established position put forth as authoritative (proceeding from the authority of the industry) without adequate grounds (against Occam). The industry uses the opposition against the language principle to stimulate the discussion about FW that it lives on, but its system of (self)censorship ensures that the opposition does not become too influential. This is the easier to achieve, the more inflated the definition of English is, for the vaguer the language principle is, the less refutable.

One can also infer that the language position resembles a dogma from that the 1939 prototext (or any of its later variants) remains monopolised by the field of humanities that discusses English language and literature. The monopoly is not out of necessity. It would be incorrect to maintain that FW *has to* to be subject to that monopoly because there are no better suited departments[98] and it would be incorrect to maintain that the fact that FW was written by James Joyce prescribes firmly its belonging to departments of English. One can imagine that Joyce, regarded as an author who wrote most of his texts in English but whose last work is in another language, finds himself in the company of writers such as Nabokov pertaining to studies in Russia and Anglophone countries, or Beckett in Francophone and Anglophone countries. It is also easy to imagine that the 1939 prototext of FW as a work in an unknown language is taken up for research by any academic unit in the world that finds it interesting. Since there are no valid reasons for submitting the discussion of FW to the monopoly of departments of English, yet that monopolisation gives an impression that the 1939 prototext is in English, a proposition should be worked out in order to explain why the Joyce industry has not abandoned the language principle. This can be explained with its extraliterary motivation.

---

[98] One could think of departments of unknown languages. Incidentally, there is one university at fewest that uses a constructed language, communicative though (Gobbo and Fößmeier 2012).

Chapter 3 – The Academic Paradigm of Competence

So far, Chapter 1 has presented the name *Finnegans Wake* (FW) as a vastly polyauthorial and polytextual polyreferentiality without a privileged, intuitive referent. In Chapter 2, set against the language principle popular in the Joyce industry, it has been argued that the position that the Wakese language of a source text is not English (is unknown) is optimal. Chapter 3 will focus on the paradigm of hierarchical competence in the Joyce industry, especially its academic sector, and indicate that the assumption of its superior competence is inconsistent as long as one evaluates the epistemic result of processing FW as a work of literature. It will discuss the assumed *extraliterary* motivation for preserving the paradigm of competence in the industry. Since it will be argued that the paradigm cannot be upheld by naming the value of keeping the interpretation of FW under unjustified (not consistently privileged) control of the industry or, more broadly, the literary institution, the Chapter will call to revise the paradigm.[99]

The position made here against the paradigm of competence is that it is impossible to rank claims about FW as a specimen of literature (e.g., by indicating misinterpretations) in a consistent and non-dogmatic manner. First, a hierarchy of claims is impossible under the rule of NMA which says that nothing about FW can be said, or said with certainty, because all claims concerning FW (including this one) use vague terms whose definitions are tacit, therefore uncertain (here: "all", "claims", "concerning", "FW", "use", "vague", "terms", "definitions", "tacit", "uncertain").

Secondly, even where some tentative meaning of a claim is established by means of conjecturing about the terms which it uses, it is not possible to say with any consistently privileged competence that any claim about FW is better than another one because claims about FW refer to the text in an unknown language. An interpreter cannot speak with any privileged competence about it. This is not to say that while all claims are equally valid (or else, equally invalid), they have the same chances to appear, be called equally productive, etc. Still, conjectures about meaning in Wakese resist appeals to the majority. Arguments

---

[99] It should be noted that the Joyce industry is not the FW (sub)industry. Albeit the non-FW community of Joyceans (if it could be isolated) could probably defend the claim that 'their' Joyce wrote in English, the two industries could be said to have been similar in establishing their unproductively large volumes of claims, and without a coherent set of criteria for claiming (more) interpretive competence.

from statistics are unavailable (because the volume of FW exegesis is too large to permit testing of data) and fallible (because not always a majority knows better, and we do not know when it does). The Wakese language is the historical reason for the epistemic impasse which consists in that the more statements about FW are made, the more unfixed the reference of FW is, but trying to fix the reference can only produce more statements. The volume of FW exegesis, which has grown so large that it prevents any identification or even cataloguability of data, is the second reason for the impasse: the more we say about FW, the less we know what has already been said. The epistemology of FW is deprived of any primitive terms (i.e. intuitively assumed undefined terms) and thus appeals to intuition are not successful either.

Thirdly, the claims in the volume which are (i.e. appear to be) in conflict concern many aspects of FW: the boundaries, availability, finality, purpose, medium, genre, plot, characters, motifs, structure, semiotic code, phonology, phonetics, translatability of FW, and other issues. Terms as initial as "text", "reading", and "understanding" are unfixed in their meaning, and Joyce's authorship of FW is also in question. However, the paradigm of competence has not made itself dependent on any coherent criteria or mechanisms for adjudicating (apparent) conflicts between Wakean interpreters who are on the same level in a hierarchy, for categorising (apparently) equivalent claims made with different means, for categorising (apparently) different claims made with equivalent means, not to mention the ranking of such claims which (apparently) have not entered into the relation of conflict.

Fourthly, it is doubtful that the Wakean exegete has been consistent in their use of just one type of logic in their discussion of FW. One reads about translating "dream logic into waking logic" (Campbell and Robinson 1976: 294), whatever that means, as well as about a "quadratic logic of inclusion" (S. P. Murphy 2003: 157), and a logic of quantum mechanics (see Muller 2015). Supposedly, Joyce offers a "critique" of "binary logic" (Lewiecki-Wilson 1994: 62, see Bartnicki 2010a: 20, fn. 10, McGee 2003: 176) because the "cause-and-effect logic" "cannot do justice" to FW (M. P. Gillespie 2003: 29) and rejection of "the principle of non-contradiction" may be "justified" by the "character" of FW (Riquelme 1991: 533, re Sandulescu 1987). There are frequent violations of the law of contradiction in the volume of FW exegesis. For instance, FW is both translatable and untranslatable (Leslie Hill 2007: 99) and FW "totally resists cutting" "because it does not resist cutting at all" (Attridge 2004a: 217). Anyway, propositions that FW should abandon binary logic can be argued to lack consistency if they themselves do not contest that logic.

The question would be why "the critical text comes to us nicely coherent", though it should "itself be paranomasial and chaotic" (Leitch 1983: 262). Similarly, if the perfection of FW consists in an "aesthetic of error" (T. Conley 2001: ii, and *passim*), or, a "corrective to 'false' ideals of totality and completion" (Dilworth 2004-2005: 556), it does not look like the exegete strives for the same aesthetic in their own text.

Fifthly, if "[w]hat the *Wake* is not is easier to determine than what it is" (Tindall 1996: 14), one might expect to find some positive epistemic value in apophatic statements (e.g., "*Finnegans Wake* is a book rather than a brooch or a chalice", P. A. McCarthy 1988: 238). However, due to the metaphoricity of language, negating a claim is problematic even to those exegetes who have not renounced binary logic. For instance, while intuition might judge the following claims to be true:

> (a_1) "*Finnegans Wake* is not a colorless green idea that sleeps furiously",
>
> (a_2) "*Finnegans Wake* is not an elephant",
>
> (a_3) "*Finnegans Wake* is not about the twenty-four golden umbrellas of the King of Thailand",
>
> (a_4) "*Finnegans Wake* is not about a French lady who reads love stories, commits adultery, and poisons herself",
>
> (a_5) "*Finnegans Wake* is not the Beatles",
>
> (a_6) "*Finnegans Wake* is not the soundtrack of the *Star Wars* saga",

one can contend there is some truth in their negations. The negation of (a_1), using Noam Chomsky's example of syntax vs. sense, was anticipated in FW (T. Conley 2002: 237, 2009: 314). The negation of (a_2) makes sense on reading B. Benstock 1965: 42-107, see C. Hart 1963, Senn 1964. As (a_3), (a_4) are examples of absurd given by, respectively, Clive Hart (1985: 116; see McHugh 1976: 10) and Umberto Eco (2013: 9), the fact that they could come to mind reduces or eliminates their absurdness.[100] The negation of (a_5) is true in the sense that the Beatles are the continuation of FW by other means (see Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes in Poprawa 2009: 41). The negation of (a_6) is true in the sense that the text of FW contains "matches, or near matches, to pre-existing musical works" (Mills 2017), including *Star Wars* themes (see Jewell 2016).

Sixthly, while one might want to consider errors in claims as a factor that helps one to construct a hierarchy of claims, that person would need to allow for that errors may be

---

[100] As suggested in the Introduction—in a manner of speaking, misinterpretations of FW may only be *in potentia*, in the domain of absurdness so inconceivable that it could not be expressed in any claim.

the founding deed of FW, since "*Finnegans Wake*, quite literally, began with the task of correcting *Ulysses*" (Slote 2011: 138, see Groden 2013c, Lamos 1998: 118), and that many exegetes see Joyce's line in *Ulysses*: "A man of genius makes no mistakes. His errors are volitional and are the portals of discovery" as non-fictional words that concern FW as well (Bishop 1986: 434, n. 15, Schoemaker 2011: 144, see Dettmar 1996: 222, Vladimir Nabokov in Ramey 2012b: 2). If the error is not opprobrious, but conversely, it is desired and necessary, it might be incoherent of anyone to take steps towards an error-free text of FW. Also, while there are different categories of error, if the "*readers'* corrections of the erroneous *text*" are one of them (Letzler 2011: 1), one may conclude that the entire process of annotating FW is error, and the volume of FW exegesis contains nothing but error. What problematises even further the potential applicability of error is the closely related category of mistake, and the one of failure, yet their definitions are diverse and inconsistent. Joyce's privatisation of language may have been Joyce's mistake (Kubiak 1993: 280-281), but not an error (e.g., if Wakese operates the way he planned)—or vice versa. Moreover, errors are user-dependent, e.g., the claim that Krzysztof Bartnicki posits that FW "was written as an elaborate subterfuge for Joyce's alleged homosexuality" (Luo 2013: 48) may be correct to Luo, but is incorrect to Bartnicki. Also, there are erroneous claims meant to be about FW which can be correct claims about something else. For instance, "*Finnegan's Wake* is not intended to mystify readers" (Ellie Ragland-Sullivan qtd. in Neilsen 2016: 78, cf. Ragland-Sullivan 1990: 77) is a correct thing to say about the song *Finnegan's Wake*. On the other hand, the claim that Beckett helped Joyce "write *Finnegan's Wake*" (Tereszewski 2013: 15), is, thanks to the names of the writers, likely assumable as something about FW, despite the misspelling. It seems then that an error about FW needs to be (i) noticed, (ii) recognised as pertaining to the text of FW, (iii) assessed as non-negligible, (iv) recognised as a deviation from a plan, including, paradoxically, a plan to appreciate errors—however, these requirements with regard to errors are too many to use errors to construct a hierarchy of claims.

Seventhly, since the number of claims, and even *true* claims, in the volume of FW exegesis can be increased with disjuncts of a claim about FW and any scientific truth or a statement of a fact (e.g., "FW is a book or 2+2=4", "FW is a book or the water shrew is a venomous mammal", "FW is a book or Schopenhauer said: *Die kaltblütigen Tiere allein sind die giftigen*") as well as with metalevel statements (e.g., "It is true that it is not certain if FW is a book"), one can easily imagine a model in which the volume of FW exegesis

contains discoveries of the fields of science, and approaches—or eventually becomes—the volume of human knowledge. There are no consistent and non-dogmatic mechanisms for eliminating such claims from the hermeneutical output about FW, i.e. for saying that they do not really concern FW.

In short, the absence of inferior claims (e.g., misinterpretations) and consequently, the absence of better or superior claims about FW should be understood as the absence of any consistently justified authority to indicate them. Against this position, there operates the academic paradigm of hierarchical competence, manifesting itself, i.a., in (i) appeals implying a difference of competence, (ii) terms implying a difference of competence, and (iii) suggested prerequisites for reading. These elements of the paradigmatic approach to competence will be discussed in the subsections below.

3.1. Appeals Implying a Difference of Competence

In this subsection 3.1 are discussed appeals to (i) intuition, (ii) certainty, (iii) plausibility, (iv) James Joyce, (v) canonicity, (vi) topicality, (vii) telos, (viii) historicity, (ix) majority, minority, (x) emotions; and (xi) knowledge, which the academic system of FW studies has made or could use to establish some criteria for a hierarchy of claims, and consequently, a hierarchy of hermeneutical competence.

3.1.1. Appeals to Intuition

By appealing to intuition, the exegete implies that statements which agree with intuition are better than claims which do not. Yet, exegetes disagree on the use of intuition. Umberto Eco, for example, praises "a certain *intuitive* pleasure when we read" (Pujol Duran 2015: 55); also, an exegete may experience the irresistible feeling that a line in FW is "clearly wrong" (Killeen 2013) and be self-denied the pleasure of finding meaning where it "seems intuitively wrong" (Takács 1987: 166), using intuition as an instrument of self-censorship. However, FW may as well be "a 'counter-intuitive' system" (R. Brown 1992: 119). While in logic, intuition founds our understanding of the primitive terms, i.e. those undefined

expressions "that seem to us to be immediately understandable" (Tarski 1994: 110), the epistemological system of FW deprived itself of them.

3.1.2. **Appeals to Certainty**

By appealing to certainty, the exegete implies that statements which are certain are better than claims which are less certain. One identifies the former by the presence of an absolute quantifier (*all, always, every, never, none*) or some other certainty marker (a word such as *definitely, evidently, indubitably, obviously, of course, positively, surely, undoubtedly*). Most resolute appeals to certainty may be called *laws* (e.g., C. Hart 1982: 249-250), *rules* (e.g., Bernard Benstock's rule qtd. in P. O'Neill 2013: 8), or *principles* (e.g., G. Davenport 2013: 247). One learns from their criticism that they are not so certain to all. For instance, while John Gordon had the resolve to form "a law of *Finnegans Wake*" (1981: 169), his move "toward the categorical" was criticised (Riquelme 1985: 242, see P. A. McCarthy 1987: 156). Naturally then, the fact that an appeal is made does not make the certainty that it calls up real. An example of that is the tradition of regarding FW as a text in dreamspeak, represented by the claim below (with the certainty marker underlined):

> (1) "There is <u>no doubt</u> that Joyce's object in *Finnegans Wake* is to depict the dream state" (Humphrey 1954: 126, n. 3);

which idea had been imposed on the early reader, but grew contestable with time (Attridge 2012-2013: 185, see Hofheinz 1995: 21). Bernard Benstock "reversing his earlier opinion on the subject" (Farbman 2008: 93) is among the scholars who lost confidence in the idea of dreamspeak.

Moreover, some appeals to certainty are self-contradictory, as in the following example:

> (2) "*Finnegans Wake* <u>never</u> has had and <u>never</u> will have <u>any</u> readers and <u>whoever is</u> a true reader will sooner or later cast out his guide or turn on his guide and read him and then become a guide himself" (Glasheen 1969: 70).

Some appeals contradict one another, e.g., the inevitability of biographism implied here:

> (3) "Although written in 'darktongues', *Finnegans Wake* <u>always</u> leads back to Joyce himself" (M. Ellmann 2012: 37);

probably disagrees with the "absence of authorial control" praised here:

> (4) "Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* is <u>obviously</u> more worthy of praise than, say, Raymond Chandler's *The Big Sleep* because the former, from a poststructuralist perspective, refuses absolute apprehension, pointing to the absence of authorial control and freeing its readers from the constraining illusion of subject-hood and the possibility of stable truth claims" (Toth 2010: 43).

Then, if there is anything common in this set of examples:

> (5) "<u>Without a doubt</u>, *Finnegans Wake* is one of the least read and least understood of all modern classics" (Abrams 2012);

> (6) "While Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* is <u>undoubtedly</u> a great literary masterpiece, understanding it requires an effort that few people will ever be able to give" (Cawelti 2004: 69);

> (7) "*Finnegans Wake* is a <u>clear</u> example of tampering too much with the balanced ratio between speaker's meaning and the power of language itself" (Kennedy 1979: 131);

> (8) "Finnegans Wake is not, and <u>never</u> will be, comprehensible to anybody outside of, maybe, God" (McManus 2010);

> (9) "The 'plot' of *Finnegans Wake* is <u>always</u> cast in shadows" (K. Mullin 2007: 110);

> (10) "The contrived abstruseness of *Finnegans Wake* is <u>evident</u> from its first line" (Torres and Kahmi 2000: 244);

> (11) "Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* <u>never</u> tires of telling us, for instance, on so many different registers how it wants to be read and understood" (Beitchman 1998: 6);

it would be the text's inscrutability, a complexity few can handle, the Wakese language as an obstacle to understanding, which is illusive or incomplete or both.

Also, there has been disagreement among the exegetes about the origin and role of certainty. One view is that an exegete "should never be certain" (Halper 1981: 99 re Senn 1980, see Senn 1982b), but it does not have to be certainly correct itself. Even if "all

uncertainties are not equal" (Halper, op. cit., 100), this claim itself is uncertain. In any case, even if one could establish what is uncertain in or about FW, it would not necessarily be revealing what is certain. It may be a sign of the times that a few decades after Hart's and Gordon's texts announcing their 'laws', the exegete may have moved on the side of caution. Symbolically, John Barger's list of 50+ conjectures concerning Joyce (2007) has 6 guesses concerning FW, and not even one marked as certain.

3.1.3. Appeals to Plausibility

By appealing to plausibility, the exegete implies that a more plausible claim is better than a less plausible one—"plausible interpretation" outperforms "conjecture" (McCourt 2012: 110). Still, setting the "threshold of plausibility" between a "tendency to go too far" and a "safer more reductive analysis" (Leblanc 2018) is always subjective. In theory, plausible reasoning is "based on common knowledge" and "the way things generally go in familiar situations" (Walton, Tindale, and Gordon 2014: 114), however, the volume of FW exegesis offers no such common knowledge. Indeed, given that long past 1939 the scholar still tries to "clarify the textual status of *Finnegans Wake*" (Slote 2018: 405) and agrees with a 40 years old assessment that "the complete meaning of the whole work must escape us" (J. S. Atherton qtd. in Slote 2000: 203), one may call the existence of any knowledge of or about FW into question and admit that FW permits nothing but conjectures. Plausibility is all the more resolutely refused as a criterion for assessing claims when apparently "one can make sense of something that might actually be nonsensical" (W. Van Mierlo 2012) or even "the categories of 'sense' and 'nonsense' get dissolved" in FW (Pal 2015: n.pag. [1]).

3.1.4. Appeals to James Joyce

By appealing to James Joyce, the exegete implies that in interpreting FW it is advisable to refer to Joyce's intent and make use of his privileged knowledge. It will be argued that a decision to follow Joyce is not a matter of choosing one's side in the intellectual rivalry between poststructuralists and intentionalists (Lernout 2006: 82), the former more free but

more likely eisegetic, the latter bound to Joyce's word but at least with the hermeneutical compass to protect one from absurd interpretation—eisegesis is unavoidable either way.

The intentionalist's choice may be considered poor if its price is high—accepting James Joyce's genius. Initially, this genius had not been discovered by "all the world" (A. Crowley 1923: 52), but had been "sorely mocked" (Edna O'Brien 2004), given various qualifications (see, e.g., Nora Barnacle qtd. in McAlmon 1990: 106, Stanislaus Joyce qtd. in Parrinder 1984: 17, Bennett 1977: 290, Ronen 2009: 154). Later it became "all too easy to casually assume" that Joyce is a genius (Means 2008: 37).[101] But if "Joyce is a genius" and "therefore, *Finnegans Wake* is a work of genius, a masterpiece" (Dettmar 1996: 222), and Joyce's work itself is a "justification sufficient for reading" it (D. G. Bridson qtd. in Deming 2005: 511), this circular reasoning is poor. A disadvantage of assuming his genius is that it is religious in nature: a believer shall not blaspheme that Joyce can be wrong and FW is of little worth. They need to assume a method in Joyce's madness, "misunderstood by those who are not geniuses" (O'Malley 2007) and see FW as a text "whose wisdom, bar Joyce, the rest of us has not yet reached" (García Tortosa 2011-2012: 346). They exempt Joyce from serious criticism. Bernard Benstock, for instance, complains about FW "in preconceived pigeonholes" (1965: 42), yet does not consider *Joyce's* authorial commentary a pigeonhole. Roland McHugh boasts of his "distrust of gurus" (1981: 29) and yet he trusts James Joyce. Kevin Dettmar would like to "get past this kind of thinking" that Joyce was "approaching omniscience and omnipotence" but only in order "to form a just estimation of his real genius" (ibid.). Despite that Joyce's comments on FW are of problematic quality and his competence is limited (see *Finnegans Wake. A BookCaps…* 2011, McManus 2010; Reichert 1988: 89, "Review…" 1940: 502, Roraback 2004-2005; see Joyce's own remark, "do any of us know what we are creating?", in Leblanc 2018), the intentionalist cannot afford calling Joyce seriously wrong lest their main source should be challenged. In theory, the gain of that devotion is that intentionalists at least rely on *something*, but the practical worth of that something is annulled by Joyce's self-exegesis being "self-contradictory" (J. S. Atherton 1974: 18) and incomplete as Joyce's death halted "any expectation of a full explication" (B. Benstock 1965: 40, see Parandowski 2015: 135). Thus, one can assume that the Joyce of the intentionalist is a product in the Joyce industry. The post-Joyce editor who revises the text in Joyce's name pursues their own professional interest. The editor should "add and secure value to books for the benefit of interested parties" (B. Brown

---

[101] And the phrase "not a genius" became a rarity, and as polite as in "a colossal talent, but not a genius" (George Russell qtd. in F. O'Connor 1994: 342).

2016: 11), but Joyce is no such party (for he is dead), nor is the reader that party (given that no revisions in the text make it more readable). Claims such as that "textual scholars should do the job [of revising], not ordinary readers" (Letzler 2014: 76) point at the interested party—appeals to Joyce are a necessity of the entrepreneur's. That said, the opposition to intentionalism is the same: an economically motivated movement, in which some products replace others—e.g., the institutional Joyce replaces the "biographical Joyce" who replaces the "erotic Joyce" who replaces the "modernist Joyce" (Goodwin 1999: 200). Attempts at leaving the 'genius' model organised in "the American academy" (Vanderham 2000: 567 re J. Kelly 1998) have been, to use the words from Wim Van Mierlo's review of Kelly's text, "never disinterested" (1988: 3).

3.1.5. Appeals to Canonicity

By appealing to canonicity, the exegete implies that claims which belong in the canon of FW exegesis or are part of the mainstream criticism of FW, are better than claims outside of that canon or mainstream. A systemic-level problem that challenges this option is that canonicity is subject to appropriation and struggle in the industry (Cheng 1996-1997: 92, Slote 2009: 67). Another problem lies in that "readers of the *Wake* comprise an atypical subcategory of Joyce criticism that is often far from 'mainstream'" (Vicki Mahaffey qtd. in Yao 2002: 192), while the larger set, "Joyce studies itself" is "underground" in an "American mainstream" (Pyle 2020: 100), which mainstream in turn is not necessarily representative of the world's interest in FW. Besides, as FW shows "oddness" and challenges "orthodoxy" (E. McLuhan 1997: 237), some would like to see it "banished to the very edges of the literary canon" (Attridge 2004a: 237).

Had there ever been a mainstream, the community of Wakeans (either among other Joyceans or against them), it must have remained in "the previous century" (Sandulescu 2012e: 13) when scholars knew one another by name, and could even hope to arrive at a complete exegesis (C. Hart 1962: 15-16; McHugh 1991: v). Later, the founders of the industry and their pioneering texts lost significance, in self-assessment too (see, e.g., Brooker 2004: 87-88 and Levin 1980: 3 on Levin 1941). Some scholars would conclude that there cannot be "enough research" (Margot Norris in Burrell 1996: xii) as an excuse to

write more and more; others grew more disheartened, falling into "semantic despair" (Fritz Senn in Hamada 2013: 16).

The volume of FW exegesis is too large to permit any canon or mainstream. While C. G. Sandulescu, for one, requests "uniformity" "in the methodology of reading Joyce" (2012b: 10), his own contribution, "A Manual for the Advanced Study of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*", is ca. 30.000 pages long (see Sandulescu and Vianu 2016). If Fritz Senn is "the world's most eminent Joyce scholar" (Killeen 2018), it is Senn who listed FW's "pragmatic impossibilities" (1990b: 78), declared a lack of qualifications to discuss FW "with scholarly pretense" (1984: xi), and called the failure of the collective "lamentable" (2019: 171)—so, either Senn summarizes what the (self-proclaimed) mainstream achieved, or his disgruntlement is an outsider's voice (and the mainstream is more likely a myth).

3.1.6. Appeals to Topicality

By appealing to topicality, the exegete implies that claims which are focused on the main, "central message of *Finnegans Wake*" (Smoley 2018: 2) are better than claims about some 'peripheral' aspects. This can be opposed by saying that attempts to find "a central theme or dominant message" "narrow the focus of an otherwise expansive universe" of FW, and are at a "loss" (B. Benstock 1985: 154, see M. Norris 1976). Either way, it is not certain what the central message of FW might be. Centrality has appeared in a range of contexts in the volume of FW exegesis, including "central constellation of images" (Bishop 1981: 4), "central figure" (J. Campbell 2004: 197), "central matrixes" (V. J. Cheng qtd. in Hamada 2013: 229), "central metaphor" (DiBernard 1980: 8), "central episode" (M. McLuhan 2016: 7), "central theme" (P. O'Neill 2013: 126), "central role of the river" (Quadrino 2015b), "central motif" (Rose and O'Hanlon 1982: xxi), "central cast of characters" (Thakur 2010: 247), and many more.

Some assert that the volume of FW exegesis contains general analyses as well as "topical studies" which "illuminate a particular class of references in the canon" (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: xii), yet it is hard to say which texts are primary and which represent "the wealth of secondary material" (LeBlanc 2011: 182). Even if we could agree that, say, an essay connecting Tolkien and FW (Hiley 2015) is "least expected" (Carpentier 2015: 6), given the scarcity of the intertextual data (see *Tolkien Gateway*, s.v. "James Joyce", 2005,

Tolkien 2012: 87-89), a general hierarchy of topicality to identify what texts are expected more in exchanges of thought has not appeared. Nor can one cross-prioritize "assertions", "nods", "echoes", and "counter-signatures" (Attridge 2015: ix) in a coherent typology of responses to FW. What "the wheat" is, separable from "the chaff", depends on "particular tastes, temperament and prejudices" (Senn 1970: 210). Finally, if the main message of FW is its *eventual* message, it could be a vague feeling of inscrutability, or something about us saying "that we are not sophisticated enough to understand beyond our linguistic rules" (Shaughnessy 2004).

3.1.7. Appeals to Telos

By appealing to telos, the exegete implies that claims which serve the purpose, or, the telos of FW, are better than other claims. Still, the objective of FW has never been agreed on. One of the many expressed possibilities is that while *Ulysses* could serve a reconstruction of Dublin (Budgen 1972: 69), FW may have been meant to secure a reconstruction of "our society" (Campbell and Robinson 1993: 8)—whatever this means. Alternately, if FW "is about language" (Buckalew 1974: 93), its objective is to establish and sustain language. Or perhaps it is about darkness (Bishop 1986) and obscurity (Glasheen 1963: xvii). Szegedy-Maszák asserts that "Joyce aimed to invalidate" "the teleology of reading" (1997: 275). If FW is "about anybody, anywhere, anytime" (Tindall 1996: 3), its purpose is as uncertain as the ontologies of spacetime and humanity. If "*Finnegans Wake* is about *Finnegans Wake*" (Tindall 1959: 237), its telos is its own existence. In the epistemological conditions that FW set up, its objective is turning into some kind of teleological indeterminacy, to "keep piling up information" (John S. Gordon in Hamada 2013: 41).

3.1.8. Appeals to Historicity

By appealing to historicity, the exegete implies that claims which concern an element existing in the times of Joyce, especially one familiar to him, are better than claims which concern an element that became known after Joyce had finished writing FW. Following this logic, asserting that, say, "aosch" (FW 286.2) means "chaos" (Epstein 1966: 263) is

more reasonable than asserting that "aosch" refers to "Ausch" or "Schoa" [Auschwitz and Shoah]. Asserting that "aosch" refers to "bosch" (see, e.g., FW compared to H. Bosch's *The Garden of Earthly Delights* in Hervé 2017) is better than a proposition that the word refers to chaos theory (discovered by Edward Lorenz in 1961, the term coined by James A. Yorke in 1975). The criterion of historicity would disqualify possible references to Andy Warhol ("And he war", 258.12), George Soros ("Soros cast", 601.33), Pol Pot ("a pot on a pole", 451.05) and such, however, it could not as easily discredit claims that in FW Joyce alludes, e.g., to Lavrentiy Beria (see Eco 1992: 35-37) or that the acronym HCE stands for an "Englishman" with "initials C. H." (Stockdale 1812: 311) who in 1774 found the Upas tree of Java ("three…upastairs", FW 362.33).

The criterion of historicity is negated by such claims which suggest FW as a "book of prophecies" (Lemos 2012: 89, see J. P. Anderson 2010: 71, Carver 1978a: 208, Catlin 1989: 89, Chrisp 2019a, R. Ellmann 1982: 550, Jolas 2009a: 403, S. W. Klein 1994: 238-239, n. 53, cf. Harvey 2015c), able to make an impact "backward in time" (Quadrino 2018b), a display of the "timelessness and clairvoyance of Joyce" (Zyjeski 1997). Some of the alleged prophecies, varying in metaphoricity, concern: "the Wall Street Crash of 1929" (Critchley and McCarthy 2005: 184), the audio tape (Dick 2011a: 9), the murder of John Lennon (Leszkiewicz 2012: 223-224), Conor McGregor's triumph against Jose Aldo (Loynd 2015), Sarah Palin ("Palin's Wake", 2016), "*2001*'s black monolith and the iPhone" (Quadrino 2013a), Donald Trump (id. 2019b), "Tiger Woods, Princess Diana, or Clinton" (J. A. Snyder 2004: 520), "the atom bombing of Nagasaki" and "the space age" (R. A. Wilson 1988), as well as "a world of peace run by women" (Sheldon Brivic in Fordham 2013b: 339). Translators and scholars discovered their names in FW (Dai 2010: 586, Hunter 1983, Łuba 2007: 56).

Since "literary criticism will always be tempted to break free from intentional and historical constraints on interpretation" (Newton 1982: 109), this may explain why people did manage to link FW with chaos theory (Jamili 2013, Soliński 2006) and Auschwitz (Boheemen-Saaf 1999: 14, Reizbaum 1999: 140) after all, and people can imagine Joyce's opinion on the post-Joyce world (see Barlow 2014). Newton asserts that the reason for neglecting historical constraints is that the exegete "is not forced by any practical necessity to interpret the text in relation to a limited set of interests" (op. cit., ibid.), but one can well imagine that the Joyce industry *is* forced by the conditions of its operation to interpret FW in a professionally useful way. Joyce engaged in gender studies, "fierce feminism" (Sailer

1997), postcolonial studies (Cheng 1996-1997), cyberspace (Liu 2006: 516) etc., represents various movements *avant la lettre*. As such exceptions to the principle of historicity are not explained by a rule of literary criticism clarifying why one can make exceptions at all, they greatly reduce any effectiveness of appeals to historicity.

3.1.9. Appeals to the Majority or Minority

By appealing to the majority with their commonsensical authority, the exegete implies that claims with which more people agree are better than claims with which fewer people agree. On the other hand, by appealing to the minority and their elitism the exegete implies that claims shared by the few experts are better than claims of many less qualified people. A combination of the two is the appeal to both groups, seen in this example that "literary critics and ordinary readers" alike think FW "borders on the illegible" (Liu 2010: 101). However, the scholar announcing agreement with the common reader probably mistakes an academic model of the common reader for the actual reader. A "casual reader is not a reader of *FW*", and not even more specific subsets of readers are "homogenous" (Halper 1971: 5). An exegete who does not want to appear presumptuous inserts a safety word in the appeal (e.g., "probably" in: "Most readers of *Finnegans Wake* would probably hesitate to call it a novel", Attridge 2001: 126), but safety words like "probably" (used without explaining the calculus of probability) make any such claim simply vague. Finally, even if statistical tests could be performed, the statistician would remain baffled how to weight claims of a non-reader commenting on FW against claims of a scholar who "failed in a most elementary way" (Senn 1984: xi) or claims of a reader who thinks, on behalf of "most of us", that the text is "simply unreadable" (Pierce 2013: 301).

3.1.10. Emotive Persuasion

Embracing appeals to emotion, fear, pity, flattery, ridicule, spite and such with the term "emotive persuasion", emotive persuasion refers to the use of rhetorical devices relying on emotions in order to make the exegete look (more) competent and their claim (more) compelling. This has a rich tradition in the system of FW—the text earned labels as distant

as masterpiece from failure (see Fordham 2011: 73), oxymoronic ones too, such as "the product of a deranged intellect or a misguided genius" (Fleming 1972: 19). The volume of FW exegesis contains clichés like "the most genial book in the world" (Tindall 1996: 23) as well as claims that reading three pages of FW was "a waste of time" (Roddy Doyle qtd. in Chrisafis 2004). Where claims about FW are called "unhinged", "crackpot", "deranged" (Tim Conley in Lawrence 2019), one sees rudeness as pointless as accounting for taste, but also a hint of the idea that some claims are sane, balanced, and thus better, which idea is of no hermeneutic value, especially if the insulted party might answer in kind, following their own idea about what "deranged" is.

Parsing appeals to emotions sometimes can expose content probably unintended by the author. For example, claims such as that "*Finnegan's Wake* is the ultimate linguistic experience" (Daily 1977: 303) can be taken as either warnings or exhortations (but in either case, the misspelling does not make the author trustworthy). Even if FW is "a waste of Joyce's talent" (Wexler 1997: 70), FW can still be better than any text by any person whose talent was not wasted. Phrases such as "a cold pudding of a book" (Nabokov 1990: 71) are likely meant to dissuade one from reading FW, but the same effect can be reached with apparently neutral observations, e.g., that FW "takes patience" (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 107) or even likely praises, e.g., that FW is "most innovative" (ibid., 74). Therefore, emotive persuasion is hermeneutically redundant.

3.1.11. Appeals to Knowledge

By appealing to knowledge—signalled with phrases such as "it is (well) known that" (see Hornik 1960: 123, McHugh 2006: xiii, L. Wilson 2013: 75)—the exegete implies that there are claims which deliver some certainty, even a truth, and thus are better than claims which rely on conjectures. In an epistemological hierarchy proposed by Geert Lernout, the editor comes first (since he establishes the text), then is the annotator, then the translator, and the hierarchically lowest is the interpreter (1996a: 143). However, this proposition is doubtful, at least when we think of FW, if one agrees that the editor has not established *the* text yet (and may never do), the annotator notified us of "linguistic dissatisfaction" (Senn 1992b), and the translator is a rare species. It is also debatable if "nothing can be done" without the

text (Lernout, op. cit., ibid.): apparently, a lot of texts have been written about FW without the source text having been established.

Since Lernout implies that the advantages of the editor's work can be "falsifiability, objectivity" (ibid.), and promises scientificity "in Karl Popper's sense of the word" (1995: 48), two instant objections should arise. First: If Joyce's intentions are a privileged source of knowledge, but "it would be pretentious to assert that genetic criticism is able to decipher all the secrets of Joyce's magnum opus" (Van Herbruggen 2004, see Deppman 2010: 155), then who, and how, settles the conflicts of *interpretation* of Joyce's intention? Second: If falsifiability suffers from the dearth of volunteers to perform it (Lernout 1995: 47, see Deppmann 2006, Fuse 2019, Rose 1995: 19), is it not available just theoretically, which means, one could say, that it is not actually available?

Umberto Eco, discussing "the falsifiability of misinterpretations" (1988: 163-165), mentions Popper-like falsifiability as well, linking it to his (Eco's) idea that interpretation has limitations. Eco's associative diagram for a word in FW (1984: 75) is not boundless— it can be inscribed in a circle, outside which there would be something Eco calls "blatantly unacceptable" (1990: 6) or "paranoiac interpretation" (1991: 165). For instance, says Eco, FW will not provide "the proof of Fermat's Last Theorem, or the complete bibliography of Woody Allen" (1996a: 303). Another person's example is that the question "Why do I am alook alike a poss of porterpease?" (FW 21:18-19) does not refer "to the price of oranges in Calcutta" (Herring 1987: 185). One might answer this by denying the existence of any absurd in actual interpretation. Secondly, even if absurd exists, it can be a positive thing, if "interpretation is interesting only when it is extreme" (Culler 2004: 110). Thirdly, to an extent, FW supports what its eisegetes wish to find in the text.[102] Fourthly, as "we ought not to confuse the *Wake*'s exemplary complaisance with our understanding of it" (Senn 1984: xi), so its resistance against some associations does not indicate that they are misinterpretations. This is not to say that, say, two claims about the word "riverrun" (FW 3.1), that, (i), it refers to a river, and (ii), it refers to a feline duchess of Mars, are equally

---

[102] Against Eco: "Hill of Allen" (FW 57.13) refers to Woody Allen's *Annie Hall* (1977), "allenalaw" (FW 83.34) to Allen's a *Rainy Day in New York* (2017) starring Jude Law; Pierre de Fermat's *Hanc marginis exiguitas non caperet* (1637) is called "immarginable" (FW 4.19). Against Herring: If the 'price of oranges' is a metaphor for expulsion from Eden (see "link between oranges and the original sin", Milesi 1998: 21), the pottery in the Indus Valley stands for Adam; then as one recalls the Porters in the service of the Dutch East India Company, the text in FW becomes defensible as mentioning the oranges in the riverine port by the bay of Bengal.

probable to appear. Still, *if* (or *once*) they both appear, then they are equally (in)valid. It is not so that a claim is correct or acceptable if it "provides answers" (C. Hart 1963: 6), as long as "answers" is a vague term. Claim (i) can probably be expected to generate more text or more *data* than Claim (ii), but it still cannot provide more *answers*, certainly not when the data do not synthesise with and into coherence.

Against ideas that interpretations are regulated by the *intentio auctoris* and *intentio operis*,[103] one can say that the former one is often called fallacious (Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946, cf. Coleman 1995) and is as inefficient as appeals to James Joyce. Indeed, if Joyce's intention was to cede on the reader the "responsibility for making his creation meaningful" (Loxterman 1991: 125, see Colangelo 2016: 72, Fordham 2007: 219, Senn 1990b: 63, Tindall 1959: 237), the reader replaces Joyce as the administrator of his *intentio auctoris*. Regarding Eco's *intentio operis*, supposedly able to reject conjectures that cannot pass the test "upon the text as a coherent whole" (1991: 181), FW prohibits this testing because it has no "coherent whole". Last but not least, the knowledge of overinterpretations suggested by Eco, which seems to detect "bad" claims but not lead to good or "best ones" (ibid., 169), is of very limited use.

The post-Eco Wakean toned down their rhetoric—an interpretation is "sufficiently accurate" if its "likelihood can hold at bay all alternatives" (Renggli 2014: 1014), 'better' is 'more pleasing' (Rabaté 2001: 207), 'meaningful' is 'useful' (T. Conley 2017b: 20), in line with the pragmatist answer to Eco given by Richard Rorty (2004). Still the pragmatist has not abandoned the concept of misreading, held back by "a sense of propriety" (Nash 2006: 120), attempting to dodge the conclusion that "semiotic universe" is "alarmingly chaotic" (Simpkins 2001: 159). Trying to find some stability against chaos and anarchy in interpreting, Andrzej Szahaj proposes that interpretations become objective in debates (1997: 33) of ethically sensitive people (ibid., 24, see Begnal 1971: 7, Halper 1971: 6). It is persuasiveness, Szahaj says (op. cit., 33), which makes a claim convincing, interesting, convenient, exciting, meaningful, and even true-by-consensus (27), but it needs intercommunication (22), a community. This is in homage to Stanley Fish's view that there is no interpretation without or outside of the associative context imposed by 'interpretive community' (1980). This community is in demand because of "the desire to extend the reference of 'us'" (Rorty 1989: 169), reinforced by the "human desire for closure and

---

[103] Against Lernout, Eco implies that the quest for *intentio auctoris* may pollute *intentio operis* (1988: 166).

epistemological security" (Floyd Merrell in Simpkins 2001: 154). There are nods toward this community where the plural is used in claims such as that FW is "what we do with it" (Senn 1990b: 63) or "about our ideas about it" (Tindall 1959: 237).

But one can present various objections to Fish, including this one that "interpretive communities can neither be defined nor recognized" (Nash 1996: 285, see Kálmán 1992, E. M. Roberts 2006). Then, regarding FW more specifically, "the field of Joyce studies [is] problematic as an interpretive community" (McGee 2001: 43). The question without clear answers is who announces that a community has reached agreement. Moreover, a vision of a Wakean community as an agora of "fellow inquirers" (Rorty 1982: 165) with "the desire for solidarity" (Rorty 1991: 39) is naïve. Academic capitalism demands fierce competition, an element of which is the pressure to 'publish or perish'. In communal solidarity there is a threat of "group-think" and one of "ethnocentrism" of "middle-class liberal Westerners" (Fyffe 1996: 8). The individual, idiosyncratic interpreter, "an irresponsible reader" (Fish 1980: 336), giving in to private fancies and incomprehensible gibberish (Szahaj 1977: 22), is not granted the benefit of the doubt why a sane person would like to generate nonsense for nonsense's sake or invent absurd to spite a fellow man. Presuming such malice is not coherent with the other assumption of solidarity.

3.2. Terms Implying a Difference of Competence

Embracing the idea that interpretive competence can and should be differentiated, the academic system of FW studies has followed the tradition of distinguishing 'specialists' from 'amateurs'. Among the relevant terms, "Joycean" should command some more initial attention if this is how "most Joycean specialists choose to call themselves" (Gaiser 1986: 248), albeit one must keep in mind that not all Joyceans are Wakeans. The text of FW can be left unmentioned in Joycean books (e.g., Scholes and Kain 1965) and academic papers (e.g., A. Fogarty 2008). A Joycean not preoccupied with FW will "steer clear of it" (B. Benstock 1976: 126). On the other hand, every Wakean is a Joycean, or is expected to be. Where not being disparaged in contrast to *Ulysses* which "towers over the rest of Joyce's writings" (Nabokov 1990: 71), FW culminates—and asks for a reading of—Joyce's entire oeuvre (T. S. Eliot in Brannon 2003: 18, V. Heller 1995: 11, Lane 2002: 139, Lerm Hayes

2011: 329, T. McCarthy 2014: 39). The connection between FW and *Ulysses* can be illustrated by the similarity in these texts:

> "Nowadays *Ulysses* was introduced and annotated, gazetteers and lexicons were written, the book was commented on by philosophers and literary theoreticians, adaptations and imitations as well as works of criticism were published in increasing numbers and frequency, yet the text still makes readers tentative creators of contexts" (Ionescu 2003: 221)

and

> "*Finnegans Wake* has been introduced and annotated, gazetteers and lexicons were written, the book has been commented on by philosophers and literary theoreticians; the professors have not been sitting on their hands. But neither have the ordinary readers, and some of the key-texts in the artillery of guides to *Finnegans Wake* we owe to *amateurs*, to readers who do not get tenure or promotion for working on this difficult book" (an advert in Thomson 1990: 220),

where one notices a division line set between the professor and the amateur. However, if the larger text of FW should comprise not only Joyce's oeuvre, but also "the history" of FW, which is what "good interpretation requires" (Deppman 2006), and Joyce's biography, and Joyce's sources of input "from history, politics, literature, and popular culture [and] science" (Booker 2000: 131), Joyce's source of knowledge of "myth, theology, religion, sculpture, opera and popular music, history, literature, gender psychology, medicine, science" (Thomas 2007: 1) and other texts, this larger FW, demanding multiprofessorial competence, could never be approached by a "flesh-and-blood reader" (Pym 2010: 111).

Since the reader of FW is expected to be acquainted with various texts, it can be problematic to say where one's reading of FW actually begins. If, let's say, the work of Giambattista Vico, "a fairly obscure" thinker (Chabon 2012, see Peake 1977: 355) is unknown to a prospective FW reader (McHugh 1981: 29-30), but the reader is persuaded into thinking that Vico is somehow vital for understanding FW (see J. S. Atherton 1974: 29-34, Barger 2003, Orr 1987, Verene 2003), their reading Vico (or about Vico) might be regarded as part of the process of reading FW. It must be psychologically taxing, however, to become familiar with various texts, possibly even without opening the source text, still call it "reading FW". This may be why the professional in the industry likes to suggest that the level of entry knowledge be higher. As "one modernizes one's understanding of that term"—"the common reader" (Bishop 1999: viii), the "plain reader" becomes "cultured enough" (Rabaté 2002: 31), a highly skilled intellectual (Bellow 1994: 147), who knows Vico in advance—and then the time to read Vico is not on the side of FW expenditures.

But then a difference of erudition between ordinary readers and experts becomes unclear. What only adds to confusion is the existence of other levels of alleged expertise, such as the "middle-range" reader (B. Benstock 1965: vii; see also Scholes and Kain 1965: x, Schwarz 2015: 334). As one mentions a difference "between critic and scholar" (W. Van Mierlo 2002: 3), but "FW criticism" may be in a "pre-critical stage" (Sandulescu and Vianu 2015b: 17), and some scholars admit incompetence (e.g., Senn 1984: xi) and authors of exegetical texts call themselves "not an expert on Joyce at all" (Zatkalik 2001: 55), an "amateur scholar" (Mink 1992: 36), "no scholar" (Cliett 2011: 13, see LeBlanc 2011), and so on, this certainly obscures the "definitional boundaries" separating "Joyceans" from "non-Joyceans" (B. Benstock 1988: 4).

Since one's additional competence, such as that about Vico, does not open a secret door to understanding FW, but reveals a "set of clichés" (Nemerov 1975: 654, see Kitcher 2007: 46, Stocker 2019: 204) instead, and since FW "baffles critics and readers alike" (C. George Sandulescu in Hamada 2013: 87), the need of boundaries between various exegetes can easily be explained by the critic's wish to *appear* more professional. Then, as the aura of interpretive superiority which some scholars try to exploit professionally can be vitiated by such other scholars who join the 'amateur' side, conflicts of interest arise. For example, a conflict is marked by the opposition to Fritz Senn's idea that readers should not be "forced to acquire and study the multi-volume edition of the [FW] notebooks" (Lernout 1998: 294), which can be explained as Lernout's defence of his own professional interests. On the other hand, a scholar taking the "scholar=amateur" turn, motivated by their psychological self-defence to exchange the awareness of a scholarly fiasco for the amateur's freedom to be carefree ("unbeschwert", Senn 2018: 6), self-exempted from having to prove professionalism, seeks a place in the amateur's world about which he or she is quite ignorant (see Platt 2011: 12). It should be noted that no scholars "flaunting" their amateurship (Senn 2015:22, see Gula 1999: 262) rush to redact or retract their old FW exegesis made with scholarly pretence. It appears that the turn has separated the scholars who can afford to call themselves amateurs from those who cannot do that, but both groups "do not depart too far from the intellectual status quo" (Pyle 2018-2019: 12), unwilling to say it openly and in clear terms that the claims about FW are non-hierarchical.

In absence of an "absolute criterion for measuring the relevance of the discourse" (Derrida 1988: 52) and demanded, albeit questioned, "varieties of competence" (Nash 2006: 99), some scholars prioritize their work and time inputs. The concept of time-based

competence has some support in that the time Joyce took to write FW allegedly certifies to its purposefulness and meaningfulness (Bowen 2004: 658, Dettmar 1996: 222, Hutchins 2016: 216, Strong 1939 in Deming 2005: 661, see Burgess 2008: 49).[104] Among the announcements is 1000 hours demanded from a "veritable reader" (Tindall 1959: 240), the number attributed to Thornton Wilder (Nemerov 1975: 654), albeit he used it in a different context (Delpech 1992: 52), and admitted he had "wasted all those hours" (qtd. in Wolf 2018: 48-49). Since "[p]rofessors of English don't have that kind of time" (Mink 1992: 35), 1000 hours may be replaced with "a hundred hours" to "get you into the circle" (Tindall, ibid., see Semmler 1961: 332), whatever that means. It is unlikely that either number of hours has actually been counted. More likely, they were chosen because they looked neat, as neat as "the magic number for true expertise" (Gladwell 2008: 40). If a FW reader "is not measured by time spent but by intelligence and information contributed toward an understanding of the work" (B. Benstock 1965: 4), and scholars can "theorize intelligently about *Finnegans Wake* without actually having gone near it" (Senn 1984: xi), the criterion of intelligence is dubious, all the more so that intelligence is in the eye of the observer.

The real difference between non-specialists and specialists follows this definition of professionalism: the specialist, using Joyce to further an "auspicious career" (Senn 1998-1999: 191), is paid to work on FW (but not necessarily to read it), which privilege does not apply to the "common reader" (Gołąb 2013: 217). The "difference of competence", as Derrida suggested, is about one's membership in the "institution" (1988: 37).

3.3. Prerequisites for Reading

Admitting any prerequisites for reading FW, the exegete reinforces the academic paradigm of hierarchical competence by implying that some readers can arrive faster than others at some knowledge about the text. While laboriousness, diligence, patience have always been among the commonly advertised features of a FW reader, if "the important reading prerequisite is not selectivity nor even quality, as much as it is quantity" (Jenkins 1998: ix), they can all be embraced by the prerequisite called time. The importance of time moves to

---

[104] The time of work would be stressed in nearly every review of the Polish 2012 translation of FW, comparing Joyce's 17 years to Bartnicki's 13 years (see, e.g., Krukowski 2012).

the foreground, or—where the level of entry knowledge about FW is set high—to the "necessary background" (Joe Schork in Hamada 2013: 112).

As time and money are the key prerequisites for participating in international symposia, reading groups, and other "rituals" (Rabaté 2011: 267), they are not the prerequisites for reading FW, which is to say that the decades of the 'ritualised' scholarly discussion of FW have failed to produce a testably better "Joycean knowledge" (ibid.). It is symbolic that in 1941 Harry Levin enjoyed the thought that a prerequisite for reading FW was "a curiosity" (177) and a reader could identify the "well-defined themes" and "characteristic devices" in FW (178), yet his opinion quoted in the 2000s was followed by a list of many titles which symbolise the "collective endeavour" of the "[a]ttempting to understand *Finnegans Wake*" (Fargnoli and Gillespie 2006: 107), and another decade later, even "the ideally educated, polyvocal and poly-national reader" must "hit a few bumps" (Ch. Van Mierlo 2017: 142).

3.4.   The Extraliterary Motivation(s) in the Joyce Industry

While it has been argued throughout the thesis that all claims concerning FW are equally (in)valid, this is against the academic paradigm of hierarchical hermeneutical competence adopted in the Joyce industry. The word "paradigm" is with the sense of Thomas Kuhn (1996). It can be found in the volume of FW exegesis—see, e.g., "the paradigm of the dream" (H. Adams 1990: 155), paradigms of thought (Dumitrescu 2006), FW's "paradigmatic rapport with the letter" (LeBlanc 1999a), paradigmatic reading (Sandulescu 2012d: 7-32); and it appears in texts which present Joyce's work as parallel to Kuhn's (Bohnenkamp 1989: 20, Duszenko 1997, Lernout 1990: 6), still discussions of Kuhn in relation to the Joyce industry, such as Lernout's (1989b: 185), seem rare. If the industry is reluctant to discuss the paradigm in the context of competence, this may be in order not to discuss anomalies that challenge the paradigm.

The existence of the paradigm is confirmed by various statements, appeals, and terms implying a difference of competence, the scholar-amateur dichotomy, assumed actuality of error, absurd, misinterpretation, etc. The paradigm will be called inconsistent because the difference of hermeneutical competence that it assumes is not correlated with coherent criteria or mechanisms for (i) adjudicating conflicts between exegetes on the same level in a hierarchy, (ii) ranking equivalent claims made with different means, and (iii)

ranking different claims made with equivalent means, beside the problem of ranking non-conflicted claims. The same kind of inconsistency is present in the hierarchical models that remove the hermeneutical effect as the criterion for categorisation of claims, replacing it, e.g., with ergometrics (ranking claims by the work-time input), intellectual aesthetics (ranking claims by their style, idiom) or formal markers (ranking claims by the proponent's academic degree). Inconsistency is aggravated by the fact that Wakean exegetes apparently do not rely on one kind of logic and violate the law of contradiction.

But there are some more fundamental reasons why one should dismiss an idea to differentiate interpretive competence about FW. First, the epistemology of FW cannot rely on primitive terms, and so every claim about FW (including this one) is vague, uncertain. What is usually considered a claim is its recipient's conjectural assumption about what the claim says, with its tacitly defined terms. Indeed, it is not even certain what "about FW" mean. The name "FW" is a set of many referents, none of which is intuitive or privileged. Exegetes cannot overcome the epistemic impasse: the more statements about FW are made, the more unfixed the reference of FW becomes, but attempts to fix the reference only result in more statements. The volume of FW exegesis cannot be precisely described. It is large enough to prevent identification and cataloguability of its data, disable appeals to the majority, arguments from statistics, and so on. The volume, or its size, is one reason for the impasse, common in the Joyce industry. Another reason, referring more exclusively to FW, is the inscrutability of the source text, which is due to its language, called Wakese here. In the past, Wakese was miscategorised as English—despite that the position that Wakese is an unknown language is better under Occam's law of parsimony.

When no one has any better hermeneutical competence about FW, yet the paradigm suggests otherwise, the assumption here goes on that the primary motivation why the Joyce industry has used and promoted the paradigm is *extraliterary*, transgressing beyond the hermeneutical concerns with FW as a literary text. The assumption aims to reconcile the fact that the system of FW is initially, inescapably, irreparably restricted by the rule of NMA with the suggestions that there is and should be a difference of competence about FW. In other words, it tries to answer the question why so many people would engage in the examination of FW, which is hermeneutically futile. While any hermeneutical model of literary study privileges one or more elements in the following set: the author – the text – the interpreter – the method – the interpretation (Szahaj 2011), the extraliterary model emphasises the nonliterary aspects of FW. This is opposite to Thomas Kuhn's decision in

his seminal work to discuss paradigm without discussing "external social, economic, and intellectual conditions in the development of the sciences" (1996: xii).

The most obvious extraliterary motivation is economic, following directly from that the Joyce industry is a community of professionals, or, people paid to process FW. At that professional level, the criterion for evaluation of claims can (re)gain consistency, simply put: a claim is acceptable if it serves the Joyce industry. This motivation explains why the industry would not opt for the unknown language position, and why it has abode by the paradigm of competence. Other extraliterary motivations are the psychological one(s) (already discussed in the Introduction), notably, self-defence in the individuals who try not to admit incompetence or ignorance, and the ideological motivation(s) at the super-system levels.[105]

3.4.1. The Joyce Industry in Academic Capitalism

This section aims at describing the Joyce industry, the institution of professionals remunerated for their engagement with Joyce being a "hot academic property" (Lernout 1990: 17). The word 'industry' has "negative connotations" (Meyers 1994: 17), and can be used "disparagingly" (Killeen 2018), associated with the so-called Joyce Wars (Brannon 2003, Hitt 2018), the "particularly aggressive" policing of copyrights by the Joyce Estate (Rimmer 2005), etc., still some of its synonyms are even harsher: "Joyce cult" (Deming 1964: 40 re Kavanagh 1954), "Joyce Mafia" (Jaurretche 1999: 451, O'Shea 1995), though there are more moderate ones too, including "Joyce inflation" (Ezra Pound in Carlin 1994: 133, F. Read 1970: 257), "Joyce enterprise" (Attridge 2009a: xix), "Joyce trade" (Staley

---

[105] Some people in the literary institution admit that "all literature is produced by the literary establishment, in terms of the latter's authoritative and authorizing power structure and *corresponding economic arrangements*" (Alexander Search in Gupta et al. 2017: 17; emphasis added, see ibid., 30), yet "dismiss[] the political verve of scholarship" (Suman Gupta in ibid., 12). Some admit that "all criticism is ineluctably (good Joycean word, that) ideological" (Dettmar 2007: 376), yet do not hasten to say that all ideology is ineluctably economic. Since one can argue things such as that 'culture is the continuation of war by other means' (see Bartnicki 2012c), 'ideology is all about power', 'power is all about money', and so on, the principle assumed here is as follows: Everything belongs to or results from a struggle for resources, therefore everything is economic. Notwithstanding that, for easier distribution of arguments, economy and ideology will be discussed as if they were separate.

2001), "Joyce community" (Abu et al. 2019). The industry knows that except for FW being "awash with money" (Critchley and McCarthy 2005: 184) at the literary level, or even FW being useful to hedge fund managers (T. McCarthy 2018: 183), there is FW plainly as a commodity in the enterprise offering employment (Flood 2012, Yeager 2011: 168), even "an auspicious career" (Senn 1998-1999: 191), social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986), including "power and prestige" (Lernout 1989b: 185), typically convertible into economic capital. "Did you get money / For your Joycean knowledge?", a poet duly asks (Patrick Kavanagh in Pierce 2000: 650).

In the industry commodifying Joyce (Bielenberg 1996, Caines 2016, Chrisp 2019b, Malouf 1999, Nohrnberg 2011: 233, Singh 2009, S. Thompson 1997), the profit drive works not only in academia. One may consider the examples of a translation of FW for the money ("que pour l'argent", Meltz 2003, see also Reich 2015) and a Google-assisted translation that the author called a pointless, egregious joke (A. Roberts 2019b), yet put it on sale anyway (2019a). More openly profit-minded allies of Wakean academics are the publishing industry, travel industry, with hotel services, transport, catering—they would certainly welcome a "*Wake*-day" (Fordham 2013a) for some extra profit beside what is drawn from *Ulysses* around every Bloomsday.[106] Still, the 'Joyce industry' hereinafter will mean the subindustry of scholars, the "allusions industry" (Michael Hollington in Hanna 2009: 62), the "Joycean academic industry" (Brannigan, Ward and Wolfreys 1998: xii). As the term "industry" might vex or offend academics not primarily interested in economy, writing texts with an above-par quality of intellectual craftsmanship, certain clarifications are due. That systemic responsibility should not concern anyone who does not gain a net profit from their work on FW or who can explain how their competence (which sells their work) is better. Still, as the industry is assumed to be a beneficiary of the paradigm of competence *which it cannot justify*, then even such scholars who are not concentrated on the economic aspect of the job benefit from the unjustified paradigm. Anyway, the scholars who try to make Joyce "accessible to the general reader", yet towards a "hierarchical model of reading" (A. Kelly 2010), are wrong regardless of their motivations, which can be different—some (e.g., one's desire to broaden the customer base) aggravating the

---

[106] In 2004, the centenary of Bloomsday, was "a moment of unprecedented commercial exploitation" of Joyce's work (Nolan 2004: 23). After 2012, when Joyce "emerged from copyright", becoming one of the "particularly valuable commodities" (R. Boland 2013), this exploitation must have intensified.

charge of gaining undue advantages, others (e.g., one's wish to disseminate knowledge) mitigating it.[107]

The Joyce industry operates under "academic capitalism" (Münch 2014, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). Its centres are in the USA and Western Europe (Brooker 2014: 25-26). Their "investment in Joyce" (Gibson 2006: 15) is expected to yield a positive ROI. As the industry seeks to have skilled participants, the most appreciated skills are those which help the industry to operate. As the text of FW has been "highly complicated", "enough to keep Ph.D.'s going full speed" (Merton 1969: 543) and the "dearth of easy answers" "has generated a thriving Joyce industry" (E. F. O'Connor 2015: 16), the industry is not at all interested in either easy or definitive answers about FW. In accordance, *mutatis mutandis*, with the worse-is-better philosophy (Gabriel 2000: 8), the industry uses strategies to maximise and privatise profits, while minimising and socialising costs. Under the publish-or-perish pressure, the scholar sticks to a minimal sample of FW, choosing not to read FW, but rather to "quote it, mine for epigrams, footnote it" (S. D. G. Knowles 2008: 98). The economic motivation can explain why FW is "read and written about for status, too often academic" (Sandulescu and Vianu 2015b: 17) and/or is written about without being read (Tindall 1959: 240) by people "more interested in the scholarship than in the writing on which the scholarship is based" (W. Harris 2002). The career-driven newcomer, asked to follow the "intellectual heart, and make it marketable" (Jaurretche 1999: 452), prioritises the latter part. One can assume that many a Wakean academic offered a chance to work in a more profitable enterprise will leave Joyce. The example of Dan Weiss comes to mind: having written a dissertation on FW (2001), he left Joyce for show-running HBO's *Game of Thrones*. Making an example of cost optimisation is text genetics—an interest which, due to the work it requires, does not attract many volunteers (see Lernout 1995: 47-48). Academics choosing a more popular interest, such as postcolonial Joyce, tend to routinise "its protocols" (Wollaeger 2011: 175), or even abuse it ("by nie powiedzieć nadużyciem", Surdykowski 2014: 299) till the "surfeit" of "theoretizations" (Wollaeger, 181).

---

[107] The Joyce industry itself does not always act like a system in which individuals face responsibility for individual actions (such as was the case described in Mutnick 2015). Sometimes it deals in absolutes about collectives. One will consider an open letter to the Joyce community (written as if from outside the community) against "harassment, misogyny, inappropriate behaviour, assault, and other abuses of power in Joyce studies" (Abu et al. 2019) and an answer to that letter mentioning "the Joyce community as a whole" and usurping some knowledge about the "success" of "Joyce studies" (Latham 2018).

Oversupply is the key issue in this discussion. Various reports on the industry (see, e.g., B. Benstock 1966, 1976, Senn 1998-1999, Brockman 2003-2004, M. P. Gillespie 2009) kept coming closer to the implication of the inability to catalogue its production. In these conditions, instances of animosity and uncooperativeness (on that see, e.g., Bowker 2012a, Brannon 2003: xiii, Cornwell 1992: 125, Halper 1972, Meyers 1994: 18-19, Polhemus 1980: 333, Senn 1981: 459, Thornton Wilder in Delpech 1992: 52), ranging from one-on-one clashes (e.g., Dettmar 1999 vs. Booker 1999, L. Knuth 1986, 1987 vs. Lernout 1985, 1987, 1988, Rose and Kidd 1998) driven by a more private "obsession" (Seidel 1986: 520) to hostilities "related to departmental structures" (Nash 1996: 125) and "frictions" between Joycean schools (Lernout 1990: 129) should abound. As the industry maintains overt and covert censorship and self-censorship (see Fordham 2017: 312, Saint-Amour 2011: 35, Senn 2002a), censorship can be used to control internal competition. With haughtiness stereotyped upon the scholar (Vintage Bracketologist 2016, 2017), the people higher in the hierarchy, thinking they are "beyond criticism from upstarts" (Groden 1999: 235) may pass their competition over in *mokusatsu*-like silence. Still, sometimes exegetes are not silent at all. Roland McHugh, for one, having admitted that his reading of other people's texts "grotesquely exceeded the time any reasonable person would devote to a book" (1981: 1), asked the reader to forgo the less useful authors and then aim at "direct confrontation with Joyce's text" (ibid.) via McHugh's book. This gesture is hypocritical (T. Conley 2001: 142, see id. 2017b: 42) only if one does not recognise the tactic to secure a better place on the market. The tactic should be ubiquitous. Possibly, there are just some differences of register and degree of polemical openness.—Some exegetes are at liberty to name the rival (see Faktorovich 2020 vs. Roland McHugh), but others evade particulars, complain against unnamed "critics" (B. Benstock 1965: 42), dislike unnamed "gurus" (McHugh 1981: 1). Some express their disagreement politely, allowing for the personal relation with the opponent (e.g., Lernout 1998 vs Fritz Senn), others have the luxury to be more "opinionated and acerbic" (Senn 1995: 5).

As James Joyce was "always keen to 'sell' his work to critics" (Nash 1996: 309, see Patterson and Brown 2000), so academics are keen to sell theirs, but in order to do that they cannot give up their status of an expert. This explains the need for the paradigm of competence. Their self-promotion is tasked to remove any suggestion that scholarship is "irrelevant to the practice of reading" (Brannon 2003: xiii). They stress their value.—As "newcomers to the text inevitably sense" a "literary otherness" (Devlin 1991: ix), the

newcomers who "want to know more" should "turn to guidebooks and commentaries" (McHugh 1981: 1), "for help" (Attridge 2004b: 9). Some texts in the industry are brazen in making the promise of leasing the means of useful interpretive production as early as in the title (e.g., Campbell and Robinson 1976, Epstein 2009, Rose and O'Hanlon 1982, Tindall 1996; see Deppman 2009 on titles). Making assurances that FW is "open to the majority of the population" (Attridge 2001: 33) is a logical move to enlarge the group of customers, though conflicted with another one, namely, that the difficulty of Joyce's work is meant to constrain easy consumption (Eagleton 2005: 295). Saying that "the resources that exist to expound the text should be utilized to the fullest extent" (Rocco 2016: n.pag. [1]), meant to persuade people into buying those resources, is understandable in Capitalism, albeit it is colonially abusive to readers outside the wealthy centre.[108]

As the scholar had decades to become aware of some basic failure to understand FW, the man in the street who may have realised that intuitively—and sooner—should be called a peer, or even a better, exegete. Admitting that peerage would force the industry to open up to mass competition, what would make their oversupply worse, while questioning the scholar's right to advertise their exegesis as a better product. While "the changing nature of Joyce's audience" (Lerm Hayes and Pyle 2017-2018: 201) induces texts "far from the purview of traditional academics" (ibid., 202), it looks as if the scholar continues to reserve the right to deign these different texts "recognition in forums like *JJQ*" (ibid.). Instead of admitting nonliterary reactions to FW in popular culture as equivalent exegesis, the scholar rejects them, saying, e.g., that James Joyce makes "references to the popular" not "seriously" (K. E. Williams 2018: 14). The disinformation that academic competence is better than lay competence spreads thanks to academic institutional structures, access to mass media, as well as degrees, titles, and other attributes of "symbolic capital" (Bourdieu 1996: 291), which can intimidate non-academic exegetes. One detects certain intimidation in Peter O'Brien's case, whose art reaction to FW (2018a) was performed only after 40 years of his struggle with FW as a novel (2018b). The artist, in deference to academia, dared not to claim *more* competence, even though his work makes more sense of FW to more people than a scholarly text does.

---

[108] The 8 books that make the "survival tools for *Finnegans Wake*" (Gioia 2013) are valued at ca. 210 Euro (paperback if possible; shipping costs excluded; prices from Amazon.de website, March 2019), i.e. ca. 900 Polish Złoty. The living wage in Poland is 920 Polish Złoty (per capita in household of four; Sep. 2018), the minimum subsistence level is 580 Polish Złoty (May 2018), the minimum wage is 1600 Polish Złoty (net, 1st quarter of 2019) [source: GUS, Poland].

It also appears that a man in the street who would like to read FW and is looking for professional help will be expropriated of some most basic terms. That is, FW is never *simple*. Instead of confirming that FW is *simply* nonsense, the newcomer will be given texts about how FW is either no nonsense or is a special kind of nonsense. Similarly, FW is not *simply* unreadable—it is unreadable in some sophisticated way that an erudite scholar is willing to reveal, making FW "*intensely* readable" (Fordham 2012b: xxix). Even where FW *is* called "simply unreadable" (Pierce 2013: 301), the Wakean scholar writes more on the subject as if a *simple* unreadability should demand that. There is no "simple text" in FW (M. Norris 1976: 117) or it "is lost in the design" (Tindall 1996: 13) or it is under "the linguistic embroidery, embellishment, and just plain obfuscation" (LeBlanc 1999b: 297). Claims that FW is just overrated, one of the "perfect springboards for interminable, non-concrete speculation" that "the universities and cultural institutes adore" (Fahy 2017) meet calls to patience—FW is "far from having been "assimilated" (Galindo 2017), and judging it is premature (Barger 2017). Perhaps judging it will never be possible if "the deeper we dig", the "greater and greater theoretic resignation" (id. 1997: 389). This resignation is not called *simply* ignorance; instead one may read about "an irreducible ignorance" (Colangelo 2018: 242-243), or nescience, or aporias, and so on.

This is not to say that academic texts should not be eloquent, but this is to say that a simple observation can do without scholastically verbose analyses. However, the industry has its reasons to burden simplicity with sophistry. One, as suggested, is professional: the industry that produces texts should avoid coming to any final conclusions. "Nothing with Joyce is ever easy" (Slote 2018: 405)—eighty years past the prototext, these words should signal a hermeneutical fiasco, but paraphrased as: "Nothing with Joyce is ever over", they indicate a strength in the SWOT analysis of the academic business. Another reason for not keeping things simple belongs in the ideologies of relativism that dismantle the otherwise operational differences between simple and complex, worthy and unworthy of deliberation. In the epistemic impasse, the industry cannot (in addition to that it will not) return to the state when one could have primitive notions in their discussion about FW. The removal of simple is symbolic in the example of "And he war" (FW 258.12), three words in English, in which one was still able to notice German words (Derrida 1984), Danish "og han var" (McHugh 1991: 258), references to Northumbrian *Cursor Mundi* and *Huckleberry Finn* (Reisman 2009a), Heidegger and Anaximander (Slote 2003: 196), an "anagrammatical encoding of the proper name Yahwe" (Armand 2001) and much more. But on seeing such

discoveries, the newcomer is likely to think that FW requires hyperinventiveness, yet when too many data fail to synthesize into coherence, the newcomer is not expected to go back and reconsider the process of interpreting, but is encouraged to keep looking for more data and context, to "read forwards and backwards, above all to reread" (P. A. McCarthy 1997: 153), to participate maximally in the "act of meaning meaning" (Whitley 1998: 173), and accept "an active role in piecing together clues" (Attridge 2004b: 7). The teacher's advice that the student should be active serves the teacher wonderfully—the student is encouraged to aim for exactly the sort of competence which the student-teacher relation has theretofore disadvised, to take responsibility for the exegetical co-product, and to provide labour, but with no such remuneration that the teacher receives. When the product's quality turns out to be unsatisfactory, the disillusioned student may choose to abandon FW, but by then the academic has sold some texts. Trying to keep the consumer on the demand side for longer, the supply side offers texts in which scholars say how other scholars are wrong, and design new models of reading. For instance, the customer may be informed about two modes of reading, the way of a 'cicada' [the reader goes straight into the text, without much care for meaning] and the way of an 'ant' [or a scholar making preparations for a scrupulous study] ("Cicala" and "Formica", Pedone and Terrinoni 2017b: 1, see also "the manner of a grasshopper" and "the way of ant", Fordham 2012b: xxix). But this is a mock choice if no 'cicada' would buy an academic text to learn how to read without academic texts. So, while Joyce may have aimed for "the ordinary reader" (C. Hart 1962: 27), the academic fails to explain why that ordinary reader should ever be guided by a specialist.

In another marketing move to keep the consumer interested, FW is advertised as fun, associated with some ludic experience, implied to bear the quality of a play, a game (Ferguson 2014ab, Latham 2015, Quadrino 2018a), to be transferable into modern media, even a computer video-game. Contrary to various advertisements, not one project of FW gamification made it past the stage when people "fantasize about exactly how such a thing might be devised" (Sean Latham qtd. in O'Connell 2012; see also Kidney 2017 and L. Weir 2018 on two *Ulysses* gamification projects). What one sees in academic remediations of FW (e.g., Wróblewski and Bazarnik 2016) is that they do not dispute the tenets that FW is a novel, Joyce's work, and in English (see Bazarnik and Wróblewski 2017, Wróblewski 2016). Nor are the tenets called into question by such academic projects which turn the Internet into a supplementary channel of reception (see Barlow 2018). Enrolling Joyce in the Digital Age (see Groden 1997, Ito 2019, Kera 1999, Theall 1997), even as its patron

saint or prophet (Lillington 1998, Mills 2015, see Barry 2012: 168, 2014: 225, T. McCarthy 2015ab) may be meant to imply that the text of FW holds the similar potential for entertainment that the web-wide world does, still the Internet is a mass producer of text in oversupply, and of dissatisfying quality on average. In the environment of fast-changing infotainment, FW cannot become a read. Instead, it is reduced to a curiosity, akin to projects of uncreative writing (Goldsmith 2011), a concept noted for the concept's sake, and not for longer than the Warhol unit. Joyce and FW often rank as high culture (M. Morris 2018), so, are fit as brands which a politician (see Rennix 2020) or a member of the entertainment industry (see Quadrino 2018b) mentions to suggest intellectual poshness.

According to various descriptions, FW is hilarious and serious, philosophical and vulgar, high and low. Not meant as a niche text, it behaves as one, "doomed to an elitist audience" (Bloom 2020: 154). It is "between phenomenology and technology" (Herr 1999), it is a piece of literature or an aesthetic object (Sowa 2010: 278), it is revolutionary (Platt 2014: 113) and counterrevolutionary (Philip Rahv in Segall 1993: 104), it is claimed by both modernists and postmodernists (Hermans 2017: 223), culture and counterculture (Wiśniewska 2010: 349). With little effort it can serve any agenda. But this is a weakness of FW as a commodity: no consistent vision of its target reader, which inconsistency one can trace back to Joyce, playing different roles—a great writer in English, the author of *Ulysses*, a celebrity carving a "selective version" of himself (McCourt 2012: 103), a linguist worried that FW may be too difficult, hence a self-commentator coming to the rescue, shedding some interpretive light, but not enough, hesitant whether to prioritize the linguistic unorthodoxy over his "jealous[y] of Shakespeare's audience" (Bloom 1994: 423) or vice versa.

Satisfying the potential to serve various agendas contributed to the overabundance of FW exegesis. Its volume grows even on claims about its growth, e.g., whether "the sheer mass of *Wake* studies" is "disastrous" (P. A. McCarthy 1984: 626) or not quite (Erzgräber 1986: 363), or whether the "prospects for Joyce studies are bright" (Attridge 2009a: xx), but the minimisation of FW in Joyce studies will advance (see ibid., xviii, Latham 2002: 120, Terrinoni 2012: 13). Not only can the industry pull newcomers "into the force field of the book's complex reputation before they ever lay eyes on page 3" (Saint-Amour 2001: 125), being then, in the words of James Simpson, "relentlessly preemptive, buying up the discursive space before the interpretive transaction takes place" (qtd. in Joy 2009), but it is

apparently ready to turn any criticism of FW exegesis into FW exegesis (see Graff 2002: 3-4), and use voices against recourse to exegetical epitext to generate epitext.

While the industry advertises and sells competence (on the level of literary study) that it cannot coherently justify, this is not unique. Nor is it exclusive for the industry to misinform the customer that the production is under control since there is a canon of its *acquis* known to all, and Wakeans academics do not "fall[] victim to the most common of scholastic anxieties: the fear of being exposed as a person who does not know as much as everyone else" (M. P. Gillespie 2009: 213). The oversupply in the Joyce industry participates in the oversupply on the Internet and the oversupply in the publishing industry, where Lem's Law, "No one reads; if someone does read, he doesn't understand; if he understands, he immediately forgets" (1986: 2) is true, and also in the oversupply in the humanities, with such an "unmasterability of the domain" (Culler 2007: 79) that not only is there no canon of texts to be read, but there is no canon of texts one should "feel guilty about not having read" (ibid.), and a mission to build "our new literary canon" (Popova 2013a) is utopian, so thinking about Joyce as a canonical writer is as wishful as that he is "anti-canonical" (Cheng 1996-1997: 81). Nor is unique Joyce industry's ethical position to turn the exercises at interpretive futility into profit, or, what one might call "commercial cynicism" (Weninger 2012: 36).[109] The criticism of the industry could be applied to other players in the Western humanities. Perhaps only in making economic use of the charges of its hermeneutical impotence by selling texts about its impotence is the Joyce industry more radical or peculiar (Graff 2002: 8) than other industries dealing with oversupply.

Oversupply has its advantages though, and the Joyce industry knows that. The giant size of the volume of exegesis can be good—old readings are undetected as they undergo recycling and are sold "as if for the first time" (Latham 2002: 120). Oversupply disperses responsibility and accountability among too many exegetes to name. Thanks to oversupply, the industry reduces the risk of having to defend itself against a single front of criticism—the diversity of products makes it impossible to pinpoint the core claims that one could oppose.[110] Since it takes a lot of time to learn what propositions the industry has made, or

---

[109] On ethics of interpreting FW see Bartnicki 2012c, Halper 1971: 6, see also Alexandrova 2016, Eide 2002.

[110] The industry appeals to diversity with what one may call the reverse of the 'no true Scotsman' fallacy. An example of that is, in response to Jordan Peterson's criticism of feminism, Marion Trejo's defence that Peterson makes "use of radical feminism as a synecdoche for feminism generally" (in Burgis et al. 2020: 186). The situation with FW study is even more troublesome than in the above

enough of them to start suspecting they were not made by a more competent interpreter, then, until enough people sacrifice time to become able to contest the production *en masse*, the industry can successfully pretend being competent. As this voice against the paradigm wants to disrupt that usurpation of competence, it will point to certain inconsistencies in the professional's slogans, adapting arguments against the postmodern rejection of truth (Hicks 2004: 184) to work against the Joyce industry: If truth about FW is relative, how dares anyone in the industry say anything in belief that what they say is solid? If "[t]here is no Truth; there are only truths, and truths change" (ibid., 78), why will not the professional sit through their urge to talk, leaving their truths unexpressed till they have been replaced by the subsequent truths (and then wait till the next truths have been replaced by the next ones)? If "[a]ll interpretations are equally valid" (ibid.. 20), how can anyone recognise mis- or overinterpretation? If "[c]onflict and contradiction are the deepest truth of reality" (ibid., 65), why should not a professional in the industry contradict every claim they themselves make? How can the professional praise the novelty of FW, but their own "text comes to us nicely coherent" while it should "itself be paranomasial and chaotic" (Leitch 1983: 262)? Why would the Joyce industry impose any principles at all, almost dogmatically? Is it not so because the purpose of the text principle is to keep FW as a product whose exegesis is sold by departments of literature? Is not the purpose of the language principle to preserve FW as an interest of English studies? (And if its Englishness is in question, why is the question the property of the Anglophone scholar?) Is not the author principle in the service of Capitalist copyright law?

Except the *mokusatsu* method, there are basically two ways of answering the charge that the professional in the Joyce industry does not try to practise what they preach. In one, the professional calls the self-contradictory diversity a good thing, better than resolving contradictions by removing the defeated knowledge from the volume. It will be argued that such diversity should be repudiated and that the paradigm adopted in the humanities is pernicious. The problem with diversity is that it does not submit claims to evaluation with firm consequences. As Wakeans call one another's ideas worse than their own, out of their conflict there never really emerges either the victor or the defeated party. There has never been invalidated a line of thinking about FW, an approach degraded, its literature removed from the market, the customer forewarned about any discredited concepts. The industrial

___

example, as the volume of FW exegesis accepts claims that one may call right, their apparently opposite claims that may be right too, and, like in the joke about the rabbi settling a dispute, their paradoxical cohabitation is also right.

system of FW knowledge seems to be designed to never see a revolution in the Kuhnian sense (1996). It has no hard core (Lakatos 1968-1969: 168)—if it had, it would be a canon. The "protective belt" (ibid., 169) is not made of hypotheses concerning the interpretation of FW. It is at the metalevel—the industry will deny anything that threatens the industry.

Without constraints that result in the removal of poor data, the volume of exegesis could but grow. At some point, this empire had to collide under its weight, contributing to the humanist's "profound anxiety about our authority and legitimacy as interpreters" (Jaurretche 1999: 454) occasionally interspersed with a yearning for the time "when we knew less about *Finnegans Wake*" (S. Thompson 2012: 17). As the industrial study of FW is not exempt from the crisis in the Western academic capitalism (on that see Crane 2018, Marche 2019, Mueller 2019), FW is special if the rule NMA that results from the loss of primitive notions is more uniquely FW's. The problem of diversity will be unsolvable as long as the ideas how to break the epistemic impasse are simply more texts drowning in the volume. One such idea (found only because pure luck would have it) is in Sebastian D. G. Knowles's book *At Fault: Joyce and the Crisis of the Modern University*.[111] Knowles prescribes the return to "risk" "removed from university education" (Jaurretche 2019-2020: 200). But since taking risk is meant there as approaching Joyce "boldly, innovatively, and without constraints" (ibid.), Knowles is looking for more 'diversity', so, his prescription is counterproductive. Moreover, it probably disregards the "unease" at "the idea of exploiting Joyce in less obvious ways" (Beja and Benstock 1989: xi) [while both parties disregard the risk of exploiting Joyce intellectually for profit]. The range of risk-taking is circumscribed by the industry's internal policies. One may easily suspect that the risk of submitting, say, a pro-Nazi interpretation of FW would not be welcome. For ideological reasons, the industry might not even applaud someone taking the risk to call a Nazist FW as criminal as a Communist one (the latter provided by S. Thompson 2012). As the risk-taker should "balance a hermeneutic of suspicion" by means of "ethical practice" (S. D. G. Knowles 2007: 2), the call to take risk is under the guise of appealing to mores, but only such mores that the industry prescribes.

The other way of justifying the indiscriminate generation and accumulation of data received from FW is to appeal to economic reason. Choosing that, the professional stops making "[g]lib moralistic denunciations of profit-making" (Alexander Search in Gupta et al. 2017: 9), "admit[s] to their entrepreneurialism" (ibid., 30) and admits that, at the scale

---

[111] As Capitalism would have it, the book was too expensive and so was approached only through reviews.

of the industry, diversity sells better than the model of competitive approaches in which the output of the losing approach is removed from the market. While the professional in this scenario confirms the extraliterary motivation, one can specify the variety of Capitalism in which the industry operates. When the professional profits from the paradigm, yet does not explain how/why their expertise is better than that of their competition outside the industry, this can mean false advertising (omitting vital information about the producer). When the professional does not accept the 1939 prototext as the source text but prepares or assists in the publication of a new source text variant, yet cannot provide a good reason for that (discussing the scale and validity of the differences between the variants), this can mean misinforming the customer in order to trick him or her into purchasing more of the same. The variety which condones such false advertising and in which the producer can lie to the consumer if that can increase their profit is an extremely laissez-faire model of free market Capitalism.

3.4.2. Ideological Aspects of the Joyce Industry

While, as assumed, the main reason for having paradigmatized the model of competence that prioritises the interpretive authority of the academic in the Joyce industry, typical for the whole "literary institution" (Newton 1986: 8), is professional (*economic*), one should not omit other extraliterary motivations which influence the result of interpreting. One can expect, for instance, that there are psychological factors which underlie the assumption that some positive knowledge about FW is available. But the process of interpreting FW in academia is also submitted to various ideological factors at the supersystem levels.

Since the Joyce industry operates in Western Capitalism, one of its (meta)tasks is to support, promote, propagate Western axiologies. Saying that Joyce is not "the patrimony of an exclusive Anglo-American club" (Caneda Cabrera 2006: 147) is true insofar as there are other members of the Western club: France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland. Ireland is a recent member, driven to reclaim Joyce (McCourt 2012: 101, 2014: 62-63, Platt 1998: 233, see Conner 2007: 138, Parsons 2007: 135, R. A. Wilson 1988) from other members, notably London, in what one may call "an act of colonial vengeance" (Eagleton 2005: 290, see Mays 1998: 26). The industry is burdened with the Western bias, or, "fetish of the West" (Lazarus 2004), translating itself into neglect of non-Western perspectives

(Armand 2002b: xxiv-xxv, see Lernout 1989b: 178-181). Symbolically, German words were found in the FW line chosen by Derrida (1984), and not, say, "hewar" in Kurmanji. As Danis Rose wondered who could have guessed that *jisty* and *pithy* in FW echo Russian verbs (1995: 148), the answer is: every user of a Slavonic language. Patrick O'Neill's book on translations of FW (2013), with the "downside of parochialism" (Kearns 2017b: 221), neglects major Asiatic achievements. Texts such as Lernout and Van Mierlo's (2004ab) are exceptions to West-centrism, but still are written in English. What is not Western oft does not even have its own name, but is made to carry the vassalised adjective—"non-Western" (e.g., in Barlow 2018, Ledwith 2019, Schotter 2010: 90, 101).

In a couple of decades of institutionalising the industry the West was colonial,[112] then neocolonial, with English-speaker's cultural imperialism that replaced direct military control. The industry is not postcolonial, certainly not in the sense of anti-colonialism. If one agrees with this, then Joyce is no longer "*oddly* united in colonizing enterprise of non-Western worlds" (Pelaschiar 2015: xiii; emphasis added). As the industry tries to "export" Joyce by recolonising "the former pockets of refreshing resistance to Western cultural dominance" (Kosters 2010: 69), it sees a potential in China. It may not have a cultural foothold there though—even in the 1980s the "avant-gardist writings like Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* were criticised in China for having no great literary merit" (Gu 2006: 206). The print run of 8000 copies of a Chinese partial translation of FW in 2013 was, considering the population of China, a dud. The reason for calling it a "hit", a "bestseller" (Kaiman 2013), "success" (Luo 2013: 49), could be part of the typical Western blurbing activity. One can imagine why Western media would invest more attention in the Chinese work than in the translations made in Greece and Serbia. The industry has disregarded the non-academic translators of FW in Argentina (Zabaloy 2017), France (Malette 2018: 107-110), and Russia (Rene 2018).[113]

Where the industry, eager to expand, advertises FW as making one "feel what the universally human is and what universal man is" (Finn Fordham qtd. in Fernández Vicente 2019: 34) or asserts, e.g., that FW is "not a Western work insofar as it succeeds in speaking

---

[112] The American "neocolonial system of client states" (Chomsky and Herman 1979: ix) aside, post-WW2 colonialism of Western Europeans was evident in "Indochina, Indonesia, Algeria and Egypt; Malaya, Kenya, Angola, Guinea, Mozambique and the Spanish Sahara" (T. Snyder 2019).

[113] Another factor why a translation receives more coverage in the West is the translator's belonging to the academic milieu. It played a role in the 2019 Dublin roundtable on translating FW (with academics from China, Italy, and the Netherlands).

for the entire planet" (Brivic 2008: 184), its message, the patronising tone aside, is false (if one agrees that there is much more than Western to universally human) and pernicious (if it is not good to universalize the axiologies of the Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic [WEIRD] economies). It seems that for promotion the industry will conceal its actual motivations beneath slogans about some noble values it would make associable with Joyce. Richard Ellmann, for example, by championing Joyce among other Irish writers, "would, like the liberating American armies and navy, help to build a new European ideal" and "rescue the humanist content of European modernism after the Holocaust" (Kiberd 2005: 245). This goes against the assumption that armies fight for resources, not for ideals. It will be left to one's imagination how the phrase "rescuing the humanist content" might be perceived in the post-1945 Poland that had suffered "irreparable losses" (Anna Fotyga in Fishman 2007: 63) while the USA, ignoring the likes of Jan Karski, in due time paid the Holocaust "little heed" (Finkelstein 2000: 13). For historical reasons too, "a communist *Finnegans Wake*" (S. Thompson 2012) can easily annoy Wakeans in the countries where Communism or Soviet-controlled Socialism was not in a Gucci edition.[114] Embedding FW in the context of "scientific racism" as a "landmark feature of *common European* culture" (Platt 2007: 93; emphasis added) is incorrect and insulting if it tries to link colonial guilt to all of Europe.[115] Praising FW for setting up a 'transnationalism' different from Marxist and Fascist internationalism (Sollers 2007) is most suspect given the historical context—the praise was given in 1975 at a Joyce conference in France (with her rather fresh memories of Vichy, Algerian War, May 68), by the founder of the *Tel Quel* magazine which in 1971 broke with French Communists only to support Chinese Marxists, and whose "attempt to align" FW with Mao Zedong might even be considered "fascistic" (J. Davies 2005: 16-17).

---

[114] Coming from a country of the Soviet Bloc is required to understand Communism in Europe, but it does not suffice. The Hungarian voice (albeit in English) asserting that "the fate of Joyce's works in the Eastern Bloc was heavily influenced by an ideological condemnation" (Mecsnóber 2013: 7) is wrong or inaccurate. It is wrong in not excluding FW more expressly from "Joyce's works" (ibid., 8) since the opacity of FW made it immune to censorship. Or it is inaccurate if it blames Communism even though (e.g.) Japan obstructed Joyce studies in Korea (Chong-keon 1990: 466), Joyce "was marginalized in Denmark" (Caneda Cabrera 2006 144), and censored in Francoist Spain (ibid., 146), but "never banned in Croatia" (ibid., 142).

[115] The assumption made here is that *state-run racist* colonialism is a Western invention. If one chose to regard the USSR as a non-Western colonial state, because the USSR under Stalin underwent "internal colonization" (Snyder 2020: 159), or, "self-colonization" (ibid., 249), it would be noted that the concept of racial superiority does not agree with that the Soviet state mass murdered its own people.

But there is more in the industry than the hypocrisy of its neocolonialism—certain hypocrisy is also detected in the politicization of Joyce. His political affiliations were named—socialism and anarchism (Manganiello 1992, see D. Weir 1997: 220, Platt 1998: 13 fn. 7, Segall 1993: 14, Yee 1997: 126) against Joyce's "no wish to codify" himself "as anarchist or socialist or revolutionary" (qtd. in Balinisteanu 2015: 11). Being an example of how Joyce's word can be twisted to suit one's eisegetic purpose is that Joyce's "refusal of 'codifying' his identity" as anarchist can be read as "itself an anarchist stance" (ibid.). Helmut Bonheim saw FW as a text in which Joyce called "to seek freedom" from "oppression of any kind" (1964: 127) and Dominic Manganiello 'hijacked' that view where he insisted that Joyce's call was "in keeping with Joyce's anarchistic temperament (although Bonheim denies it so)" (2016: 224).

Certainly, if James Joyce's anarchism should mean making any kind of objection, it could manifest itself in anticolonialism, antinationalism, anarcho-feminist sexual liberation (Hogan 2014: 3), the Irish rebel (Rabaté 2001: 26), or even in James Joyce's opposition to anarchism. However, if Joyce's anarchism is so successful that it is able to rebel against itself, it is self-refuting. Apparently, such paradoxes are welcome in the industry—Joyce can be antitheist (B. Benstock 1961: 437) yet with "religious enthusiasm" (Robert Boyle in Jaurretche 1997: 5), and FW can be formidably anti-fascist (Carnell 1994, see Fordham 2017: 315-317, Ledwith 2019) though it revisits proto-fascism (Lilly 1999: 107).

If "everything is political" (see Middleton 1982: 204), then the political key to FW is as unproductive as it is all-encompassing. But perhaps not everything is *meant* to be said (and become political). Tellingly, no one in the industry seems to have proposed to wonder if Joyce's comments made in the late 1930s: "Let us leave the Czechs in peace and occupy ourselves with *Finnegans Wake*" (qtd. in Mercanton 1963: 107) and "Let them leave Poland in peace and occupy themselves with *Finnegans Wake*" (ibid., 114), megalomaniac or not (Mahaffey 1998: 35, 143), did not advocate anarchy, but rather signalled his desire for *peace*—or appeasement. As the industry has had a professional interest in keeping the brands "Joyce" and "FW" away from any affiliations that could taint them, the ideologues trying to exploit the brands would not like them to depreciate as well. The exegesis of FW in the industry has been reflecting the ideological condition of the West. Since, with time passing, after some kite-flying and flag-raising, Western intellectuals grew unashamed to utter things like "Nazism was a humanism" (Badiou 2008: 175) and "humanism is a kind of fascism" (Jacques Derrida in Veith 1993: 178), one of the major ideological turns that

affected the industry was to offer more room to Marxism, in whose spirit the political Joyce arose in Paris, 1975 (see Rabaté 2011: 267), or, to the "School of Resentment", as Harold Bloom called it, with its 6-7 branches: "Feminists, Marxists, Lacanians, New Historicists, Deconstructionists, Semioticians" (1994: 527) and "Afrocentrists" (ibid., 20). Bloom disliked the School of Resentment for its wish to overthrow the Western literary canon (ibid., 4), but he would see FW in the canon, likely setting a trap for himself since the more firmly canonical a text is, the more likely it is to be intercepted by the School for ideological purposes. FW has been used in many a Marxist reading of Joyce, e.g., Patrick McGee's (2001), revisiting contributions made by "feminism, queer theory, post-colonialism" (Plock 2005: 2) and other partisans of the School.

The history of Marxist interest in Joyce and his (exegete's) interest in Marxism is one of a change (Herr 1988, P. Hitchcock 1999: 55, Moretti 1988: 339, Segall 1990: 536-537), from initial Soviet criticism (Radek 1934, see Segall 1993: 27-35, Tate 1996: 141-142) to such revisions in the Western approaches to Marxism that would grant unabashed discussion of Joyce via Marxist criticism (Booker 1990, 2000, Eagleton 1990, Jameson 1990, MacCabe 1979), even holding "special strengths" (Osteen 2002: 602). From the exegete with insights into Joyce's soul that could strengthen J. Edgar Hoover's suspicion that Joyce is a communist (Culleton 2004), one could learn that "Joyce was a socialist" (Fodaski Black 1995: 195), ready to adapt "Marx's description of a future communist society" (Manganiello 2016: 70, see ibid., 112) and he "would have read *The Communist Manifesto*" (McGee 2001: 220, see S. Thompson 2012: 27). The shift in Marxist approach to FW may have matched what Stanisław Stomma called in Polish 'mądrość etapu', or, the wisdom of the phase. The same kind of wisdom may have made Joyce serve the feminist discourse *despite* that James Joyce, a dead white European male and feminism are "strange bedfellows" (J. Johnson 2004: 196).[116] This is how Marxism (or the School of Resentment) tries to take control over the discursive field: making famous people to speak in their favour and endorse their cause even though these people are not their ideological allies, that is, to treat them as some kind of poputchiks, useful idiots in the sense attributed to Lenin, preferably with works in the public domain and being dead since the dead cannot

---

[116] Such re-evaluations that may remind one of Orwellian rectification (and Marxist self-criticism, and Stalinist censorship) can be found on much subtler levels. Harry Levin wrote in 1939 that Joyce in FW alludes to "the sickle and the hammer" (qtd. in Deming 2005: 703); later, the allusion was to "Lenin and Marxism" (1941: 197).

oppose being appropriated. The practice reminds one of the Joyce industry's ability to turn any criticism of the industry into texts that belong to and even reinforce the industry.[117]

If "Joycean language reshaped Lacanian theory" (Massiha and Omar 2013: 204), and FW made "some seminal post-1950s innovations in the field of modern literary theory and criticism" possible (Zangouei 2012: 31), then it seems that FW used to have a more single, vital role in the School of Resentment, but after the School had exploited Joyce, he may have lost most of its value to the School, FW then becoming just one title in a myriad of texts in the Digital era.

What somewhat ironically agrees with the Postmodern disapproval of certainty is that the ideologues of today who would still like to use the brand of FW may be unable to present their cause in clear terms. On the one hand, Jordan Peterson names the "corrupted" disciplines in Western academia: women's studies, racial studies, sociology, anthropology, English literature, as he embraces them with the label: "postmodern Neo-Marxism" (2017); on the other hand, some Marxists do not believe in "a fruitful consummation of postmodernist and Marxist outlooks" (Rikowski and McLaren 2002: 3). Peterson is a member of the so-called Intellectual Dark Web (B. Weiss 2018), a very ideologically diverse union of people, yet he receives criticism mainly from the left (Burgis et al. 2020). Harold Bloom is hardly a political friend of Peterson's, still he implies that the "plague" of American academia are "pseudo-Marxists" (1996: 166). So-called Cultural Marxism is either a real and dangerous ideology of terror (Karoń 2019) or a label for the historical work of the Frankfurt School in the 1930-40s (Mendenhall 2019) or just an alt-right meme (Moyn 2018). Neo-Marxists enjoy living in Western Capitalism and they use all the filters of Western propaganda (for which see Herman and Chomsky 1988: 2), perhaps hesitant only about anti-Communism.[118] Post-truth, a concept for the absence of standards of truth replaced by emotions, has been linked to the right (Sim 2019: 2-3), while Postmodernism, whose leaders "are Left" (Hicks 2004: 94), can be accused of "the disinformation" that "people ingest" and "the vitriol" that they "spit out" (Kay 2020). Some Marxists call Postmodernism "the cultural logic" of Capitalism (Jameson 1997), but it can be difficult to agree on a definition of Capitalism when the "empires of today" are "China, America, Russia; Amazon, Google, Facebook" (T. Snyder 2019). In this confusion, as the 21st

---

[117] Given the differences between 'rituals' in Nazism and Stalinism (Žižek 2018), it is Stalinist in nature.

[118] It is not clear what Communism or Socialism means today if National Socialism can be "a right-wing phenomenon" (Feldstein 1997: 123) or "[w]orkplaces are fascist" (Nouri in Graeber 2018: 67).

century sees that texts announcing the end of Postmodernism grow more commonplace, the successor is "yet undefined" (Peters, Tesar, and Jackson 2018: 1299).

From one point of view, what succeeds Postmodernism is (Neo-)Marxism. The postmodernist who "rejects the notion that literary texts have objective meanings and true interpretations" (Hicks 2004: 16, see Brożek 2014: 70) concludes that "no canonical manner of interpretation can be reliably derived" (J. Peterson qtd. in Taylor 2018), and the Marxist is *post*-Postmodern in drawing one crucial conclusion further: the way to express one's interpretation is with power struggle (ibid.). Marxist assertoric practice is violent, prescribing—along with intolerant "liberating tolerance" (Marcuse 1969: 109), Political Correctness (Geser 2010: 6), call-out culture, etc.—what one should and should not say, and who is more and who is less welcome to speak: the underprivileged should be given voice, while the privileged, the white, boomers, mansplainers and others should self-censor themselves lest they be censored more severely by others. As a result of such pressures, life—including life in the Joyce industry—"requires constant vigilance, fear, and self-censorship" (Lukianoff and Haidt 2018: 72), as "justice and open debate" are threatened by the "forces of illiberalism" (Ackerman et al. 2020).

These considerations should not be taken as a voice in favour of any side or one in the debate whether Western, notably American academia, should be socially engaged (Wilkinson 1994) or instead focused on ideology-free knowledge since the "real purpose of academic research is to seek truth" (Ho 2014: 9). Still, it will be pointed out that a decision to call FW Postmodern makes the extraliterary criterion for evaluation of claims about FW inoperative since Postmodernism, preaching that "language is too imprecise to guarantee the truth of anything we say" (Sim 2019: 5), is self-refuting. However, if *post*-Postmodern objectivity and truth are determined in political struggle (Angermuller 2018: 2-3), then Marxism, where it can enforce its agenda, could restore some consistency in the evaluation of claims, with this extraliterary criterion: 'more acceptable' means 'more useful to our ideology'. Marxist attempts at calling Marxism "truer" (Solecki 1993: 560) in order to expand the area where they enforce their hierarchy are, first of all, against the *nemo iudex in causa sua* principle, and more importantly, invalid in assuming that Marxism can make 'truer' observations at a metalevel of assessing ideologies. In short, the ideological ranking of claims about FW can be consistent only where and when the ideologue controls the discursive field, and can employ censorship to "avoid the *tu quoque* response" (ibid., 559) by not letting that response even appear.

What follows is aimed against the Neo-Marxist (just like it would be against any other) system of privileging some claims at the expense of others *without consistency*. Where the ideologue opposes privileges (e.g., class, gender, race, age, IQ, height, religion, disability, technology, wealth privileges and others), whether with good or bad intent, and recommends that voice be given to the underprivileged—a great inconsistency is in that after one defined the nature of oppression and identified the oppressed, still non-oppressed people hold positions of power and privilege to act on behalf of the oppressed. E.g., "the practitioners of postcolonial studies" are "predominantly situated in, or products of, the U.S. academy" (Cheng 2005: 25). While Cheng calls it a "paradox" that:

> "the very structures of authority through which [the] texts and voices seeking social change must be channeled in order to even have an audience are the very structures and institutions they are trying to overcome" (ibid., 20),

this is not quite paradoxical once we acknowledge the economic motivation in the Joyce industry. If so, the Joyce industry is no different from a system of privileging the defenders of social justice, in which, as a Polish saying would go, "lud pije szampana ustami swoich przedstawicieli", the people drink champagne through the throats of their representatives. As the beneficiaries take privileged positions to discuss the plight of the underprivileged, they rationalise their behaviour, e.g., by telling themselves that they have the right to be beneficiaries as long as they are aware of their privilege and feel a moral obligation to pay it 'back' or 'forward' (see Helen Lewis in J. Peterson 2018). Or they may take the Leninist position of vanguardism: the beneficiaries know better than the underprivileged what the underprivileged need.

The key inconsistency here is in that, as the West has been discussing privileges *in English*, it has been exploiting the most crucial advantage of all, and an undeserved one: the *language privilege*. Both the left and the right, Marxists and Capitalists, liberals and conservatives, people against the Postmodern "industry of pseudo-scholarly 'knowledge' production with no end in sight" (Boghossian and Lindsay 2018: 1346-1347) and people against those people (see Webster 2019), have apparently been in self-serving unison about not renouncing this fundamental privilege. They realise of course that a critique of the "white, wealthy, and endowed" (Unsigned/NDA et al. 2020) is not the same as, say, of "i bianchi, ricchi e benestanti", or that the energies wasted on Joyce as a "dead white male" (Cheng 2004: 12) are not the same as those wasted on, say, "mŕtvy biely muž". Their decision is understandable, but against their own logic of promoting equal opportunities.

The language privilege, an instrument of Western cultural neocolonialism, presets the initial terms of every discussion, despite that it is easier to renounce it than to influence a sex or racial privilege. Regarding the USA, the neocolonial centre, the question how many Americans acquire skills to reduce that privilege has answers like these: "America's lacking language skills" (A. Friedman 2015), "Americans have a reputation for being bad at learning languages" (Sonnad 2018). It is the same in the Joyce industry—the exegesis of FW has always been Anglophone there. An introduction to a discussion about FW under the title "Theoretical Preliminaries" (MacCabe 1979: 1) is grossly misleading—the choice of the English language makes all theoretical concerns posterior.

3.4.3. Call for a Revision of the Paradigm

If the better part of the thesis looks like a listing of many things that various people said about different aspects of FW, one will bear in mind that presenting such a list may have been the only way to illustrate—what under the rule of equal (in)competence cannot aspire to be claimed as more correct, and what under the rule of EME cannot be stably true, and under the rule of NMA cannot be said non-vaguely—that the volume of FW exegesis is too large for any line of canonical argumentation to emerge within it, in a non-dogmatic way. The sources mentioned in the thesis are less than a sixth of what I have stored on my PC in my 25 years around FW, and less than a tenth or so of what I have encountered online, in addition to dozens of shelves of pre-Digital text in print. For whatever anecdotal evidence my personal experience stands, it is the feeling of there having been said too much about FW to the point of not being certain of anything and not being able to recall much from the swarm of words. As the thesis would like to express a yearning for less, it is likely in vain, and against its own preaching—the thesis is one more text in the volume of FW exegesis.

Due to the size of the volume, the epistemological system of FW was left without any primitive terms. It disables any coherently justified competence to assert that FW as a literary text is a more privileged referent of the name than any other referent. There is no coherently justified competence to indicate the best variant among the many source texts. There is no coherently justified competence to categorise claims (i.e. conjectures about claims), e.g., by indicating misinterpretations. In sum, there exist no consistent criteria for establishing a hierarchy of literary competence about FW. The existing models of

competence are either *extraliterary* (i.e. not concerned primarily with FW as a literary text) and/or *inconsistent*. Some of the latter rely on appeals (e.g., to common sense, knowledge, authorial intention), use ergometrics (ranking claims by the work input), intellectual aesthetics (e.g., ranking claims by their style), markers of competence (e.g., ranking claims by the proponent's academic degree), still they fail to explain how one can (i) adjudicate conflicts between Wakean exegetes on the same level in a hierarchy, (ii) categorise claims which (apparently) are not in conflict, (iii) categorise (apparently) equivalent claims made with different means, or (iv) categorise (apparently) different claims made with equivalent means.

Inconsistent is the paradigm of literary competence in the Joyce industry, promoting academic competence as, on average, superior. The industry has invested effort in upholding a number of tenets, including those saying that FW is (i) Joyce's (ii) literary fiction, and (iii) in English, although it has no coherently justified literary competence to demonstrate that any of those tenets is correct or even more likely.

In theory, the academic paradigm could be upheld if the Joyce industry (and/or the literary institution above it) named an otherwise unavailable value that would justify its otherwise unjustified control held over literary interpretation. It has been assumed that no such value exists, or at least that no such value has been clearly indicated and convincingly justified. Indeed, there is no hermeneutically relevant reason for satisfying the "critic's desire to interpret" (Newton 1986: 14), ensuring their "pleasure" (Fabio Akcelrud Durão in Gupta et al. 2017: 12, 52), "academic freedom" (Suman Gupta in ibid., 45), "self-understanding" (Alexander Search in ibid., 8), "contemplation of the insights" (ibid., 9).

The academic paradigm could also regain consistency if the Joyce industry (and/or the literary institution above it) admitted that its primary motivation is economic, and so it prioritises such claims (tenets, etc.) that suit its business operation. In this scenario, the professional stops denying that literature is "*posterior* to the literary establishment" and its "economic arrangements" (ibid., 29). The price for gaining that kind of consistency might be deterioration in the economic situation of the industry. On taking the entrepreneurial approach to FW as a product, it might become more difficult (than it is now) to defend the industry against assessments such as that "*Finnegans Wake* is bullshit" (Gischler 2004: n.pag.) or that the professional keeps "excavating Joyce's excrement" (Pyle 2014). It might become harder to convince a large number of consumers to regard the academic exegesis as valuable enough to pay for it and to see the collective of Wakeans as more than people

with bullshit jobs in the sense of David Graeber (2018). Academic can be a bullshit job (ibid.: xvii, 291, n. 27), "so completely pointless, unnecessary, or pernicious that even the employee cannot justify its existence" (9), though it can also seem pointless to the outsider (xiii).[119] Certainly, it would not help the defence of the Joyce industry that it has a tradition of discussing FW as a "story of fucking and shitting" (Lipták 2018), and which connects "the language of *Finnegans Wake* with shit" (Harry Levin in Heumann 2001: 203), affirms "the significance of Wakean scatology" (Miyahara 2017: 83, see Anspaugh 1994: 82, Cheng 1992: 91-98, Nemerov 1975: 654, Whitley 2000), uses the psychoanalytic exploration of FW to reclaim "the usually negative aspects of shit for the higher, ethical purpose of the revealed 'truth'" (Musgrave 2014: 98 re Ch. G. Anderson 1972), annotates the word "bullshit" (see "Dungtarf" in McHugh 1991, 2006: 16, cf. 2016: 16), and so on. Also, some customers might turn away from the industry on learning that for decades it has been using a model of business operation which is laissez-faire enough to accept lying to the consumer in order to increase profits, or that it is neocolonially West-centric enough to insist that the text is in English.

A majority of the charges concerning the poor quality of the industry's exegetical product cannot be attributed exclusively to the industry. They concern the quality in the much larger Postmodern industry, with its overwhelming excess of data. It seems that no attempt to revert that excess by instating (reinstating?) some antagonistic mechanisms for removing incorrect, outdated and otherwise discredited claims from knowledge could rely on intuition. Even in the STEM disciplines it may be more and more often the case that scientific intuition is not innate and common, but constructed and elitist—"by now we should have learned that it is our intuition that should be shaped by mathematical reasoning, and not vice versa" (M. Heller 2008: 262). Not even mathematical truth is stable. "Abhorrent" as it is to some, mathematical truth is, e.g., to L. E. J. Brouwer, time-dependent, resting on "society-dependent criteria" (Penrose 1991: 115). One can imagine that truth in humanities is even less available. If "post-truth", a "feature of hypermodern

---

[119] Graeber asserts that "[m]ost academics are first drawn to their careers because they love knowledge and are excited by ideas" (271) but this is not substantiated. Academic jobs of little to no worth are more likely to appear in Capitalism than in Socialism (18). Describing Capitalism, Graeber reveals an ideological bias: he wonders at an irregularity in the Capitalist law of supply and demand [regarding nurses and lawyers] (212-213), yet opposes the law of supply and demand where it actually works [a stripper earns more than a professor] (23). Graeber speculates that the reasons for bullshit jobs are politics (xvi), "class power and class loyalty" (213), but also "moral envy" (248), sadomasochism (246).

times" (Quintana-Paz 2018: 143), tries to mark a new, *post*-Postmodern era, it fails—defined as "unresponsiveness to truth" (ibid., 146), post-truth is as vague as truth which it supposedly ignores. Post-modernism and hypermodernism are undistinguishable, also in their openness to totalitarism (about which see Hannah Arendt in ibid., 157).

The problem of everyone being unable to assert anything non-dogmatically truer or more competent is insoluble—the inability is permanent, especially as the epistemological system of FW precludes a hierarchy of claims more firmly than Postmodernism. The latter replaces truth with "provisional statements that are neither valid nor invalid" (Miroslav Kruk qtd. in LeMoine 2012: n.pag. [2]), whereas an exegete of FW cannot even rely on any common understanding of the words "provisional", "statements", "are" "neither, nor", "valid/invalid". If this epistemological disaster is due to the excess of text, then a *dogmatic* approach to competence might be called desirable, if censorship could stem the inflow of new data or even remove some old data from the volume. The Goethian *lieber Unrecht als Unordnung* kind of argument (order aimed at by the censor is better than silenced claims) could be employed by the Joyce industry if it decided to admit its ideological motivation. The industry could silence various charges of self-defeating inconsistency, such as that Postmodernism questions truth, yet it does not question its own decision to question truth. The censor in the industry could silence the powerful argument against Postmodernism (Marxism, the School of Resentment) that in its attempts at deactivating metanarratives for excluding the "other" because of their race, gender, religion, socio-economic status, etc., Postmodernism conveniently forgot to deactivate the great metanarrative that excludes the non-English speaking world.

In sum, the Joyce industry has these options: (i) conduct business as usual, usurping unjustified literary competence; (ii) admit that its primary systemic motivation is economic (more precisely: laissez-faire Capitalist and neocolonially Western), restoring consistency to the academic paradigm, justifying it with reasons of its economic well-being; (iii) admit that its primary systemic motivation is ideological, and its ideology sanctions censorship and intellectual terror, thereby restoring consistency to the paradigm by not letting its opponents raise their arguments against the paradigm.

Supplement 1 – **Expansion of Claims toward Non-Logicisable Propositions**:

As an example of how a claim about FW can expand, becoming a set of data which cannot be synthesized into coherence one will consider this assertion: "FW is a book". According to the rule of NMA, each of its words is uncertain.—What is "FW"? What does "is" mean? What is a "book"?—Trying to explain, one might say something like "FW is a novel", or even more specifically: "Joyce's novel" (Rice 1997: 137), though two distinct claims would arise then: "FW is a novel", "FW is Joyce's", either contestable. Regarding the first one, FW has made "novel" a non-intuitive term: "what—if anything—is it besides a novel?" (J. S. Atherton 1974: 14). "Is this arabesque of motifs a novel?" (Tindall 1996: 13). "The *Wake* is not, like a novel, to be read at one go" (E. McLuhan 1997: xiii). "It is difficult to say that the *Wake* is a novel; equally difficult to deny it" (S. Deane 1992: vii). "*Finnegans Wake* is neither a novel, nor an anti-novel" (Fordham 2011: 90).

Nor is it certain whether FW has a plot. James Atherton claims that "the basic plot or groundwork of the book has not been established with certainty" (1974: 11). If "[r]eading *Finnegans Wake* for the plot requires overcoming a lot of resistance" (Shoptaw 1995: 212), finding it should be difficult, still possible (Aschenbrenner 1974: 147, see Burrell 1996, Gordon 1986, see also García Tortosa 2011-2012: 338-339). "Looking for a plot is a bad approach" though, says Roland McHugh (in Hamada 2013: 78). Answers to the question "Can you understand the plot while you are reading?" (Hamada, *passim*) are not a simple 'yes' or 'no'—"Yes, but the relationship of one subplot to another keeps changing" (John S. Gordon, ibid., 37), "Yes, but there is not always a plot in any conventional sense" (David Hayman, ibid., 43), "Yes, because the plot of relations (conflict) among five people is nearly always present" (Richard Kostelanetz, ibid., 57). "Since there are multiple plots in the *Wake* and as plots they are not central to the nature of its structure, it is relatively straightforward to understand the various plots" (Donald Theall, ibid., 119). Fritz Senn's "No" (ibid., 12) does not necessarily contradict his assertion that "no plot structure seems plausibly extractable" (1990b: 76)—if the plot cannot be extracted, then it cannot be understood. The "answer to the question is there a plot in *Finnegans Wake* is an ambiguously Joycean yes, and no" (Begnal 1992: 119).

Possibly against FW as a novel, though not so much against FW as a book there are various claims in the volume of exegesis which concern the genre: FW is an epic prose-

poem (Wales 1992: 154), an untypical epic (B. Benstock 1965: 175), a recitative-psalmodic poem (Gronczewski 1972: 141), a narrative 'mother-poem' ("poematka", Lem 1974: 473), a cento (Sławiński 1999: 161), "a Menippean satire" (E. McLuhan 1997: x), a "drama, performed aloud by the reader" (ibid., 307), a comedy of remarriage (Utell 2010: 16), an autobiography (James Stephens qtd. in Ferris 2010: 36), a confession (Hodgart 1978: 134), a "palimpsest of Dublin" (McCormack 2013: 22), a "record of our age" (Campbell and Robinson 1976: 8), "a compendium of reality" (Eco 1989b: 175), a "hyperencyclopedic compendium of World Literature" (Sussman 2007: 76), "an encyclopedia of literary styles, techniques and structures" (Donald Theall in Hamada 2013: 125), "the psycho-spiritual history of mankind" (J. P. Anderson 2010: 21), "a riddle" (P. A. McCarthy 1980: 16), "a rebus, a crossword puzzle" (Bishop 1986: 315), a "crossword puzzlers' bible" (Stanislaus Joyce qtd. in J. S. Atherton 1974: 20), a dream-like puzzle (Burgess 1967: xxvii, M. Norris 1976: 5), "a dream book" (Kitcher 2007: xx), "a code book" (Burgess 2012: 255), and something *sui generis* (Frye 2010: 336, *Wikipedia*, s.v. "Finnegans Wake", edit 2 May 2020). In no way is FW a novel, says C. G. Sandulescu (1987, see Lernout 1987: 398, Riquelme 1991: 534). If FW is "the limit case of literary narrative" (Attridge 2001: 132) or a narrative with minimal "tellability" (Richardson 2019: 20), one should not be taking for granted that FW is literary.

The initial pair, (pre-P) "FW is a book" and (pre-¬P) "FW is not a book", attracts so many sub- and side-propositions with their own new conditions and assumptions that it is practically impossible to learn its logical value, let alone to assess it. As simple as pre-P or pre-¬P a claim about FW may look, it always expands into a non-logicisable multi-tier nexus of interrelated polyreferential terms, like P or ¬P below:

> **(P)** FW <u>is</u> a book
>   *which*
> (Pa^1) does not exist *or* (Pa^2) it exists
>   (Pa^{A1}) ideally *or* (Pa^{A2}) actually,
>   *in*
>   (Pa^{AA}) pre-textual *or* (Pa^{AB}) prototextual *or*
>   (Pa^{AC}) post-prototextual variant(s) *or*
>   (Pa$^{AD(E,F…)}$) combination(s) thereof
>   *and was*
> (Pb^1) authored by James Joyce *or* either
> (Pb^2) not him *or* (Pb^3) not just him,
>   *and is*
> (Pc^1) a novel *or* (Pc^2) not,
>   (Pc^{A1}) with *or* (Pc^{A2}) without a plot
>   *which*

(Pc^{B1}) does not exist *or* (Pc^{B2}) exists
(Pc^{B21}) ideally *or* (Pc^{B22}) actually
and is
(Pd^1) readable with *or* (Pd^2) without the exegetical co-text
which is
(Pd^{1A}) complementary *or* (Pd^{1B}) supplantive,
and
(Pd^{1C}) to be read together with the book *or* (Pd^{1D}) not
and
(Pd^{1E}) exists ideally *or* (Pd^{1F}) actually
and
(Pd^{1G}) may *or* (Pd^{1H}) may not be represented
by a selection of texts
(Pd^{1G1}) chosen at random *or* (Pd^{1G2}) not,
and if it is not a novel [see Pc^2], it *is* nonetheless classifiable as
(Pc^{3A}) literary fiction,
(Pc^{3B1}) a book of prose *or* (Pc^{3B2}) poetry,
for example (Pc^{3B21}) an epic, (Pc^{3B22}) a cento
(Pc^{3C}) fiction/non-fiction,
for example (Pc^{3C1}) an autobiography,
(Pc^{3D}) non-fiction,
for example (Pc^{3D1}) an encyclopedia,
(Pc^{3D2}) a dictionary
and is
(Pe^1) submitted in language which
(Pe^{11}) is a variety of English *or* (Pe^{12}) not
and is
(Pe^{11A}) linguistically accessible *or* [Pe^{11B}] not
(Pe^{11C}) in part *or* (Pe^{11D}) in whole
unless it is recognised as
(Pf^1) a text outside of literature, for example:
(Pf^{11}) a visual text *or*
(Pf^{12}) a sound text
and at all times
[D^1] any and all *or* [D^2] some interpretive decisions on
[D^A] any and all *or* [D^B] some constituting elements of this proposition (P)
[D1L] ought *or* [D2L] ought not to be assessed from a diachronic perspective
as well as
[L1] assessed with a trivalent *or* [L2] a four-value *or* [L3] another logic.

OR

(¬P) FW <u>is not</u> a book
which (…) etc.

Supplement 2 – **Degrees of Separation from the Central Text**:

In the volume of FW exegesis, the terms *pre-text* and *post-text* have usually been used with no indication of the degree of separation from the central text. One will consider the following example: the text of Bartnicki 2016b is a *1st degree* post-text of FW since it copies sequences of 8 musically symbolic letters directly from the 1939 prototext; as some of the sequences were turned into soundtext (Bartnicki 2012d), they became *2nd degree post-texts of FW*; parts of that soundtext were remade (Dunajko 2014, Ostalski 2013, Kucharczyk 2016, 2017), becoming *3rd degree post-texts of FW*.

The degree of separation from the central text announced by the author or assumed by the reviewer may not be the actual one. For example, the phrase "a film of *Finnegans Wake*" (P. A. McCarthy 2009) implies a 1st degree post-text of FW, but the film in question (Bute 1965) is a post-text of a post-text—Mary Manning's adaptation for stage, published in variants *The Voice of Shem*, 1958, and *Passages from Finnegans Wake*, 1957 (see Evans 2016: 76). Another example is John Cage's song *Nowth upon Nacht* (1984) whose lyrics were allegedly "derived from *FW*, 556.23" (S. W. Klein 1999: 155). Cage said that he bought a copy of the prototext in 1939 (1981: 133, Silverman 2012: 345), but it is not in the prototext where he could find the lyrics for his song given that the word "nowth" does not appear in the prototext, established only later in the corrigendum (Joyce 1945: 15). Certainly, *Nowth upon Nacht* is not a 1st degree post-text then.

The greater distance of a text from the central text, the less obvious Joyce's participation in it, and his authorship of it. To consider what differences appear between post-texts let us stay with the example of John Cage's *Nowth upon Nacht*. As one collates its lyrics against:

> (A) Joyce 1939, the prototext of FW;
>
> (B) Joyce 2005, a post-Joyce source text of FW incorporating the said 'nowth' corrigendum;
>
> (C) Joyce 2012c, another post-Joyce source text of FW incorporating the corrigendum;

(D) Cage 1983: 99, with the text marked as coming from p. 556 of Joyce's FW, New York: Viking Press, an "edition embodying all author's corrections" (ibid., 101);

(E) Williams and Friedlander 1997, an unpaged concert program with the note "The texts for *The Wonderful Widow of Eighteen Springs* and *Nowth Upon Nacht* are adapted from James Joyce's *Finnegan's* (sic) *Wake*";

(F) Versmoren 1995/2003, submitted to online archive, marked as "verified 1 time", with the following note: "Authorship by James Joyce (1882-1941), from *Finnegan's* (sic) *Wake*";

various discrepancies are revealed, underlined below—differently spelled words, differently divided words, varied punctuation, indentation, organisation of lines:

(A) now upon nacht while in his tumbril Wachtman Havelook
seequeerscenes, from yonsides of the choppy, punkt by his
curserbog, went long the grassgross bumpinstrass that henders
the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle in a hole for at whet his
whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for lovers' lost pro-
pertied offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og gneiss
ogas gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, handsboon
and strumpers, sminkysticks and eddiketsflaskers;

(B) nowth upon nacht, while in his tumbril Wachtman Havelook
seequeerscenes, from yonsides of the choppy, punkt by his
curserbog, went long the grassgross bumpinstrass that henders
the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle in a hole for at whet his
whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for lovers' lost pro-
pertied offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og gneiss
ogas gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, handsboon
and strumpers, sminkysticks and eddiketsflaskers;

(C) nowth upon nacht, while in his tumbril wachtman Havelook Seequeer-
scenes from yonsides of the choppy, punkt by his curserbog, went long the
grassgross bumpinstrass that henders the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle
in a bole for at whet his whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for
lovers' lost propertied offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og
gneiss ogas gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, handshoon and
strumpers, sminkysticks and eddiketsflaskers;

(D) nowth upon
nacht, while in his tumbril Wachtman Havelook seequearscenes, from yon-____

<u>sides</u> of the choppy, punkt by his curserbog, went long the grassgross bump-instrass that henders the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle in a <u>hole</u> for at whet his whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for lovers' lost <u>prop-ertied</u> offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og gneiss <u>ogas</u> gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, <u>handsboon</u> and strumpers, <u>sminky-sticks</u> and eddiketsflaskers;

(E) <u>nowth</u> upon <u>nacht,</u> while in his tumbril <u>Wachtman</u> <u>Havelook</u> <u>see queerscenes,</u> from <u>yonsides</u> of the choppy, punkt by his curserbog, went long the grassgross bumpinstrass that henders the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle in a <u>hole</u> for at whet his whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for lovers' lost <u>propertied</u> offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og gneiss <u>og as</u> gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, <u>handsboon</u> and strumpers, <u>sminky sticks</u> and eddiketsflaskers;

(F) <u>nowth</u> upon <u>night,</u> while in his tumbril <u>Wachtman Havelock</u> <u>seequeerscenes,</u> from <u>yonsides</u> of the choppy, punkt by his curserbog, went long the grassgross bumpinstrass that henders the pubbel to pass, stowing his bottle in a <u>hole</u> for at whet his whuskle to stretch ecrooksman, sequestering for lovers' lost <u>propertied</u> offices the leavethings from allpurgers' night, og gneiss <u>ogas</u> gnasty, kikkers, brillers, knappers and bands, <u>handsboon</u> and strumpers, <u>sminkysticks</u> and eddiketsflaskers.

If the prototext is FW, then (A) is a sample of FW and the remaining ones are post-texts. Among them, (B) and (C) are *1st degree* post-texts if they followed the prototext or are higher degree post-texts if they followed a post-Joyce variant of the prototext. (E) and (F) are post-texts of Cage's text, hence 3rd (or higher) degree post-texts of FW. While in support of the author principle all these sources identify James Joyce as the author of *the same* text—i.e. as if the discrepancies should not preclude the samples from representing the same text—the post-Joyce editor's attention to detail implies that such discrepancies in punctuation, spelling, letter case, and so on, are not trivial, in which case the samples do *not* represent the same text.

Supplement 3 – **The Authorship in the Bibliography**:

It has been said here that James Joyce is not the main author of various referents of FW, e.g., of any post-Joyce translation of the prototext. To suggest that he is the main author (where he is not) would be misleading and wrongful. The system of indexing in the Bibliography below has an ideological purpose to oppose such pressures that the neocolonial copyright owner makes to *misrepresent* facts in order to profit more from their publications. Another purpose is scientific, to improve the citing method's *consistency*. In pursuit of that ambition, the focus is on Joyce's work, in accordance with this thesis's scope of discussion.

In the Bibliography below James Joyce is deservedly the main (or the first) author in the bibliographic entry of a source text of FW, but he is not the main author in the entries for many derivative texts. For instance, Joyce is not the main author of my literary translation of FW (it has always seemed to me false and unfair that the cover of that text presents Joyce as the main or even the only author). Putting the translator's name first agrees with the option to distinguish the translator in discussions of translatorial work (Lipson 2006: 54, *MLA…*, 2009: 165).

Regarding bilingual editions made of a source text, which is primarily Joyce's, and its primarily non-Joyce's translation, they are indexed as Joyce's work owing to the assumption that the original text is a more important element of such an edition. Accordingly, this applies to editions with an abridged text of FW and its translation.

It is always an uneasy decision to decide who is the main author of an anthology of texts. Regarding openly collaborative efforts, the ideal solution is to name every contributor, but this would require making very long lists. For instance, the co-authorship of a multimedia adaptation of FW would include: the director, James Joyce, many people responsible for text adaptation and revision, camerawork, editing, music, sound, design; also: camera operators, voice actors, animators, web developer, producers, supporters, patrons, and many others (Wróblewski 2016: 8-9). The idea to include everyone is oft abandoned for practical reasons. A sound rendition of FW made by various artists (e.g., Pyle 2017b) is indexed with the name of the project organiser. The editor's role may be under- as well as overrated: consider the problematic example of Reichert and Senn

1989—one could argue that the main author is the collective of German translators, thus their work should be indexed: Beck et al. 1989.

Excepting bilingual editions, Joyce is not the main author of a literary translation of FW; accordingly, he is not the first author of an intersemiotic translation. Nor is he the main author of films that use text from FW. Nor is he the first author of songs with lyrics taken from FW. Usually, the main author of a sound text (a referent of FW) that is not extensively collaborative is the composer though one could also argue that it is the performer who should be viewed as the first author. A live reading from FW should be indexed with the performer's name first because the choices that the performer makes— what language provides phonetic patterns, what to do on encountering words which do not look familiar, and words which look familiar but are unknown, where to put accent, which words should be articulated more distinctly, faster, etc.—are crucial. Accordingly, the audioreader is the main author of an audiobook (e.g., P. Healy 1992) and an abridged audiobook (e.g., Ball 1997, Bedford 1963, Cusack and McKenna 1959, Norton and Riordan 1998; for discussion of audiobooks see Attridge 1994, Harvey 2015b, Saint-Laurent 2009). While it is

> "tempting to think that every source has only one complete and correct format for its entry in a list of works cited, in truth there are often several options" (*MLA…*, 2009: 129),

still various options should not be exercised without internal consistency. It will be argued that a convention lacks consistency, in which a cited song will have the composer or the performer in the main author's position, a cited live performance citing contribution of a particular individual will distinguish the performer, still a cited audiobook will distinguish the book's author. Against that inconsistency that will mark Joyce's text in a song as initially the songwriter's work, Joyce's text read live as initially the performer's work, and Joyce's text in an audiobook as initially Joyce's, the argument is that human voice deserves equal treatment in the bibliography regardless of whether it reads or sings, to accompaniment or without it, and so on.

To demonstrate that more consistency is both required and possible, this supplement closes with examples of inconsistency found in a popular online source of Joycean resources, namely the James Joyce Checklist ["JJC"] (Brockman and Cohn 1963-2008). For comparison, the authorship according to the present system is given in square brackets prior to the quoted JJC entries.

First, regarding the JJC's bibliographic treatment of <u>literary translations</u>. These entries of an abridged monolingual edition include the translator's name in the secondary role:

[Bartnicki 2004a] "Joyce, James. "Finneganów tren." *Literatura na Świecie*, whole nos. 396-97, vii-viii (2004): 5-31. Polish trans. by Krzysztof Bartnicki of *FW* I.1.",

[Bartnicki 2004b] "Joyce, James. "Finneganów tren." *Literatura na Świecie*, whole nos. 396-97, vii-viii (2004): 69-105. Polish trans. by Krzysztof Bartnicki of *FW* IV."

whereas this entry of an unabridged monolingual edition does not mention the translator at all:

[Hervé 2015] "Joyce, James. *Veillée Pinouilles*. 2015. https://sites.google.com/site/finicoincequoique/. French translation of FW."

At times the translator is given as the author, e.g., in this entry of an abridged translation:

[Bartnicki 2012a] "Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *Finneganów Bdyn*. Krakow: Korporacja Ha!art, 2012. [105] pp. ISBN 978-83-62574-68-1. Table of *FW* variants between the Faber & Faber 1975, Viking 1959, Penguin 1992 editions and Joyce's "Correction of Misprints in *Finnegans Wake*" with their Polish variants to accompany *Finneganów Tren*."

Regarding <u>bilingual editions</u>. This entry of an abridged edition mentions the translator (in the secondary role):

[Joyce 2004-2005] "Joyce, James. "*Finnegans Wake* ['The Mookse and the Gripes,' 152.04-159.23] = *Finneganów tren* [Bajka o Mooksie i Gripowronie, 152.04-159.23]." *Przekładaniec*, nos. 13-14 (2/2004-1/2005): 156-71. Original English and Polish trans. by Krzysztof Bartnicki on facing pp."

but other entries exclude the translator at all; see, e.g., this abridged bilingual edition:

[Joyce 2016a] "Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Letteratura, 3. Macerata: Giometti & Antonello, 2016. 140 pp. ISBN 978-88-98820-02-3. Eduardo Camurri, "Prefazione," 5-16. Excerpts from FW translated into Italian with facing English pages, from the 1961 publication."

or this unabridged bilingual edition:

[Joyce 1993] "Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wehg: Kainnäh ÜbelSätzZung des Wehrkeß fun Schämes Scheuß*. [Darmstadt]: Verlag Jürgen Häusser, 1993. 628 leaves pp. ISBN 3-927902-74-8. German trans. of FW, corresponding to English text on facing pages."

Whereas this abridged bilingual translation is with the translator's name, yet without Joyce's:

[Joyce 2019] "Waldrigues Galindo, Caetano. "Juto & Muto (um excerto do *Finnegans Wake*)." *Qorpus*, 9, iii (December 2019): 151-57."

Regarding <u>abridgements</u> of the prototext. Joyce is given as the main author of an abridgement to "about one-third of the whole" (B. Benstock 1967: 137) made by the editor:

[Joyce 1966a] "Joyce, James. *A Shorter Finnegans Wake*. Ed. Burgess, Anthony. London: Faber & Faber, 1966. 278 pp. From the 1964 edition of *Finnegans Wake*."

The entry for an abridgement retaining 96% content of the prototext does not mention Joyce:

[Joyce 2014a] "Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *F_NNEGANS _A_E: Suite*. Warsaw: Sowa Sp. z o.o., 2014. 391 pp. ISBN 978-83-64033-62-9."

Another abridged source text (a film script) is indexed with the script-writer's name:

[Joyce 2009] "Bute, Mary Ellen. "The First Two Pages of the Filmscript for *Passages from Finnegans Wake*." *Flashpoint*, 12 (2009). http://www.flashpointmag.com/butescript.htm."

Regarding <u>illustrated texts of FW</u>. Some are marked as Joyce's work, e.g.:

[Joyce 1983] "Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake, Chapter One: The Illnesstraited Colossick Idition*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983. [n.p.] pp. ISBN 0-295-95991-6. Illus. by Tim Ahern."

[Joyce 2010a] "Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake, the Final Chapter: The Illnesstraited Colossick Idition*. Littleton: AFIPR, 2010. [237] pp. ISBN 0-9702241-2-5. Illustrated by Tim Ahern."

but some are not, e.g.:

[Joyce 2014c] "Boose, John. *James Joyce's Finnegans Wake Illustrated, Volume 1*. [Charleston]: New Century Dada Press, 2014a. 177 pp. ISBN 978-1-5005-6677-1. Includes I.1 and I.2. (and) Boose, John. *James Joyce's Finnegans Wake Illustrated, Volume 2*. [Charleston]: New Century Dada Press, 2014b. 257 pp. ISBN 978-1-5008-2575-1. Includes I.3-7."

A collection of <u>sound texts</u>, with songs citing Joyce's text, is given without Joyce's name:

[Bartnicki 2018] "Y? Collective. *-Y? Multi-Genre Polish Sound Reactions to James Joyce*. Bandcamp, 2018."

Joyce is not the main author of this text, an audiobook-*cum*-sound:

[Pyle 2017b] "Pyle, Derek. Waywords and Meansigns: Recreating Finnegans Wake [in its Whole Wholume]. 2017. http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/." [NB: Pyle's name is followed by about 160 collaborating performers, in no particular order, without mentioning James Joyce.]

but he is the main author, e.g., of this audiobook:

[P. Healy 1992] "Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Dublin: Rennicks Auriton, 1992. 17 compact discs. RAP CD01. Read by Patrick Healy. Recorded January 1992 at Bow Lane Recording Studios, Dublin. Includes *The Modern and the Wake*."

Regarding <u>audiovisual material</u>. The name of the director is in the initial position in this entry:

[Bute 1965] "Bute, Mary Ellen. *Passages from James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. New York: Expanding Cinema, 1965. film. Based on the Mary Manning play."

but the director is removed from the initial position, e.g., in this entry:

[Buszewicz 2014] "*Finnegans Wake / Finneganów tren*. 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ni43rB9c0xE. Enactment, in Polish, of the "Prankquean" episode. Directed by Michał Buszewicz from the translation by Krzysztof Bartnicki."

In another example, the author of a filmed theatrical adaptation is mentioned, but not Joyce:

[Erdman 1999] "Erdman, Jean. *The Coach with the Six Insides*. Kent, CT: Creative Arts Television, 1999. Videocassette. 26 min. Theatrical adaptation of *FW*, broadcast on Camera Three television in 1964."

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Printed sources:

Abblitt, Stephen. *Joyce/Derrida: Meaning as Potentiality and the Illegitimacy of the Institution*. PhD thesis. Bundoora, VIC: La Trobe University, 2010.

Abel, Jessica Rose. *Teaching Joyce's "Ulysses"*. PhD thesis. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2018.

Adamiec, Marek. "…*Pomnik trochę niezupełny*…: Rzecz o apokryfach i poezji Zbigniewa Herberta." Gdańsk: WUG, 1996.

Adams, Mary. "The Beauty of *Finnegans Wake*. Remembering and Re-Imagining: A Return to the Father." *British Journal of Psychoterapy*, 3 (2018): 467-483.

Adams, Hazard. "Yeats, Joyce, and Criticism Today." *Antithetical Essays in Literary Criticism and Liberal Education*. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1990. 144-159.

Adams, Hazard. "The difficulty of difficulty." *The Idea of Difficulty in Literature*. Ed. Alan C. Purves. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991. 23-50.

Albright, Daniel. *Music Speaks. On the Language of Opera, Dance, and Song*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2009.

Alexandrova, Boriana. "'Babababblin' Drolleries and Multilingual Phonologies: Embodying Impediments of Speech and Language in *Finnegans Wake*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 2.

Alexandrova, Boriana. "Joyce's deplurabel muttertongues: Re-examining the multilingualism of *Finnegans Wake*." PhD thesis. Heslington: University of York, 2016.

Ali, Kazim. *Bright Felon: Autobiography and Cities*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2009.

Altizer, Thomas J. J. "Joyce and the End of History." *History as Apocalypse*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1985. 209-254.

Altizer, Thomas J. J. *Genesis and Apocalypse: A Theological Voyage Toward Authentic Christianity*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990.

Altizer, Thomas J. J. *This Silence Must Now Speak: Letters of Thomas J. J. Altizer, 1995-2015*. Ed. Mike Grimshaw. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Anderson, Chester G. "On the Sublime and Its Anal-Urethral Sources in Pope, Eliot, and Joyce." *Modern Irish Literature: Essays in Honor of William York Tindall*. Eds. Raymond J. Porter, and James D. Brophy. New York: Iona College Press and Twayne Publishers, 1972. 235-249.

Anderson, John P. *Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": The Curse of Kabbalah*. Vol. 1. Boca Raton: Universal Publishers, 2008.

Anderson, John P. *Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": The Curse of Kabbalah*. Vol. 2. Boca Raton: Universal Publishers, 2009.

Anderson, John P. *Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": The Curse of Kabbalah*. Vol. 3. Boca Raton: Universal Publishers, 2010.

Anderson, John P. *Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": The Curse of Kabbalah*. Vol. 8. Boca Raton: Universal Publishers, 2013.

Andreasen, Nancy J. C. "James Joyce: A Portrait of the Artist as a Schizoid." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1 (1973): 67-71.

Angermuller, Johannes. "Truth after post-truth: for a Strong Programme in Discourse Studies." *Palgrave Communications*, 4 (2018): 1-8.

Angier, Natalie. *Kanon. Wyprawa galopem przez piękne podstawy nauki*. Polish trans. Monika Betley, and Paweł Strzelecki. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka, 2008.

Anspaugh, Kelly. "Powers of Ordure: James Joyce and the Excremental Vision(s)." *Mosaic*, 1 (1994): 73-100.

Anton, Corey. "Drugs as Environments: Being Inside What is Inside Us." *Drugs & Media: New Perspectives on Communication, Consumption, and Consciousness*. Ed. Robert C. MacDougall. New York and London: Continuum, 2012. 35-51.

Anton, Karen. "The Audible in Joyce's Texts." *Lucerna [An Undergraduate Journal Presented by the Honors Program: The University of Missouri-Kansas City]*, 1 (2009): 29-41.

Arfini, Selene. *Ignorant Condition: A Philosophical Investigation of the Cognitive Features of Not-Knowing*. Cham: Springer, 2019.

Armand, Louis. "Introduction: "Probapossible Prolegomena"." *Night Joyce of a Thousand Tiers*. By Petr Škrabánek. Eds. Louis Armand, and Ondřej Pilný. Prague: Litteraria Pragensia, 2002b. xxiii-xxxvii.

Armand, Louis. *Techné: James Joyce, Hypertext & Technology*. Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Philologica: Monographia, 139. Prague: Karolinum, 2003.

Armand, Louis. "Strange Attractions: Technopoetics in the Vortext." *Contemporary Poetics*. Ed. Louis Armand. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2006. 293-320.

Armand, Louis. *Solicitations: Essays on Criticism and Culture*. Prague: Litteraria Pragensia, 2007.

Armstrong, Alison. "Transition Years: James Joyce and Modernist Art." *Essays for Richard Ellmann: Omnium Gatherum*. Eds. Susan Dick, Declan Kiberd, Dougald McMillan, and Joseph Ronsley. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989. 351-359.

Aschenbrenner, Karl. *The Concepts of Criticism*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing, 1974.

Atherton, Carol. *Defining Literary Criticism: Scholarship, Authority and the Possession of Literary Knowledge, 1880-2002*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Atherton, James S. *The Books at the Wake: A Study of Literary Allusions in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974. (First published in 1959.)

Attridge, Derek. "Unpacking the Portmanteau, or Who's Afraid of *Finnegans Wake*?." *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*. Ed. Jonathan Culler. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988. 140-155.

Attridge, Derek. "[The Peculiar Language of *Finnegans Wake*]." *Critical Essays on James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. Patrick A. McCarthy. New York: G. K. Hall; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992. 73-84.

Attridge, Derek. "[Review]." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, read by Patrick Healy, on 17 CDs, Dublin: Rennicks Auriton Publishers, 1992. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1994): 130-132.

Attridge, Derek. *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. (First published in 2000.)

Attridge, Derek. *Peculiar Language: Literature as Difference from the Renaissance to James Joyce*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004a.

Attridge, Derek. "Reading Joyce." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. 2nd edition. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004b. 1-27.

Attridge, Derek. *How to Read Joyce*. London: Granta Books, 2007.

Attridge, Derek. "Introduction." *Joyce in Progress: Proceedings of the 2008 James Joyce Graduate Conference in Rome*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, John McCourt, and Enrico Terrinoni. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009a. xvii-xxi.

Attridge, Derek. "Joyce's Noises." *Oral Tradition*, 24/2 (2009b): 471-484.

Attridge, Derek. "Finnegans Awake: The Dream of Interpretation." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2012-2013): 185-202. (First published in 1989.)

Attridge, Derek. "Foreword." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. vii-xx.

Aubert, Jacques. "riverrun." *Post-structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*. Eds. Derek Attridge, and Daniel Ferrer. Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 69-77.

Auden, W. H., Jacques Burzun, and Lionel Trilling. "Jameschoice for January. The Editors. On not writing about *Finnegans Wake*." *A Company Of Readers: Uncollected Writings of W. H. Auden, Jacques Barzun, and Lionel Trilling from the Readers' Subscription and Mid-Century Book Clubs*. Ed. Arthur Krystal. New York: The Free Press, 2001. 272-274.

Backus, Margot Gayle. *Scandal Work: James Joyce, the New Journalism, and the Home Rule Newspaper Wars*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013.

Badiou, Alain. *Conditions*. English trans. Steven Corcoran. London and New York: Continuum, 2008. (Original in French: *Conditions*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1992.)

Badley, Linda. *Lars von Trier*. Contemporary Film Directors series, ed. James Naremore. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press, 2010.

Bajtlik, Stanisław. "O baranach, równaniu Schrödingera i róży, albo o tym, czym różnią się astronomia, fizyka i matematyka." *Młody Technik*, 3 (2008): 44-46.

Balcerzan, Edward. *Włodzimierz Majakowski*. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1984.

Balinisteanu, Tudor. *Religion and Aesthetic Experience in Joyce and Yeats*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Ballard, J. G. *The Atrocity Exhibition*. Revised edition with author's annotations. Eds. V. Vale, and Andrea Juno. San Francisco: RE/Search Publications, 1990. (First published in 1970.)

Ballard, J. G. "Studio 5, The Stars." *The Complete Short Stories*. London: Flamingo, 2001. 208-234. (First published in 1961.)

Baranowska, Anna Tamara [at]. "Przegląd zagraniczny (Anglia)." *Twórczość*, 9 (1960): 157-160.

Baranowska, Anna Tamara [at]. "Przegląd zagraniczny (Stany Zjednoczone)." *Twórczość*, 5 (1964): 102-104.

Barciński, Łukasz. "Apofenia czytelnika/tłumacza wobec językowego medium na przykładzie polskiego przekładu *Tęczy grawitacji* Thomasa Pynchona oraz *Finneganów trenu* Jamesa Joyce'a." [English title: "The Reader's/Translator's Apophany in the Face of the Linguistic Medium as Illustrated in the Polish Translation of *Gravity's Rainbow* by Thomas Pynchon and *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce."] *Przekładaniec*, 35 (2017): 57-72.

Barciński, Łukasz. "Trans(a)l(e)atory Studies or the Translator as a Performer: *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce in Polish Translation." *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem*, 41 (2018): 29-48.

Barger, Jorn. Review of Hayman, David, and Sam Slote, eds., *Genetic Studies in Joyce*, 1995. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1997): 389-393.

Barlow, Richard. *The Celtic Unconscious: Joyce and Scottish Culture*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2017b.

Baron, Scarlett. "Joyce and the Rhythms of the Alphabet." *New Quotatoes: Joycean Exogenesis in the Digital Age*. Eds. Ronan Crowley, and Dirk Van Hulle. European Joyce Studies, 25. Leiden and Boston: Brill Rodopi, 2016. 18-44.

Barry, Marguerite. *The Age of Interactivity: An historical analysis of public discourses on interactivity in Ireland 1995-2009*. PhD thesis. Dublin: Dublin City University, 2012.

Barry, Marguerite. "Please do touch: Discourses on aesthetic interactivity in the exhibition space." *Participations – Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 1 (2014): 216-236.

Barthelmess, Eugênia. *Politics and Metaphysics in Three Novels of Philip K. Dick*. MA dissertation. Curitiba: Universidade Federal do Paraná, 1987.

Barthés, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image-Music-Text*. English trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. 142-148. (Original in French: "La mort de l'auteur", published in *Manteia*, 5, 1968.)

Bartnicki, Krzysztof, trans. "Finneganów tren." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Literatura na Świecie*, 7-8 (2004a): 5-31.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof, trans. "Finneganów tren." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Literatura na Świecie*, 7-8 (2004b): 69-105.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "Podtekst bajkowy." *Przekładaniec*, 13-14 (2004-2005a): 172-178.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "To Wake or Not to Wake, czyli o szaleństwach w metodzie." *Przekładaniec*, 13-14 (2004-2005b): 180-186.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "*Finnegans Wake*, Featuring Time." *James Joyce and After: Writer and Time*. Eds. Katarzyna Bazarnik, and Bożena Kucała. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010a. 17-25.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *Prospekt emisyjny*. Kraków: korporacja ha!art, 2010b.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *Finneganów bdyn*. Polish translation variants of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce for Penguin edition 1992 (reissue of the prototext of 1939) against Faber and Faber edition 1975, Viking edition 1959 and Joyce's Correction of Misprints in *Finnegans Wake* of 1945. Kraków: korporacja ha!art, 2012a.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof, trans. *Finneganów tren*. Polish translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce; text of the edition of 1939. Kraków: korporacja ha!art, 2012b.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof, ed. *Fu wojny albo Tłumacz w wyprawie na wschód*. Translation of Chinese treatises on art of war applied to James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. Kraków: korporacja ha!art, 2012c.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "Tłumacz molekularny." Interview by Grzegorz Jankowicz. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 10 (3269): *Magazyn Literacki*. 27 Feb. 2012 (2012e).

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "Final Word." *Finnegans ake: Suite in the Key of Ш (1939)*. By James Joyce. Warszawa: Sowa, 2014a. 373-386.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "Co nowego w branży arcykapłańskiej?." *EleWator*, 2 (2016a): 192-193.

Bartnicki Krzysztof, trans. *Da Capo al Finne*. Translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce into musical cryptogram. 2nd revised, English edition, bearing ISMN. Piaseczno: Sowa, 2016b. (First published in 2012 with Polish foreword and notes, and bearing ISBN.)

Bartnicki Krzysztof, and Marcin Szmandra, trans. *Finnegans Meet*. Translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce into Rolodex. Opole and Tychy, 2015.

Bauer, Friedrich L. *Decrypted Secrets: Methods and Maxims of Cryptology*. Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer, 1997.

Bayard, Pierre. *How to Talk About Books You Haven't Read*. English trans. Jeffrey Mehlman. New York: Bloomsbury, 2007. (Original in French: *Comment parler des livres que l'on n'a pas lis?*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 2007.)

Baydere, Muhammed. "A New (Mis)Conception in the Face of the (Un)Translatable: '*Terscüme*'." *transLogos*, 1 (2018): 92-120.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "List od Macieja Słomczyńskiego." *Dekada Literacka*, 6-7 (1998): 4-6.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "*Ab ovo*. Leksykon polskich elementów w *Finnegans Wake*." *Wokół Jamesa Joyce'a*. Eds. Katarzyna Bazarnik, and Finn Fordham. Kraków: Universitas, 1999a. 109-127.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "Globalne spojrzenie na *Finnegans Wake*." *Wokół Jamesa Joyce'a*. Eds. Katarzyna Bazarnik, and Finn Fordham. Kraków: Universitas, 1999b. 143-155.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "Looking at *Finnegans Wake* from a Polar Perspective." *Abiko Quarterly*, 19 (2000): 6-9.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. *Some Aspects of Spatiality of the Literary Work: As exemplified by James Joyce's "Giacomo Joyce", "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake" (with a reference to L. Sterne, S. Mallarmé, B. S. Johnson, and R. Federman)*. PhD thesis. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 2006.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "Imaginatywne itinerarium przez *Finnegans Wake* (na marginesie przekładu Krzysztofa Bartnickiego)." *Portret*, 3 (2007a): 14-31.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "Liberature: A New Literary Genre?." *Insistent Images*. Eds. Elżbieta Tabakowska, Christina Ljungberg, and Olga Fischer. Iconicity in Language and Literature, 5. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007c. 191-208.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "A Polish Translation of *Finnegans Wake* in Progress." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (2010): 567-577.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. *Joyce and Liberature*. Prague: Litteraria Pragensia, 2011.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "A Half-Formed Thing, a Fully Formed Style. Repetition in Eimear McBride's a *Girl Is a Half-Formed Thing*." *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 13 (2018): 77-88.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna, and Jakub Wróblewski. "*First We Feel Then We Fall*: James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* as an interactive video application." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, vol. 32, issue suppl. 2, 1 (2017): ii.124-ii.134.

Beach, Sylvia. "Introduction." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. vii-viii.

Beach, Sylvia. *The Letters of Sylvia Beach*. Ed. Keri Walsh. New York and Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2012. (First published in 2010.)

Beckett, Samuel. "Dante… Bruno. Vico.. Joyce." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 3-22.

Beckett, Samuel. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett: Volume II, 1941-1956*. Eds. George Craig, Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn, and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Begnal, Michael. "The Sommerfool in the Elephant's Belly, or Come Back to the Text Again, Peg, Honey!." *A Wake Newslitter*, 1 (1971): 7.

Begnal, Michael H. "Introduction." *A Conceptual Guide to "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Michael H. Begnal, and Fritz Senn. Minneapolis: University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974. ix-xi.

Begnal, Michael H. *Dreamscheme: Narrative and Voice in "Finnegans Wake"*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988.

Begnal, Michael H. "A Skeleton Key to Campbell and Robinson." *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*. Ed. Janet Egleson Dunleavy. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991. 36-45.

Begnal, Michael H. "*Finnegans Wake* and the Nature of Narrative." *Critical Essays on James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. Patrick A. McCarthy. New York: G. K. Hall; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992. 119-128.

Begnal, Michael H., and Fritz Senn, eds. *A Conceptual Guide to "Finnegans Wake"*. Minneapolis: University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974.

Beitchman, Philip. *I Am a Process with No Subject*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1988.

Beitchman, Philip. *Alchemy of the Word: Cabala of the Renaissance*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1998.

Beja, Morris. *James Joyce: A Literary Life*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1992.

Beja, Morris, and Shari Benstock. "Introduction." *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium*. Eds. Morris Beja, and Shari Benstock. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1989. ix-xv.

Bellow, Saul. "Common Needs, Common Preoccupations: An Interview with Saul Bellow." Interview by Jo Brans (1977). *Conversations with Saul Bellow*. Eds. Gloria L. Cronin, and Ben Siegel. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1994. 140-160.

Benjamin, Roy. "What Era's O'ering?: The Precession of the Equinoxes in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2010): 111-128.

Bennett, Linda. "George Moore and James Joyce: Story-Teller versus Stylist." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 66 (1977): 275-291.

Benstock, Bernard. "The Final Apostacy: James Joyce and *Finnegans Wake*." *ELH*, 4 (1961): 417-437.

Benstock, Bernard. *Joyce-again's Wake: An Analysis of "Finnegans Wake"*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1965.

Benstock, Bernard. "The James Joyce Industry: An Assessment in the Sixties." *Southern Review*, 2 (1966): 211-212.

Benstock, Bernard. Review of Joyce, James, a *Shorter Finnegans Wake*, Ed. Anthony Burgess, 1966. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1967). 137-139.

Benstock, Bernard. "The James Joyce Industry: A Reassessment." *Yeats, Joyce, and Beckett: New Light on Three Modern Irish Writers*. Eds. Kathleen McGrory, and John Unterecker. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1976. 118-132.

Benstock, Bernard. *James Joyce: The Undiscover'd Country*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1977a.

Benstock, Bernard. "The State of the "Wake"." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1977b): 237-240.

Benstock, Bernard. "Three Generations of *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1977c): 333-338.

Benstock, Bernard. Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 1980. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1980): 103-106.

Benstock, Bernard. *James Joyce*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1985.

Benstock, Bernard. "Introduction." *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988. 3-24.

Benstock, Shari. "Apostrophes: Framing *Finnegans Wake*." *Joycean Occasions: Essays from the Milwaukee James Joyce Conference*. Eds. Janet E. Dunleavy, Melvin J. Friedman, and Michael Patrick Gillespie. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1991. 95-124.

Bereś, Stanisław, and Kazimierz Braun. *Rozdarta kurtyna*. Londyn: Aneks, 1993.

Bereza, Henryk. "James Joyce." *Doświadczenia z lektur prozy obcej*. Warszawa: PIW, 1967. 83-94.

Bereza, Henryk. "Miara." *Obroty. Szkice literackie*. Warszawa: Spółka Wydawniczo-Księgarska, 1996. 97-101.

Bernstein, Matt A., and William A. Friedman. *Thinking about Equations: A Practical Guide for Developing Mathematical Intuition in the Physical Science and Engineering*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, 2009.

Berressem, Hanjo. "The Letter! The Litter!: The Defilements of the Signifier in *Finnegans Wake*." *Fifty Years*. Ed. Geert Lernout. European Joyce Studies, 2. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990. 139-164.

Best, Nigel. *Dawn: A Study of the Present Age and "Finnegans Wake" through a Close Look at FW Page 594: One Page Sufficient for Our Time*. 2nd edition. New Plymouth, New Zealand: Dawn Publishers, 1979.

Biddle, Arthur W., ed. *When Prophecy Still Had a Voice: The Letters of Thomas Merton and Robert Lax*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.

Bindervoet, Erik, and Robbert-Jan Henkes. "*Finnegans Wake* po holendersku, holenderski w *Finnegans Wake* i jak sobie z tym poradzić." Polish trans. Agata Sadza. *Przekładaniec*, 13-14 (2004-2005): 188-208.

Binelli, Andrea. "Joyce and What Is to Become of English." *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Enrico Terrinoni. Rome: Edizioni Q, 2012. 209-215.

Birmingham, Kevin. "A Portrait of the Artist as a Syphilitic: Revisiting James Joyce's Medical Record." *Harper's Magazine*, 329 (2014a): 76-77.

Birmingham, Kevin. *The Most Dangerous Book: The Battle for James Joyce's "Ulysses"*. New York: Penguin Books, 2014c.

Bíró, Endre. *Finnegan ébredése*. Hungarian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Budapest: Holnap, 1992.

Bishop, John. *The End: An Introductory Study of "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Stanford, CA: Standford University, 1981.

Bishop, John. *Joyce's Book of the Dark: "Finnegans Wake"*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.

Bishop, John. Review of Phipps, Frances, *Let Me Be Los: Codebook for "Finnegans Wake"*, 1987. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1989): 456-459.

Bishop, John. "Introduction." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. New York: Penguin, 1999. vii-xxv.

Black, Elizabeth. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Blades, John. *How to Study James Joyce*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996.

Blish, James. "Special Announcement: A *Wake* Appendix." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1972): 174-176.

Blish, James. *Spock Must Die!*. London: Corgi Books, 1984. (First published in 1974.)

Blish, James. *A Case of Conscience*. New York: Del Rey Impact, 2000. (First published in 1958.)

Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and Schools of the Ages*. New York, San Diego, and London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994.

Bloom, Harold. "An Interview with Harold Bloom." Interview by José Antonio Gurpegui. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 9 (1996): 165-181.

Bloom, Harold. *Take Arms Against a Sea of Troubles: The Power of the Reader's Mind Over a Universe of Death*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2020.

Bloor, Anthony John. *A Congitive Model of Fiction Writing*. PhD thesis. London: Middlesex University, 1997.

Blumenbach, Ulrich. *Üb-Errsetzungen aus dem Anglo-Wakischen ins Germano-Wakische: Untersuchungen zum Problem der Übersetzbarkeit von James Joyces* Finnegans Wake. MA dissertation. Berlin: Free University of Berlin, 1990.

Blumenbach, Ulrich. "A Bakhtinian Approach towards Translating *Finnegans Wake*." *Images of Joyce*. Eds. Clive Hart, C. George Sandulescu, Bonnie K. Scott, and Fritz Senn. Princess Grace Irish Library Series, 11. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1998. 645-649.

Błoński, Jan. *Widzieć jasno w zachwyceniu. Szkic literacki o twórczości Prousta*. Warszawa: PIW, 1965.

Boghossian, Peter, and James Lindsay. "What comes after postmodernism?." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 14 (2018): 1346-1347.

Boheemen, Christine van. "Joyce's Sublime Body: Trauma, Textuality, and Subjectivity." *Joycean Cultures/Culturing Joyces*. Eds. Vincent J. Cheng, Kimberly J. Devlin, and Margot Norris. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998. 23-43.

Boheemen-Saaf, Christine van. *Joyce, Derrida, Lacan, and the Trauma of History: Reading, Narrative and Postcolonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Bohnenkamp, Dennis. "Post-Einsteinian Physics and Literature: Towards a New Poetics." *Mosaic*, 3 (1989): 19-30.

Boldrini, Lucia. *In Dante's Wake: The Dantean Poetics of Finnegans Wake*. PhD thesis. Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996.

Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria. "Joyce on the Turrace of Babbel." *Classic Joyce*. Ed. Franca Ruggieri. Joyce Studies in Italy, 6. Rome: Bulzoni, 1999. 417-429.

Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria. "Joyce Slipping across the Borders of English: The Stranger in Language." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2001): 395-409.

Bonapfel, Elizabeth M. "Joyce's Punctuation and the Evolution of Narrative in *Finnegans Wake*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 4 (2019): 54-73.

Bonheim, Helmut. *Joyce's Benefictions*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964.

Bonheim, Helmut. *A Lexicon of the German in "Finnegans Wake"*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

Booker, M. Keith. *Work in Progress: History, Subjectivity, and Textuality in the Fiction of James Joyce*. PhD thesis. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1990.

Booker, M. Keith. "Decolonizing Literature: *Ulysses* and the Postcolonial Novel in English." *Pedagogy, Praxis, UIysses: Using Joyce's Text to Transform the Classroom*. Ed. Robert Newman. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. 135-151.

Booker, M. Keith. Review of Dettmar, Kevin, *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism*, 1996. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1999): 348-353.

Booker, M. Keith. *Ulysses, Capitalism, and Colonialism: Reading Joyce After the Cold War*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Booth, Wayne C. "The Problem of Distance in a *Portrait of the Artist*." *The Rhetoric of Fiction: Second Edition*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 323-336. (First published in 1961.)

Borden, Richard C. Toward a Postmodern "Bad": Sasha Sokolov." *The Art of Writing Badly: Valentin Kataev's Mauvism and the Rebirth of Russian Modernism*. Studies in Russian Literature and Theory. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1999. 311-338, 386-392.

Borg, Ruben. *The Measureless Time of Joyce Deleuze and Derrida*. London and New York: Continuum, 2007a.

Borg, Ruben. "Neologizing in *Finnegans Wake*: Beyond a Typology of the Wakean Portmanteau." *Poetics Today*, 1 (2007b): 143-164.

Borodin, David. "'Group Drinkards Maaks Grope Thinkards or How Reads Rotary' (*FW* 312.31): *Finnegans Wake* and the Group Reading Experience." *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 151-164.

Borowski, Gabriel. "Trankreacja: myśl przekładowa Haroldo de Camposa." *Przekładaniec*, 26 (2012): 87-107.

Bourbon, Brett. "The 'Twitterlitter' of Nonsense: Askesis at *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2002): 217-232.

Bourbon, Brett. "Senses and Nonsenses: Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations." *Finding a Replacement for the Soul: Mind and Meaning in Literature and Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2004. 143-259.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Forms of Capital." English trans. Richard Nice. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Ed. John G. Richardson. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1986. 241-258. (First published in German: Bourdieu, Pierre. "Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital." *Soziale Ungleichheiten*. Ed. Reinhard Kreckel. Goettingen: Otto Schartz & Co., 1983. 183-198.)

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. English trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. First published in 1984. (Original in French: *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1979.)

Bowen, Zack. *Musical Allusions in the Works of James Joyce*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1974.

Bowen, Zack. "*Ulysses* as a Comic Novel." *Joyce's "Ulysses": The Larger Perspective*. Eds. Robert D. Newman, and Weldon Thornton. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1987. 157-167.

Bowen, Zack. *Bloom's Old Sweet Song: Essays on Joyce and Music*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1995.

Bowen, Zack. "James Joyce." Encyclopedic entry. *Great World Writers: Twentieth Century*. Vol. 5. Ed. Patrick M. O'Neill. Tarrytown, NY: Marshall Cavendish, 2004. 635-658.

Bowker, Gordon. *James Joyce: A Biography*. London: Phoenix, 2012b.

Boyle, Robert. "Miracle in Black Ink: A Glance at Joyce's Use of His Eucharistic Image." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1972): 47-60.

Boysen, Benjamin. "Joyce's 'mimic miening': The *Wake* Language as the Language of Love." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 8.

Bradford, Richard. *Is Shakespeare Any Good? And Other Questions on How to Evaluate Literature*. Chichester, and Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

Brannigan, John, Geoff Ward, and Julian Wolfreys. "Foreword and Acknowledgements." *Re: Joyce: Text, Culture, Politics*. Eds. John Brannigan, Geoff Ward, and Julian Wolfreys. Houndmills: Macmillan; New York: St. Martins, 1998. xii-xvii.

Brannon, Julie Sloan. *Who Reads "Ulysses"? The Rhetoric of the Joyce Wars and the Common Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.

Brazier, Lucy. *Finnegans What?: Finnegans Wake – a guide by an idiot*. London: Smashing Blouse Productions, 2018.

Brick, Martin. "How Does Eschatology Order This Book of Kills: Religion and Fractal Geometry in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2012): 297-313.

Briggs, Andre. "Joyce's Drinking." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2012-2013): 453-482. (First published in 2011.)

Brink, André. "Introduction: Languages of the Novel." *The Novel: Language and Narrative from Cervantes to Calvino*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 1998. 1-19.

Brion, Marcel. "The Idea of Time in the Work of James Joyce." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 23-33.

Bristow, Daniel. "Following the Riverrun: *Finnegans Wake*'s First Word." *Notes and Queries*, 2 (2013): 291-292.

Bristow, Daniel. *Waking the Read: What is it to be Post-Joycean? In Reading, Writing, and Psychoanalysis*. PhD thesis. Manchester: University of Manchester, 2014.

Brivic, Sheldon. "The Mind Factory: Kabbalah in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1983): 7-30.

Brivic, Sheldon. *Joyce the Creator*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Brivic, Shelly. *Joyce Through Lacan and Žižek: Explorations*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Brockman, William S. "The "James Joyce Checklist": A Portrait of the Industry." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2003-2004): 61-67.

Brockman, William S. "Current JJ Checklist (102)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2007): 133-147.

Brockman, William S. Personal communication (Email). 16 Dec. 2014.

Brockman, William S. Personal communication (Email). 14 Mar. 2016a.

Brockman, William S. Personal communication (Email). 15 Mar. 2016b.

Brooker, Joseph. *Joyce's Critics: Transitions in Reading and Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Brooker, Joseph. "Reception History." *The Cambridge Companion to "Ulysses"*. Ed. Sean Latham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 19-32.

Brown, Norman O. *Apocalypse and/or Metamorphosis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.

Brown, Richard. *James Joyce and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. (First published in 1985.)

Brown, Richard. *James Joyce*. Modern Novelists. New York: St. Martin's Press / Macmillan Education, 1992.

Brown, Richard. "Jarry, Joyce and the Apocalyptic Intertextuality of The Atrocity Exhibition." *J. G. Ballard: Landscapes of Tomorrow*. Eds. Richard Brown, Christopher Duffy, and Elizabeth Stainforth. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2016. 69-86.

Brownstein, Marilyn L. "Against Mediation: The Rule of the Postmodern in the *Phaedrus* and *Finnegans Wake*." *Joyce, Modernity, and Its Mediation*. Ed. Christine van Boheemen. European Joyce Studies, 1. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989. 79-96.

Brożek, Bartosz. "Gdzie leżą granice słowa i czy istnieje język idealny?." Interview by Marcin Rotkiewicz. *Polityka*, 13 (2014): 68-70.

Bruns, Gerald L. "On the Words of the *Wake* (and What to Do with Them)." *Interruptions: The Fragmentary Aesthetic in Modern Literature*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2018. 117-132.

Bryll, Ernest, and Małgorzata Goraj. *Celtycki splot*. Poznań: Zysk, 2010.

Brzozowski, Jerzy. *Stanąć po stronie tłumacza. Zarys poetyki opisowej przekładu*. Kraków: WUJ, 2011.

Buckalew, Ronald E. "7. Night Lessons on Language. Book II chapter ii." *A Conceptual Guide to "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Michael H. Begnal, and Fritz Senn. Minneapolis: University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974. 93-115.

Budgen, Frank. "James Joyce's *Work in Progress* and Old Norse Poetry." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 35-46.

Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses'*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972. (First published in London: Grayson & Grayson, 1934.)

Bugajski, Leszek. "Wielki List." Review of Joyce, James, *Anna Livia Plurabelle*, in Maciej Słomczyński's Polish translation, 1985 *Fantastyka*, 8 (1986): 59.

Bulson, Eric. *The Cambridge Introduction to James Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Bulson, Eric. "Ulysses by Numbers." *Representations*, 1 (2014): 1-32.

Burgess, Anthony. *Here Comes Everybody: An Introduction to James Joyce for the Ordinary Reader*. London: Faber, 1965.

Burgess, Anthony. "What It's All About." *A Shorter Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Ed. Anthony Burgess. New York: Viking Press, 1967. xi-xxviii.

Burgess, Anthony. *Re Joyce*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Co., 1968.

Burgess, Anthony. *Joysprick: An Introduction to the Language of James Joyce*. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975. (First published in London: Deutsch, 1973.)

Burgess, Anthony. *This Man and Music*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.

Burgess, Anthony. "Nonsense." *Explorations in the Field of Nonsense*. Ed. Wim Tigges. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987. 17-21.

Burgess, Anthony. "Dealing with the Hinterland of the Consciousness." Interview by John Cullinan (1972). *Conversations with Anthony Burgess*. Eds. Earl G. Ingersoll, and Mary C. Ingersoll. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2008. 46-73.

Burgess, Anthony. *Little Wilson and Big God: Being the First Part of the Confessions of Anthony Burgess*. London: Vintage, 2012. (First published in 1987.)

Burgis, Ben, Conrad Hamilton, Matthew McManus, and Marion Trejo, with Slavoj Žižek. *Myth and Mayhem: A Leftist Critique of Jordan Peterson*. Winchester, UK: Zero Books, 2020.

Burke, Maxine. *James Joyce and His Influences: William Faulkner and Anthony Burgess*. PhD thesis. Des Moines: Drake University, 1981.

Burrell, Harry. *Narrative Design in "Finnegans Wake": The "Wake" Lock Picked*. Gainesville and Tallahassee: University Press of Florida, 1996.

Butor, Michel. "Crossing the Joycean Threshold." English trans. Jerry A. Stewart. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1970): 160-176.

Butor, Michel. *Powieść jako poszukiwanie*. Polish trans. Joanna Guze. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1971. (Selection of essays from original in French: Butor, Michel. *Répertoire*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1960 [vol. I], 1964 [vol. II], 1968 [vol. III].)

Byrne, Patrick. "Joyce's Dream Book Took Seventeen Years to Write." *Irish Digest*, LXXI (July 1964), 73-76.

Cage, John. *Writing through "Finnegans Wake"*. Tulsa: University of Tulsa, 1978.

Cage, John. *Empty Words: Writings '73-'78*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1981.

Cage, John. "Laughtears: Gespräch über *Roaratorio*/Laughtears: conversation on *Roaratorio*." Interview by Klaus Schöning. *Roaratorio: Ein irischer Circus über Finnegans Wake/An Irish Circus on Finnegans wake*. Ed. Klaus Schöning. Königstein/Taunus: Athenäum, 1982. 72-114.

Cage, John. *X: Writings '79-'82*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Cahalan, James M. *The Irish Novel: A Critical History*. Boston: Twayne, 1988.

Cahalan, James M. "'Dear Reader' and 'Drear Writer': Joyce's Direct Addresses to His Readers in *Finnegans Wake*." *Twentieth Century Literature*, 3 (1995): 306-318.

Cahalan, James M. *Double Visions: Women and Men in Modern and Contemporary Irish Fiction*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.

Cahalan, James M. "Irish Comedy." *Comedy: A Geographic and Historical Guide*. Vol. 2. Ed. Maurice Charney. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005. 380-393.

Cahill, Clinton. "Reflecting the Wake: *Finnegans Wake* as Stimulus and Context for Artists' Books." *Blue Notebook,* 2 (2010): 41-45.

Cahill, Clinton Barry. *Drawing the Wake: How might illustrative drawing contribute to a valid alternative reading of "Finnegans Wake"?*. PhD thesis. Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University, 2017.

Calvert, Sheena. *(Un)disciplined Gestures and (Un)common sense: The Sensual, Acoustic Logic(s) of Paradox and Art*. PhD thesis. London: University of Greenwich, 2009.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Commemorative Edition. Bollingen Series XVII. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004. (First published in 1949.)

Campbell, Joseph. *The Power of Myth*. With Bill Moyers. New York: Anchor Books, 1991.

Campbell, Joseph. *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words: On the Art of James Joyce*. Novato, CA: New World Library, 2004. (First published in 1993.)

Campbell, Joseph, and Henry Morton Robinson. *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake*. Cutchogue, NY: Buccaneer Books, 1976. (First published in New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1944.)

Campos, Haroldo de. "Sanscreed Latinized: The *Wake* in Brazil and Hispanic America." *In the Wake of the Wake*. Eds. David Hayman, and Elliott Anderson. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Camurri, Edoardo. "*Finnegans Wake*, un'opera psichedelica." *aut aut*, 372 (2016a): 75-91.

Camurri, Edoardo. "La guida di un poeta ingegnere nel labirinto di Joyce." *Il Foglio*, 2 Feb. 2016 (2016b).

Caneda Cabrera, M. Teresa. "The Sameness of Difference: Joyce's Kaleidoscopic Odyssey(s) throughout Europe." Review of Lernout, Geert, and Wim Van Mierlo (eds.), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, 2004. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2006): 139-150.

Capili, April. "'Yes, yes: a woman too. Life, life'. Lucia and the Life-Writing Aspects of Joyce's Novels." *Joyce's Fiction and the New Rise of the Novel*. Ed. Franca Ruggieri. Joyce Studies in Italy, 19. Rome: Editoriale Anicia, 2017. 47-59.

Caramello, Charles. *Silverless Mirrors: Book, Self & Postmodern American Fiction*. Tallahassee: University Press of Florida, 1983.

Carlin, Gerald. *Art and Authority: A Comparative Study of the Modernist Aesthetics of Ezra Pound*. PhD thesis. Coventry: The University of Warwick, 1994.

Cârneci, Magda. *Haosmos: Poeme 1985-1989*. Bucureşti : Cartea Românescâ, 1992.

Carnell, Simon. "*Finnegans Wake*: 'The Most Formidable Anti-Fascist Book Produced between the Two Wars'?." *Finnegans Wake: "teems of times"*. Ed. Andrew Treip. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994. 139-163.

Carpenter, William. "'Le Livre' of Mallarmé and James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Mallarmé in the Twentieth Century*. Eds. Robert Green Cohn, and Gerald Gillespie. Madison, WI and Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998. 187-202.

Carpentier, Martha C. "Introduction." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 1-10.

Carey, Phyllis. "Ireland, Island of Saints and Searchers." *In Principle, Beckett is Joyce*. Ed. Friedhelm Rathjen. Edinburgh: Split Pea Press, 1993. 83-97.

Carrière, Jean-Claude, and Umberto Eco. *This is Not the End of the Book: A Conversation Curated by Jean-Philippe de Tonnac*. English trans. Polly McLean. London: Harvill Secker, 2011. (Original in French: *Ne pensez pas vous débarrasser des livres*. Paris: Éditions Grasset & Fasquelle, 2009.)

Carroll, Lewis. "Stanza of Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *The Rectory Umbrella and Mischmasch*. Ed. Florence Milner. London: Cassell & Co., 1932. 139-141. (First presented in 1855.)

Carroll, Lewis. *The Annotated Alice: The Definitive Edition*. With introductions and notes by Martin Gardner. New York: W. N. Norton & Co., 2000.

Carter, John, and Nicolas Barker. *ABC for Book Collectors*. Eighth edition. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press; London: The British Library, 2004. (First published in 1952.)

Carver, Craig. "James Joyce and the Theory of Magic." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1978) [1978a]: 201-214.

Carver, Craig. *The Esoteric Joyce*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978b.

Carver, Craig. "An Inquiry into Wake Lexicography." *A Wake Newslitter*, 3 (1980): 33-46.

Catlin, Daniel D. *The Haunted Inkbottle: Problems of Artistic Communication in Modernism*. Trident Scholar Project Report, 156. Annapolis, MD: US Naval Academy, 1989.

Cawelti, John G. *Mystery, Violence, and Popular Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Chabon, Michael. "What to Make of Finnegans Wake?." *New York Review of Books*, 59.12 (2012): 45-48. [With replies by (i) Peter D'Epiro, (ii) Garrett Barden. "On the Vico Road.", with Michael Chabon's replies. 27 Sep. 2012.]

Chamberlin, London. "Creating a Lexical Universe: Redefining Burke's Dramatic Pentad through the Language of Finnegans Wake." *Papers and Publications: Interdisciplinary Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 3 (2014).

Cheng, Vincent J. *Shakespeare and Joyce: A Study of Finnegans Wake*. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1984.

Cheng, Vincent J. "'Goddinpotty': James Joyce and the Language of Excrement." *The Languages of Joyce: Selected Papers from the 11th International James Joyce Symposium, Venice, 12-18 June 1988*. Eds. R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli, C. Marengo Vaglio, and Chr. van Boheemen. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992. 85-99.

Cheng, Vincent J. "Of Canons, Colonies, and Critics: The Ethics and Politics of Postcolonial Joyce Studies." *Cultural Critique*, 35 (1996-1997): 81-104.

Chenier, Natasha Rose. *Dictionary Joyce: A Lexicographical Study of James Joyce and the* Oxford English Dictionary. MA dissertation. Vancouver: The University of British Columbia, 2014.

Cheu, Hoi Fung. *Zen and the Art of James Joyce*. PhD thesis. London, ON: University of Western Ontario, 1997.

Chia, Robert. *Organizational Analysis as Deconstructive Practice*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

Chomsky, Noam, and Edward S. Herman. *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1979.

Chong-keon, Kim. "Joycean Study in Korea." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1990): 465-472.

Christian, David. "Swimming upstream: Universal Darwinism and Human History." *Globalistics and Globalization Studies: Big History and Global History*. Eds. Leonid E. Grinin, Ilya V. Ilyin, Peter Herrmann, and Andrey V. Korotayev. Volgograd: Uchitel Publishing House, 2015. 138-154.

Christiani, Dounia Bunis. *Scandinavian Elements of Finnegans Wake*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Chwalewik, Witold. "O "Tristramie Shandy" L. Sterne'a." *Lawrence Sterne. Życie i myśli JW Pana Tristrama Shandy*. Vols. 1-2. Polish trans. Krystyna Tarnowska. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1958. 5-43.

Ciaccio, Jason. *Waking Dreams: Modernist Intoxications and the Poetics of Altered States*. PhD thesis. New York: The City University of New York, 2016.

Cieślikowska, Teresa. *Pisarstwo Teodora Parnickiego*. Warszawa: PAX, 1965.

Cixous, Hélène. "Promised Cities." English trans. Laurent Milesi. *Ex-Cities*. Eds. Aaron Levy, and Jean-Michel Rabaté. Contemporary Artist Series, 5. Philadelphia: Slought Books, 2006. 27-71.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Pleasure Reinciple or Paradox Lost." English trans. Laurent Milesi. *Volleys of Humanity: Essays, 1972-2009*. Ed. Eric Prenowitz. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011. 75-84.

Clark, Hillary Ann. *The Idea of Fictional Encyclopaedia: "Finnegans Wake", "Paradis", "The Cantos"*. PhD thesis. Vancouver: The University of British Columbia, 1985.

Clarke, Jim. "The 'Baroque Weaving Machine': Contrasting Counterpoint in James Joyce and Anthony Burgess." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 127-149.

Clements, Reed. *Non-Euclidean Eye Problems in the Geometry Lesson of "Finnegans Wake"*. MA dissertation. Halifax, NS: Dalhousie University, 2015.

Cliett, Bill Cole. *Riverrun to Livvy: Lots of Fun Reading the First Page of James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. n.p.: CreateSpace, 2011.

Colangelo, Jeremy. "Disauthoritative Joyce: Reading *Finnegan(')s Wake(s)*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 14.

Colangelo, Jeremy. "Textual Authority and Diagnostic Joyce: Re-Reading the Way We Read the *Wake*." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 2016: 65-83.

Colangelo, Jeremy. *Agnotologies of Modernism: Knowing the Unknown in Lewis, Woolf, Pound, and Joyce*. PhD thesis. London, ON: University of Western Ontario, 2018.

Coleman, Edwin. "There is no Fallacy of Arguing from Authority." *Informal Logic*, 3 (1995): 365-383.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge. In Two Volumes*. Vol. 1. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1835.

Compagno, Dario. "Theories of Authorship and Intention in the Twentieth Century. An Overview." *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 1 (2012): 37-53.

Conley, Craig. *Wye's Dictionary of Improbable Words: All-Vowel Words And All-Consonant Words*. n.p.: CreateSpace, 2009.

Conley, Tim. *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation*. PhD thesis. Kingston: Queen's University, 2001.

Conley, Tim. "'Oh Me None Onsens!': *Finnegans Wake* and the Negation of Meaning." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2002): 233-249.

Conley, Tim. ""Are You to Have All the Pleasure Quizzing on Me?" *Finnegans Wake* and Literary Cognition." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (2003): 711-727.

Conley, Tim. Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 2006. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2007): 363-366.

Conley, Tim. "Language and languages." *James Joyce in Context*. Ed. John McCourt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 309-319.

Conley, Tim, ed. *Joyce's Disciples Disciplined: A Re-Exagmination of the 'Exagmination' of 'Work in Progress'*. University College Dublin Press, 2010.

Conley, Tim. "'Avec hésitance': Lavergne's Footnotes and Translations of *Finnegans Wake*." *Scientia Traductionis*, 12 (2012): 20-35.

Conley, Tim. ""Tuck in your blank!": Antiaposiopetic Joyce." *Doubtful Points: Joyce and Punctuation*. Eds. Elizabeth M. Bonapfel, and Tim Conley. European Joyce Studies, 23. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2014. 193-210.

Conley, Tim. "'Uptenable from the Orther': New Editions of *Finnegans Wake*." Review of (i) Joyce, James, *The Restored Finnegans Wake*, 2012; (ii) Joyce, James, *Finnegans*

Wake, Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Eric Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham, 2012. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2017a): 417-424.

Conley, Tim. *Useless Joyce: Textual Functions, Cultural Appropriations*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2017b.

Conner, Marc. Review of Gibson, George Sinclair, *Wake Rites: The Ancient Irish Rituals of Finnegans Wake*, 2005. *South Atlantic Review*, 4 (2007): 135-138.

Conner, Marc C. "The Poetry of James Joyce Reconsidered." *The Poetry of James Joyce Reconsidered*. *South Atlantic Review*. Ed. Marc C. Conner. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012. 1-32.

Connor, Steven. "The Modern Auditory I." *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. Ed. Roy Porter. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. 203-223. (First published in 1997.)

Cook-Deegan, Robert M. "Social and Ethical Implications of Advances in Human Genetics." *Southern Medical Journal*, 8 (1990): 879-882.

Corkern, James. *Symphony and the Aesthetic in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Honors thesis. Chattanooga: University of Tennessee, 2010.

Cornwell, Neil. *James Joyce and the Russians*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1992.

Cosgrove, Brian. *James Joyce's Negations: Irony, Indeterminacy and Nihilism in "Ulysses" and Other Writings*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2007.

Cotter, David. *James Joyce & the Perverse Ideal*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.

Crawford, Robert. "MacDiarmid and English Identity." *The Literature of Place*. Eds. Norman Page, and Peter Preston. Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1993. 132-155.

Crispi, Luca. "The Notescape of Ulysses." *New Quotatoes: Joycean Exogenesis in the Digital Age*. Eds. Ronan Crowley, and Dirk Van Hulle. European Joyce Studies, 25. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2016. 75-87.

Crispi, Luca, and Sam Slote, eds. *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007.

Crispi, Luca, Sam Slote, and Dirk Van Hulle. "Introduction." *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Eds. Luca Crispi, and Sam Slote. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007. 3-48.

Critchley, Simon, and Tom McCarthy. "Of Chrematology: Joyce and Money." *Theology and the Political: The New Debate*. Sic 5. Eds. Creston Davis, John Milbank, and Slavoj Žižek. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005. 183-199.

Cronin, Michael. "Game Theory and Translation." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker, with Kirsten Malmkjær. London and New York: Routledge: 2001. 91-93. (First published in 1998.)

Cronin, Michael. *Translation in the Digital Age*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge: 2013.

Cross, Richard K. *Flaubert and Joyce: The Rite of Fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Crow, Timothy J. "Is schizophrenia the price that Homo sapiens pays for language?." *Schizophrenia Research*, 2-3 (1997): 127-141.

Crow, Timothy J. "Schizophrenia as the price that homo sapiens pays for language: A resolution of the central paradox in the origin of the species." *Brain Research Reviews*, 2-3 (2000): 118-129.

Crowley, Aleister. "The Genius of Mr. James Joyce." *New Pearson's Magazine*, xlix (1923): 52-53.

Crowley, Tony. "Signs of Belonging: Languages, Nations and Culture in the Old and New Europe." *Language, Culture and Communication in Contemporary Europe*. Ed. Charlotte Hoffmann. Clevedon, Philadelphia, and Adelaide: Multilingual Matters, 1996. 47-60.

Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 5th edition, revised by M. A. R. Habib. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Culler, Jonathan. "The Call of the Phoneme: Introduction." *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*. Ed. Jonathan Culler. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988. 1-16.

Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. (First published in 1997.)

Culler, Jonathan. "In defence of overinterpretation." *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. By Umberto Eco, with Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler, and Christine Brooke-Rose. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 109-123. (First published in 1992.)

Culler, Jonathan. *The Literary in Theory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Culleton, Claire A. *Names and Naming in Joyce*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

Culleton, Claire A. *Joyce and the G-Men: J. Edgar Hoover's Manipulation of Modernism*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Cummins, Alison. *The Languages of Music and Emotion in Joyce, Schoenberg, Cage, and Beckett*. Research thesis. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2016.

Curyłło-Klag, Izabela. "Rendering the Peculiarities of Style: Witkacy in translation." *Continutiy in Language: Styles and Registers in Literary and Non-Literary Discourse*. Ed. Ewa Willim. Kraków: Kraków Society for Education: AFM Publishing House, 2014. 67-79.

Czarnecki, Jan. *Musica Textualis: Word-Made Music in Prose as a Philosophical Problem*. PhD thesis. Padua: Università degli Studi di Padova, 2017.

Ćwiąkała-Piątkowska, Jadwiga. "Poezja Joyce'a." *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1973): 268-277.

Dabney, Lewis M. *Edmund Wilson: A Life in Literature*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2007. (First published in New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2005.)

Dai, Congrong. "A Chinese Translation of *Finnegans Wake*: The Work in Progress." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (2010): 579-588.

Dai, Congrong. *Fen ni gen de shou ling ye [Fennigen de Shouling Ye]*. Chinese (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Shanghai: Renmin Chubanshe, 2013.

Daily, Jay E. "Novels." *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*. Vol. 20. Eds. Allen Kent, Harold Lancour, Jay E. Daily, and William Z. Nasri. New York and Basel: Marcel Dekker, 1977. 284-314.

Dalton, Jack P. "Advertisement for the Restoration." *Twelve and a Tilly: Essays on the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Jack P. Dalton, and Clive Hart. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965. 119-137.

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?*. Princeton, NJ, and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Daniel, E. Valentine. *Fluid Signs: Being a Person the Tamil Way*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1984.

Dapp, Theresa. "Viel gefeiert, wenig gelesen?." *Neue Westfälische*. 14 Jan. 2016, 23.

Darasz, Wiktor J. "Tadeusz Szczerbowski. Gry językowe w przekładach *Ulissesa* Jamesa Joyce'a." *Język Polski*, 5 (2000): 382-384.

Davenport, Guy. "The Symbol of the Archaic." *The Guy Davenport Reader*. Ed. Erik Reece. Berkeley: Counterpoint, 2013. 239-254. (First published in 1974.)

Davenport, John. *Will as Commitment and Resolve: An Existential Account of Creativity, Love, Virtue, and Happiness*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007.

Davies, James. *Reading of selected writings of James Joyce in relation to the works of Gilles Deleuze (and Felix Guattari)*. PhD thesis. Leeds: The University of Leeds / The School of English, 2005.

Deane, Seamus. "Introduction." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 1992. vii-l.

Deane, Seamus. "Note on the New Edition of *Finnegans Wake*." *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 2012. vii-viii.

Deane, Vincent. "Editorial." *A "Finnegans Wake" Circular*, 1 (1985): 1.

De la Durantaye, Leland. *Beckett's Art of Mismaking*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Delany, Samuel R. *The Einstein Intersection*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press. 1998. (First published in 1967.)

Delany, Samuel R. *Dhalgren*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001. (First published in 1975.)

Delany, Samuel R. "Time Considered as a Helix of Semi-Precious Stones." *Aye, and Gomorrah*. New York: Vintage Books. 2003: 218-259. (First published in 1968.)

Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*. English trans. Mark Lester, with Charles Stivale. Ed. Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990. (Original in French first published in 1969.)

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. English trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. (Original in French first published in 1980.)

DeLillo, Don. *Libra*. New York: Penguin Books, 1991. (First published in 1988.)

DeLillo, Don. "'An Outsider in This Society': An Interview with Don DeLillo." Interview by Anthony DeCurtis. *Conversations with Don DeLillo*. Ed. Thomas DePietro. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2005. 52-74.

Delpech, Jeanine. "Thornton Wilder: Author of *Our Town* and *The Ides of March* in Paris." Interview. English trans. Elizabeth J. Bryer. *Conversations with Thornton Wilder*. Ed. Jackson R. Bryer. Jackson and London: University Press of Mississippi, 1992. 51-55.

Delville, Michel. "Epifanie i poematy prozą: James Joyce a poetyka fragmentu." Polish trans. Katarzyna Bojarska. *Literatura na Świecie*, 11-12 (2007): 33-57.

De Meyer, Carolyn. "The Economy of Translation." *Economically Speaking: Essays in Honour of Chris Braecke*. Eds. Katja Pelsmaekers, and Craig Rollo. Antwerp and Apeldoorn: Garant, 2007. 139-152.

Deming, Robert H. *A Bibliography of James Joyce Studies*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Libraries, 1964.

Deming, Robert H., ed. *James Joyce. Volume 2, 1928-1941: The Critical Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. (First published in 1970.)

Deppman, Jed. Review of Fordham, Finn, *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake*, 2007. *The Review of English Studies*, 239 (2008): 312-314.

Deppman, Jed. Review of Brown, Richard, ed, a *Companion to James Joyce*, 2007. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2009): 379-382.

Deppman, Jed. "The Problem of Genesis." *Hypermedia Joyce*. Eds. David Vichnar, and Louis Armand. Prague: Litteraria Pragensia, 2010. 141-162.

Derrida, Jacques. "Two Words for Joyce." English trans. Geoffrey Bennington. *Post-structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*. Eds. Derek Attridge, and Daniel Ferrer. Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 145-159. (Translation of the transcript of Derrida's talk given at the Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 1982.)

Derrida, Jacques. "Ulysses Gramophone: *Hear say yes in Joyce*." *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988. 27-75.

Dettmar, Kevin J. H. *Rereading the New: A Backward Glance at Modernism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Dettmar, Kevin J. H. *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism: Reading Against the Grain*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.

Dettmar, Kevin J. H. Review of Brooker, Joseph, *Joyce's Critics: Transitions in Reading and Culture*, 2004. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2007): 376-379.

Devlin, Kimberly J. *Wandering and Return in "Finnegans Wake": An Integrative Approach to Joyce's Fictions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.

DiBernard, Barbara. *Alchemy and "Finnegans Wake"*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1980.

Dick, Philip K. *The Divine Invasion*. Boston: First Mariner Books, 2011a. (First published in 1981.)

Dick, Philip K. *The Exegesis of Philip K Dick*. Eds. Pamela Jackson, and Jonathan Lethem. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011b.

Dick, Philip K. *Flow My Tears, the Policeman Said*. Boston: First Mariner Books, 2012. (First published in 1974.)

Diepeveen, Leonard. *The Difficulties of Modernism*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.

Dilworth, Thomas. Review of Conley, Tim, *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation,* 2003. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 1 (2004-2005): 555-557.

Dixon, Vladimir. "A Litter to Mr. James Joyce." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 193-194.

Donoghue, Denis. *We Irish: Essays on Irish Literature and Society*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1988. (First published in 1986.)

Donoghue, Denis. "Joyce, Leavis, and the Revolution of the Word." *Irish Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 170-190.

Drozdowski, Bohdan. *O poezji: Szkice*. Warszawa: Iskry, 1977.

Drożdż, Stanisław, Paweł Oświęcimka, Andrzej Kulig, Jarosław Kwapień, Katarzyna Bazarnik, Iwona Grabska-Gradzińska, Jan Rybicki, and Marek Stanuszek. "Quantifying origin and character of long-range correlations in narrative texts." *Information Sciences*, 331 (2016): 32-44.

Dukaj, Jacek. "10 sposobów na zgnojenie książki." *Science Fiction*, 28 (2003): 92-93.

Eagle, Chris. "'Stuttutistics': On Speech Disorders in *Finnegans Wake*." [Title inside volume: "'Stuttistics': On Speech Disorders in *Finnegans Wake*."] *Literature, Speech Disorders, and Disability: Talking Normal*. Ed. Chris Eagle. New York and London: Routledge, 2014. 82-99.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso Editions, 1978. (First published in London: NLB, 1976.)

Eagleton, Terry. "Nationalism: Irony and Commitment." *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. 23-39.

Eagleton, Terry. "James Joyce." *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005. 281-307.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Meaning of Life: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Eagleton, Terry. *How to Read Literature*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013.

Eastman, Max. *The Literary Mind: Its Place in an Age of Science*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. 97-102. (Excerpted in Deming 2005: 416-419.)

Eckley, Grace. *The Encryption of "Finnegans Wake" Resolved: W. T. Stead*. Lanham, MD, and London: Hamilton Books, 2018.

Eco, Umberto. "Come si dice in italiano tumptytumtoes?." *L'Espresso*. 28 May 1978: 74-83.

Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Midland Books, 1984. (First published in Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.)

Eco, Umberto. "Intentio Lectoris." *Differentia: Review of Italian Thought*, 2 (1988): 147-168.

Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: The Middle Ages of James Joyce*. English trans. Ellen Esrock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989a.

Eco, Umberto. *The Open Work*. English trans. Anna Cancogni. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989b.

Eco, Umberto. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Midland Books, 1990.

Eco, Umberto. "Interpretation and Overinterpretation: World, History, Texts." *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Ed. Grethe B. Paterson. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1991. 141-203.

Eco, Umberto. "Joyce, Semiosis and Semiotics." *The Languages of Joyce: Selected Papers from the 11th International James Joyce Symposium, Venice, 12-18 June 1988*. Eds. R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli, C. Marengo Vaglio, and Chr. van Boheemen. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992. 19-38.

Eco, Umberto. "Afterword." *The Future of the Book*. Ed. Geoffrey Nunberg. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996a. 295-306.

Eco, Umberto. "Ostrigotta, ora capesco." *Anna Livia Plurabelle*. By James Joyce. In French and Italian translations. Ed. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli. Turin: Einaudi, 1996b. v-xxix.

Eco, Umberto. *Poetyki Joyce'a*. Polish trans. Marek Kośnik. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR, 1998. (Original in Italian: *Le poetiche di Joyce*. Milano: Bompiani, 1994.)

Eco, Umberto. "Dwie hipotezy na temat śmierci sztuki." *Sztuka*. Polish trans. Piotr Salwa, and Mateusz Salwa. Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2008a. (Original in Italian: "Due ipotesi sulla morte dell'arte." *Il Verri*, June 1963.)

Eco, Umberto. *Experiences in Translation*. English trans. Alastair McEwen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008b. (First published in 2001.)

Edel, Leon. "The Genius and the Injustice Collector: A Memoir of James Joyce." *American Scholar*, 4 (1980): 467-487.

Eide, Marian. *Ethical Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Eile, Stanisław. "Światopogląd powieści." *Literatura współczesna*. 3rd edition, revised. Ed. Jacek Kajtoch. Kraków: UJ, 1980. 277-328.

Elektorowicz, Leszek. *Zwierciadło w okruchach*. Warszawa: PIW, 1966.

Elgue-Martini, Cristina. "*Finnegans Wake* in Ricardo Piglia's *La ciudad ausente*." *ABEI Journal: The Brazilian Journal of Irish Studies*, 10 (2008): 67-74.

Elliott, Richard. *The Sound of Nonsense*. New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Ellmann, Maud. "The Sixth Act: Shakespeare After Joyce." *Shakespeare Survey*, 56 (2003), 137-145.

Ellmann, Maud. "James Joyce." *Joyce, T. S. Eliot, Auden, Beckett*: *Great Shakespeareans. Volume XII*. Ed. Adrian Poole. London: Continuum, 2012. 10-56.

Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce. The First Revision of the 1959 Classic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Polish trans. Ewa Krasińska. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984.

Ellmann, Richard. "A Portrait of James Joyce's Biographer." Interview by William K. Robertson (1982). *Essays for Richard Ellmann: Omnium Gatherum*. Eds. Susan Dick, Declan Kiberd, Dougald McMillan, and Joseph Ronsley. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989. 42-48.

Eoyang, Eugene. *East-West Symbioses: The Reconciliation of Opposites*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019.

Epstein, E. L. "Interpreting *Finnegans Wake*: A Half-Way House." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1966): 252-271.

Epstein, Edmund Lloyd. *A Guide through Finnegans Wake*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009.

Erickson, Millard J. *Introducing Christian Doctrine*. 2nd edition. Ed. L. Arnold Hustad. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006. (First published in 1992.)

Eriksson, Richard. *The Truce, the Old Truce, and Nationbuff the Truce: A Creative Reading of James Joyce's* Finnegans Wake. BA project. Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2012.

Erzgräber, Willi. "Zack Bowen and James F. Carens, a *Companion to Joyce Studies*." Review. *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch*. Vol. 27. Ed. Kurt Müller. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1986. 360-363.

Eustachiewicz, Lesław. *Między współczesnością a historią*. Warszawa: PAX, 1973.

Evans, Oliver Rory Thomas. *"What cant be coded can be decorded": Reading Writing Performing "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Birkbeck: University of London, 2016.

Evans, Ollie, Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes, and Derek Pyle. "Joyce Smithy: A Curated Review of Joyce in Visual Art, Music, and Performance." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2014): 181-191.

Evans, Ollie, Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes, and Derek Pyle. "Joyce Smithy: A Curated Review of Joyce in Visual Art, Music, and Performance (2016)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2015): 693-706.

Fabb, Nigel. "Is literary language a development of ordinary language?." *Lingua*, 5 (2010): 1219-1232.

Fagan, Paul. *"nat language at any sinse of the world": The Processes of Signification in James Joyce's* Finnegans Wake. MA dissertation. Vienna: University of Vienna, 2010.

Fagan, Paul. "'A Mixer and a Wordpainter': *Finnegans Wake* in the Age of Remix Culture." *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Enrico Terrinoni. Roma: Edizioni Q, 2012. 49-67.

Fagan Paul. "F for (Finnegans) Fake: James Joyce and The Great Hoax." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 19.

Fagan, Paul. "'An Upstart Crow, Beautified with Our Feathers': *Finnegans Wake*, *Hamlet*, and the Problem of Context." *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Ed. Laura Pelaschiar. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2015. 161-188.

Fajfer, Zenon. "Co nowego w branży hotelarskiej." *EleWator*, 4 (2015): 155-157.

Farbman, Herschel. "Finnegans Wake." *The Other Night: Dreaming, Writing, and Restlessness in Twentieth-Century Literature*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008. 89-108.

Fargnoli, A. Nicholas, and Michael Patrick Gillespie. *Critical Companion to James Joyce: A Literary Reference to his Life and Work*. New York: Facts On File, 2006.

Farkas, Á. I. *Will's Son and Jake's Peer: Anthony Burgess's Joycean Negotiations*. Philosophiae Doctores, 4. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2002.

Feldstein, Richard. *Political Correctness: A Response from the Cultural Left*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Fennell, Conor. *A Little Circle of Kindred Minds: Joyce in Paris*. Dublin: Green Lamp Editions, 2011.

Ferguson, Andrew. "Escaping Mother Brain: Gameplay and Glitches in *Finnegans Wake*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014a: 20.

Fernández Vicente, Olga. "Escaping the Boundaries of Modernism: James Joyce's Continuous Search for Independence." *Joyce's Heirs: Joyce's Imprint on Recent Global Literatures*. Eds. Olga Fernández Vicente, Mari Mar Boillos Pereira, Richard Jorge Fernández, and Paulo Kortazar Billelabeitia. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2019. 24-42.

Ferrer, Daniel. "Joyce's Notebooks: Publicizing the Private Sphere of Writing." *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace*. Eds. Ian Willison, Warwick Gould, and Warren Chernaik. Houndmills: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's, 1996. 202-222.

Ferris, Kathleen. *James Joyce and the Burden of Disease*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010. (First published in 1995.)

Feshbach, Sidney. "The Hundredlettered Name: Thunder in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *New Queries in Aesthetics and Metaphysics: Time, Historicity, Art, Culture, Metaphysics, the Transnatural*. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. *Analecta Husserliana*, 37. Dordrecht: Springer Science/Kluwer, 1991. 283-297.

Feshbach, Sidney. "Deeply Indebted: On Thornton Wilder's Interest in James Joyce." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1994): 495-517.

Finnegans Wake. A BookCaps Study Guide. [no author] CreateSpace, 2011. ISBN: 978-1478251958.

Finkelstein, Norman. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. London: Verso Books, 2000.

Fischer, Andreas. "Strange Words, Strange Music: The Verbal Music of the 'Sirens' Episode in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *On Strangeness*. Ed. Margaret Bridges. SPELL: Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature, 5. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1990. 39-55.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fishman, Joel. "The Big Lie and the Media War Against Israel: From Inversion of the Truth to Inversion of Reality." *Jewish Political Studies Review*, 1-2 (2007): 59-81.

Fisk, Catherine L. "The Modern Author at Work on Madison Avenue." *Modernism & Copyright*. Ed. Paul K. Saint-Amour. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 173-194.

Fitch, Noel. "Sylvia Beach's Shakespeare & Company: Port of Call for American Expatriates." *Research Studies*, 33 (1965): 197-207.

Fitch, Toby. *Themparks: Alternative Play In Contemporary Australian Poetry*. DArts thesis. Sydney: The University of Sydney, 2016.

Fleming, William S. "Formulaic Rhythms in *Finnegans Wake*." *Style*, 1 (1972): 19-37.

Fodaski Black, Martha. *Shaw and Joyce: "The Last Word in Stolentelling"*. Gainesville and Tallahassee: University Press of Florida, 1995.

Fomenko, E. G. "Славянизмы в "Поминках по Финнегану" Джеймса Джойса." Zaporozhye: Classic Private University: 2017b.

Fomenko, E. G. "Obstacles to the Cyrillic Version of "Finnegans Wake" by J. Joyce." *General and Specialist Translation / Interpretation: Theory, Methods, Practice*. Ed. A. G. Gudmanyan. Kyiv: Agrar Media Group, 2018. 31-35.

Ford, Jane M. *Patriarchy and Incest from Shakespeare to Joyce*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Fordham, Finn. "Nokturny *Finnegans Wake*." Polish trans. Katarzyna Bazarnik. *Wokół Jamesa Joyce'a*. Eds. Katarzyna Bazarnik, and Finn Fordham. Kraków: Universitas, 1999. 97-108.

Fordham, Finn. "Powieści jako podziemne światy: *Finnegans Wake* Jamesa Joyce'a, *Infinite Jest* Davida Fostera Wallace'a, *Podziemia* Dona De Lillo i *House of Leaves* Marka Z. Danielewskiego." Polish trans. Izabela Curyłło-Klag [pages 144-155 directly on FW], and Bożena Kucała, with passages from FW translated by Katarzyna Bazarnik. *Od Joyce'a do liberatury*. Ed. Katarzyna Bazarnik. Kraków: Universitas, 2002: 139-168.

Fordham, Finn. *Lots of Fun at "Finnegans Wake": Unravelling Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fordham, Finn. Review of Kitcher, Philip, *Joyce's Kaleidoscope: An Invitation to Finnegans Wake*, 2007. *The Review of English Studies*, 239 (2008): 314-316.

Fordham, Finn. "*Finnegans Wake* in a Dentist's Waiting Room." *Joyce's Disciples Disciplined: A Re-Exagmination of the 'Exagmination' of 'Work in Progress'*. Ed. Tim Conley. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2010. 128-142.

Fordham, Finn. "*Finnegans Wake*: Novel and Anti-Novel." *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2011. 71-89. (First published in 2008.)

Fordham, Finn. "Chapter by Chapter Outline." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012a. xxxv-xlv.

Fordham, Finn. "Introduction." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012b. vii-xxxiv.

Fordham, Finn. "Select Bibliography." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012c. l-lv.

Fordham, Finn. "Lightning Becomes Electra: Violence, Inspiration, and Lucia Joyce in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2012-2013) [2013b]: 335-357. (First published in 2002.)

Fordham, Finn. "Joyce in the Shadow of War and Fascism: A Review of *Finnegans Wake* by Mario Praz." *Joyce's Fiction and the New Rise of the Novel*. Ed. Franca Ruggieri. Joyce Studies in Italy, 19. Rome: Editoriale Anicia, 2017. 301-322.

Fordham, Finn, Robbert-Jan Henkes, and Erik Bindervoet. "Announcing: An Emended *Finnegans Wake* with Full Explanatory Apparatus: A Sample of Pages 3-9." *Dublin James Joyce Journal*, 8 (2015): 95-113.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?." *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*. English trans. Donald Bouchard, and Sherry Simon. Ed. Donald Bouchard. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977. 113-138.

Fowler, Alastair. *Literary Names: Personal Names in English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Fox, Brian. *'land of breach of promise': James Joyce and America*. PhD thesis. Egham: Royal Holloway, University of London, 2014.

Franke, William. "Linguistic Repetition as Theological Revelation in Christian Epic Tradition: The Case of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *Neophilologus*, 1 (2006): 155-172.

Franke, William. "James Joyce and the Bible." *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*. Eds. Rebecca Lemon, Emma Masson, Jonathan Roberts, and Christopher Rowland. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009a. 638-649.

Franke, William. "Linguistic Repetition as Theological Revelation in Christian Epic Tradition from Dante to Joyce." *Poetry and Apocalypse: Theological Disclosures of Poetic Language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009b. 97-123.

Franz, Milon. *Confronting Modernity, Subjectivity and Nationality: A Study of James Joyce's "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" and O. V. Vijayan's "The Legends of Khasak"*. PhD thesis. Aluva: Union Christian College, 2012.

Fraser, Howard, and Daniel Altamiranda. "Carlos Fuentes." Updated by Susana Perea-Fox. *Critical Survey of Long Fiction*. 4th edition. Ed. Carl Rollyson. Pasadena, CA, and Hackensack, NJ: Salem Press, 2010. 1664-1673. (First published in 1983.)

Fraser, Jennifer Margaret. "The 'Laughtears' of the Child Be Longing: James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *Be a Good Soldier: Children's Grief in English Modernist Novels*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011. 176-209.

Fredkin, Grace. "S in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1986): 189-199.

Freedman, Carl. *Critical Theory and Science Fiction*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2000.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Reading Joyce: Icon of Modernity? Champion of Alterity? Ventriloquist of Otherness?." *Joycean Cultures/Culturing Joyces*. Eds. Vincent J.

Cheng, Kimberly J. Devlin, and Margot Norris. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998. 113-133.

Frumkin, Robert. "Zen in *Finnegans Wake*: Joyce's Prankquean Koan." *Abiko Literary Rag*, 11 (1992-1993): 65-67.

Frumkin, Robert. "*Finnegans Wake* and Tibetan Buddhism." *Abiko Quarterly with James Joyce Studies*, 6 (1994): 264-288.

Frye, Northrop. *The Educated Imagination*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Frye, Northrop. "Cycle and Apocalypse in *Finnegans Wake*." *Northrop Frye on Twentieth-Century Literature*. Ed. Glen Robert Gill. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010. 332-349.

Frye, Northrop. "Theory of Genres." (1957) *The Lyric Theory Reader: A Critical Anthology*. Eds. Virginia Jackson, and Yopie Prins. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 30-39.

Fuller Torrey, E., and Judy Miller. *The Invisible Plague: The Rise of Mental Illness from 1750 to the Present*. New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2001.

Fuse, Mikio. "The Letter and the Groaning: Chapter I.5." *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Eds. Luca Crispi, and Sam Slote. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007. 98-123.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "Joyce's Text in Progress." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 213-236.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "Appendix 1." *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 2012. 495-502.

Gagliardi, Caio. "The problem of *authorship* in literary theory: deletions, resumptions and reviews." *Estudos Avançados*, 23 (2011): 285-299.

Gaiser, Gottlieb. "Joyce and Joyceans: A Critical View on the Problem of Institutionalization." *International Perspectives on James Joyce*. Ed. Gottlieb Gaiser. Troy, NY: Whitston, 1986. 247-260.

Galloway, David D. "Absurd Art, Absurd Man, Absurd Heroes." *Literature and Western Civilization: The Modern World. III. Reactions*. Eds. David Daiches, and Anthony Thorlby. London: Aldus Books, 1976. 117-146.

García Tortosa, Francisco. "*Finnegans Wake* in Retrospective." *Papers on Joyce*, 17-18 (2011-2012): 333-348.

Garvin, John. *James Joyce's Disunited Kingdom and the Irish Dimension*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976.

Gault, Jean-Louis. "Two Statuses of the Symptom: "Let Us Turn to Finn Again"." *The Later Lacan: An Introduction*. Eds. Véronique Voruz, and Bogdan Wolf. Albany: SUNY Press, 2007. 73-82.

Gayford, Norman L. "Lovecraft and James Joyce." *Lovecraft Studies*, 8 (1989): 3-9.

Geist, Sidney. *Brancusi: A Study of the Sculpture*. Paris: Galerie de France – Editions de Regard, 1985. (First published in 1968.)

Gell-Mann, Murray. *The Quark and the Jaguar: Adventures in the Simple and the Complex*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1994.

Genette, Gérard. "Introduction to the Paratext." English trans. Marie Maclean. *New Literary History*, 2 (1991): 261-272.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. English trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997. (Original in French: *Seuils*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987.)

Gibson, Andrew. *James Joyce*. London: Reaktion, 2006.

Gibson, George Cinclair. *"Wake" Rites: The Ancient Irish Rituals of "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 2001.

Giczela-Pastwa, Justyna: *Ekwiwalencja tłumaczeniowa na przykładzie wybranych fragmentów polskich przekładów prozy James Joyce'a*. Gdańsk: WUG, 2011.

Gilbert, Stuart. "Prolegomena to *Work in Progress*." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 47-75.

Gillespie, Gerald. *Echoland: Readings from Humanism to Postmodernism*. Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2006.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 1980. *Studies in the Novel*, 1 (1982): 116-119.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "Lurking Ad the Litter." *New Alliances in Joyce Studies: "When it's Aped to Foul a Delfian"*. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988. 230-237.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "Reading on the Edge of Chaos: *Finnegans Wake* and the Burden of Linearity." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 2 (1998-1999): 359-371.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. *The Aesthetics of Chaos: Nonlinear Thinking and Contemporary Literary Criticism*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.

Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "Past Its Sell-By Date: When to Stop Reading Joyce Criticism." *Bloomsday 100: Essays on Ulysses*. Eds. Morris Beja, and Anne Fogarty. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009. 213-227.

Gillespie, Paula. "James Joyce (1882-1941)." *Modern Irish Writers: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Alexander C. Gonzalez. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Gillet, Louis. *Claybook for James Joyce*. English trans. Georges Markow-Totevy. With an article by André Gide. London and New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1958. (Original in French: *Stèle pour James Joyce*. Marseille: Sagittaire, 1941.)

Gischler, Victor. *The Pistol Poets*. New York: Delacorte Press, 2004.

Gladwell, Malcolm. *Outliers: The Story of Success*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2008.

Glasheen, Adaline. *A Second Census of "Finnegans Wake": An Index of the Characters and Their Roles*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Glasheen, Adaline. Review of Tindall, William York, a *Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*, 1969. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1969): 70.

Glasheen, Adaline. *Third Census of "Finnegans Wake"*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Głos, Łukasz. "Na pograniczu literatury. Z problemów literackości w sztuce XXI wieku." *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska*, 2 (2017): 91-101.

Gloversmith, Frank. *The Theory of Reading*. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1984.

Gluck, Barbara Reich. *Beckett and Joyce: Friendship and Fiction*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1979.

Gobbo, Federico, and Reinhard Fößmeier. "A University Mainly in Esperanto." *RASK*, 35 (2012): 87-106.

Goldman, Arnold. Review of Tindall, William York, a *Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*, 1969. *The Review of English Studies*, 85 (1971): 105-107.

Goldman, Arnold. Review of Benstock, Bernard, *James Joyce: the undiscover'd country*, 1977. *Journal of Beckett Studies*, 4 (1979).

Goldschmidt, Charlene. *Finnegan's Wake*. Bloomington, IN: Xlibris, 2015.

Goldsmith, Kenneth. *Uncreative Writing: Managing Language in the Digital Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Goldwasser, Thomas A. "Who Was Vladimir Dixon? Was He Vladimir Dixon?." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1979): 219-222.

Gołaszewska, Maria. *Zarys estetyki*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1973.

Gołaszewska, Maria. *Człowiek w zwierciadle sztuki*. Warszawa: PWN, 1977.

Gołaszewska, Maria. "Pytanie o tożsamość estetyczną dzieła literackiego. Esej z pogranicza teorii literatury i estetyki filozoficznej." *Dialog, komparatystyka, literatura*. Eds. Edward Kasperski, and Danuta Ulicka. Warszawa: Aspra-Jr, 2002. 19-34.

Gołąb, Marcin. *"The chapters of coming forth from the day." Ancient Egyptian mythology from the "Papyrus of Ani" in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. MA dissertation. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2010.

Gołąb, Marcin. "A Centre of Peripheries: The Narrative Structure of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *The Central and the Peripheral: Studies in Literature and Culture*. Eds. Paweł Schreiber, Joanna Malicka, and Jakub Lipski. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 207-219.

Goodwin, Willard. Review of Kelly, Joseph, *Our Joyce: From Outcast to Icon*, 1998. *Libraries and Culture*, 2 (1999): 199-200.

Gordin, Michael D., and Joshua T. Katz. "The Walker and the Wake: Analysis of Non-Intrinsic Philological Isolates." *Pataphilology: An Irreader*. Eds. Sean Gurd, and Vincent W. J. van Gerven Oei. Brookly, NY: Punctum Books, 2018. 61-92.

Gordon, John. *James Joyce's Metamorphoses*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan; Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1981.

Gordon, John. *Finnegans Wake: A Plot Summary*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan; Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.

Gottfried, Roy. "Error and Testimony." *Errears and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*. Ed. Matthew Creasy. European Joyce Studies, 20. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011. 43-56.

Górska-Olesińska, Monika. "Twórczy kanibalizm." *Indeks*, 5-6 (2012): 17-18.

Grabska-Gradzińska, Iwona, Andrzej Kulig, Jarosław Kwapień, and Stanisław Drożdż. "Complex Network Analysis of Literary and Scientific Texts." *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 7 (2012): [1250051] 1-15.

Graeber, David. *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. London: Penguin Books. 2018.

Graff, Agnieszka. "Nie oddamy Joyce'a!." *Od Joyce'a do liberatury*. Ed. Katarzyna Bazarnik. Kraków: Universitas, 2002. 3-20.

Graff, Agnieszka. *This Timecoloured Place: The Time-Space Binarism in the Novels of James Joyce*. Katowice Interdisciplinary and Comparative Studies: Literature, Anthropology and Culture, 1. Ed. Tadeusz Sławek. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012.

Grasso, Sebastiano. [Introduction.] *Lampedusa on Joyce*. By Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa. English trans. McD Emslie. *Literary Review*, 44 (1982): 19-21.

Greetham, David. "Appendix 2: 'Begin Again… Stop!." *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 2012. 503-514.

Grice, Paul. *Studies in the Way of the Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995. (First published in 1989.)

Grochowski, Grzegorz. "Joyce wagnerzysta." *Literatura na Świecie*, 8-9 (1995): 360-365.

Grochowski, Grzegorz. "Przekład w toku. Wokół ostatniej stronicy *Finnegans Wake*." *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 4 (2000): 155-180.

Groden, Michael. "Flying by the Net: James Joyce in Cyberspace (1)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1997): 129-147.

Groden, Michael. "Perplex in the Pen—and in the Pixels: Reflections on *The James Joyce Archive*, Hans Walter Gabler's *Ulysses*, and James Joyce's *Ulysses* in Hypermedia." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 2 (1999): 225-244.

Gronczewski, Andrzej. *Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz*. Warszawa: PIW, 1972.

Gross, John. "Nawiedzony kałamarz." Polish trans. Hanna Zbierzchowska. *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1973): 86-120.

Grutman, Rainier. "Auto-translation." Encyclopedic entry. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker, with Kirsten Malmkjær. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 17-20. (Reprint. First published in 1998.)

Gu, Ming Dong. *Chinese Theories of Fiction: A Non-Western Narrative System*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Gula, Marianna. Review of Senn, Fritz, *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, 1995. *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, 1 (1999): 262-265.

Gupta, Suman, Alexander Search, Fabio A. Durão, and Terrence McDonough. *Entrepreneurial Literary Theory: A Debate on Research and the Future of Academia*. London: Shot in the Dark, 2017.

Hall, Susan Grove. "The Grammar of *Finnegans Wake*." *A Wake Newslitter*, 4 (1980): 51-59.

Halper, Nathan. "Being a Sommerfool (2)." *A Wake Newslitter*, 1 (1971): 3-6.

Halper, Nathan. "Letter to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1972): 297-299.

Halper, Nathan. "Letter to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1981): 99-100.

Hamada, Tatsuo. *How/Why/What to Read Finnegans Wake?* Kōchi: Abiko Literary Press, 2013. [Includes interviews with Finn Fordham, John S. Gordon, David Hayman, Tim Horvath, Richard Kostelanetz, Geert Lernout, Patrick McCarthy, Roland McHugh, C. George Sandulescu, Fritz Senn, Joe Schork, Sam Slote, Donald Theall, Aida Yared.]

Hames, Irene. *Peer Review and Manuscript Management in Scientific Journals: Guidelines for Good Practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Hanegraaff, Wouter J. "Magic I: Introduction." Encyclopedic entry. *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism*. Ed. Wouter J. Hanegraaff. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. 716-719.

Hanna, Julian. *Key Concepts in Modernist Literature*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Hansen, Maxwell T. *Multi-Hadron Observables from Lattice Quantum Chronodynamics*. PhD thesis. Seattle: University of Washington, 2014.

Harari, Roberto. *How James Joyce Made His Name: A Reading of the Final Lacan*. English trans. Luke Thurston. New York: Other Press, 2002. (Original in Spanish: *¿Cómo se llama James Joyce?: A partir de «El Sinthoma», de Lacan*. Buenos Aires, Amorrortu, 1995.)

Harbison, Robert. *Ruins and Fragments: Tales of Loss and Rediscovery*. London: Reaktion Books, 2015.

Harris, H. S. "What is Mr. Ear-Vico Supposed to Be 'Earing?." *Vico and Joyce*. Ed. Donald Phillip Verene. Albany: SUNY Press, 1987. 68-82.

Harris, Sam. *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. New York: Free Press, 2010.

Harryman, Carla. "Poetics Statement: Siren." *Eleven More American Women Poets in the 21st Century: Poetics Across North America*. Eds. Claudia Rankine, and Lisa Sewell. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2012. 136-142.

Hart, Clive. "Notes on the Text of *Finnegans Wake*." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 2 (1960): 229-239.

Hart, Clive. *Structure and Motif in "Finnegans Wake"*. London: Faber and Faber; Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1962.

Hart, Clive. Review of Hayman, David, a *First-Draft Version of "Finnegans Wake"*, 1964. *Modern Language Review*, 1 (1964): 128-130.

Hart, Clive. "*Finnegans Wake* in Perspective." *James Joyce Today: Essays on the Major Works, Commemorating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of His Death*. Ed. Thomas F. Staley. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1966a. 135-165.

Hart, Clive. "The Hound and the Type-Bed: Further Notes on the Text of *Finnegans Wake*." *A Wake Newslitter: Studies in James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*, III.4 (1966b): 77-83.

Hart, Clive. Review of O Hehir, Brendan, a *Gaelic Lexicon for Finnegans Wake and Glossary for Joyce's Other Works*, 1967. *Modern Language Review*, 2 (1970): 408-409.

Hart, Clive. *A Concordance to "Finnegans Wake": Corrected Edition*. Mamaroneck, NY: Paul P. Appel, 1974.

Hart, Clive. "Rhythm, Rule, and Resolution in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce: A New Language*: *Actas/Proceedings del Simposio Internacional en el Centenario de James Joyce*. Eds. Francisco García Tortosa, Manuel Amalgro Jiménez, José Carnero González, and Paul Witkowsky. Seville: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1982. 243-252.

Hart, Clive. "The Elephant in the Belly: Exegesis of *Finnegans Wake*." *Critical Essays on James Joyce*. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1985. 111-120. (First published in 1963.)

Hart, Clive. "*Finnegans Wake* in Adjusted Perspective." *Critical Essays on James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. Patrick A. McCarthy. New York: G. K. Hall; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992. 15-33.

Hart, Kevin. "The Poetics of the Negative." *Reading the Text: Biblical Criticism and Literary Theory*. Ed. Stephen Prickett. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991. 281-340.

Harteis, Christian, and Stephen Billett. "Intuitive Expertise: Theories and empirical evidence." *Educational Research Review*, 9 (2013): 145-157.

Hartwig, Julia. "Różni, a podobni." *Więź*, 1 (2002): 156-158.

Hassan, Ihab. "( ): *Finnegans Wake* and the Postmodern Imagination." *Paracriticisms: Seven Speculations of the Times*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1975. 77-94.

Hawthorne, Mark D. "Forty Years with Computer Technology: A Personal Remembrance of Things Past." *Internet-based Workplace Communications: Industry & Academic Applications*. Eds. Kirk St. Amant, and Pavel Zemliansky. Hershey, PA, and London: Information Science Publishing, 2005. 1-22.

Hayman, David. "Introduction." *A First-Draft Version of "Finnegans Wake"*. By James Joyce. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963. 3-43.

Hayman, David. *The "Wake" in Transit*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Hayman, David. "Notes for Staging *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 165-176.

Heaney, Seamus. "Place And Displacement: Recent Poetry from Northern Ireland." *Finders Keepers: Selected Prose 1971-2001*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002. 122-145. (First published in Cumbria: FrankPeters, 1984.)

Heath, Stephen. "Ambiviolences: Notes for Reading Joyce." *Post-structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*. Eds. Derek Attridge, and Daniel Ferrer. Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 31-68.

Hegerfeldt, Anne, and Dirk Vanderbeke. "The Terrestrial Humours of an All-Shemical Son: Alchemy and the Linguistic Transformations of *Finnegans Wake*." *The Golden Egg: Alchemy in Art and Literature*. Eds. Alexandra Lembert, and Elmar Schenkel. Glienicke: Galda+Wilch Verlag, 2002. 61-79.

Heller, Michael. "Where Physics Meets Metaphysics." *On Space and Time*. Ed. Shahn Majid. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 238-277.

Heller, Vivian. *Joyce, Decadence, and Emancipation*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Helsztyński, Stanisław. *Od Szekspira do Joyce'a*. 2nd edition. Warszawa: Stanisław Cukrowski, 1948.

Helsztyński, Stanisław. *Od Chaucera do Ezry Pounda*. Warszawa: PIW, 1976.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan. Personal communication (Email). 7 June 2014.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "Appendix: Selected Variants." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012a. 631-646.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "Note on the Text." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012b. xlvi-xlix.

Henseler, Donna L. "'Harpsdichord,' The Formal Principle of HCE, ALP, and the Cad." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1968): 53-68.

Hepburn, Allan. Review of McGee, Patrick, Joyce *Beyond Marx: History and Desire in "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake"*, 2001. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2001): 161-164.

Herbert, Stacey. "Composition and Publishing History of the Major Works: An Overview." *James Joyce in Context*. Ed. John McCourt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 3-16.

Herman, David. "The Mutt and Jute dialogue in Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: Some Gricean Perspectives." *Style*, 2 (1994): 219-242.

Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Hermans, Cor. *Interbellum Literature: Writing in a Season of Nihilism*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2017.

Herr, Cheryl. "Joyce and Marxism: Prefatory Note." *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988. 309-311.

Herr, Cheryl. "The Erratics of Irishness: Schizophrenia, Racism, and Finnegans Wake." *Cultural Studies of James Joyce*. Ed. R. Brandon Kershner. European Joyce Studies, 15. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2003. 117-136.

Herr, Cheryl Temple. "The Color of Schizophrenia." *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*. Ed. Alfred J. López. Albany: SUNY Press, 2005. 137-153.

Herring, Phillip F. *Joyce's Uncertainty Principle*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Hershman, Emily. "Men's Fashion, Military Uniforms, and the Construction of War in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2018): 391-404.

Heumann, Michael. "The Haunted Inkbottle: Shem's Shit-Script and Anal Eroticism in *Finnegans Wake*." *Masculinities in Joyce: Postcolonial Constructions*. Eds. Christine van Boheemen-Saaf, and Colleen Lamos. European Joyce Studies, 10. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 2001. 195-218.

Hiatt, Tim. "Stylistic Variations in James Joyce's Works." *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society Symposium*. 1 (1993): 116-122.

Hicks, Stephen R. C. *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault*. Tempe, AZ, and New Berlin/Milwaukee, WI: Scholargy Publishing, 2004.

Higginson, Fred H. "Notes on the Text of *Finnegans Wake*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 3 (1956): 451-456.

Higginson, Fred H. "The Text of *Finnegans Wake*." *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium*. Ed. Fritz Senn. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press; Don Mills: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1972. 120-130.

Hiley, Margaret. "'Bizarre or dream like': J. R. R. Tolkien on *Finnegans Wake*." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 112-126.

Hill, Archibald A. "A Philologist Looks at *Finnegans Wake*." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, 4 (1939): 650-656.

Hill, Leslie. *The Cambridge Introduction to Jacques Derrida*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hitchcock, Peter. "Answering as Authoring: or, Marxism's Joyce." *Mosaic*, 1 (1999): 55-69.

Hodgart, Matthew. *James Joyce: A Student's Guide*. London: Routledge, 1978.

Hodgart, Matthew J. C., and Ruth Bauerle. *Joyce's Grand Operoar: Opera in "Finnegans Wake"*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Hodgart, Matthew J. C., and Mabel Worthington. *Song in the Works of James Joyce*. Philadelphia: Temple University Publications, 1959.

Hofheinz, Thomas C. *Joyce and the Invention of Irish History: "Finnegans Wake" in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Hogan, Patrick Colm. *"Ulysses" and the Poetics of Cognition*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Hollier, Denis. "1989: The Bicentennial of the French Revolution Is Celebrated. *How Can One Be French?*." *A New History of French Literature*. Ed. Denis Hollier. London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001. 1061-1067. (First published in 1989.)

Holzbauer, Hermann. "Preface." English trans. Aimée Waha. *Joyce's Dublin Family: "My Home was simply a Middle-Class Affair…."* By Ken Monaghan. Eds. Hermann Holzbauer, and Klaus Walter Littger. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000. 11-12.

Hopper, Keith. Review of Fordham, Finn, *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unravelling Universals*, 2007. *Notes and Queries*, 2 (2009): 303-306.

Hornik, Marcel P. "A Page in *Finnegans Wake* Explained." *Modern Language Notes*, 2 (1960): 123-126.

Horvath, Joachim, and Alex Wiegmann. "Intuitive expertise and intuitions about knowledge." *Philosophical Studies*, 10 (2016): 2701-2726.

Humphrey, Robert. *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel: A Study of James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, Dorothy Richardson, William Faulkner, and others*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1954.

Hunter, Aida L. "His Prophetic Soul." *A Wake Newslitter Occasional Paper*, 3 (1983): 7-8.

Hutchins, Patricia. *James Joyce's World*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016. (First published in London: Methuen and Company, 1957.)

Innis, Robert E. "From Perception to Metaphor." *Karl Bühler: Semiotic Foundations of Language Theory*. New York: Springer-Science+Business Media, 1982. 43-54.

Ionescu, Arleen. "The interior monologue–a practice of reading." *Annales Universitatis Apulensis*, series *Philologica*, 4:2 (2003): 221-226.

Izzo, David Garrett. "James Joyce." *W. H. Auden Encyclopedia*. Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Co., 2011. 133-134.

Jakubowiak, Maciej. *Nieuchronny plagiat. Prawo autorskie w nowoczesnym dyskursie literackim*. [English title: *Inevitable plagiarism: copyright law in modern literary discourse*.] PhD thesis. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 2017.

Jameson, Fredric. "Modernism and Imperialism." *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. 43-66.

Jameson, Fredric. *Signatures of the Visible*. New York and London: Routledge, 2011. (First published in 1992.)

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997. (First published in 1991.)

Jamili, Leila Baradaran. "Shahrzad and the Persian Culture in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: A Chaotic "nightmaze"." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19 (2013): 226-232.

Janus, Adrienne. "From "Ha he hi ho hu. Mummum" to "Haw! Hell! Haw!": Listening to Laughter in Joyce and Beckett." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 3 (2009): 144-166.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. "Od początku, czyli Portret artysty w przekładzie." *Literatura na Świecie*, 7-8 (2004): 276-285.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. "Tłumacz wysokiego ryzyka." Interview by Agnieszka Wolny-Hamkało. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 300 (26 Dec. 2005): 12.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. *Heaney. Wiersze pod dotyk*. Kraków: Znak, 2011.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. "James Joyce rozszyfrowany. Kiedy śledź oznacza Irlandię." Interview by Donata Subbotko. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 159 (10 July 2015) [2015a]: 14.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. "Posłowie: Zanim Finn rozpoczął tren." *Hotel Finna*. Polish translation of *Finn's Hotel* by James Joyce. Trans. Jerzy Jarniewicz. Warszawa: Grupa Wydawnicza Foksal, 2015b. 69-95.

Jarniewicz, Jerzy. "O tym, jak tłumacz tworzy swojego autora, czyli skąd wzięło się dwóch polskich Heaneyów." *Tłumacz między innymi. Szkice o przekładach, języku i literaturze*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 2018. 186-205.

Jasiński, Bogusław. *Życie i cierpienie młodego W*. Warszawa: Ethos, 1999.

Jasiński, Bogusław. "James Joyce, czyli fenomenologia powieści." *Twórczość*, 4 (2000): 71-86.

Jasper, David. "Literary Readings of the Bible." *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. John Barton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 21-34. (First published in 1998.)

Jasper, David. "The Weakening of Theology by Literature Is Not a Bad Thing." Interview by Tomasz Garbol and Łukasz Tischner. *Konteksty Kultury*, 3 (2018): 271-290.

Jassy, Miriam. *'Austrasia or Anywhere': Place, Space and the Antipodes in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Sydney: University of New South Wales, 2015.

Jaurretche, Colleen. *The Sensual Philosophy: Joyce and the Aesthetics of Mysticism*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

Jaurretche, Colleen. "The Profession and the Making of a Joyce Scholar." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1999): 451-455.

Jaurretche, Colleen. Review of Knowles, Sebastian D. G., *At Fault: Joyce and the Crisis of the Modern University*, 2018. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2019-2020): 200-203.

Jenkins, William D. *The Adventure of the Detected Detective: Sherlock Holmes in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Jeyifo, Biodun. "In the Wake of Colonialism and Modernity." *Anglophonia: French Journal of English Studies*, 7 (2000): 71-84.

Jęczmyk, Lech. "Polski głos Vonneguta i innych." Interview by Krzysztof Głuch. *Czas Fantastyki*, 7 (2006): 17-26.

"Jimmys Haßgesang." *Der Spiegel*, 51 (1960): 81-82.

Johnson, D. Barton. "Sasha Sokolov: The New Russian Avant-Garde." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 30 (1989): 163-178.

Johnson, Jeri. "Joyce and feminism." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. 2nd edition. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 196-212.

Johnson, Jeri. "A Chronology of James Joyce." *Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. lvi-lxii.

Johnson-Laird, P. N., and Keith Oatley. "Emotions in Music, Literature, and Film." *Handbook of Emotions*. 4th edition. Eds. Lisa Feldman Barrett, Michael Lewis, and Jeanett M. Haviland-Jones. New York and London: The Guilford Press, 2016. 82-97.

Johnson-Roullier, Cyraina E. *Reading on the Edge: Exiles, Modernities, and Cultural Transformation in Proust, Joyce, and Baldwin*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2000.

Johnston, Denis. "Introduction." *The Voice of Shem: Passages from "Finnegans Wake" by James Joyce*. Free adaptation for the theatre by Mary Manning. London: Faber and Faber, 1958. vii-xi.

Jolas, Eugene. "The Revolution of Language and James Joyce." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 77-92.

Jolas, Eugene. "My Friend James Joyce (March-April 1941)." *Eugene Jolas: Critical Writings, 1924-1951*. Eds. Klaus H. Kiefer, and Rainer Rumold. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2009a. 393-404.

Jolas, Eugene. "Elucidation of James Joyce's Monomyth: Explication of *Finnegans Wake* (July 1948)." *Eugene Jolas: Critical Writings, 1924-1951*. Eds. Klaus H. Kiefer, and Rainer Rumold. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2009b. 405-420.

Jolley, Kelly Dean. "Filosofys Wake." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1997): 558.

Jones, Darryl. "In defence of horror." *The OUPblog Tenth Anniversary Book: Ten Years of Academic Insights For the Thinking World*. Ed. Alice Northover. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 143-147.

Jones, Ellen Carol. "A Letter Selfpenned to One's Other: Joyce's Writing, Deconstruction, Feminism." *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium*. Eds. Morris Beja, and Shari Benstock. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1989. 180-194.

Jones, Richard. *The Bible: The World's Most Misunderstood Book: Examining Popular Religious Beliefs in the Light of Bible Truth*. Parker, CO: Outskirts Press, 2011.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber & Faber, 4 May 1939. (1st public edition: the prototext.)

Joyce, James. *Correction of Misprints in* Finnegans Wake *by James Joyce: As Prepared by the Author after Publication of the First Edition*. New York: Viking, 1945.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. New York: Viking Compass, 1959.

Joyce, James. *A First-Draft Version of "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. David Hayman. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963. Includes these Hayman's texts: "Introduction.", 3-43. "Reader's Key.", 44. "Draft Catalogue.", 286.

Joyce, James. *A Shorter Finnegans Wake*. Ed. Anthony Burgess. London: Faber & Faber, 1966a.

Joyce, James. *Letters of James Joyce*. Vols. 1-3. Eds. Stuart Gilbert (vol. 1), Richard Ellmann (vols. 2-3). New York: Viking; London: Faber and Faber, 1966b.

Joyce, James. *The James Joyce Archive*. 63 volumes. Eds. Michael Groden, Hans Walter Gabler, A. Walton Litz, and Danis Rose. New York: Garland, 1977-1980.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake: HCE*. Trans. Luigi Schenoni. Bilingual ed. with Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 1982.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake, Chapter One: The Illnesstraited Colossick Idition*. Illustrated by Tim Ahern. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983.

Joyce, James *Finnegans Wake*. London: Penguin Books, 1992. Includes: Deane, Seamus. "Introduction.", vii-l.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wehg: Kainnäh ÜbelSätzZung des Wehrkeß fun Schämes Scheuß*. Trans. Dieter H. Stündel. Bilingual ed. with German translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Darmstadt: Verlag Jürgen Häusser, 1993.

Joyce, James. *Anna Livia Plurabelle*. From *Criterion Miscellany* (1930). London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

Joyce, James. "*Finnegans Wake* – pages 44-47 / strony 44-47." Trans. Maciej Słomczyński. Bilingual ed. with Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Przekładaniec*, 5 (1999): 80-87.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Trans. Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes. Bilingual ed. with Dutch translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Amsterdam: Athenaeum Polak & Van Gennep, 2002a.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. 3 volumes. Part of: *The Work of James Joyce in Ten Volumes*. Bath: Robert Frederick, 2004. (First published in 1999.)

Joyce, James. "*Finnegans Wake* ['The Mookse and the Gripes,' 152.04-159.23] = *Finneganów tren* [Bajka o Mooksie i Gripowronie, 152.04-159.23]." Bilingual ed. with Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Przekładaniec*, 13-14 (2004-2005): 156-171.

Joyce, James. *The Dirty Letters of James Joyce to Nora*. Illustrated by Eleni Marini. Marin Publishing Library, 2008.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake, the Final Chapter: The Illnesstraited Colossick Idition*. Illustrated by Tim Ahern. Littleton: AFIPR, 2010a.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Eds. Danis Rose, and John O'Hanlon. Mousehole, Cornwall: Houyhnhnm Press, 2010b.

Joyce, James. *The Cat and the Devil*. Zurich: Schweitzerisches Jugendschriftenwerk, 2010c.

Joyce, James. *The Complete Novels of James Joyce: Dubliners, a Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Ulysses, Finnegans Wake*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 2012a.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Eds. Robbert-Jan Henkes, Erik Bindervoet, and Finn Fordham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012b. Includes the following texts (Authors, alphabetically): Fordham, Finn. "Chapter by Chapter Outline.", xxxv-xlv. Fordham, Finn. "Introduction.", vii-xxxiv. Fordham, Finn. "Select Bibliography.", l-lv. Johnson, Jeri. "A Chronology of James Joyce.", lvi-lxii. Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "Appendix: Selected Variants.", 631-646. Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "Note on the Text.", xlvi-xlix.

Joyce, James. *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. Trade version of the Houyhnhnm Press limited edition of 2010. Eds. Danis Rose, and John O'Hanlon. London: Penguin Classics, 2012c. Includes the following texts (Authors, alphabetically): Deane, Seamus. "Note on the New Edition of *Finnegans Wake*.", vii-viii. Gabler, Hans Walter. "Appendix 1.", 495-502. Greetham, David. "Appendix 2: 'Begin Again… Stop!.", 503-514. Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. "Afterword.", 515-523. Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. "Preface.", ix-x.

Joyce, James. *Winnegans Fake: Aus dem Spätwerk*. Trans. Friedhelm Rathjen. Bilingual ed. with German (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Südwesthörn: Edition ReJoyce, 2012d.

Joyce, James. *Finn's Hotel*. Ed. Danis Rose. Dublin: Ithys Press, 2013.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans ake: Suite in the Key of Ш (1939)*. Arranged by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Warszawa: Sowa, 2014a.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Eds. Danis Rose, and John O'Hanlon. Illustrated by John Vernon Lord. London: Folio Society, 2014b. Includes the following texts (Authors, alphabetically): Deane, Seamus. "Note on the New Edition of *Finnegans Wake*.", xi-xii. Greetham, David. "Introduction: 'Begin Again… Stop!.", xv-xxvi. Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. "Preface.", xiii-xiv.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake Illustrated*. Vols. 1-2. Illustrated by John Boose. Charleston: New Century Dada Press, 2014c.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Trans. J. Rodolfo Wilcock. Bilingual ed. with Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Macerata: Giometti & Antonello, 2016a.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake & Exiles*. Timeless Wisdom Collection. n.p., 2016b.

Joyce, Stanislaus. "James Joyce: A Memoir." Trans. Felix Giovanelli. *Hudson Review*, 2 (1941): 485-514. (First published in Italian, in *Letteratura*, July-September and October-December 1941.)

Joyce, Stanislaus. *Stróż brata mego*. Polish trans. Maciej Słomczyński. Warszawa: PIW. 1971. (Original in English: *My Brother's Keeper: James Joyce's Early Years*. Ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking Press, 1958.)

Joyce, Stephen J. "Letters." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1989): 461-464.

Jung, Carl Gustav. "*Ulisses*. Monolog." *Archetypy i symbole. Pisma wybrane*. Polish trans. Jerzy Prokopiuk. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1981. 460-488. (First published in 1932. Original volume in German: Jung, C. G. *Ausgewählte Werke*. Olten: Walter Verlag.)

Jung, Hwa Yol. "The Piety of Thinking: Heidegger's Pathway to Comparative Philosophy." *Analecta Husserliana*, 21 (1986). 337-368.

Kaczmarek, Jacek. "Literackie zapisywanie przestrzeni w kontekście trwania miasta na przykładzie Dublina." *Białostockie Studia Literaturoznawcze*, 5 (2014): 89-111.

Kager, Maria. "A Search for the Viscous and Sawdust: (Mis)pronunciation in Nabokov's American Novels." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1 (2013): 77-89.

Kahneman, Daniel. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.

Kahneman, Daniel, and Gary Klein. "Conditions for Intuitive Expertise. A Failure to Disagree." *American Psychologist*, 6 (2009): 515-526.

Kálmán, György C. "What Is Wrong with Interpretive Communities?." *HJEAS*, 1 (1997): 53-73.

Kałużyński, Zygmunt. *Paszkwil na samego siebie*. Warszawa: PIW, 1988.

Kałużyński, Zygmunt. "Rankiem 16 czerwca." *Polityka*, 25 (2004): 60-62.

Kaplan, Robert. "Madness and James Joyce." *Australian Psychiatry*, 2 (2002): 172-176.

Kaplan, Robert M. "Doctors, Disease and James Joyce." *Australian Family Physician*, 8 (2008): 668-669.

Karoń, Krzysztof. *Historia antykultury 1.0: Podstawy wiedzy społecznej*. Revised 1st ed. Warszawa: 2019.

Katz, David. *American Modernism's Expatriate Scene: The Labour of Translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Kauffman, Linda S. *Special Delivery: Epistolary Modes in Modern Fiction*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Kavanagh, Peter. "Joyce—At Ten Paces." *New York Times Magazine*, 7 Mar. 1954: 6.

Kaźmierczak, Marta. "Od przekładu intersemiotycznego do intersemiotycznych aspektów tłumaczenia." *Przekładaniec*, 34 (2017): 7-35.

Kearns, John. "*Finneganów tren*, *Da Capo al Finne*, and *Finnegans _ake*: Krzysztof Bartnicki, Translation and Authorship." *Authorizing Translation*. Ed. Michelle Woods. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017a. 96-113.

Kearns, John. Review of O'Neill, Patrick, *Impossible Joyce: Finnegans Wakes*, 2013. *Translation Ireland*. 1 (2017b). 220-225.

Keller, Lech. *Przyczynek do biografii Stanisława Lema (Contribution to Biography of Stanisław Lem)*. Acta Polonica Monashiensis, 2. Melbourne: Monash University, 2019.

Kelly, Joseph. *Our Joyce: From Outcast to Icon*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

Kennedy, Alan. *Meaning and Signs in Fiction*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979.

Kędzierski, Marek. "Końcówka." *Samuel Beckett*. By Jan Błoński, and Marek Kędzierski. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1982. 52-86.

Kępiński, Antoni. *Schizofrenia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2001. (First published in 1972.)

Kiberd, Declan. Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 1980. *Irish University Review*, 1 (1981): 103-105.

Kiberd, Declan. *The Irish Writer and the World*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kidd, John. "Making the Wrong Joyce." Review of Joyce, James, *Ulysses*, Ed. Danis Rose, 1997. *New York Review of Books*, 14 (1997): 54-56.

Kim, Jong-geon [김종건], trans. *Pinnegan-eui Kyong-ya* [피네간의 경야]. Korean translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Seoul: Beomusa [범우사], 2002.

Kimmel, Lawrence. "Telling Stories." *The Reincarnating Mind, or the Ontopoietic Outburst in Creative Virtualities*. Book 2. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. *Analecta Husserliana*, 53. Dordrecht: Springer Science/Kluwer, 1998. 143-154.

Kirkland, Larry R., and E. Reid Kirkland. "Finnegans Wake." In: "Letters to the Editor." *Southern Medical Journal*, 2 (1991): 283.

Kitcher, Philip. *Joyce's Kaleidoscope: An Invitation to "Finnegans Wake"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Kitcher, Philip. "Collideorscape: *Finnegans Wake* in the Large and in the Small." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 17 (2009): 188-211.

Kitliński, Tomek. "Z naszego sadomasochizmu. W "Lublinie/Dublinie": "między Boskim Markizem a Leopoldem Freiherrem von Sacherem–Masochem." *Teksty Drugie*, 5 (2002): 141-149.

Kivy, Peter. *Speaking of Art*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Klein, Scott W. *The Fictions of James Joyce and Wyndham Lewis: Monsters of Nature and Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Klein, Scott W. "The Euphonium Cagehaused in Either Notation: John Cage and *Finnegans Wake*." *Bronze By Gold: The Music of Joyce*. Ed. Sebastian D. G. Knowles. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999. 151-170.

Klein, Wayne. *Nietzsche and the Promise of Philosophy*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1997.

Knauth, K. Alfons. "Literary Multilingualism I: General Outlines and Western World." *Comparative Literature: Sharing Knowledges For Preserving Cultural Diversity*. Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems, 3. Eds. Lisa Block de Behar, Paola Mildonian, Jean-Michel Djian, Djelal Kadir, Alfons Knauth, Dolores Romero Lopez, and Marcio Seligmann Silva. Oxford: Eolss Publishers, 2009. 41-64.

Knight, Christopher J. *Uncommon Readers: Denis Donoghue, Frank Kermode, George Steiner, and the Tradition of the Common Reader*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Knowles, J. Mark. "Nora's Filthy Words: Scatology in the Letters of James Joyce." *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, 2 (2006): 91-101.

Knowles, Sebastian D. G., ed. *Bronze by Gold: The Music of Joyce*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1999.

Knowles, Sebastian D. G. "Introduction." *Joyce in Trieste: An Album of Risky Readings*. Eds. Sebastian D. G. Knowles, Geert Lernout, and John McCourt. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007. 1-9.

Knowles, Sebastian D. G. "*Finnegans Wake* for Dummies." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2008): 97-111.

Knowlton, Eloise. *Joyce, Joyceans, and the Rhetoric of Citation*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Knuth, Leo. "The *Finnegans Wake* Translation Panel at Trieste." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1972): 266-269.

Knuth, Leo. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1986): 511-518.

Knuth, Leo. "Letters." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1987): 167-174.

Kokoszka, Magdalena. *Powtarzanie i niepowtarzalność w antologii osobistej Tymoteusza Karpowicza. Przypadek "Słojów zadrzewnych"*. PhD thesis. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 2006.

Kołodziej, Agata. "O demilitaryzacji języka. Autorstwo a wymogi formalne w *Writings through Finnegans Wake* Cage'a." *Remiks. Teorie i praktyki*. Eds. Michał Gulik, Paulina Kaucz, and Leszek Onak. Kraków: Hub Wydawniczy Rozdzielczość Chleba, 2011. 113-120.

Korg, Jacob. "Polyglotism in Rabelais and *Finnegans Wake*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1 (2002): 58-65.

Kostelanetz, Richard. "Text-Sound Art: A Survey." *Performing Arts Journal*, 2 (1977): 61-70.

Kostelanetz, Richard. *The Avant-garde Tradition in Literature*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1982.

Kostellanetz, Richard. "Nowa amerykańska proza fabularna." Polish trans. Jacek Wiśniewski. *Nowa proza amerykańska. Szkice krytyczne*. Ed. Zbigniew Lewicki. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1983: 254-272.

Kostelanetz, Richard. *The Old Fictions and the New*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1987.

Kostelanetz, Richard. *On Innovative Music(ian)s*. New York: Limelight Editions, 1989.

Kostelanetz, Richard. *The New Poetries and Some Old*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Kosters, Onno. Review of Brown, Richard, a *Companion to James Joyce*, 2007. *The European English Messenger*, 1 (2010): 65-69.

Kosters, Onno, Tim Conley, and Peter de Voogd, eds. "List of Contributors." *A Long the Krommerun: Selected Papers from the Utrecht James Joyce Symposium*. European Joyce Studies, 24. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2016. viii-x.

Krauth, Nigel. *Creative Writing and the Radical: Teaching and Learning the Fiction of the Future*. Bristol and Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2016.

Królikowski, Adam. "Finnegans Wake (1)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Magazyn Literacki*, 1 (1998a): 91-92.

Królikowski, Adam. "Finnegans Wake (2)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Magazyn Literacki*, 2-3 (1998b): 139.

Królikowski, Adam. "James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*. Notes tłumacza." *Magazyn Literacki*, 2-3 (1998c): 140.

Ku, Pingta. "Schizo-Lucia on "Jungfraud's Messongebook": The Techno-Thanatopolitics of (Mis)Diagnosis." *James Joyce Journal*, 2 (2019): 55-81.

Kubiak, Zygmunt. "Przestrzeń dzieł wiecznych." Interview by Tomasz Fiałkowski. *Przestrzeń dzieł wiecznych*. Kraków: Znak, 1993. 272-282. (First published in *Tygodnik Powszechny*. 25 Nov. 1990.)

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996. (First published in 1962.)

Kukulak, Szymon Piotr. "O trzech zegarach. Relatywistyczne fabuły w polskiej fantastyce naukowej (Lem — Huberath — Snerg)." *Creatio Fantastica*, 2 (2018): 39-56.

Kuliczkowska, Krystyna. *W świecie prozy dla dzieci*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia, 1983.

Kuncewiczowa Maria. "Czysty Józef." *Lublin literacki 1932-1982*. Eds. Waldemar Michalski, and Józef Zięba. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 1984. 195-211.

Kurowska, Elżbieta. *Recepcja literatury angielskiej w Polsce (1932-1939)*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1987.

Kutnik, Jerzy. *Gra słów. Muzyka poezji Johna Cage'a*. Lublin: UMCS, 1997.

Kwapień, Jarosław, and Stanisław Drożdż. "Physical approach to complex systems." *Physics Reports*, 515 (2012): 115-226.

Kydryński, Juliusz. "Ulisses – Glosa wstępna." *James Joyce. Bloomusalem*. Theatre programme. Warszawa: Teatr Ateneum – Atelier, 1974. 5-6.

Labron, Tim. *Bultmann Unlocked*. London and New York: T&T Clark – Continuum Books, 2011.

Lacabanne, Raúl. *@wake: interpretation audiovisual en tiempo real del Finnegans Wake de James Joyce*. MA dissertation. Barcelona – Catalunya: Institut Universitari de l'Audiovisual – Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2006.

Lakatos, Imre. "Criticism and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 69 (1968-1969): 149-186.

Lamos, Colleen. *Deviant Modernism: Sexual and Textual Errancy in T. S. Eliot, James Joyce, and Marcel Proust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Lane, Jeremy. "Falling Asleep in the *Wake*: Reading as Hypnagogic Experience." *Re: Joyce: Text, Culture, Politics*. Eds. John Brannigan, Geoff Ward, and Julian Wolfreys. Houndmills: Macmillan; New York: St. Martins, 1998. 163-181.

Lane, Jeremy. "James Joyce's Book of Laughter and Forgetting." *A History of English Laughter: Laughter from Beowulf to Beckett and Beyond*. Ed. Manfred Pfister. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002. 137-152.

Larocca, Flavia. *Literary Dynamics in Nonlinear Narratives*. PhD thesis. Porto: Universidade do Porto, 2015.

Lashomb, Donald A. *Working through Tradition Alone: Joyce's Mythic Return*. PhD thesis. York: University of York, 2008.

Latham, Sean. "Hating Joyce Properly." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1 (2002): 119-131.

Latham, Sean. "Playful Reading: I.6 and Game Theory." *Joyce's Allmaziful Plurabilities: Polyvocal Explorations of "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Kimberly J. Devlin, and Christine Smedley. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2015. 90-113.

Lavergne, Philippe, trans. *Finnegans Wake*. French translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce (Text of 1939 edition). Paris: Gallimard, 1982.

Lawrence, Karen R. *Who's Afraid of James Joyce?*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010.

Lazarus, Neil. "The fetish of "the West" in postcolonial theory." *Marxism, Modernity, and Postcolonial Studies*. Eds. Crystal Bartolovich, and Neil Lazarus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 43-64. (First published in 2002.)

Leary, Timothy. *The Game of Life*. With contributions by Robert Anton Wilson. Phoenix, AZ: New Falcon Publications: 1993. (First published in 1979.)

LeBlanc, Jim. Review of Burrell, Harry, *Narrative Design in "Finnegans Wake": The "Wake" Lock Picked*, 1996. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1999b): 297-300.

LeBlanc, Jim. Review of Cliett, Bill Cole, *Riverrun to Livvy: Lots of Fun Reading the First Page of James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*, 2011. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2011): 181-184.

Lee, L. L. "Some Uses of Finnegans Wake in John Barth's the Sot-Weed." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1968): 177-178.

Leitch, Vincent B. *Deconstructive Criticism: An Advanced Introduction*. New York: Columbia Univeristy Press, 1983.

Lem, Stanisław. *Summa technologiae*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1974.

Lem, Stanisław. "One Human Minute." *One Human Minute*. English trans. Catherine S. Leach. San Diego, New York and London: San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986. 1-36. (Original in Polish: "Jedna minuta." *Prowokacja*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984. 55-80.)

Lem, Stanisław. *A Perfect Vacuum*. English trans. Michael Kandel. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1999. (Original in Polish: *Próżnia urojona*. First published in Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1971.)

Lemos, Márcia. *'Failing Better' com Joyce e Beckett: Um Estudo sobre os Espaços em 'Murphy' e em 'Finnegans Wake'*. PhD thesis. Porto: Universidade do Porto, 2009.

Lemos, Márcia. "*Finnegans Wake* and the Art of *Pun*ishing the English Language." *Papers on Joyce*, 16 (2010): 49-66.

Lemos, Márcia. "Dr. 'Jeems Joker' or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love *Finnegans Wake*." *Weaving New Perspectives Together: Some Reflections on Literary Studies*. Eds. María Alonso Alonso, Jeanette Bello Mota, Alba de Béjar Muíños, and Laura Torrado Mariñas. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2012. 74-93.

Lerer, Seth. "Errata: Print, Politics And Poetry in Early Modern England." *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe, and Steven N. Zwicker. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 41-71.

Lerm Hayes, Christa-Maria. *Joyce in Art: Visual Art Inspired by James Joyce*. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2004.

Lerm Hayes, Christa-Maria. "The Joyce Effect: Joyce in Visual Art." *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2011. 318-340. (First published in 2008.)

Lerm Hayes, Christa-Maria. "'I will re-create Finnegans Wake anyway': Joseph Beuys reads James Joyce." *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 1 (2018): 152-180.

Lerm Hayes, Christa-Maria, and Derek Pyle. "Joyce Smithy: A Curated Review of James Joyce in Visual Art, Music, and Performance in the Time of Trump and #MeToo." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2017-2018): 192-212.

Lernout, Geert. "Dutch in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1985): 45-66.

Lernout, Geert. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1987): 375-380.

Lernout, Geert. "Letters." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1988): 541-543.

Lernout, Geert. Review of Sandulescu, C. George, *The Language of the Devil: Texture and Archetype in Finnegans Wake*, 1987. *Irish University Review*, 2 (1989a): 397-400.

Lernout, Geert. "The Tertium Comparationis is the Message: Mediation and European Joyce Studies." *Joyce, Modernity, and Its Mediation*. Ed. Christine van Boheemen. European Joyce Studies, 1. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989b. 177-188.

Lernout, Geert. *The French Joyce*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.

Lernout, Geert. "James Joyce and Fritz Mauthner and Samuel Beckett." *In Principle, Beckett is Joyce*. Ed. Friedhelm Rathjen. Edinburgh: Split Pea Press, 1993. 21-27.

Lernout, Geert. "Time and the Wakean Person." *Finnegans Wake: "teems of times"*. Ed. Andrew Treip. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994. 119-125.

Lernout, Geert. "The *Finnegans Wake* Notebooks and Radical Philology." *Genetic Studies in Joyce*. Eds. David Hayman, and Sam Slote. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995. 19-48.

Lernout, Geert. "Against Interpretation: Hermeneutics and Empirical Studies." *The Search for a New Alphabet: Literary Studies in a Changing World*. Eds. Harald Hendrix, Joost Kloek, Sophie Levie, and Will van Peer. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996a. 140-144.

Lernout, Geert. "Further Notes toward a Reading Proposal: *Work in Progress* and *Finnegans Wake*." *Papers on Joyce*, 2 (1996b): 35-40.

Lernout, Geert. "And Yes I Said Yes Fritz But." *A Collideorscape of Joyce: Festschrift for Fritz Senn*. Eds. Ruth Frehner, and Ursula Zeller. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1998. 294-305.

Lernout, Geert. "Genetic Criticism and Philology." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies*, 14 (2002): 53-75.

Lernout, Geert. "*Finnegans Wake*: Annotation, Translation, Interpretation." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies*, 16 (2006): 79-86.

Lernout, Geert, and Wim Van Mierlo, ed*s. The Reception of James Joyce in Europe. Volume 1: Germany, Northern and East Central Europe*. London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004a.

Lernout, Geert, and Wim Van Mierlo, ed*s. The Reception of James Joyce in Europe: Volume 2: France, Ireland and Mediterranean Europe*. London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004b.

Leszkiewicz, Adam. "Pępek naszego snu. Pierwsze czytanie Joyce'a." *Pressje*, 30-31 (2012): 221-226.

Letzler, David. *Reading Cruft: A Cognitive Approach to the Mega-Novel*. PhD thesis. New York: The City University of New York, 2014.

Levin, Harry. *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction.* Norfolk, CT: New Directions Books, 1941.

Levin, Harry. "James Joyce." *Atlantic Monthly*, 6 (1946): 125-129.

Levin, Harry. "A Letter to James Lauglin." *Memories of the Moderns.* New York: New Directions Books, 1980. 3-12.

Levine, Jennifer Schiffer. "Originality and Repetition in *Finnegans Wake* and *Ulysses*." *PMLA*, 1 (1979): 106-120.

Levitt, Morton P. "Introduction." *Joyce and the Joyceans*. Ed. Morton P. Levitt. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002. xi-xiii.

Levy, Nurit. *Textplicating Iconophones: Articulatory Iconic Action in "Ulysses"*. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics, 72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016.

Lewandowska, Olga. "Chaos i kosmos w poezji Josifa Brodskiego – refleksje inspirowane powieścią *Finneganów tren* Jamesa Joyce'a." [English title: "Chaos and Cosmos in the Poetry of Joseph Brodsky – Reflections Inspired by James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*."] *Slavia Orientalis*, 3 (2016): 523-538.

Lewicki, Zbigniew. "Katedra na piasku." *Rzeczpospolita*, 83 (2012): 30-31.

Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia. *Writing Against the Family: Gender in Lawrence and Joyce*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Lewis, Janet E. "*The Cat and the Devil* and *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1992): 805-814.

Libera, Antoni. "O sztuce przekładu." Interview by Grzegorz Sowula. *ZAiKS Wiadomości*, 27 (2020): 74-77.

Likides, John. *Out of the Labyrinth*. Bloomington, IN: Xlibris, 2002.

Lilly, Amy M. "Fascist Aesthetics and Formations of Collective Subjectivity in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1999): 107-125.

Linzmayer, Owen W. *Apple Confidential 2.0: The Definitive History of the World's Most Colorful Company*. San Francisco: No Starch Press, 2004.

Lipson, Charles. *Cite Right: A Quick Guide to Citation Styles—MLA, APA, Chicago, the Sciences, Professions, and More*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Litz, A. Walton. "The Genesis of *Finnegans Wake*." *Notes and Queries*, 198 (1953): 445-447.

Liu, Lydia H. "iSpace: Printed English After Joyce, Shannon, and Derrida." *Critical Inquiry*, 3 (2006): 516-550.

Liu, Lydia H. "*Finnegans Wake*: A Hypermnesiac Machine?." *The Freudian Robot: Digital Media and the Future of the Unconscious*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 101-113.

Llona, Victor. "I Don't Know What To Call It But Its Mighty Unlike Prose." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 93-102.

Lodge, David. *The Practice of Writing: Essays, Lectures, Reviews and a Diary*. London: Vintage Books, 2011. (First published in 1996.)

Loll, Udo. *James Joyce: Genie im Patriarchat*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1992.

Loska, Krzysztof. *Wokół "Finnegans Wake". James Joyce i komunikacja audiowziualna*. Kraków: WUJ, 1999.

Loska, Krzysztof. *"Finnegans Wake" Jamesa Joyce'a: rozumienie i interpretacja*. Kraków: Rabid, 2000.

Lovejoy, Laura. "'undeleted glete': Venereal Disease and Post-Colonial Catholic Social Purity Narratives in the *Wake*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 40.

Lowery, Robert G. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1983): 95-96.

Loxterman, Alan S. "Every Man His Own God: From *Ulysses* to *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 115-129.

Lukianoff, Greg, and Jonathan Haidt. *The Coddling of the American Mind: How Good Intentions and Bad Ideas Are Setting Up a Generation for Future*. New York: Penguin Press, 2018.

Luo, Valentina. "Re-Joyce! Cresting to Success in *Finnegans Wake*." *That's Shanghai*, 3 (2013): 48-49.

Lurz, John. "Literal Darkness: *Finnegans Wake* and the Limits of Print." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (2013): 675-692.

Lyngstad, Sverre. Review of Tindall, William York, a *Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*, 1969. *Books Abroad*, 4 (1969): 604-605.

Lyons, J. B. *Thrust Syphilis Down to Hell and Other Rejoyceana: Studies in the Borderlands of Literature and Medicine*. Dun Laoghaire: Glendale Press, 1988.

Łazarczyk, Bohdan. "Poetyka integralna. O niektórych właściwościach warsztatu poetyckiego Wielemira Chlebnikowa." *Literatura rosyjska i jej kulturowe konteksty*. Ed. Ryszard Łużny. Kraków: Ossolineum, 1990. 149-158.

Łuba, Arkadiusz. "Monolog Anny Livii (ostatnie dziesięć stron powieści *Finnegans Wake*)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Portret*, 2 (2005): 214-220.

Łuba, Arkadiusz. *Okno na Joyce'a*. Olsztyn: Polskie Towarzystwo Czytelnicze, 2007.

Łuba, Arkadiusz. "«ACOMEDY OF LETTERS!» Das Spiel der Buchstaben in Literatur und Graphik." *Denkbilder: Das Germanistikmagazin der Universität Zürich*, 24 (2008): 21-23.

Macaffey, Vicky. *Reauthorizing Joyce*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

McAlmon, Robert. "Mr. Joyce Directs an Irish Word Ballet." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 103-116.

McAlmon, Robert. "With James Joyce." *James Joyce: Interviews and Recollections*. Ed. E. H. Mikhail. Houndmills and London: Macmillan Press, 1990. 103-107.

MacCabe, Colin. *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1978.

MacCabe, Colin. "*Finnegans Wake* at Fifty." *Critical Quarterly*, 4 (1989): 3-5.

MacCabe, Colin. "An Introduction to *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 23-32.

McCarthy, Patrick A. *The Riddles of Finnegans Wake*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1980.

McCarthy, Patrick A. "The Structures and Meanings of *Finnegans Wake*." *A Companion to Joyce Studies*. Eds. Zack Bowen, and James F. Carens. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood, 1984. 559-632.

McCarthy, Patrick A. Review of Gordon, John, *Finnegans Wake: A Plot Summary*, 1986. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1987): 155-159.

McCarthy, Patrick A. "Reading the Letter: Interpreting the *Wake*." *New Alliances in Joyce Studies: "When it's Aped to Foul a Delfian"*. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988. 238-242.

McCarthy, Patrick A. "The Last Epistle of *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1990): 725-733.

McCarthy, Patrick A. "The World as Book, the Book as Machine: Art and Life in Joyce and Lowry." *Joyce/Lowry: Critical Perspectives*. Eds. Patrick A. McCarthy, and Paul Tiessen. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997. 145-158.

McCarthy, Tom. "Zero Degree Everything: An Interview with Tom McCarthy." Interview by Nicholas Huber. *Novel*, 2 (2018): 176-187.

McCawley, James D. "A Case of Syntactic Mimicry." *Functionalism in Linguistics*. Eds. René Dirven, and Vilém Fried. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987. 459-470.

McCormack, Jerusha. "Wilde's Dublin; Dublin's Wilde." *Oscar Wilde in Context*. Eds. Kerry Powell, and Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 17-27.

McCourt, Frank. *'Tis: A Memoir*. New York: Scribner, 1999.

McCourt, John, ed. *James Joyce in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

McCourt, John. "After Ellmann: The Current State of Joyce Biography." *Polymorphic Joyce: Papers from The Third Joyce Graduate Conference, Dublin 22-23 January 2010*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Anne Fogarty. Roma: Edizioni Q, 2012. 97-110.

McCourt, John. "Mapping the Holy Ground: The Expansion of Irish Joyce Reception in the Nineteen Sixties." *Parallaxes: Virginia Woolf Meets James Joyce*. Eds. Marco Canani, and Sara Sullam. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2014. 50-65.

McCourt, John. "'I have met with you, bird, too late, or if not, too worm and early': The Eternal Circling of Yeats and Joyce." *Journal of English Language & Literature*, 3 (2016a): 341-360.

McCourt, John, ed. *Shakespearean Joyce/Joycean Shakespeare*. Joyce Studies in Italy, 18. Rome: Anicia, 2016b.

McCreedy, Jonathan. *James Joyce and "Difficult Music": References to Modernist Classical Composers in "Finnegans Wake"*. MA dissertation. Ulster University, 2008.

McCreedy, Jonathan. *'Narrating Sigla': A Genetic Study of "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Ulster University, 2013.

McCreedy, Jonathan. "The Nature of Multilingualism and Code-Switching in *Finnegans Wake*." *Ireland – Europe: Cultural and Literary Encounters*. Eds. Plamen Gaptov, Maria Georgieva, and Jonathan McCreedy. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, 2017. 65-77.

MacDiarmid, Hugh [Christopher Murray Grieve]. "Kaikhosru Shapurji Sorabji." Including transcript of a recorded conversation. *The Company I've Kept*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967. 38-70.

MacDuff, Sangam. "The Logic of the Doodles in *Finnegans Wake* ii.2." *James Joyce and the Art*. Eds. Emma-Louise Silva, Sam Slote, and Dirk van Hulle. European Joyce Studies, 29. Leiden and Boston: Brill Rodopi, 2020. 166-180.

McFall, Leslie. "Was Nehemiah Contemporary with Ezra in 458 BC?." *Westminster Theological Journal*, 53 (1991): 263-293.

McFeaters, Andrew V. *Signs of Intelligence: The Self-Aware Textuality of James Joyce*. MA dissertation. Tallahassee: Florida State University/College of Arts and Sciences, 2003.

McGann, Jerome J. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.

McGee, Patrick. *Telling the Other: The Question of Value in Modern and Postcolonial Writing*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.

McGee, Patrick. *Joyce Beyond Marx: History and Desire in "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake"*. Gainsville, University Press of Florida, 2001.

McGee, Patrick. "The Communist *Flâneur*, or, Joyce's Boredom." *Joyce, Benjamin and Magical Urbanism*. Eds. Maurizia Boscagli, and Enda Duffy. European Joyce Studies, 21. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011. 122-131.

McGreevy, Thomas. "The Catholic Element in *Work in Progress*." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 117-127.

McHugh, Roland. "Recipis for the Price of the Coffin: Book I, chapters ii-iv." *A Conceptual Guide to "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Michael H. Begnal, and Fritz Senn. Minneapolis: University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974. 18-32.

McHugh, Roland. *The Sigla of "Finnegans Wake"*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976.

McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. 1st edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

McHugh, Roland. *The "Finnegans Wake" Experience*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981.

McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake: Revised Edition*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. 3rd edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. 4th edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016.

McKenna, Peter J., and Tomasina M. Oh. *Schizophrenic Speech: Making Sense of Bathroots and Ponds that Fall in Doorways*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

McKenna, Terence. "Surfing on Finnegans Wake." Video recorded at the Esalen Institute, Big Sur, CA: 1995. (Transcript by Eva Petakovic.)

McKenna, Terence. *Food Of The Gods: The Search for the Original Tree of Knowledge: A Radical History of Plants, Drugs and Human Evolution*. London, Sidney, Auckland, and Johannesburg: Rider, 1999. (First published in New York: Bantam Books, 1992.)

McKevitt, Paul, and Chengming Guo. "From Chinese Rooms to Irish Rooms: New Words on Visions for Language." *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 10 (1996): 49-63.

McLuhan, Eric. *The Role of Thunder in "Finnegans Wake"*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Culture is Our Business*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1970.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Joyce, Mallarmé, and the Press." *Essential McLuhan*. Eds. Eric McLuhan, and Frank Zingrone. London: Routledge, 1997. 53-65.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Radio and TV vs. The Abced-Minded." *Explorations: Studies in Culture and Communication*. Vol. 5. Eds. Edmund Carpenter, and Marshall McLuhan. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016. 7-13. (First published in 1955.)

McLuhan, Marshall, and Quentin Fiore. *The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects*. Corte Mader, CA: Gingko Press, 2014. (First published in 1967.)

McMorran, Ciaran. *Geometry and Topography in James Joyce's "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 2016.

McShane, Philip. "The Meaning of Credit." *Divyadaan*, 2 (2010): 163-182.

McWilliams, Ellen. "Adaptations of Joyce in the Fiction of Patrick McCabe." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 71-91.

Maddox, Brenda. *Nora: The Real Life of Molly Bloom*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin-Mariner, 2000. (First published in 1988.)

Magala, Stanisław. "Art as Moral Gamble: Phenomenological Aspects of Creative Responsibility." *The Reincarnating Mind, or the Ontopoeitic Outburst in Creative Virtualities: Harmonisations and Attunements in Cognition, the Fine Arts, Literature*. Ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka. *Analecta Husserliana*, 53. Dordrecht: Springer Science/Business Media, 1998. 35-47.

Magee, Paul. Personal communication (Email). 7 Mar. 2015.

Magee, Paul. "How Do We Read *Finnegans Wake* in Silence?." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2017): 353-372.

Maguire, Peter A. "*Finnegans Wake* and Irish Historical Memory." *Joyce and the Joyceans*. Ed. Morton P. Levitt. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002. 91-125.

Mahaffey, Vicki. *States of Desire: Wilde, Yeats, Joyce, and the Irish Experiment*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Maharaj, Sarat. "Typotranslating the Green Box." *The Duchamp Effect*. Eds. Martha Buskirk, and Mignon Nixon. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1999. 61-91. (First published in 1995.)

Mahon, Peter. *Joyce: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Continuum, 2009.

Mahon, Peter. "From Book to Text: Theory of/in the Margins." *Editors, Scholars, and the Social Text*. Ed. Darcy Cullen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012. 115-145.

Mahon, Vincent. Review of Hodgart, Matthew, *James Joyce: A Student's Guide*, 1978. *The Modern Language Review*, 2 (1980): 378-382.

Majewicz, Alfred F. *Języki świata i ich klasyfikowanie*. Warszawa: PWN, 1989.

Majewski, Sławomir. "Sylwia Beach. Narodziny geniusza." *Migotania: Gazeta Literacka*, 3-4 (2011): 12-13.

Malette, Antoine. *L'Irlande en Québec*. MA dissertation. Montréal: Université Concordia, 2018.

Malicki, Jacek. "Przebudzenie Finnegana." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Gnosis*, 9 (1996): 71-72.

Mamigonian, Marc Aram. "The Armenian Genocide in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *The Armenian Genocide: Cultural and Ethical Legacies*. Ed. Richard G. Hovannisian. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2007. 81-119.

Manganaro, Marc. *Culture, 1922: The Emergence of a Concept*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Manganiello, Dominic. "The Politics of the Unpolitical in Joyce's Fictions." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1992): 241-258.

Manganiello, Dominic. *Joyce's Politics*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016. (First published in 1980.)

Manista, Frank C. and Gillespie, Michael Patrick. "Using enquiry-based learning methods to teach Finnegans Wake to undergraduates." *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 1 (2011): 85-98.

Marchisotto, Jennifer. "'Myself and My Malody': (In)visible Disability in *Finnegans Wake*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 43.

Marcuse, Herbert. "Repressive Tolerance." *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969. 81-123. (First published in 1965.)

Marino, Gabriele. "On the untranslatability of *Finnegans Wake* (and its semiotic consequences)." *Languagescapes*, 1 (2020): 61-72.

Markowski, Michał Paweł. "Babeliada." *Efekt inskrypcji: Jacques Derrida i literatura*. 2nd (Revised and Augmented) Edition. Kraków: Wyd. Homini, 2003. 306-319.

Martin, Timothy. *Joyce and Wagner: A Study of Influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. (First published in 1991.)

Martin, William. *Joyce and the Science of Rhythm*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Mason, Ellsworth. "Mr. Stanislaus Joyce and John Henry Raleigh." *Modern Language Notes*, 3 (1955): 187-191.

Massiha, Laleh, and Noritah Omar. "James Joyce's Father Foreclosure: The Symbolic Order of Language and Social Existence." *Social Science and Humanities*, 1 (2013): 203-216.

Max, D. T. "The Injustice Collector: Is James Joyce's Grandson Suppressing Scholarship?." *New Yorker*, 82 (2006): 34-43.

Mays, Michael. "*Finnegans Wake*, Colonial Nonsense, and Postcolonial History." *College Literature*, 2 (1998): 20-34.

Means, Robert. Review of Edel, Leon, *James Joyce: The Last Journey*, 1947. *Swiss American Historical Society Review*, 3 (2008): 34-37.

Mecsnóber, Tekla. "James Joyce and 'Eastern Europe': An Introduction." *Joycean Unions: Post-Millennial Essays from East to West*. Eds. R. Brandon Kershner, and Tekla Mecsnóber. European Joyce Studies, 22. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2013. 15-46.

Melchiori, Giorgio. "The Languages of Joyce." *The Languages of Joyce: Selected Papers from the 11th International James Joyce Symposium, Venice, 12-18 June 1988*. Eds. R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli, C. Marengo Vaglio, and Chr. van Boheemen. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992. 1-18.

Mercanton, Jacques. "The Hours of James Joyce. Part II" English trans. Lloyd C. Parks. *The Kenyon Review*, 1 (1963): 93-118.

Merton, Thomas. "News of the Joyce Industry." *Sewanee Review*, 3 (1969): 543-554.

Meyers, Helene. "Industry or Community?: Joyce and the Social Function of Criticism." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1994): 17-20.

Middleton, Victoria S. Review of Manganiello, Dominic, *Joyce's Politics*, 1980. *Studies in the Novel*, 2 (1982): 204-207.

Milesi, Laurent. "L'idiome babelien de Finnegans Wake: Recherches thématiques dans une perspective génétique." *Genèse de Babel: Joyce et la création*. Ed. Claude Jacquet. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1985.

Milesi, Laurent. "Metaphors of the Quest in *Finnegans Wake*." *Finnegans Wake: Fifty Years*. European Joyce Studies, 2. Ed. Geert Lernout. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990. 79-107.

Milesi, Laurent. "The Perversions of "Aerse" and the Anglo-Irish Middle Voice in *Finnegans Wake*." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 4 (1993): 98-118.

Milesi, Laurent. "*Finnegans Wake*: The Obliquity of Trans-lations." *Joyce in the Hibernian Metropolis: Essays*. Eds. Morris Beja, and David Norris. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1996. 279-289.

Milesi, Laurent. "Dutch and Double Dutch Trouble Give in *Finnegans Wake*." *Papers on Joyce*, 4 (1998): 19-23.

Milesi, Laurent. "Introduction: Language(s) with a Difference." *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Ed. Laurent Milesi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003a. 1-27.

Milesi, Laurent, ed. *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003b.

Milesi, Laurent. "Joyce, Language, and Languages." *Palgrave Advances in James Joyce Studies*. Ed. Jean-Michel Rabaté. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 144-161.

Miller, Carl F. *Multiple Modernisms: Essays on Non-Synchronous Periodization*. PhD thesis. Gainesville: University of Florida, 2009.

Miller, William L. *The Picture and the Letter: Male and Female Creativity in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Canberra: Australian Defence Force Academy, University of New South Wales, 1995.

Mink, Louis O. *A "Finnegans Wake" Gazetteer*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Mink, Louis O. Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 1980. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1980): 97-102.

Mink, Louis O. "Reading *Finnegans Wake*." *Critical Essays on James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. Patrick A. McCarthy. New York: G. K. Hall; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992. 34-47.

Mirkowicz, Tomasz, trans. "*Finnegans Wake* (sześć pierwszych akapitów)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Literatura na Świecie*, 8 (1982a): 352-354.

Mirkowicz, Tomasz. "James Joyce i zwycięstwo powieści encyklopedycznej." *Literatura na Świecie*, 8 (1982b): 338-351.

Mitchell, Andrew J., and Sam Slote. "Introduction: Derrida and Joyce: On Totality and Equivocation." *Derrida and Joyce: Texts and Contexts*. Eds. Andrew J. Mitchell, and Sam Slote. Albany: SUNY Press, 2013. 1-16.

Mizrahi, Moti. "Three Arguments against the Expertise Defense." *Metaphilosophy*, 1 (2015): 52-64.

Mizrahi, Moti. "What's So Bad About Scientism?." *Social Epistemology*, 4 (2017): 351-367.

MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers. 7th edition. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2009. (First published in 1977.)

Moffat, Karen Jean. *Dream Language in Literature: A Linguistic Approach: (The Dream Language of James Joyce's Finnegans Wake)*. MA dissertation. Pokfulam: University of Hong Kong, 1985.

Montesi, Albert. "Joyce's 'Blue Guitar': Wallace Stevens and *Finnegans Wake.*" *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 99-111.

Moore, Steven. "I Ching." *A Wake Newslitter*, 2 (1980): 25.

Morawiec, Elżbieta, and Jerzy Madeyski. *Józef Szajna*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1974.

Moretti, Franco. "The Spell of Indecision." *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson, and Grossberg. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988. 339-346.

Morris, Nicholas. "Metaphors for Writing: Genetic Criticism and *Finnegans Wake* I.1." MA dissertation. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2008.

Morse, David E. "Breaking the Silence." *Kurt Vonnegut's "Slaughterhouse-Five" New Edition*. Ed., with an introduction by Harold Bloom. New York: Blooms Literary Criticism, 2009. 85-102.

Morse, J. Mitchell. "Burrus, Caseous, and Nicholas of Cusa." *Modern Language Notes*, 4 (1960): 326-334.

Morse, J. Mitchell. "1. Where Terms Begin. Book I, chapter i." *A Conceptual Guide to "Finnegans Wake"*. Eds. Michael H. Begnal, and Fritz Senn. Minneapolis: University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974. 1-17.

Muller, F. A. "Circumveiloped by Obscuritads. The nature of interpretation in quantum mechanics, hermeneutic circles and physical reality, with cameos of James Joyce and Jacques Derrida." *Conceptual Clarifications. Tributes to Patrick Suppes (1922-2014)*. Eds. Jean-Yves Beziau, Décio Krause, and Jonas R. Becker Arenhart. London: College Publication, 2015. 107-135.

Mulliken, Jasmine Tiffany. *"From "Disentangling the Subtle Soul" to "Ineluctable Modality": James Joyce's Transmodal Techniques*. PhD thesis. Austin: University of Texas, 2011.

Mullin, Albert A. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1982): 359.

Mullin, Katherine. "James Joyce and the Language of Modernism." *The Cambridge Companion to the Modernist Novel*. Ed. Morag Shiach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 99-111.

Münch, Richard. *Academic Capitalism: Universities in the Global Struggle for Excellence*. New York and London: Routledge, 2014.

Munz, Peter. "James Joyce, Myth-Maker at the End of Time." *Vico and Joyce*. Ed. Donald Phillip Verene. Albany: SUNY Press, 1987. 48-56.

Murphy, Sean P. *James Joyce and Victims: Reading the Logic of Exclusion*. London: Associated University Presses, 2003.

Musgrave, David. *Grotesque Anatomies: Menippean Satire since the Renaissance*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Mushtrieva, Maria. *Montage figures in Pavel Ulitin's Writing: Voices, fishes and rubber cement*. MA dissertation. Berlin: Free University of Berlin, 2018.

Mussweiler, Thomas, and Fritz Strack. "The Use of Category and Exemplar Knowledge in the Solution of Anchoring Tasks." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6 (2000): 1038-1052.

Nabokov, Vladimir. *Strong Opinions*. New York: Vintage, 1990. (First published in 1973.)

Nadel, Ira B. *Joyce and the Jews: Culture and Texts*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan Press, 1989.

Naganowski, Egon. *Telemach w labiryncie świata. O twórczości Jamesa Joyce'a*. Poznań: Rebis, 1997.

Nanay, Bence. "Philosophy versus Literature? Against the Discontinuity Thesis." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 4 (2013): 349-360.

Nash, John Edward. *"Finnegans Wake" and Readership*. D.Phil. thesis. Oxford: Trinity College, University of Oxford, 1996.

Nash, John. "'A Constant Labour': *Work in Progress* and the Specialization of Reading." *Joyce's Audiences*. Ed. John Nash. European Joyce Studies, 14. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002. 127-140.

Nash, John. *James Joyce and the Act of Reception: Reading, Ireland, Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Nash, John. "Genre, place and value: Joyce's reception, 1904-1941." *James Joyce in Context*. Ed. John McCourt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 41-51.

Navarrete Franco, Ricardo. "The Apparition of One Sir Ghostus." *Papers on Joyce*, 5 (1999): 23-34.

Navarrete Franco, Ricardo. "The Quinet Motif and Joyce's Memory for *Finnegans Wake*." *New Perspectives on James Joyce: Ignatius Loyola, Make Haste to Help Me!*. Eds. M.a Luz Suárez Castiñeira, Asier Altuna García de Salazar, and Olga Fernández Vicente. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2009. 53-63.

Navarrete Franco, Ricardo. "Joyce's Final Period." *Papers on Joyce*, 17-18 (2011-2012): 371-384.

Neilsen, Philip. "Creative Writing: Literature Review and Evidence-Based Research." *Creative Arts in Counseling and Mental Health*. Eds. Philip Neilsen, Robert King, and Felicity Baker. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016. 75-86.

Nell, Victor. "The Psychology of Reading for Pleasure: Needs and Gratifications." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 1 (1988), 6-50

Nemerov, Howard. "Thoughts on First Passing the Hundredth Page of *Finnegans Wake*." *American Scholar*, 4 (1975): 653-655.

Nényei, Judith. *Thought Outdanced: The Motif of Dancing in Yeats and Joyce*. Philosophiae Doctores, 10. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2002.

Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001. (First published in 1988.)

Newton, K. M. "Interest, Authority and Ideology in Literary Interpretation." *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, 2 (1982): 103-114.

Newton, K. M. "Validity in Interpretation and the Literary Institution." *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, 3 (1985): 207-219.

Newton, K. M. *In Defense of Literary Interpretation: Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1986.

Newton, K. M. "Performing Literary Interpretation." *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 475-485.

Nohrnberg, Peter C. L. "Political Economy, Tourism, and the Future of Ireland." *Twentieth-Century Literature*, 2 (2011): 224-254.

Nolan, Emer. "Joyce and the Colonial Commodity." *Journal of Humanities [Seoul]*, 2 (2004): 23-39.

Norburn, Roger. *A James Joyce Chronology*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Norris, David. Letter to the editor, in reply to Stephen J. Joyce's letter of the same issue. Includes partial text of remarks made during the Senate proceedings on the floor of the Dail in April 1992. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1993): 349-356.

Norris, David. *Introducing Joyce*. Illustrations by Carl Flint. Duxford: Icon Books, 2000.

Norris, Margot. "The Consequence of Deconstruction: A Technical Perspective of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *ELH*, 1 (1974): 130-148.

Norris, Margot. *The Decentered Universe of "Finnegans Wake": A Structuralist Analysis*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Norris, Margot. "The Critical History of *Finnegans Wake* and the *Finnegans Wake* of Historical Criticism." *Joyce and the Subject of History*. Eds. Mark A. Wollaeger, Victor Luftig, and Robert Spoo. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. 177-193.

Norris, Margot. "Finnegans Wake." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. 2nd edition. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 149-171.

Norris, Margot. "Possible Worlds Theory and the Fantasy Universe of *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism/Infobase Publishing, 2009. 221-239.

Novalis. *Uczniowie z Sais. Proza filozoficzne – studia – fragmenty*. Polish trans. Jerzy Prokopiuk. Selection from original texts in German, annotations, edition by Jerzy Prokopiuk. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1984.

Novalis. "Logological Fragments I." *Philosophical Writings*. English trans. Margaret Mahony Stoljar. Albany: SUNY Press, 1997. 47-66. (Original in German: *Logologische Fragmente*. Published in 1798.)

Nowakowski, Radosław. "Czterolistna koniczyna. Vierblättriges Kleeblatt. A four-leaf clover." Polish-German-English edition. *Ferment: Music Demonstrations*, 2 (2005). [Unpaginated inlay text accompanying double CD with music by Carantuohill. Kielce: Ferment, 2005.]

Nuessel, Frank. "Deviant Ortography." *International Handbook of Semiotics*. Ed. Peter Pericles Trifonas. Dordrecht: Springer, 2015. 291-301.

O'Brien, Edna. *James Joyce*. New York: Viking, 1999.

O'Brien, Eugene. *The Question of Irish Identity in the Writings of W. B. Yeats and James Joyce*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.

O'Brien, Flann. "Ustęp w tunelu." Polish trans. Robert Ginalski. *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1984): 188-200.

O'Connor, Elizabeth Foley. "Kate O'Brien, James Joyce, and the 'Lonely Genius'." *Joycean Legacies*. Ed. Martha C. Carpentier. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 11-32.

O'Connor, Frank. *A Frank O'Connor Reader*. Ed. Michael A. Steinman. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994.

O'Donoghue, Darragh. "*Histoire(s) du Cinema*." Review. *Cineaste*, 2 (2012): 58-59.

O Hehir, Brendan. *A Gaelic Lexicon for Finnegans Wake, and Glossary for Joyce's Other Works*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

O Hehir, Brendan, and John M. Dillon. *A Classical Lexicon for Finnegans Wake: A Glossary of the Greek and Latin in the Major Works of Joyce*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.

O'Kelly, Michael. "Using Computer Networks to Share Ideas about *Finnegans Wake*." *Images of Joyce*. Eds. Clive Hart, C. George Sandulescu, Bonnie K. Scott, and Fritz Senn. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1998. 687-688.

Okulska, Inez. "Przekład – wojna – koń trojański." *Przekład – kolonizacja czy szansa?*. Ed. Piotr Fast. Katowice: Śląsk, 2013. 93-104.

Okulska, Inez. *Wer hat's geschrieben, wer übersetzt? Autor- und Übersetzerschaft als kontingente Rollen*. Thematicon 32. Berlin: Logos Verlag, 2018.

Olsson, Gunnar. "Social Science and Human Action or On Hitting Your Head against the Ceiling of Language." *Philosophy in Geography*. Eds. Stepehen Gale, and Gunnar Olsson. Dordrecht, Boston and London: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979. 287-307.

O'Neill, Christine, ed. *Joycean Murmoirs: Fritz Senn on James Joyce*. Dublin: The Lilliput Press. 2007.

O'Neill, Patrick. *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

O'Neill, Patrick. *Impossible Joyce: Finnegans Wakes*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

O'Neill, Patrick. *Transforming Kafka: Translation Effects*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Orel, Mark. *Towards an Encyclopedia as a Web of Knowledge. A Systematic Analysis of Paradigmatic Classes, Continuities, and Unifying Forces in the Work of Peter Greenaway*. PhD thesis. Vienna: Universität Wien, 2011.

Orr, Leonard. "Vico's Most Ancient Italian Wisdom and the Epistemology of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *Neohelicon*, 1 (1987): 21-37.

O'Shea, Michael J. "A Review Essay: New and Used Perspectives on *Finnegans Wake*." Review of Gordon, John, *Finnegans Wake: A Plot Summary*, 1986, and of Bishop, John, *Joyce's Book of the Dark: "Finnegans Wake"*, 1986. *Modern Language Studies*, 2 (1989): 78-84.

Osteen, Mark. Review of Booker, M. Keith, *Ulysses, Capitalism, and Colonialism: Reading Joyce After the Cold War*, 2000. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (2002): 598-603.

O'Sullivan, Michael. *Irish Expatriatism, Language and Literature: The Problem of English*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan/ Springer Nature Switzerland, 2018.

Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. (Reissue of 1929 edition in Paris: Shakespeare and Company, Sylvia Beach.) Includes the following texts (Authors, alphabetically): Beach, Sylvia. "Introduction (1961).", vii-viii. Beckett, Samuel. "Dante… Bruno. Vico.. Joyce.", 3-22. Brion, Marcel. "The Idea of Time in the Work of James Joyce.", 23-33. Budgen, Frank. "James Joyce's *Work in Progress* and Old Norse Poetry.", 35-46. Dixon, Vladimir. "A Litter to Mr. James Joyce.", 193-194. Gilbert, Stuart. "Prolegomena to *Work in Progress*.", 47-75. Jolas, Eugene. "The Revolution of Language and James Joyce.", 77-92. Llona, Victor. "I Don't Know What To Call It But Its Mighty Unlike Prose.", 93-102. McAlmon, Robert. "Mr. Joyce Directs an Irish Word Ballet.", 103-116. McGreevy, Thomas. "The Catholic Element in Work in Progress.", 117-127. Paul, Elliot. "Mr. Joyce's Treatment of Plot.", 129-137. Rodker, John. "Joyce and His Dynamic.", 139-146. Sage, Robert. "Before Ulysses — And After.", 147-170. Slingsby, G. V. L. "Writes a Common Reader.", 189-192. Williams, Williams Carlos. "A Point for American Criticism.", 171-185.

Owens, Cóilín. "James Joyce." *Critical Survey of Long Fiction*. 4th edition. Ed. Carl Rollyson. Pasadena, CA, and Hackensack, NJ: Salem Press, 2010. 2452-2461. (First published in 1983.)

Palmer, Helen. *Deleuze and Futurism: A Manifesto for Nonsense*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.

Paltin, Judith. "The *Wake*'s Democratic Speech of the Multitude." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 50-51.

Panzera, Daniela. "Dante's Legacy: Kinship between Languages in Seamus Heaney's Poetics." *Estudios Irlandeses*, 11 (2016): 199-212.

Parandowski, Jan. *Alchemia słowa*. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1976.

Parandowski, Jan. "Meeting with Joyce." *Studi irlandesi. A Journal of Irish Studies*, 5 (2015): 135-142.

Parikh, Prashant. *Language and Equilibrium*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 2010.

Paris, Vaclav. "Picturing the Wake: Arcimboldo, Joyce, and His 'Monster'." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2012): 235-259.

Parks, Gerald. "Blotty Words for Dublin: An Excursus around the Translation of *Finnegans Wake* by Luigi Schenoni." *SSLM Miscellanea* (Trieste), 1992: 197-206.

Parks, Tim. "Joyce and Company." Review of Bowker, Gordon, *James Joyce: A Biography*, 2012. *London Review of Books*, 13 (2012): 12-15.

Parrinder, Patrick. *James Joyce*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Parsons, Deborah. *Theorists of the Modernist Novel: James Joyce, Dorothy Richardson, Virginia Woolf*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Pascual, Arturo Marcelo. *Człowiek i twórca: James Joyce*. Warszawa: Muza, 2007. (Polish translation by Maria Mróz from Spanish: *El lector de… James Joyce*. 2001.)

Paszek, Jerzy. *Stylistyka. Przewodnik metodyczny*. Katowice: WUŚ, 1974.

Paszek, Jerzy. *Styl powieści Wacława Berenta*. Katowice: WUŚ, 1976.

Paszek, Jerzy. "Abecadło." *Śląsk*, 2 (2016): 40-42.

Patell, Cyrus R. K. *Joyce's Use of History in "Finnegans Wake"*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1984.

Patterson, Anthony, and Stephen Brown. "Marketers wake! A portrait of the artist as a marketing man." *Imagining Marketing: Art, Aesthetics and the Avant-Garde*. Eds. Stephen Brown, and Anthony Patterson. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 73-84.

Paul, Elliot. "Mr. Joyce's Treatment of Plot." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 129-137.

Peake, Charles. *James Joyce: The Citizen and the Artist*. Stanford, CA: Standford University Press, 1977.

Pearson, Neil. *Obelisk: A History of Jack Kahane and the Obelisk Press*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007.

Pelaschiar, Laura. "Introduction." *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Ed. Laura Pelaschiar. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2015.

Penrose, Roger. *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics*. New York: Penguin Books, 1991. (First published in 1989.)

Perloff, Marjorie. *Unoriginal Genius: Poetry by Other Means in the New Century*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Peterson, Richard F. "Did Joyce Write Hamlet?." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1990): 365-372.

Peters, Michael A., Marek Tesar, and Liz Jackson. "After postmodernism in educational theory? A collective writing experiment and thought survey." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 14 (2018): 1299-1307.

Petrov, Vladimir A. "Half a Century with QUARKS (A Superficial Review)." *Particle and Astroparticle Physics, Gravitation and Cosmology: Predictions, Observations and New Projects: Proceedings of XXXth International Workshop on High Energy*

Physics: Protvino, Moscow Region, Russia, 23-27 June 2014. Eds. V. Petrov, and R. Ryutin. Signapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2015. 172-180.

Pickett, Jonathan Warren. *"Finnegans Wake": The Agency of Letters in the Conscious*. Vol. 1. PhD thesis. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2008.

Pierce, David. "The Politics of *Finnegans Wake*." *Textual Practice*, 3 (1988): 367-380.

Pierce, David, ed. *Irish Writing in the Twentieth Century: A Reader*. Cork: Cork University Press, 2000.

Pierce, David. *Reading Joyce*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013. (First published in 2008.)

Pietrkiewicz, Jerzy. *Literatura polska w perspektywie europejskiej*. Polish trans. Anna Olszewska-Marcinkiewicz, and Ignacy Sieradzki. Warszawa: PIW, 1986.

Piglia, Ricardo. *The Absent City*. English trans. Sergio Waisman. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000.

Pilling, John. *A Samuel Beckett Chronology*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Pilshchikov, Igor, Piret Peiker, Nikolay Poselyagin, and Mikhail Trunin. "Preface to the Volume." *Urban Semiotics: The City as a Cultural-Historical Phenomenon*. Ed. Igor Pilshchikov. Tallinn: TLU Press, 2015. 7-22.

Pióro, Tadeusz. "Wokół Jamesa Joyce'a." *Literatura na Świecie*, 4-5 (2000): 408-413.

Pisarski, Mariusz. "New plots for hypertext?: Towards Poetics of a Hypertext Node." *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM conference on Hypertext and hypermedia – HT '11, Eindhoven, the Netherlands*. New York: ACM, 2011: 313-318.

Plath, Sylwia. *The Bell Jar*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1966. (First published in 1963).

Platt, Len. *Joyce and the Anglo-Irish: A Study of Joyce and the Literary Revival*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998.

Platt, Len. *Joyce, Race, and "Finnegans Wake"*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Platt, Len. "Madame Blavatsky and Theosophy in *Finnegans Wake*: An Annotated List." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2008): 281-300.

Platt, Len. *James Joyce: Texts and Contexts*. London: Continuum, 2011.

Platt, Len. "'Now, just wash and brush up your memoirias': Nation Building, the Historical Record, and Cultural Memory in *Finnegans Wake* 3.3." *Memory Ireland: James Joyce and Cultural Memory*. Vol. 4. Eds. Oona Frawley, and Katherine O'Callaghan. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2014. 112-124.

Plock, Vike Martina. Review of McGee, Patrick, *Joyce Beyond Marx: History and Desire in 'Ulysses' and 'Finnegans Wake'*, 2001. *James Joyce Broadsheet*, 72 (2005): 2.

Polhemus, Robert M. *Comic Faith: The Great Tradition from Austen to Joyce*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Poprawa, Adam. "CDn (65)." *Odra*, 4 (2005): 131-132.

Poprawa, Adam [A. P.]. "Arkadiusz Łuba. Okno na Joyce'a." Review. *Odra*, 1 (2008): 149.

Poprawa, Adam. "Niedoceniona orkiestra samotnych serc." *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 40 (2009): 41-43.

Potkański, Jan. "Myślenie metaleptyczne. *Tekst (w) sieci 2. Literatura, społeczeństwo, komunikacja*. Ed. Anna Gumkowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, 2009. 33-41.

Potter, Rachel. *Modernist Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Power, Henriette Lazaridis. "Shahrazade, Turko the Terrible, and Shem: The Reader as Voyeur in *Finnegans Wake*." *Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium*. Eds. Morris Beja, and Shari Benstock. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1989. 248-261.

Prescott, Joseph. "Concerning the Genesis of *Finnegans Wake*." *PMLA,* 5 (1954): 1300-1302.

Prior, Arthur N. "Something to Read – The Theology of James Joyce – *Finnegan's Wake*: An Interpretation." *Philosophical Inquiries*, 1 (2013): 203-214. (First published in 1941.)

Priore, Irna. "Vestiges of Twelve-Tone Practice as. Compositional Process in Berio's *Sequenza I for Solo Flute*." *Berio's Sequenzas: Essays on Performance, Composition, and Analysis*. Ed. Janet Halfyard. Birmingham: Ashgate Publishers, 2007. 191-208.

Promiński, Marian. "Joyce: przygoda osobista." *Świat w stylach literackich*. Annotated by Maria Mirecka. Ed. Michał Sprusiński. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977. 207-225, 298-299. (First published in 1970.)

Przyboś, Julian. "*Panta rhei*." *Zapiski bez daty*. Warszawa: PIW, 1970a. 149-152.

Przyboś, Julian. "Czyżby suma literatury?." *Zapiski bez daty*. Warszawa: PIW, 1970b. 383-385.

Pujol Duran, Jèssica. "Umberto Eco's New Paradigm and Experimentalism in the 1960s." *Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich*, 2 (2015): 51-61.

Purcell, Siobhán. "'Do you know anything about the body?…': Reading the Vivisective Aesthetic in *Stephen Hero*." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 54.

Purdy, Strother B. "Mind Your Genderous: Toward a Wake Grammar." *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium*. Ed. Fritz Senn. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press; Don Mills: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1972. 46-78.

Purdy, Strother B. "Iconicity Typological and Theological: J. G. Hamann and James Joyce." *Signergy*. Eds. C. Jac. Conradie, Ronél Johl, Marthinus Beukes, Olga Fischer, and Christina Ljungberg. Iconicity in Language and Literature, 9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. 259-278.

Pyle, Derek. "Being in the Cultural Illuminati Doesn't Juice My Juices: Waywords and Meansigns." *The Agenbite*, 1 (2017a): 8-11.

Pyle, Derek. "Dublin Celebrates the *Wake*'s 80th Birthday: "*Finnegans Wake* at 80; "Lucia Joyce: Perspectives"; "Text/Sound/Performance: Making in Canadian Space"; and "Finnegans Wake-End," 11-13 April, 25-27 April, and 3-5 May, 2019." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2018-2019): 10-17.

Pyle, Derek. "Static Crooning Consciousness Expansion: Musical Undergrounds Respond to James Joyce." *James Joyce and the Arts*. Eds. Emma-Louise Silva, Sam Slote, and Dirk van Hulle. European Joyce Studies, 29. Leiden and Boston: Brill Rodopi, 2020. 96-108.

Pym, Anthony. *Translation and Text Transfer*. Taragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2010. (First published in 1992.)

Pyzik, Agata. "Podróż do kresu literatury." *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 269 (18 Oct. 2008): 18.

Quatermain, Peter. *Disjunctive Poetics: From Gertrude Stein and Louis Zukofsky to Susan Howe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Quintana-Paz, Miguel Ángel. "Post-Truth as a Feature of Hypermodern Times." *Edukacja Filozoficzna*, 66 (2018): 143-161.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *Language, Sexuality, and Ideology in Ezra Pound's* Cantos. Albany: SUNY Press, 1986.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "A Portrait of the Artist as a Bogeyman." *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*. Ed. Bernard Benstock. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988. 103-134.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *La pénultième est morte: Spectrographies de la modernité: (Mallarmé, Breton, Beckett et quelques autres*. Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1993.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Joyce and Jolas: Late Modernism and Early Babelism." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 2 (1998-1999): 245-252.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *James Joyce and the Politics of Egoism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Modernism and 'The Plain Reader's Rights': Duff-Riding-Graves Re-Reading Joyce." *Joyce's Audiences*. Ed. John Nash. European Joyce Studies, 14. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002. 29-39.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "The Worth and Girth of an Italian Hoagie." *Think, Pig! Beckett at the Limit of the Human*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2016. 23-36.

Radak, Tamara. *"The end is in the beginning and yet you go on" – riverruns and End(ing)games in James Joyce's "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake"*. MA dissertation. Vienna: Universität Wien, 2009.

Radak, Tamara. "'Sigmund Freud… analyze this': *Finnegans Wake* as a Psychotic Text." Paper abstract. *Abstracts Individual Papers: A long the krommerun: XXIV International James Joyce Symposium, Utrecht University, 15th-20th June 2014*. Eds. David Pascoe, Onno Kosters, and Tim Conley. Utrecht, 2014: 54-55.

Radek, Karl. Speech to the Soviet Writers' Congress. Moscow: August, 1934.

Rademacher, Jörg W. "Two Approaches to *Finnegans Wake* in German (Mis)appropriation or Translation?." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1993): 482-488.

Raffan, Mary. *Joyce, Philosophy and the Drama of Authorship*. PhD thesis. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 2014.

Ragland-Sullivan, Ellie. "Lacan's Seminars on Joyce: Writing as Symptom and 'Singular Solution'." *Psychoanalaysis and…*. Eds. Richard Feldstein, and Henry Sussman. New York: Routledge, 1990. 66-86.

Raleigh, John Henry. "'My Brother's Keeper'—Stanislaus Joyce and *Finnegans Wake*." *Modern Language Notes*, 2 (1953): 107-110.

Ramey, James. "Joycean Lice and the Life of Art." *College Literature*, 1 (2012a): 27-50.

Rasch, Friederike, and Peadar O'Donnell. "Sam + James = Same, or, 13-12=1: An Interconnective ALPhabet." *In Principle, Beckett is Joyce*. Ed. Friedhelm Rathjen. Edinburgh: Split Pea Press, 1993. 143-156.

Rasula, Jed. "*Finnegans Wake* and the Character of the Letter." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1997): 517-530.

Ratcliff, Jason Stuart. *The Books of Angelhaunt: Art Prose. Volume I*. San Jose, New York, Lincoln, and Shanghai: Writers Club Press, 2002.

Rathjen, Friedhelm. "Maximal Joyce is a State of Beckett: Joyce, Beckett, and Bruno's *Coincidentia Oppositorum*." *In Principle, Beckett is Joyce*. Ed. Friedhelm Rathjen. Edinburgh: Split Pea Press, 1993. 99-112.

Rathjen, Friedhelm. "Sprakin Sea Djoytsch? *Finnegans Wake* into German." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1999): 905-916.

Read, Forrest, ed., with commentary. *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce*. New York: New Directions Books, 1970. (First published in 1967.)

Read, Herbert. "The Limits of Permissiveness in Art." *The Malahat Review*, 9 (1969): 37-50.

Reed, Henry. "Joyce's Progress." *Orion*, 4 (1947), 131-146.

Reichert, Klaus. "Fragment and Totality." *New Alliances in Joyce Studies: "When it's Aped to Foul a Delfian"*. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988. 86-90.

Reichert, Klaus, and Fritz Senn, eds. *James Joyce: Finnegans Wake. Deutsch Gesammelte Annäherungen Herausgegeben von Klaus Reichert und Fritz Senn*. A selection of German translations of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce, by: Harald Beck, Ulrich Blumenbach, Georg Goyert, Gruppe des Englischen Seminars Frankfurt, Wolfgang Hildesheymer, Ingeborg Horn, Kurt Jauslin, Reinhard Markner, Friedhelm Rathjen, Klaus Reichert, Arno Schmidt, Wolfgang Schrödter, Helmut Stoltefuß, Dieter H. Stündel, Robert Weninger, and Hans Wollschläger. Frankfurt am Mein: Suhrkamp, 1989.

Reizbaum, Marilyn. *James Joyce's Judaic Other*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Rene, Andrey. "Translation of the cryptogram: BCAD to DoRe-x//Re-x." From Russian translation of *Finnegans Wake* (in progress). Received in personal communication (Facebook message). 2016a.

Rene, Andrey. "Translation of the time signature: 6-8 to 8-8." From Russian translation of *Finnegans Wake* (in progress). Received in personal communication (Facebook message). 2016b.

Rene, Andrey. "Translation of the time signature: 6-8 to 15-8." From Russian translation of *Finnegans Wake* (in progress). Received in personal communication (Facebook message). 2016c.

Renggli, Gabriel. "Suspended Pluralities: Postlapsarian Language and Pentecostal Writing in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *Modernism/modernity*, 4 (2014): 997-1015.

Renggli, Gabriel. "Specters of Totality: Reading and Uncertainty in Joyce's *Ulysses* and Borges's Fictions." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 2 (2018): 42-59.

Restine, Ryan. "'Putting Allspace in a Notshall': The Presence of Hamlet in Finnegans Wake." *Creating Knowledge*, 7 (2014): 87-93.

"Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, 1939." *Psychoanalytic Review*, 4 (1940): 502.

Rice, Thomas Jackson. *Joyce, Chaos, and Complexity*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Rice, Thomas Jackson. *James Joyce: A Guide to Research*. London and New York: Garland, 2016. (First published in 1982.)

Richardson, Brian. *A Poetics of Plot for the Twenty-First Century: Theorizing Unruly Narratives*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2019.

Rieff, Philip. "The Newer Noises of War in the Second Culture Camp: Notes on Professor Burt's Legal Fictions." *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*, 2 (1991): 315-388.

Rikowski, Glenn, and Peter McLaren. "Postmodernism in Educational Theory." *Marxism Against Postmodernim in Educational Theory*. Eds. Dave Hill, Peter McLaren, Mike Cole, and Glenn Rikowski. Lanham, MD, and Oxford: Lexington Books, 2002. 3-13.

Rimmer, Matthew. "Bloomsday: Copyright Estates and Cultural Festivals." *SCRIPT-ed*, 3 (2005): 383-428.

Riquelme, John Paul. Review of Gordon, John, *James Joyce's Metamorphoses*, 1981. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1985): 238-242.

Riquelme, John Paul. Review of Sandulescu, C. George, *The Language of the Devil: Texture and Archetype in Finnegans Wake*, 1987. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1991): 532-535.

Roberts, Adam, trans. *Pervigilium Finneganis*. Latin translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Ebook for Kindle. Ancaster eBooks, 2019a.

Roberts, Erie Martha. "Something Fishy is Going On: The Misapplication of Interpretive Communities in Literary Theory." *The Delta*, 1 (2006): 32-42.

Robbins, Tom. *Fierce Invalids Home From Hot Climates*. New York: Bantam Books, 2000.

Rodker, John. "Joyce and His Dynamic." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 139-146.

Rogers, Margaret. "Thoughts on Making Music from the Hundred-Letter Words in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake": A Casebook*. Ed. John Harty, III. New York and London: Garland, 1991. 189-197.

Ronen, Ruth. *Aesthetics of Anxiety*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2009.

Roraback, Erik S. *The Philosophical Baroque: On Autopoietic Modernities*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Rorty, Richard. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Rorty, Richard. "Solidarity or Objectivity?." *Relativism: Interpretation and Confrontation*. Ed. Michael Krausz. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989. 167-183.

Rorty, Richard. "Science as solidarity." *Objectivism, Relativism, and Truth: Philosophical Papers*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. 35-45.

Rorty, Richard. "The pragmatist's progress." *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. By Umberto Eco, with Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler, and Christine Brooke-Rose. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 89-108. (First published in 1992.)

Rose, Danis. *The Textual Diaries of James Joyce*. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1995.

Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. *Understanding Finnegans Wake: A Guide to the Narrative of James Joyce's Masterpiece*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1982.

Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. "Afterword." *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Books, 2012a. 515-523.

Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. "Preface." *The Restored Finnegans Wake*. By James Joyce. London: Penguin Classics, 2012b. ix-x.

Rose, Danis, and John Kidd. "Making the Wrong Joyce: An Exchange." *New York Review of Books*, 1 (1998): 60-61.

Rosenbloom, Eric. *A Word in Your Ear: How & Why to Read James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*. n.p.: BookSurge Publishing, 2005.

Ross, Stephen David. *The Limits of Language*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1996. (First published in 1994.)

Roughley, Alan Robert. *"Finnegans Wake" as a Deconstructive Text*. PhD thesis. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1986.

Roughley, Alan. "ALP's "Sein" und "Zeit": Questions of *Finnegans Wake*'s Being and Language in a Philosophical Context." *Finnegans Wake: Fifty Years*. Ed. Geert Lernout. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990. 125-138.

Roughley, Alan. *Reading Derrida Reading Joyce*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999.

Roussin, Rena. "Hearing and Seeing (Beyond) *Finnegans Wake: Roaratorio* and the Revitalization of Cage's and Cunningham's Experiential Aesthetic." *Musicological Explorations*, 15 (2018): 45-68.

Rovelli, Carlo. *The Order of Time*. English trans. Erica Segre, and Simon Carnell. New York: Riverhead Books, 2018. (Original in Italian: *L'ordine del tempo*. Milano: Adelphi Edizioni SPA, 2017.)

Rudnicki, Janusz. *Śmierć czeskiego psa*. Warszawa: WAB, 2009.

Ruggieri, Franca, and Enrico Terrinoni, eds. *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Rome: Edizioni Q, 2012.

Sabatini, Federico. "«It can't be all in one language»: Poetry and Verbivocovisual Language in Joyce and Pound." *Review of Literatures of the European Union*, 8 (2008): 97-114.

Sabatini, Federico. "Fullstoppers and Fools Tops: The 'Compunction' of Punctuation and Geometry in Finnegans Wake." *Doubtful Points: Joyce and Punctuation*. Eds. Elizabeth Bonapfel, and Tim Conley. European Joyce Studies, 23. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014. 153-166.

Sage, Robert. "Before Ulysses — And After." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 147-170.

Sailer, Susan Shaw. *On the Void of to Be: Incoherence and Trope in "Finnegans Wake"*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Sailer, Susan Shaw. "Fierce Feminism in *Finnegans Wake.*" Review of Brivic, Sheldon, *Joyce's Waking Women: An Introduction to "Finnegans Wake"*, 1995. *English Language in Translation*, 3 (1997): 358-361.

Sailer, Susan Shaw. "Universalizing Languages: *Finnegans Wake* Meets Basic English." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1999): 853-868.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. "Late Joyce and His Legacies: Teaching *Finnegans Wake* and Its Aftertale." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2001): 123-134.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. *The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. "Introduction: Modernism and the Lives of Copyright." *Modernism & Copyright*. Ed. Paul K. Saint-Amour. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 1-36.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. "Copyright Lives." Draft of conference paper delivered in Kraków, 2015. Received in personal communication (Email). 2015.

Salgado, César Augusto. *From Modernism to Neobaroque: Joyce and Lezama Lima*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2001.

Sandulescu, C. George. *The Language of the Devil: Texture and Archetype in Finnegans Wake*. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe; Chester Springs, PA: Dufour Editions, 1987.

Sanz Gallego, Guillermo. "*Ulysses* as a Musical Composition: Structure, Key and Cadence." *JoyceSbilya: Miscelánea de Estudios Joyceanos*. Eds. José Ma Tejedor Cabrera, José Manuel Estévez-Saá, María Isabel Porcel García, and Benigno del Río Molina. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, Secretariado de Publicaciones, 2011. 167-174.

Sárdi, Rudolf. *Világok és más világok Vladimir Nabokov műveiben: Worlds and Worlds Apart in Vladimir Nabokov's Fiction*. PhD thesis. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 2013.

Sartor, Genevieve. "Introduction: James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesic Fields." *James Joyce and Genetic Criticism: Genesic Fields*. Ed. Genevieve Sartor. European Joyce Studies, 28. Leiden: Brill, 2018. 1-10.

Savage, Sam. *Firmin: Adventures of a Metropolitan Lowlife*. Minneapolis: Coffee House Press, 2006.

Schaeffer, Jean-Marie. "James Joyce et l'homme du commun." *Communications*, 2 (2016): 95-107.

Schavrien, Judy. "Joyce, Shakespeare, and Pulsebeat Poetry." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1981): 177-187.

Schenoni, Luigi, trans. *Finnegans Wake. Libro primo, capitoli 1-4*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 1982.

Schenoni, Luigi, trans. *Finnegans Wake. Libro primo, capitoli 5-8*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 2001.

Schenoni, Luigi, trans. *Finnegans Wake. Libro secondo, capitoli 1-2*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 2004.

Schenoni, Luigi, trans. *Finnegans Wake. Libro secondo, capitoli 3-4*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 2011.

Schlossman, Beryl. *Joyce's Catholic Comedy of Language*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Schlossman, Beryl. "Madonnas of Modernism." *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Ed. Laurent Milesi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 58-78.

Schneider, Erik Holmes. *Zois in Nighttown: Prostitution and Syphilis in the Trieste of James Joyce and Italo Svevo (1880-1920)*. Rev. edition. London: Ashgrove Publishing, 2014.

Schoemaker, Paul J. H. *Brilliant Mistakes: Finding Success on the Far Side of Failure*. Philadelphia, PA: Wharton Digital Press, 2011.

Scholes, Robert, and Richard M. Kain. "Introduction." *The Workshop of Daedalus: James Joyce and the Raw Materials for "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man"*. Eds. Robert Scholes, and Richard M. Kain. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1965. xi-xiv.

Schotter, Jesse. "Verbivocovisuals: James Joyce and the Problem of Babel." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (2010): 89-109.

Schüler, Donaldo. "Donaldo Schüler em torno à tradução e o *Finnegans Wake*." Introduction note by Mauri Furlan. *Scientia Traductionis*, 8 (2010): 313-324.

Schultz, Matthew. "«Arise, Sir Ghostus!»: Textual Spectrality and *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2012): 281-295.

Schwarz, Daniel R. "Successfully Navigating the Minefields and Pitfalls of Joyce Scholarship." Review of Birmingham, Kevin, *The Most Dangerous Book: The Battle for James Joyce's "Ulysses"*, 2014. *Narrative*, 3 (2015): 333-340.

Schweizer, Wolfgang. Review of Loll, Udo. *James Joyce: Genie im Patriarchat*, 1992. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt*, 8 (1994): A-472.

Scott, Glenn. *A Sound of Voices Dying*. New York: Dutton, 1954.

Scott-James, Rolfe Arnold. "The Progress of Mr Joyce." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, 1939. *The Times Literary Supplement*. 6 May 1939: 265.

Seaman, William Curtis. *Recombinant Poetics: Emergent Meaning as Examined and Explored Within a Specific Generative Virtual Environment*. PhD thesis. CAiiA: Centre for Advanced Inquiry into the Interactive Arts, 1999.

Segall, Jeffrey. "'Kulturbolschewismus is here': James Joyce and the Anti-Modernist Crusade in America, 1928-1944." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 4 (1990): 535-562.

Segall, Jeffrey. *Joyce in America: Cultural Politics and the Trials of "Ulysses"*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1993.

Seidel, Michael. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1986): 518-520.

Seidel, Michael. *James Joyce: A Short Introduction*. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson, and Peter Brooker. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 5th edition. Harlow: Pearson Educated, 2005.

Semmler, Clement. "James Joyce: The Examination Continues." Review of Tindall, William York, a *Reader's Guide to James Joyce*, 1959. *Meanjin Quarterly*, 3 (1961): 332-336.

Sendecki, Marcin. "Wśród nocnej ciszy kartki szeleszcząąąąą." *Przekrój*, 50 (2010) [14 Dec. 2010]: 48-49.

Senn, Fritz. "One White Elephant." *A Wake Newslitter: Studies in James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*, 4 (1964): 1-3.

Senn, Fritz. "The Issue is Translation." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1967a): 163-164.

Senn, Fritz. "The Tellings of the Taling." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1967b): 229-233.

Senn, Fritz. "Quoint a quincidence (*Finnegans Wake* 299.8)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1970): 210-217.

Senn, Fritz. "Joycean Translatitudes: Aspects of Translation." *Litters from Aloft: Papers Delivered at the Second Canadian James Joyce Seminar, McMaster University*. Eds. Ronald Bates, and Harry J. Pollock. Tulsa: University of Tulsa; Hamilton, Ontario: McMaster University Library, 1971. 26-49.

Senn, Fritz. Review of Deming, Robert H., a *Bibliography of James Joyce Studies*, 2nd ed., 1977. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (1978-1979): 181-188.

Senn, Fritz. "Dogmad or dubliboused?." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1980): 237-261.

Senn, Fritz. "Letter to the Editor: In Memoriam: Jack P. Dalton" *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1981): 459-460.

Senn, Fritz. "Dynamics of Corrective Unrest." *James Joyce: A New Language*: *Actas/Proceedings del Simposio Internacional en el Centenario de James Joyce*. Eds. Francisco García Tortosa, Manuel Amalgro Jiménez, José Carnero González, and Paul Witkowsky. Seville: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1982a. 231-242.

Senn, Fritz. "Letters to the Editor." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1982b): 219-220.

Senn, Fritz. *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*. Ed. John Paul Riquelme. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

Senn, Fritz. "Protean Inglossabilities: 'To No End Gathered'." *Joyce, Modernity, and Its Mediation*. Ed. Christine van Boheemen. European Joyce Studies, 1. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989. 151-176.

Senn, Fritz. "A Cerebration of the Fiftyfication of the Publication of *Finnegans Wake* at Berkeley." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (1990a): 407-409.

Senn, Fritz. "Vexations of Group Reading: 'transluding from the Otherman'." *Finnegans Wake: Fifty Years*. Ed. Geert Lernout. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990b. 61-78.

Senn, Fritz. "A Reading Exercise in *Finnegans Wake*." *Critical Essays on James Joyce*. Ed. Patrick McCarthy. New York: G. K. Hall; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992a. 48-58.

Senn, Fritz. "Linguistic Dissatisfaction in the *Wake*." *The Languages of Joyce: Selected Papers from the 11th International James Joyce Symposium, Venice, 12-18 June 1988*. Eds. R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli, C. Marengo Vaglio, and Chr. van. Boheemen. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992b. 211-222.

Senn, Fritz. "Remembering Berni." *James Joyce Broadsheet*, 40 (1995): 5.

Senn, Fritz. "ALP Deutsch: 'ob überhaupt möglich?'." *Transcultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen R. Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 187-192.

Senn, Fritz. "The Joyce Industrial Evolution According to One European Amateur." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 2 (1998-1999): 191-197.

Senn, Fritz. "Mr Joyce Is Writing Foreign English." *Focus: Papers in English Literary and Cultural Studies*, 3 (2002b): 13-29.

Senn, Fritz. "James Joyce Is Writing Foreign English." *Variations*, 17 (2009): 59-71.

Senn, Fritz. "The Pleasure of Meeting Mr Dixon." *Joyce's Disciples Disciplined: A Re-Exagmination of the 'Exagmination' of 'Work in Progress'*. Ed. Tim Conley. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2010a. 143-146.

Senn, Fritz. "Translation as Approach / Tradução como Abordagem." Text facing its Portuguese translation from Luana Ferreira de Freitas and Alessandra Ramos de Oliveira Harden. *Scientia Traductionis*, 8 (2010b): 4-62. (First published in 1984.)

Senn, Fritz. "'I am a far-fetcher by constitution': Conversation with Fritz Senn." Conversation with Erika Mihálycsa, and Jolanta Wawrzycka. *Scientia Traductionis*, 12 (2012): 205-248.

Senn, Fritz. Review of Joyce, James, *Winnegans Fake: Aus dem Spätwerk*, Friedhelm Rathjen's German translation, 2012. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (2013): 870-875.

Senn, Fritz. "Q & A. With Fritz Senn." Interview by Lara May O'Muirithe. *Irish Literary Supplement*, 2 (2015): 21-22.

Senn, Fritz. "Finnegans wachen donnerstags auf." Interview by Jean-Claude Lin and Evelies Schmidt. *A tempo*, 6 (2018): 4-7.

Shaw, James. "*Finnegans Wake* Yoga Class." At "Joyce Without Borders" conference in Mexico, 13 June 2019.

Shelton, Jen. *Joyce and the Narrative Structure of Incest*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006.

Sherman, William H. "The Beginning of 'The End': terminal paratext and the birth of print culture." *Renaissance Paratexts*. Eds. Helen Smith, and Louise Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 65-87.

Sherwin, Byrlon L. *Sparks Amidst the Ashes: The Spiritual Legacy of Polish Jewry*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Shirky, Clay. *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing without Organizations*. London and New York: Allen Lane/Penguin Books, 2008.

Shlain, Leonard. *Art and Physics: Parallel Visions in Space, Time, and Light*. New York: William Morrow, 2007. (First published in 1991.)

Shloss, Carol Loeb. "*Finnegans Wake* and the Daughter's Fate." *Joycean Cultures/Culturing Joyces*. Eds. Vincent J. Cheng, Kimberly J. Devlin, and Margot Norris. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998. 95-112.

Shloss, Carol Loeb. *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

Shockley, Alan. "Playing the Square Circle: Musical Form and Polyphony in the *Wake*." *De-familiarizing Readings: Essays from the Austin Joyce Conference*. Eds. Alan W. Friedman, and Charles Rossman. European Joyce Studies, 18. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010. 90-101. (First published in 2009.)

Shockley, Alan. *Music in the Words: Musical Form and Counterpoint in the Twentieth Century Novel*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016. (First published in Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.)

Shoptaw, John. "The Music of Construction: Measure and Polyphony in Ashbery and Bernstein." *The Tribe of John: Ashbery and Contemporary Poetry*. Ed. Susan M. Schultz. Tuscaloosa, AL and London: University of Alabama Press, 1995. 211-257.

Shovlin, Frank. *Journey Westward: Joyce, "Dubliners" and the Literary Revival*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012.

Siedenbiedel, Catrin. "Oscar Wilde's 'Critic as Artist' and the 'Artist as Critic' in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." *The Importance of Reinventing Oscar: Versions of Wilde During the Last 100 Years*. Eds. Uwe Böker, and Richard Corballis. Internationale Forschungen zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft, 61. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002. 167-173.

Silverman, Kenneth. *Begin Again: A Biography of John Cage*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2012. (First published in 2010.)

Sim, Stuart. *Post-Truth, Scepticism & Power*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan (Springer), 2019.

Simmons, Dorothy. *Such Is Life: Myth and Meaning*. PhD thesis. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne, 2014.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations*. 4th edition. New York: The Free Press, 1997. (First published in 1945.)

Simpkins, Scott. "The Agency of the Title: *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1990): 735-743.

Simpkins, Scott. *Literary Semiotics: A Critical Approach*. Lanham, MD, and Oxford: Lexington Books, 2001.

Simpson, John. ""And words. They are not in my dictionary": James Joyce and the *OED*." *New Quotatoes: Joycean Exogenesis in the Digital Age*. Eds. Ronan Crowley, and Dirk Van Hulle. European Joyce Studies, 25. Leiden and Boston: Brill Rodopi, 2016. 45-65.

"Sixteen Years Work by James Joyce." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, 1939. *The Irish Times*. 3 June, 1939: 7.

Skiba, Tymoteusz. "Księga Schulza, Księga Lema." Paper in Polish delivered at a conference in Gdańsk, 17 Nov. 2018. Published in *Schulz/Forum*, 12 (2018): 84-94.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Slingsby, G. V. L. "Writes a Common Reader." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 189-192.

Slote, Sam. Review of Review of Sailer, Susan Shaw, *On the Void of To Be: Incoherence and Trope in Finnegans Wake*, 1993. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1994b): 148-154.

Slote, Sam. "Reading *Finnegans Wake* Genetically." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies*, 13 (2000): 203-220.

Slote, Sam. "No Symbols Where None Intended: Derrida's War at *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce and the Difference of Language*. Ed. Laurent Milesi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 195-207.

Slote, Sam. "'Après mot, le déluge' 2: Literary and Theoretical Responses to Joyce in France." *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe. Volume 1: Germany, Northern and East Central Europe*. Eds. Geert Lernout, and Wim Van Mierlo, London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004a. 382-410.

Slote, Sam. *Ulysses in the Plural: The Variable Editions of Joyce's Novel*. Joyce Studies, 5 (2004). Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 2004b.

Slote, Sam. "Prolegomenon to the Development of Wakean Styles: New Acquisitions at the National Library of Ireland." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-4 (2004-2006): 21-30.

Slote, Sam. "Structuralism, deconstruction, post-structuralism." *James Joyce in Context*. Ed. John McCourt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 65-75.

Slote, Sam. "An Imperfect Wake." *Errears and Erroriboose: Joyce and Error*. Ed. Matthew Creasy. European Joyce Studies, 20. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011. 135-149.

Slote, Sam. *Joyce's Nietzschean Ethics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Slote, Sam. "Espacement, the final frontier." *Doubtful Points: Joyce and Punctuation*. Eds. Elizabeth Bonapfel, and Tim Conley. European Joyce Studies, 23. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014. 33-41.

Slote, Sam. "Joycean Misapprehensions." Paper delivered at the Dublin James Joyce Centre, 7 Sep. 2015.

Slote, Sam. "The Texts of *Finnegans Wake*: An Annotated List of the Corrections of Misprints." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2018): 405-440.

Slote, Sam. "*Finnegans Wake*, However Basically Translated." *Translation Studies*, 1 (2019): 78-88.

Slote, Sam, and Wim Van Mierlo. "Genitricksling Joyce: An Introduction." *Genitricksling Joyce*. Eds. Sam Slote, and Wim Van Mierlo. European Joyce Studies, 9. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1999. 3-11.

Slowiaczek, Maria L, and Charles Clifton Jr. "Subvocalisation and Reading for Meaning." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 5 (1980): 573-582.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "ORT/WORT: Nomadyzm jako strategia translacji: (Jak tłumaczyć to, co nieprzetłumaczalne)." *Przekład Artystyczny*, 5 (1993): 7-17.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "William Blake i piekielna po-etyka lektury." *Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich*, 1-2 (1996): 81-110.

Sławek, Tadeusz. *U-bywać. Człowiek, świat, przyjaźń w twórczości Williama Blake'a*. Katowice: WUŚ, 2001a.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "Widok z okna (zamiast wstępu)." Introduction dated Dec. 2000. *Nagrobek ciotki Cili*. By Stefan Szymutko. Katowice: WUŚ, 2001b. 7-21.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "'rzekibrzeg/rzekibieg': rzeka i jej opowieści." *Urzeczenie: locje literatury i wyobraźni*. Eds. Mariusz Jochemczyk, and Miłosz Piotrowiak. Katowice: WUŚ, 2013. 115-142.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "Ogród przebaczenia: «The Garden of Forgiveness»." *Anthropos?*, 22-23 (2014a): 1-16.

Sławiński, Janusz. "Bez przydziału (VII)." *Teksty Drugie*, 1-2 (1999): 151-163.

Słomczyński, Maciej. "Giacomo Joyce (wstęp)." *Twórczość*, 7-8 (1970): 103-111.

Słomczyński, Maciej. "Finnegans Wake (fragmenty)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1973a): 42-53.

Słomczyński, Maciej. "Klucze otchłani." *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1973b): 4-41.

Słomczyński, Maciej. "Posłowie." *Utwory poetyckie*. By James Joyce. Polish trans. Maciej Słomczyński. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1975. 151-153.

Słomczyński, Maciej, trans. *Anna Livia Plurabelle*. Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Kraków and Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1985.

Słomczyński, Maciej, trans. "Ostatnia strona *Finnegans Wake*." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Studium*, 4 (1999): 130-131.

Słonimski, Antoni. *Obecność*. Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1973.

Smolin, Lee. *The Life of the Cosmos*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Snyder, John A. "Confessions of a Wakefiend: Bibliomantic Readings in *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (2004): 515-523.

Snyder, Timothy. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books, 2020.

Solecki, Sam. "Ideology." Encyclopedic entry. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Ed. Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1993. 558-560.

Soliński, Wojciech. "Umberto Eco: Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione." Review. *Pamiętnik Literacki*, 4 (2004): 256-264.

Soliński, Wojciech. "Umberta Eco "Poetyki Joyce'a" po latach (próba lektury "chaotycznej")." *Efekt motyla: Humaniści wobec teorii chaosu*. Wrocław: WUWr, 2006. 196-204.

Sollers, Philippe. "An Interview with Philippe Sollers." Interview by David Hayman. *The Iowa Review*, 4 (1974): 91-101.

Sollers, Philippe. *Writing and the Experience of Limits*. English trans. Philip Barnard, and David Hayman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983. (Original in French: *L'écriture et l'éxperience des limites*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1968.)

Solomon, Margaret C. *Eternal Geomater: The Sexual Universe of "Finnegans Wake"*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press; London and Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons, 1969.

Sommer, Piotr. "Laudacja Przewodniczącego Jury." *Literatura na Świecie*, 11-12 (2013): 449-457.

Souza, Raymond D. *Guillermo Cabrera Infante: Two Islands, Many Worlds*. Austin: University of Texas, 1996.

Sowa, Jan. "Sztuka — estetyka — polityka. Kilka uwag o dyskusji nad społeczno-politycznym zaangażowaniem sztuki." *Granice w kulturze*. Eds. Andrzej Radomski, and Radosław Bomba. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Portalu Wiedza i Edukacja, 2010. 266-279.

Spielberg, Peter. *James Joyce's Manuscripts & Letters at the University of Buffalo: A Catalogue*. Buffalo: University of Buffalo, 1962.

Spinks, Lee. *James Joyce: A Critical Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Spivey, Ted R. *Time's Stop in Savannah: Conrad Aiken's Inner Journey*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Splitter, Randolph. "Watery Words: Language, Sexuality, and Motherhood in Joyce's Fiction." *ELH*, 1 (1982): 190-213.

Spodaryk, Mikołaj. *Powieść a doświadczenie medium. Tekst, hipertekst i metafory lekturowe na przykładzie powieści hipertekstowej Popołudnie pewna historia Michaela Joyce'a*. MA dissertation. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 2013.

Spodaryk, Mikołaj. "Medialność powieści – bariera tekstu – poetyki typograficzne. Propozycje medialnej krytyki powieści." *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia de Cultura*, 7 (2015): 97-118.

Spoo, Robert. "Ezra Pound, Legislator: Perpetual Copyright and Unfair Competition with the Dead." *Modernism & Copyright*. Ed. Paul K. Saint-Amour. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 39-64.

Staley, Thomas F. "Notes and Comments." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1983): 265-274.

Staley, Thomas F. "Adventures in the Joyce Trade." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 12 (2001): 100-110.

Staley, Tom. Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, Folio Society, 2014. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 2 (2015): 429-431.

Stamirowska, Krystyna. "Pisarz odkryty na nowo: B. S. Johnson." *Literatura na Świecie*, 7-8 (2008): 189-207.

Stanford, G. Gann Jr. "Beyond the Grave: Continuing Life through Great Works." *Modernism & Copyright*. Ed. Paul K. Saint-Amour. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 263-264.

Staples, Hugh B. "Joyce and Cryptology: Some Speculations." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1965): 167-173.

Staples, Hugh B. "Beckett in the *Wake*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (1971): 421-424.

Starakiewicz, Maja. "Obraz jako argument w humanistyce." *Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich*, 3 (2017): 67-81.

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Stillinger, Jack. *Reading The Eve of St. Agnes: The Multiples of Complex Literary Transaction*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Stockdale, John Joseph. *Sketches, Civil and Military, of the Island of Java and its Immediate Dependencies Comprising Interesting Details of Batavia and Authentic Particulars of the Celebrated Poison-Tree*. 2nd edition. London: S. Gosnell, 1812.

Stockwell, Peter. *Texture: A Cognitive Aesthetics of Reading*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Stockwell, Peter. "Aesthetics." *The Oxford Handbook of Science Fiction*. Ed. Rob Latham. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. 35-46.

Strathern, Paul. *James Joyce in 90 Minutes*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2005.

Strycka, Anna. "Eksperyment i awangarda. O *Różach w betonie* Mariana Promińskiego." *Ruch Literacki*, 2 (2012): 227-248.

Strzetelski, Jerzy. "Noc opłakiwania Finnegana (Urywki)." Polish (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Twórczość*, 12 (1959a): 62-64.

Strzetelski, Jerzy. "Słopiewnie Jamesa Joyce'a." *Twórczość*, 12 (1959b): 60-61.

Strzetelski, Jerzy. "*Finnegans Wake* w oczach krytyki." *Literatura na Świecie*, 5 (1973): 54-84.

Strzetelski, Jerzy. *James Joyce – twórca nowoczesnej powieści*. Warszawa and Kraków: PWN, 1975.

Sukanya, Saha. "James Joyce's Experiments with Language – a Study." *The Indian Review of World Literature in English*, 2 (2012): 1-6.

Surdykowski, Tomasz. "Osobliwość postkolonialnego Joyce'a." *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 9 (2014): 295-302.

Susskind, Leonard, and Art Friedman. *Quantum Mechanics: The Theoretical Minimum*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.

Sussman, Henry. *Idylls of the Wanderer: Outside in Literature and Theory*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007.

Svevo, Italo. "Ulisses urodził się w Trieście." Polish trans. Halina Kralowa. *Zeszyty Literackie*, 2 (2005): 61-65. (Original in Italian: lecture given on 8 March 1927 in Milan, published in: Svevo, Italo. *Joyce ed altri saggi*. Roma: Carlo Mancosu Editore, 1993: 44-49.)

Switaj, Elizabeth. *James Joyce's Teaching Life and Methods: Language and Pedagogy in "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man", "Ulysses", and "Finnegans Wake"*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Sypek, Alexis. *Einstein's New Physics in James Joyce's* Finnegans Wake*: The Role of Irish Nationalism*. Honors thesis. Durham: Duke University, 2010.

Szahaj, Andrzej. "Granice anarchizmu interpretacyjnego." *Teksty Drugie*, 6 (1997): 5-33.

Szahaj, Andrzej. "Paradygmaty interpretacyjne a narodziny literaturoznawstwa postawangardowego." *Teksty Drugie*, 6 (2011): 281-288.

Szczepanik, Lidia. "'Sandhyas Sandhyas Sandhyas!' Indian Thought in *Finnegans Wake*." *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 9 (2014): 303-310.

Szczerbowski, Tadeusz. "Gry językowe w przekładach "Ulissesa" Jamesa Joyce'a." Kraków: PAN, 1998.

Szczerbowski, Tadeusz. "Autoprzekład jako oryginał (Joyce tłumaczy *Finnegans Wake*)." *Między oryginałem a przekładem*. Vol. 5. Eds. Maria Filipowicz Rudek, Jadwiga Konieczna-Twardzikowa, and Urszula Kropiwiec. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1999: 139-147.

Szczerbowski, Tadeusz. *Anna Livia Plurabelle po polsku: Finnegans Wake Jamesa Joyce'a ks. I, rozdz. 8*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, 2000.

Szegedy-Maszák, Mihály. "Nonteleological Narration." *International Postmodernism: Theory and Literary Practice*. Eds. Hans Bertens, and Douwe Foukkema. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. 273-282.

Szymutko, Stefan. *Nagrobek ciotki Cili*. Katowice: WUŚ, 2001.

Świątek, Dagmara. "Neology Translation in the Light of Cognitive Linguistics." *Prace Naukowe im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie – Studia Neofilologiczne*, 8 (2012): 149-162.

Świątek, Tadeusz. "Przegląd literacki. Zagadnienia formalne: James Joyce." *Kuryer Literacko-Naukowy*, 19 (1936): viii-x.

Tabakowska, Elżbieta. "Struktura wydarzenia w literackim tekście narracyjnym jako problem przekładu." *Przekładając nieprzekładalne*. Ed. Małgorzata Ogonowska. Gdańsk: WUG, 2000. 19-37.

Takács, Ferenc. "Joyce and Hungary." *Literary Interrelations: Ireland, England and the World*. Eds. Wolfgang Zach, and Heinz Kosok. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1987. 161-167.

Talar, Magdalena. "Czuwanie." *Didaskalia*, 105 (2011): 122-123.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. Review of Joyce, James, *The Restored Finnegans Wake*, 2012. *Common Knowledge*, 3 (2014): 506-508.

Taplin, Walter. "James Joyce wrote English." *The Critic: A Quarterly Review of Criticism*, 1 (1947): 11-16.

Tarski, Alfred. *Introduction to Logic and to the Methodology of Deductive Sciences*. English trans. Olaf Helmer. Revised edition by Jan Tarski. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. (In English first published in 1941, extension of German: *Einführung in die mathematische Logik und in die Methodologie der Mathematik*. Wien: Julius Springer, 1937, itself a translation of Polish: *O logice matematycznej i metodzie dedukcyjnej*. Lwów and Warszawa: Książnica-Atlas, 1936.)

Tate, Dennis. "James Joyce and Socialist Realism? Modernist Awareness and Ideological Constraints in GDR Literature." *In the Party Spirit: Socialist Realism and Literary Practice in the Soviet Union, East Germany, and China*. Ed. Hilary Chung. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996. 141-149.

Taylor-Batty, Juliette. "Protean Mutations: James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 113-145.

Tereszewski, Marcin. *The Aesthetics of Failure: Inexpressibility in Samuel Beckett's Fiction*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.

Terrinoni, Enrico. *Occult Joyce: The Hidden in "Ulysses"*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Terrinoni, Enrico. "Preface: Why Read Joyce at all?." *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Enrico Terrinoni. Roma: Edizioni Q, 2012. 13-16.

Terrinoni, Enrico, and Fabio Pedone. *Finnegans Wake. Libro terzo, capitoli 1-2*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 2017.

Terrinoni, Enrico, and Fabio Pedone. *Finnegans Wake. Libro terzo, capitoli 3-4. Libro quarto*. Italian (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Milan: Mondadori, 2019.

Thakur, Pradeep. *The Most Important People of the 20th Century – II: Artists and Entertainers*. Punjab: Pradeep Thakur & Sons, 2010.

Theall, Donald F. *James Joyce's Techno-Poetics*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Theall, Donald, and Joan Theall. "Marshall McLuhan and James Joyce: Beyond Media." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 4 (1989): 46-66.

Thomas, Jacqueline Kay. *Aphrodite Unshamed: James Joyce's Romantic Aesthetics of Feminine Flow*. PhD thesis. Austin: University of Texas, 2007.

Thompson, Spurgeon. "James Joyce and Tourism in Dublin: Quotation and the Mass Commodification of Irish Culture." *New Hibernia Review*, 1 (1997): 136-155.

Thompson, Spurgeon. "The Subaltern *Finnegans Wake*." *Internationalist Review of Irish Culture*, 1 (2007): 11-27.

Thompson, Spurgeon. "Returning to Political Interpretation: A Communist *Finnegans Wake*." *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Enrico Terrinoni. Roma: Edizioni Q, 2012. 17-36.

Thompson, William Irvin. "The Language of *Finnegans Wake*." *The Sewanee Review*, 1 (1964): 78-90.

Thomson, Clive, ed. *Critical Studies Vol. 2 No. 1/2 1990: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Epistemology of Discourse*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1990.

Thurston, Luke. *James Joyce and the Problem of Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Tindall, William York. *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1959.

Tindall, William York. *A Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1996. (Reissue of 1969 edition in New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.)

Todd, Richard. "The Intrusive Author in British Postmodernist Fiction: The Cases of Alasdair Gray and Martin Amis." *Exploring Postmodernism*. Eds. Matei Calinescu, and Douwe Fokkema. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987. 127-137.

Tolkien, John Ronald Reuel. "The Quenya Alphabet." Ed. Arden R. Smith. *Parma Eldalamberon*, 20 (2012): 17-159.

Toolan, Michael. *Making Sense of Narrative Text: Situation, Repetition, and Picturing in the Reading of Short Stories*. New York and London: Routledge, 2016.

Torres, Louis, and Michelle Marder Kamhi. *What Art Is: The Esthetic Theory of Ayn Rand*. Chicago and La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2000.

Toth, Josh. *The Passing of Postmodernism: A Spectroanalysis of the Contemporary*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2010.

Trela, Jola. "Joyce a zen." *Twórczość*, 11 (1989): 70-84.

Troy, Mark L. *Mummeries of Resurrection: The Cycle of Osiris in Finnegans Wake*. PhD thesis. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1976.

Tyler, Lisa. "'Everybody Has It': Syphilis and the Human Condition in the Writings of Ernest Hemingway." *Syphilis and Subjectivity: From the Victorians to the Present*. Eds. Kari Nixon, and Lorenzo Servitje. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. 163-181.

Tymicka, Magdalena. "Personifikacja teorii: gry intertekstualne w *Małym światku*." [English title: "Personification of theory: intertextual games in *Small World*."] *Przestrzenie Teorii*, 6 (2006): 191-230.

Ursul, Natalia V. "The Peculiarities of Nonsense at Lexemic Level." *Proceedings of IAC-SSaH 2014. International Academic Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities in Prague 2014*. Prague: Czech Institute of Academic Education, 2014. 329-336.

Utell, Janine. *James Joyce and the Revolt of Love: Marriage, Adultery, Desire*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Valdeira, Ana Luísa. "Cage wakes up Joyce: Recycling through *Finnegans Wake*." *Revisitar o Mito / Myths Revisited*. Eds. Abel Nascimento Pena, Maria de Jesus C. Relvas, Rui Carlos Fonseca, and Teresa Casal. Lisboa: Húmus, 2015. 93-102.

Vance, Norman. *Irish Literature Since 1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 2014. (First published in Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2002.)

Vanderham, Paul. *James Joyce and Censorship: The Trials of "Ulysses"*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1998.

Vanderham, Paul. Review of Kelly, Joseph, *Our Joyce: From Outcast to Icon*, 1998. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3-4 (2000): 564-568.

Van Hulle, Dirk. "The *Wake*'s Progress: Towards a Genetic Edition." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies*, 13 (2000): 221-232.

Van Hulle, Dirk. "'Out of Metaphor': Mauthner, Richards and the Development of Wakese." *James Joyce: The Study of Languages*. Ed. Dirk Van Hulle. Brussels: PIE Peter Lang, 2002. 91-118.

Van Hulle, Dirk. "The Inclusion of Paralipomena in Genetic Editions." *Jahrbuch Computerphilologie*, 7 (2005): 141-148.

Van Hulle, Dirk. "The Lost Word: Book IV." *How Joyce Wrote Finnegans Wake: A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*. Eds. Luca Crispi, and Sam Slote. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007. 436-461.

Van Hulle, Dirk. "Genetic Joyce criticism." *James Joyce in Context*. Ed. John McCourt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 112-124.

Van Hulle, Dirk. *James Joyce's 'Work in Progress': Pre-Book Publications of "Finnegans Wake" Fragments*. London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

Van Mierlo, Chrissie. *James Joyce and Catholicism: The Apostate's Wake*. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Van Mierlo, Wim. Review of Kelly, Joseph, *Our Joyce: From Outcast to Icon*, 1998. *James Joyce Broadsheet*, 51 (1998): 3.

Van Mierlo, Wim. "Reading Joyce in and out of the Archive." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 13 (2002): 32-63.

Van Mierlo, Wim. "Editing the Wake." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, eds. Rose and O'Hanlon, 2010. *James Joyce Literary Supplement*, 2 (2011): 6-9.

Van Mierlo, Wim. "Annotation and Commentary in the Modernist Edition: A Critique." *Modernist Cultures*, 1 (2020): 69-91.

van Tongeren, Paul, Gerd Schank, and Herman Siemens, eds. *Nietzsche-Wörterbuch: Band 1: Abbreviatur - einfach*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

van Velze, Jan [Leendert]. *Joyce's Myopia, Irisitis, and Blind Prophecy: A Critical Introduction*. MA dissertation. Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht, 2010.

Veith, Gene Edward Jr. *Modern Fascism: The Threat to the Judeo-Christian Worldview*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1993.

Verene, Donald Phillip. "Coincidence, historical repetition, and self-knowledge: Jung, Vico, and Joyce." *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 47 (2002): 459-478.

Verene, Donald Phillip. *Knowledge of Things Human and Divine: Vico's New Science and "Finnegans Wake"*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003.

Versteegen, Heinrich. "Translating *Finnegans Wake*: Translatability and the Translator's Personality." *Images of Joyce*. Eds. Clive Hart, C. George Sandulescu, Bonnie K. Scott, and Fritz Senn. Princess Grace Irish Library Series, 11. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1998. 698-707.

Vichnar, David. *Joyce Against Theory*. PhD thesis. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2008.

Vichnar, David. "James Joyce and the Materiality of Language." Unpublished conference paper delivered on 18 April 2014, Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic. Received in personal communication (Facebook message). 2014.

Vincent, Michael Lawrence. *Music & Language Interrelations: Towards an Evolutionary, Semiotic and Compositional Perspective*. DMA thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010.

Vincenti, Giovanna. *The Discourse of Madness in James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake" and Samuel Beckett's Early English Prose*. PhD thesis. Reading: University of Reading, 2018.

Visser, G. J. "James Joyce's Prose and Welsh Cynghanedd." *Neophilologus*, 4 (1963): 305-320.

Waisman, Sergio. *Borges and Translation: The Irreverence of the Periphery*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007. (First published in 2005.)

"'*Wake*' Shortened for Joyce Fans." Review of Joyce, James, a *Shorter Finnegans Wake*, Ed. Anthony Burgess, 1966. *The Indianapolis News*. 28 Jan. 1967: 33.

Wales, Katie. Review of Sandulescu, C. George, *The Language of the Devil: Texture and Archetype in Finnegans Wake*, 1987. *James Joyce Broadsheet*, 33 (1990): 3.

Wales, Katie. *The Language of James Joyce*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1992.

Wall, Richard. *An Anglo-Irish Dialect Glossary for Joyce's Works*. Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire: Colin Smythe, 1986.

Wallis, Mieczysław. *Późna twórczość wielkich artystów*. Warszawa: PIW, 1975.

Walsh, Erin Aileen. *Analogy's Territories: Ethics and Aesthetics in Darwinism, Modernism, and Cybernetics*. PhD thesis. Irvine, CA: University of California, 2010.

Walton, Douglas, Christopher Tindale, and Thomas F. Gordon. "Applying Recent Argumentation Methods to Some Ancient Examples of Plausible Reasoning." *Argumentation*, 1 (2014): 85-119.

Warner, Michael. Review of Rice, Thomas Jackson, *James Joyce: A Guide to Research*, 1982. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1 (1986): 109-113.

Wasserstein, Wendy. *Sloth: The Seven Deadly Sins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Watson, Peter. *The Age of Atheists: How We Have Sought to Live Since the Death of God*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014.

Wawrzycka, Jolanta. "The Reception of James Joyce in Poland." *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. *Volume 1: Germany, Northern and East Central Europe*. Eds. Geert Lernout, and Wim Van Mierlo, London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004. 219-229.

Wawrzycka, Jolanta. "*Epifanie* by James Joyce, and: *Finneganów Tren* by James Joyce." Review. *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1-2 (2016-2017): 167-176.

Ważyk, Adam. *Eseje literackie*. Warszawa: PIW, 1982.

Weathers, Winston Wiley. *The Broken Word: The Theme of Communication Failure in Twentieth-Century Literature*. PhD thesis. Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma, 1964.

Weaver, Jack W. *Joyce's Music and Noise*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1988.

Weaver, Jack W. "The Shortest Way to Tara is Via Holyhead: Stephen Dedalus' (Celtic) Vision, Ireland's Nightmare, and Joyce's (Re)Vision of the Irish Dream." *Visions of the Irish Dream*. Ed. Marguerite Quintelli-Neary. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. 182-201.

Weaver, Jack W. Personal communication (Email). 20 Feb. 2013.

Weaver, Jack W. Personal communication (Email). 13 Feb. 2014.

Webster, Russell. "A reply to Peter Boghsonnian and James Lindsay's, 'What comes after postmodernism?." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 7 (2019): 679-680.

Weigel, John A. "Teaching the Modern Novel: From *Finnegans Wake* to a *Fable*." *College English*, 3 (1959): 172-173.

Weir, David. *Anarchy and Culture: The Aesthetic Politics of Modernism. Critical Perspectives on Modern Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997.

Weiss, Thomas. "Psychobiology of Altered States of Consciousness." *Psychological Bulletin*, 1 (2005): 98-127.

Welsh, James M., and Donald M. Whaley. "Campbell Joseph (1902-1987)." Encyclopedic entry. *The Oliver Stone Encyclopedia*. Lanham, MD, Toronto, and Plymouth: Scarecrow Press, 2013.

Weninger, Robert. *The German Joyce*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2012.

Westfahl, Gary. *The Mechanics of Wonder: The Creation of the Idea of Science Fiction*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1998.

Wexler, Joyce Piell. *Who Paid for Modernism? Art, Money, and the Fiction of Conrad, Joyce, and Lawrence*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1997.

Wheatley, David. "'That Blank Mouth': Secrecy, Shibboleths, and Silence in Northern Irish Poetry." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1 (2001): 1-16.

Whissell, Cynthia. "What Can a String of Letters Possibly Mean When It Is Not a Word?: Speech Sounds as One Answer to the Search of Meaning in *Finnegans Wake*." *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 1 (2015): 257-272.

White, Harry. *Music and the Irish Literary Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Whitley, Catherine. "The Politics of Representation in *Finnegans Wake*'s 'Ballad'." *Joycean Cultures/Culturing Joyces*. Eds. Vincent J. Cheng, Kimberly J. Devlin, and Margot Norris. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1998. 163-176.

Whitley, Catherine. "Nations and the Night: Excremental History in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Djuna Barnes' *Nightwood*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 1 (2000): 81-98.

Whittier-Ferguson, John. "The Voice behind the Echo: Vladimir Dixon's Letters to James Joyce and Sylvia Beach." *James Joyce Quarterly*, 3 (1992): 511-531.

Wiesenmayer, Anita Theodóra. *Words Embedded in Music: A Musical Approach to Some Representative Twentieth-Century Literary Texts*. PhD thesis. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 2011.

Wilder, Thornton. "Joyce and the Modern Novel." *A James Joyce Miscellany*. Ed. Marvin Magalaner. New York: The James Joyce Society, 1957. 11-19.

Wilkinson, Doris. "Transforming the Social Order: The Role of the University in Social Change." *Sociological Forum*, 3 (1994): 325-341.

Williams, Amy, and Claudia Friedlander, performers. *Music at Bennington Presents… Amy Williams, piano. With Claudia Friedlander, soprano*. Concert program. Bennington: Deane Carriage Barn, 16 Apr. 1997.

Williams, Katlyn E. *American Magic: Authorship and Politics in the New American Literary Genre Fiction*. PhD thesis. Iowa City: The University of Iowa, 2018.

Williams, Keith. "Joyce's 'Chinese alphabet': *Ulysses* and the Proletarians." *Irish Writing: Exile and Subversion*. Eds. Paul Hyland, and Neil Sammells. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1991. 173-187.

Williams, Mary Ellen. *The Novels of Thornton Wilder*. PhD thesis. Tucson: The University of Arizona, 1971.

Williams, Williams Carlos. "A Point for American Criticism." *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. 171-185.

Williams, Tennessee. "Interview with Tennessee Williams." Interview by Cecil Brown. *Partisan Review*, 45 (1978): 276-305.

Wilson, Andrew P. *Transfigured: A Derridean Re-Reading of the Markan Transfiguration*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Wilson, Edmund. "James Joyce." *Axel's Castle*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. 191-236.

Wilson, Edmund. "The Dream of H. C. Earwicker." *The Wound and the Bow: Seven Studies in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1941. 243-271. (First published in 1939.)

Wilson, Edmund. "The Antrobuses and the Earwickers." *Nation*, 5 (1943): 167-168.

Wilson, Leigh. *Modernism and Magic: Experiments with Spiritualism, Theosophy and the Occult*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

Wilson, Robert Anton. "The Horror on Howth Hill." *Three-Fisted Tales of "Bob": Short Stories in the SubGenius Mythos*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990. 168-181.

Wilson, Robert Anton. "Robert Anton Wilson: The Man with the Cosmic Triggerfinger." Interview by Neal Wilgus. *Seven by Seven: Interviews with American Science Fiction Writers of the West and Southwest*. San Bernardino, CA: Borgo Press, 1996. 11-28.

Wilson, Robert Anton. *Prometheus Rising*. 12th printing. Temple, AZ: New Falcon Publications, 2000. (First published in 1983.)

Wilson, Robert Anton. *The Illuminati Papers*. Oakland, CA: Ronin Publishing, 2012. (First published in 1980.)

Wimsatt, William K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review*, 3 (1946): 468-488.

Wiśniewska, Lidia. "Kultura i kontrkultura (w perspektywie mitów i paradygmatów)." *Granice w kulturze*. Eds. Andrzej Radomski, and Radosław Bomba. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Portalu Wiedza i Edukacja, 2010. 343-362.

Winthrop-Young, Geoffrey. *Kittler and the Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011.

Wojewoda, Cecylia. "Bez "Miłości i gniewu"." *Dialog*, 9 (1962): 105-109.

Wolf, Howard R. "'Thornton Wilder's Syncretic Field of Reference: A Mosaic of Antiquity and Modernity." *Thornton Wilder in Collaboration: Collected Essays on His Drama and Fiction*. Eds. Jackson R. Bryer, Judith P. Hallett, and Edyta K. Oczkowicz. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018. 45-54.

Wollaeger, Mark. "Joyce and Postcolonial Theory: Analytic and Tropical Modes." *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2011. 174-192. (First published in 2008.)

Wood, Michael. "Quashed Quotatoes." Review of (i) Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*, eds. Danis Rose, and John O'Hanlon, 2010, and (ii) Conley, Tim (ed.), *Joyce's Disciples Disciplined*, 2010. *London Review of Books*, 24 (2010): 19-20.

Wójtowicz, Ewa. "Konwersje transliteraturowe – od filmu mówionego do narracji bazodanowej." *Przegląd Kulturoznawczy*, 1 (2014): 11-20.

Wróblewski, Jakub. *First We Feel Then We Fall: Self-Review of Professional Achievements*. Warszawa, Pa!riso, 2016.

Yanase, Naoki. *Fineganzu ueiku*. Japanese translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. Vols. 1-3. Tokyo: Kawadeshobo-shinsha, Kawade-bunko, 2004.

Yao, Steven G. "'Translating from the Otherman': Translation and the Language of *Finnegans Wake*." *Translation and the Languages of Modernism: Gender, Politics, Language*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. 191-208.

Yates, Aubrey J. *Biofeedback and the Modification of Behaviour*. New York and London: Plenum Press, 1980.

Yeager, Leland K. *Is the Market a Test of Truth and Beauty?: Essays in Political Economy*. Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2011.

Yee, Cordell D. K. *The Word According to James Joyce: Reconstructing Representation*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1997.

Young, John. *A Criticism on the "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard": Being a Continuation of Dr. Johnson's Criticism on the Poems of Gray*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: John Ballantine & Co.; London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1810.

Zangouei, Javad. "Joyce the Deconstructionist: *Finnegans Wake* in Context." *k@ta*, 1 (2012): 31-36.

Zangouei, Javad. "Backward Glance at James Joyce: *Finnegans Wake*'s Postmodernist Devices." *Studies in Literature and Language*, 2 (2013): 63-71.

Zanotti, Serenella. "Language and Languages in Joyce's Fiction: An Introduction." *Language and Languages in Joyce's Fiction*. Ed. Serenella Zanotti. Roma: Editoriale Anicia, 2019. 9-19.

Zarrinjooee, Bahman. "James Joyce's Rhetoric of Recirculation in *Finnegans Wake* and Rumi's Philosophy." *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 1 (2013): 17-24.

Zatkalik, Milos. "Is There Music in Joyce and Where Do We Look for It?." *Joyce Studies Annual*, 12 (2001): 55-61.

Zeller, Ursula. "'Mirrorminded curiositease': Verena Schindler's Joycean Art." *Verena Schindler: Das Weite suchen*. Exhibition catalogue. Basel, 2015: 63-68.

Zhang, Hanmo. *Authorship and Text-Making in Early China*. Library of Sinology, 2. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.

Zhang, Mingming. *Dwelling in Dreams: A Comparative Study of "Dream of the Red Chamber" and "Finnegans Wake"*. PhD thesis. Riverside: University of California, 2009.

Zielińska, Maryla. "Gry terenowe." *Didaskalia*, 92/93 (2009): 89-92.

Zimmerlich, Antonia. "Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* as a Cornucopian Text." *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 41.1 (2016): 39-56.

Zirzotti, Emanuela. "Have You Ever 'Seen' Joyce?: The Role of the Internet in the Popularization of the Man and His Work." *Why Read Joyce in the 21st Century?*. Eds. Franca Ruggieri, and Enrico Terrinoni. Rome: Edizioni Q, 2012. 131-144.

Żuławski, Andrzej. "Nora i Jim." *Twój Styl*, 12 (1995): 118-125.

Internet sources [*all links active unless marked otherwise; paywall restrictions not marked; access verified on 25 Aug. 2020*]:

"About the *Finnegans Wake* Society of New York and the Wake Watchers." Webapge. The Finnegans Wake Society of New York. Published in 2006. <https://finneganswake.org/aboutfwsociety.shtml>.

Abrams, Dennis. "Nothing's Impossible: *Finnegans Wake* Translated into Chinese." *Publishing Perspectives*. 19 Sep. 2012. <https://publishingperspectives.com/2012/09/impossible-no-finnegans-wake-translated-into-chinese/>.

Abu, Talia, et al. [130 signatories] "An Open Letter to the James Joyce Community." Dated 8 Nov. 2018. *Modernist Review*. 15 Jan. 2019. <https://modernistreviewcouk.wordpress.com/2019/01/15/an-open-letter-to-the-james-joyce-community/>.

Ackerman, Elliot, et al. [150 signatories] "A Letter on Justice and Open Debate." *Harper's Magazine*. 7 July 2020. <https://harpers.org/a-letter-on-justice-and-open-debate/>.

Adams, Michael. "Do-It-Yourself Language." *Humanities*, 1 (2013). <https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2013/januaryfebruary/feature/do-it-yourself-language>.

Alford, Charles. [Answer to question "Why is James Joyce's most impenetrable work, *Finnegans Wake*, inaccessible to most people?".] *Quora*. 1 Dec. 2015. <https://www.quora.com/Why-is-James-Joyces-most-impenetrable-work-Finnegans-Wake-inaccessible-to-most-people>.

Altena, Arie. "Metandmorefussed: *Finnegans Wake* as a Secret Agent? ….a fantasy." *Mediamatic Magazine*, 1 (1998). <https://www.mediamatic.net/en/page/9057/metandmorefussed>.

Alves-Bezerra, Wilson. "Tradutora leva o espelho opaco de 'Finnegans Wake' para o português." *Estadão*. 24 Feb. 2018. <https://alias.estadao.com.br/noticias/geral,tradutora-leva-o-espelho-opaco-de-finnegans-wake-para-o-portugues,70002200089>.

Ambrose, Darren. "'A Knot of Coherent Nonsense': Reading Joyce's 'Finnegans Wake'… Again." Blog post. 1 Apr. 2014. <https://dcambrose.com/art/a-knot-of-coherent-nonsense-reading-finnegans-wake-again/>.

"Archiving the Ephemeral." The James Joyce Collection at Buffalo Online. Exhibit in Occasion of NEMLA 2000. 6 April-5 May 2000, Buffalo, NY: State University of New York. Online: <https://library.buffalo.edu/pl/collections/jamesjoyce/collection/ephemeral.php>. [Inactive link.]

Armand, Louis. "The Art of War: Declarations of the Other." Webpage of the author's website. 2001. <http://web.ff.cuni.cz/~lazarus/jjht_declarations.html>. [Inactive link.]

Armand, Louis. "Enzymes, Reverse Transcriptions and the Technogeneses of *Finnegans Wake*." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 2 (2002a). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS2/GJS2Armand>.

Armintor, Marshall. [Answer to question "As one with an IQ in the 99.9th percentile (146+), what do you think of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*?".] *Quora*. 14 Mar. 2018. <https://www.quora.com/As-one-with-an-IQ-in-the-99-9th-percentile-146-what-do-you-think-of-James-Joyces-Finnegans-Wake/answer/Marshall-Armintor>.

Arnott, Gregory. "Email to the Universe Discussion Group, Week 11." Blog post. *RAWIllumination.net*. 24 July 2017. <http://www.rawillumination.net/2017/07/email-to-universe-discussion-group-week_24.html>.

Baars, Girilal. *Two Timing: Solo composition for voice and simple looper, based on the opening chapter of Joyce's Finnegan's Wake (1939)*. 2011. <http://www.girilal.com/twotiming.html>.

Baldwin, Craig, and Robert Dobbs. "Craig Baldwin and Robert Dobbs." Interview by Ruby Carat. *Marshall McLuhan/Finnegans Wake Reading Club*. 8 Mar. 2012. <https://venicewake.wordpress.com/2012/03/08/craig-baldwin-and-robert-dobbs/>.

Banville, John. "Joyce zużył Irlandię." Interview by Łukasz Grzymisławski. *Gazeta Wyborcza*. 23 Apr. 2007. <http://wyborcza.pl/1,75517,4083684.html>.

Barger, Jorn. "Email about James Joyce and symbolic a.i." No date marked. Published in 2003. <http://mural.uv.es/mzaso/estudio.htm>.

Barger, Jorn. "50+ Joycean conjectures annotated." Blog post. *Robot Wisdom*. 29 July 2007. <http://robotwisdom2.blogspot.com/2007/06/50-joycean-conjectures-annotated.html>.

Barger, Jorn. [Answer to question "Which edition of *Finnegans Wake* is most trustworthy?".] *Quora*. 15 June 2013. Updated 9 Aug. 2013. <https://www.quora.com/Which-edition-of-Finnegans-Wake-is-most-trustworthy/answer/Jorn-Barger?share=8991b7a0&srid=pXR9n>.

Barger, Jorn. [Answer to question "Are James Joyce's works overrated?".] *Quora*. 13 Feb. 2017. <https://www.quora.com/Are-James-Joyces-works-overrated>.

Barlow, Richard. "What might James Joyce have made of 21st-century Scottish independence?." *The Guardian*. 31 Jan. 2014. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2014/jan/31/james-joyce-scottish-independence>.

Barlow, Richard. "Joyce and the Celtic World." Lecture delivered at the Trieste Joyce School, 1 July 2017 (2017a). A 19 pages long [paginated] version online: <https://www.academia.edu/33751179/Trieste_Joyce_School_2017_lecture>. [Inactive link.]

Barlow, Richard. "Clever, Very: Richard Barlow." Interview by James Joyce Quarterly. *James Joyce Quarterly*. 20 Sep. 2018. <https://jjq.utulsa.edu/clever-richard-barlow/>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *Post-James Joyce Variations*. Translations of sequences of letters from James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* into music. Website. 2012d (ongoing). <https://soundcloud.com/gimcbart>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. *James Joyce Goes Star Wars*. Series of 10 YouTube videos. 2014b. Playlist: <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLUUEJfdy78Omp55Ou_ZUnFyOoVCfNWrzq>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "Sedno słów." Interview by Marceli Szpak. *Dwutygodnik*, 128 (2014c). <https://www.dwutygodnik.com/artykul/5081-sedno-slow.html>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "James Joyce, a Composer, Possibly Chinese." *interartive*, 75 (2015). <https://original-vs-copy.interartive.org/2015/07/bartnicki/>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof, ed. *-Y? Multi-Genre Polish Sound Reactions to James Joyce CD*. Performed by Y? Collective (14 performers). Bandcamp edition. 2018. <https://ycollective.bandcamp.com/album/y>.

Bartnicki, Krzysztof. "[Я только что прочитал…]." Post. *VK*. 8 June 2019. <https://vk.com/id419339179?w=wall419339179_58%2Fall>.

Bateman, Patrick. "not yet finished." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*. Amazon.ca. 4 July 2005. <https://www.amazon.ca/review/RVB91HWM2J0B2/ref=cm_cr_dp_title/157-7062057-8088154>.

Bausells, Marta. "Finnegans Wake: A musical reading sounds out a cryptic text." *The Guardian*. 2 Feb. 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2016/feb/02/finnegans-wake-music-james-joyce-birthday>.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. "Joyce, Liberature and the Writing of the Book." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 2 (2007b). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v8_2/main/essays.php?essay=bazarnik>.

Bazarnik, Katarzyna. Marked as by: Katarzyna Bazarnik (& Zenon Fajfer). "Liberature: Literature In The Form Of The Book." Conference paper delivered in Kraków, 9-10 July 2009. Quoted from an edited 15 pages long [unpaginated] version online: <https://www.bookarts.uwe.ac.uk/news-archive/contrad09/conpdfs/liberature.pdf>.

Beausang, Chris. "'William & Catherine Blake's Lesson in reading *Finnegans Wake*' or 'In Praise of Stichomancy.'" Blog post. *Analogue Humanist*. 1 Dec. 2014. <https://analoguehumanist.wordpress.com/2014/12/01/william-catherine-blakes-lesson-in-reading-finnegans-wake-or-in-praise-of-stichomancy/>. [Inactive link.]

Bielenberg, Kim. "An Irishman's Diary." *The Irish Times*. 4 Sep. 1996. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/an-irishman-s-diary-1.82882>.

Birmingham, Kevin. "On Joyce and Syphilis: New evidence of the author's suffering, and reflections on the scholarly debate." *Harper's Magazine: Browsings: The Harper's*

Blog. 31 July 2014 (2014b). <https://harpers.org/blog/2014/07/on-joyce-and-syphilis/>.

Bleek, Tobias. *The history of "Notations" in Boulez's creative output*. Webpage. Essen: Stiftung Klavier-Festival Ruhr, 2018. <https://www.explorethescore.org/pierre-boulez-douze-notations-history-and-context-musical-metamorphoses.html>.

Boland, Rosita. "Bloomsday is a brilliant marketing ploy – just don't take it too seriously." *The Irish Times*. 15 June 2013. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/bloomsday-is-a-brilliant-marketing-ploy-just-don-t-take-it-too-seriously-1.1429285>.

Boland, Stephanie. "Tome on the Range: Riverrun Through It: Imagining & Reimagining Finnegans Wake." *The Quietus*. 28 Mar. 2014. <https://thequietus.com/articles/14795-riverrun-olwen-fouere-national-theatre-james-joyce-finnegans-wake>.

Bonn, Scott A. "Serial Killer Myth #4: They Want To Get Caught." *Psychology Today*. 8 Feb. 2014. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/wicked-deeds/201409/serial-killer-myth-4-they-want-get-caught/>.

Bowker, Gordon. "An end to bad heir days: The posthumous power of the literary estate." *Independent*, 6 Jan. 2012 (2012a). <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/features/an-end-to-bad-heir-days-the-posthumous-power-of-the-literary-estate-6285277.html>.

Bowring, Billy. "Joyce and Beckett: *Becoming*- (anti-)Oedipal." No date marked. Published in 2009. <https://www.academia.edu/12064678/Joyce_and_Beckett_-_Becoming_Anti_-Oedipal>.

Bristow, Daniel. "Toilet Humour and Ecology on the First Page of *Finnegans Wake*: Žižek's Call of Nature, Answered by Joyce." *International Journal of Zizek Studies*, 1 (2018). <http://zizekstudies.org/index.php/IJZS/article/view/1014>.

Brockman, William S., and Alan M. Cohn, eds. *The James Joyce Checklist*. The Pennsylvania State University Libraries, James Joyce Quarterly at The University of Tulsa and the Harry Ransom Center at The University of Texas at Austin. Edited by Alan M. Cohn from 1963 to 1989. Searchable database online since 2008 (ongoing). <https://norman.hrc.utexas.edu/jamesjoycechecklist/>.

Broughton, Ellie. "Encountering Literary Bots in the Wilds of Twitter: A Novelty, a Surprise, and a Balm for News-Induced Anxiety." *LitHub*. 2 Mar 2017. <https://lithub.com/encountering-literary-bots-in-the-wilds-of-twitter/>.

Brown, Brendan. "Publishing Puzzles: Some Implications of Literary Difficulty for the Editor." Paper. Book Publishing Final Research Paper, 19. May 2016. <http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/18138>.

Brown, Susan. "The Mystery of the Fuga per Canonem Solved." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 7 (2007). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS7/GJS7brown>.

Brown, Terence. "Voices on Joyce: A showcase of Irish takes on James Joyce." Review of Fogarty, Anne, and Fran O'Rourke, eds., *Voices on Joyce*, UCD Press, Dublin, 2015. *The Irish Post*. 13 June 2015. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/voices-on-joyce-a-showcase-of-irish-takes-on-james-joyce-1.2247449>.

Bruneau, Benjamim. "Brett Despotovich." Exhibition review of *Brett Despotovitch* exhibition in Toronto, 9-21 Sep. 2014. *Magenta Magazine*. 2014. <http://www.magentafoundation.org/magazine/brett-despotovich/>.

Burrows, Leah. "Visual forensics to detect fake text." Article. Harvard John A. Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. 25 July 2019. <https://www.seas.harvard.edu/news/2019/07/visual-forensics-to-detect-fake-text>.

Byrne, Michael. "Meet the Anti-Turing Test: Did a human produce this nonsense, or was it a computer?." *Vice*. 27 May 2015. <https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/3dkw3b/meet-the-anti-turing-test>.

Caballero, Alberto. "John Cage – od podmiotu do struktury boromejskiej; dwa rodzaje pisma." For the 12th International Art Festival *Interakcje*, Piotrków Trybunalski, 14 May 2010. <http://www.geifco.org/_webAlberto/descargas/JohnCagepl.pdf>.

CafePress: Custom T-Shirts, Unique Gifts, Posters, & Personalized Mugs. Online store. Founded in 1999. <https://www.cafepress.com/>. Includes: Product 647725763. "Finnegan, Musical Notes Mens Wallet." <https://www.cafepress.com/+finnegan_musical_notes_mens_wallet,647725763>. Product 75702332. "Diagram & Tunc Classic Thong." <https://www.cafepress.com/+diagram_tunc_classic_thong,75702332>.

Caines, Michael. "Re-Joyce-ing on Bloomsday." *The Times Literary Supplement*. 16 June 2016. <https://www.the-tls.co.uk/re-joyce-ing-on-bloomsday/>. [Inactive link.]

Calvo, Josh. "Interview with Josh Calvo: On S. Yizhar's Days of Ziklag, Albert Suissa's Aqud, Volter Kilpi's Alastalon salissa, unjustly untranslated Hebrew and Arabic literary works, and on the present state of Anglophone literature." *The Untranslated*. Blog post. 1 Nov. 2018. <https://theuntranslated.wordpress.com/2018/11/01/interview-with-josh-calvo-on-s-yizhars-days-of-ziklag-albert-suissas-aqud-volter-kilpis-alastalon-salissa-unjustly-untranslated-hebrew-and-arabic-literary-works-and-on-the-present-state-of/>.

Campos, Roque E. de. "Finnegans and the Bible." Blong entry. *Finnegans Wake: James Joyce Finnegans Wake*. 15 Mar. 2018. <https://finneganswake943697706.wordpress.com/2018/03/15/finnegans-and-the-bible/>.

Campbell, Bobby. "James Joyce – Modern Psychonaut." Blog post. *Only Maybe*. 16 June 2015. <http://maybelogic.blogspot.com/2015/06/james-joyce-modern-psychonaut.html>.

Canty, Daniel. "The Translator Relay: Daniel Canty." Interview by Jessie Chaffee. *Words Without Borders: WWB Daily*. 18 Oct. 2017. <https://www.wordswithoutborders.org/dispatches/article/the-translator-relay-daniel-canty-jessie-chaffee>.

Carey, Gabrielle. "Breaking Up with James Joyce." *Sydney Review of Books*. 15 June 2018. <https://sydneyreviewofbooks.com/breaking-james-joyce/>.

Carey, Stan. "Putting language to sleep in Finnegans Wake." Blog post. *Sentence first: An Irishman's blog about the English language*. 16 June 2011. <https://stancarey.wordpress.com/2011/06/16/putting-language-to-sleep-in-finnegans-wake/>.

Carter, Hyatt [HyC]. "HCE in Finnegans Wake." Blog post. *HyC Adventures*. No date marked. Published: 15 June 2011. <http://www.hycadventures.com/page44.php>.

Celentano, Adriano, and Cory Doctorow. "It's Gibberish, But Italian Pop Song Still Means Something." Interview by Guy Raz for *All Things Considered*, NPR. 4 Nov. 2012. Transcript: <https://www.npr.org/2012/11/04/164206468/its-gibberish-but-italian-pop-song-still-means-something 30>.

Chrisafis, Angelique. "Overlong, overrated and unmoving: Roddy Doyle's verdict on James Joyce's Ulysses.". *The Guardian*. 10 Feb. 2004. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2004/feb/10/booksnews.ireland>.

Chrisp, Peter. "A Phoenix Park Nocturne." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 11 Nov. 2013. <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2013/11/a-phoenix-park-nocturne.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "Thunderbolts." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 4 Feb. 2014. <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2014/02/thunderbolts.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "Sentenced to read Finnegans Wake forever!." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 16 Apr. 2015. <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2015/04/sentenced-to-read-finnegans-wake-forever.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "'A complete fiasco' – Malcolm Muggeridge on *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 19 July 2016. <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2016/07/malcolm-muggeridge-is-baffled-by.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "Finnegans Wake as Magical Evocation." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 10 May 2019 (2019a). <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2019/05/finnegans-wake-as-magical-evocation.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "The Battle of James Joyce's Bones 2." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 7 Nov. 2019 (2019b). <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2019/11/the-battle-of-james-joyces-bones-2.html>.

Chrisp, Peter. "Adding Commas to *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *From Swerve of Shore to Bend of Bay*. 15 May. 2020. <http://peterchrisp.blogspot.com/2020/05/adding-commas-to-finnegans-wake.html>.

Christensen, Thomas. "Dodgson's Dodges." Blog post. *Thomas Christensen's Right Reading*. 23 Apr. 1991. <http://www.rightreading.com/writing/dodgsons-dodges.htm>.

Claes, Johnson. *The Clock and the Arrow: A Brief Theory of Time*. Icarus eBooks, 2008. <http://www.csc.kth.se/~cgjoh/theoryoftime.pdf>.

Clark, Carlton [clclark563]. "Meaning(s) in *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *Social Systems Theory*. 1 June 2018. <https://socialsystemstheory.com/2018/06/01/meaning-in-finnegans-wake/>.

Clarke, Jim. [Answer to question "What does the first sentence of 'Finnegans Wake' mean?".] *Quora*. 22 Feb. 2019. <https://www.quora.com/What-does-the-first-sentence-of-Finnegans-Wake-mean>.

Cleverality. "Mouths Making Water – Book Launch." Blog post/announcement. *T.B.A. Popup*. 3 July 2018. <https://tbapopup.wordpress.com/2018/07/03/mouths-making-water-book-launch/>.

de Climont, Jean. *The Worldwide List of Dissident Scientists: Critics And Alternative Theories*. Issue: June 2016. Editions d'Assailly. (First published in 2012.) <http://editionsassailly.com/dissidents.htm>.

Clute, John, and David Pringle [JC/DP]. "Aldiss, Brian W." Encyclopedic entry. *SFE: The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. 3rd edition. Eds. John Clute, David Langford, Peter Nicholls, and Graham Sleight. London: Gollancz, 2011. (First published in 1979. The 3rd edition made available online in 2011.) <http://www.sf-encyclopedia.com/entry/aldiss_brian_w>.

Coles, Stephen. "*Finnegans Wake*, 1st edition." Post. *Fonts in Use*. 24 Feb. 2015. <https://fontsinuse.com/uses/8900/finnegans-wake-1st-edition>.

Conger, Steve. "*Finnegans Wake*: First Sentence." Blog post. *Steve Conger*. 29 June 2011. <http://spconger.blogspot.com/2011/06/finnegans-wake-first-sentence.html>.

Conley, Tim. "How Limited is Your Edition? Meditations on a New Wake." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (2010-2011). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v11_1/main/essays.php?essay=conley>.

Contrada, Fred. "Finnegans Wake is Greek to me, and Latin and Slavic and a dozen other languages I don't know." *MassLive Media*. 26 Jan. 2015. <https://www.masslive.com/living/index.ssf/2015/01/finnegans_wake_is_greek_to_me_and_latin_and_slavic_and_a_dozen_other_languages_i_dont_know.html>.

Cooper, Neil. "*Finnegans Wake* for theatre? It was one of those moments." *Sunday Herald*. 25 July 2014. <http://www.heraldscotland.com/arts_ents/13171638._Finnegans_Wake_for_theatre__It_was_one_of_those_moments_/>.

Costa, Élise. "«Finnegans Wake» est-elle l'œuvre d'un psychopathe ou une des plus grandes impostures du XXe siècle?." *Slate^FR*. 18 Jan. 2017. <http://www.slate.fr/story/134798/finnegans-wake-enigme-james-joyce>.

Coulthart, John. "Passages from James Joyce's Finnegans Wake." Blog post. *{feuilleton}*. 18 July 2008. <http://www.johncoulthart.com/feuilleton/2008/07/18/passages-from-james-joyces-finnegans-wake/>.

Crane, Tim. "The peer review industry: implausible and outrageous." *The Times Literary Supplement*. 23 Oct. 2018. <https://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/peer-review-industry-implausible-outrageous/>.

Crispi, Luca. "The *James Joyce Archive* from an Archival Perspective." *Genetic Joyce Studies*. Special Issue. 2002. <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJSSI/JJALuca>.

Crook, Simon. "A Ruby and Triangled Sign upon the Forehead of Taurus: Modalities of Revelation in Megalithic Archaeoastronomy and James Joyce's Novels *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*." *Religions*, 11 (2018). <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/9/11/375/pdf>.

Crowe, Stephen. "Dante's Wake." Blog post. *Wake in Progress*. 11 Jan. 2012. <http://www.wakeinprogress.com/2012/01/dantes-wake.html>.

Crowe, Stephen. "Some More Thought on *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *Wake in Progress*. 24 Jan. 2015. <http://www.wakeinprogress.com/2015/01/some-more-thoughts-on-reading-finnegans.html>.

Crowley, Ronan. ""His Dark Materials": Joyce's "Scribblings" and the Notes for "Circe" in the National Library of Ireland." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 6 (2006). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS6/GJS6Crowley>.

Dalzell, Tom. "A Lacanian Reading of Paternity in James Joyce." *European Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 16 Jan. 2017. <http://www.journal-psychoanalysis.eu/a-lacanian-reading-of-paternity-in-james-joyce/>.

Davies, Jeremy M. "A Chorale of Dead Souls." Review of Ó Cadhain, Máirtín, *The Dirty Dust: Cré na Cille*, trans. Alan Titley, Yale University Press, n.d. *The Quarterly Conversation*, 41 (2015). [14 Sep. 2015.] <http://quarterlyconversation.com/a-chorale-of-dead-souls>. [Inactive link.]

Davis, Erik. "Foreword: HFT The Gardener. Suzanne Treister's latest art project." *Techgnosis*. 23 Feb. 2016. <https://techgnosis.com/forword-hft-the-gardener/>.

Dehany, AJ. "Fig-2 Week 30 – 27 July-2 August – Anna Barham (by AJ Dehany)." *Artlyst*. 28 Aug. 2015. <https://www.artlyst.com/news/fig2-week-30-27-july2-august-anna-barham-by-aj-dehany/>.

Denizen, Venice. "Who is Gerry Fialka? – Part Two." *Abbot Kinney First Fridays*. 6 June 2013. <https://abbotkinneyfirstfridays.com/who-is-gerry-fialka-part-two/>.

Deppman, Jed. "Joyce and the Case for Genetic Criticism." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 6 (2006). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS6/GJS6Deppman>.

"Directory of *Finnegans Wake* Reading Groups." Webpage. The Finnegans Wake Society of New York. Published in 2006. <https://finneganswake.org/ReadingGroups.shtml>.

Dobbs, Robert. "Bob Dobbs Explains *Finnegans Wake* via the Ten Thunders." With Connie Dobbs and Gerry Fialka. Lecture given in Costa Rica, January 26, 1992. Published as blog post. *iON & Bob*. 2013. <https://ionandbob.blogspot.com/2013/12/bob-dobbs-explains-finnegans-wake-via.html/>.

Doyle, Roddy. *Let's all shout 'But!'*. UCD. Writings on Joyce. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2012. <https://www.ucd.ie/ucdonjoyce/writings-on-joyce/articles/lets-all-shout-but-roddy-doyle/index.html>.

Drożdż, Stanisław [contact person]. "Multifraktale sugerują istnienie nieznanego mechanizmu fizycznego na Słońcu." Article. Kraków: IFN PAN. 29 Apr. 2015. <https://press.ifj.edu.pl/news/2015/04/>.

Duggan, Bob. "Hearing and Seeing James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* Anew." Article/Review. *big think*. 11 Aug. 2014. <https://bigthink.com/Picture-This/hearing-and-seeing-james-joyces-finnegans-wake-anew>.

Dumitrescu, Alexandra. "Bootstrapping *Finnegans Wake*." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (2006). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v7/essays/dumitrescu.htm>.

Dunajko, Paweł. "GI McBart MIDItape: *Finnegans Wake* Remixed." *Radio Alternator Com*. Wrocław, 28 Jan. 2014. <https://www.radio-alternator.com/alternator/2014-01-28-slow-audycja-audycja-w-wolnym-wymiarze-presents-gi-mcbart-miditape/>.

Duncan, Pamela. "Publication of James Joyce Collection Divides Scholars." *The Irish Times*. 15 June 2013. <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/publication-of-james-joyce-collection-divides-scholars-1.1430440>.

Duszenko, Andrzej. *The Joyce of Science: New Physics in "Finnegans Wake"*. Website with 8 webpages. 1997. <http://duszenko.northern.edu/joyce/>. [Inactive link.]

Eco, Umberto. "Some Remarks on a New Realism." Address to the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy, Athens, 4-10 Aug. 2013. (Published in "Selected Papers from the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy: Philosophy as Inquiry and Way of Life." *Journal of Philosophical Research*, vol. 40, Issue Supplement, 2015. 387-395.) Quoted from a 13 pages long [unpaginated] version online: <https://nuovorealismo.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/eco_wcp.pdf>.

Elder Scrolls Wiki, The. s.v. "The Monomyth." Online encyclopedia. 2019 (ongoing). <https://elderscrolls.wikia.com/wiki/The_Monomyth>.

Fahy, Alan. [Answer to question "Are James Joyce's works overrated?".] *Quora*. 14 Sep. 2017. <https://www.quora.com/Are-James-Joyces-works-overrated>.

Faktorovich, Anna. "Book Reviews: Spring 2020." Blog post. Including: "Nonsensical Anti-Scholarship about Joyce's Nonsense Novel." Review of McHugh, Roland, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*, 2016 (4th ed.). Blog post. 2020. <https://anaphoraliterary.com/journals/plj/plj-excerpts/book-reviews-spring-2020/>.

"FAQs: Publication Formats, Reprints, Editions, etc." Webpage. *ISBN.org by Bowker*. 2014. <http://www.isbn.org/faqs_formats_reprints_editions/>.

Ferguson, Andrew. "Let's Play *Finnegans Wake*." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 13 (2014b). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v13_1/main/essays.php?essay=ferguson>.

"Fifty-Year Index, *James Joyce Quarterly*, Volumes 1-50." Compiled by the Staff of the *JJQ*. *James Joyce Quarterly*. 2008. <https://jjq.utulsa.edu/Fifty-Year%20Index%20Master%20PDF.pdf>. [Inactive link.]

Fimi, Dimitra. "Language as Communication vs. Language as Art: J. R. R. Tolkien and early 20th-century radical experimentation." *Journal of Tolkien Research*, 1 (2018): 1-28. <https://scholar.valpo.edu/journaloftolkienresearch/vol5/iss1/2>.

Finnegan, Tim. "[Joyce's numerology]." Blog post. *Finnegans Wake page-a-day*. 20 Dec. 2014. <http://fwpages.blogspot.com/2013/12/joyces-numerology.html>.

"Finnegans Wake, The Final Chapter: The Illnesstraited Colossick Idition." Website with 5 webpages: Home webpage. *afipr: An artist owned production company currently featuring Tim Ahern's illustrations for Finnegans Wake*. No date marked. Published in 2012. <http://www.afipr.com/>.

"Finn's Hotel FAQ: Answers to commonly asked questions." Webpage. Ithys Press. No date marked. Published in June 2013. <https://ithyspress.wordpress.com/titles/finns-hotel-by-james-joyce/background-to-the-publication-of-finns-hotel/finns-hotel-faq-answers-to-commonly-asked-questions/>.

Flood, Alison. "Bloomsday fans celebrate as James Joyce scholars do battle." *The Guardian*. 16 June 2012. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/jun/16/bloomsday-fans-james-joyce-scholars>.

Fogarty, Anne. "Joyce and Popular Culture." Transcript of a recording. *UCDScholarcast*. Dublin: UCD. 27 Mar. 2008. <https://www.ucd.ie/scholarcast/transcripts/Joyce_and_Popular_Culture.pdf>.

Fogarty, Sharon. "Brighton Festival: Finding Lucia." Interview by Andrew Kay. *The Latest Brighton*. 28 Apr. 2015. <https://thelatest.co.uk/brighton/2015/04/28/brighton-festival-finding-lucia/>.

Fomenko, Elena. "A Linguistic-Synergetic Approach to James Joyce." *Jazyk a kultúra*. 8 (2017a). <https://www.ff.unipo.sk/jak/31-32_2017/Olena_Fomenko_studia.pdf>.

Fordham, Finn. "James Joyce and Birthdays." *OUPblog*. Blog post. 2 Feb. 2013 (2013a). <https://blog.oup.com/2013/02/james-joyce-and-birthdays/>.

Fordham, Finn. "Waking Up to Finnegans Wake: Finn Fordham on "Textual Complexities" of James Joyce's Most "Absorbing" Novel." Interview by Charles Carlini. *Simply Charly*. Blog post. 29 Oct. 2014. <https://simplycharly.com/interviews/waking-up-to-finnegans-wake-finn-fordham-on-textual-complexities-of-james-joyces-most-absorbing-novel/>.

Friedman, Amelia. "America's Lacking Language Skills." *The Atlantic*. 10 May 2015. <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/05/filling-americas-language-education-potholes/392876/>.

fundagain. "In Finnegans Wake, surely the dreamer is this character?." Post in discussion forum. *Literature Stack Exchange*. 25 Apr. 2018. Edited 26 Apr. 2018 (2018a). <https://literature.stackexchange.com/questions/6430/in-finnegans-wake-surely-the-dreamer-is-this-character>.

fundagain. "In Finnegans Wake, surely these two characters are different, and one is dead?." Post in discussion forum. *Literature Stack Exchange*. 18 May 2018. Edited 24 Aug. 2018 (2018b). <https://literature.stackexchange.com/questions/6593/in-finnegans-wake-surely-these-two-characters-are-different-and-one-is-dead>.

Fuse, Mikio. "Interview with Professor Mikio Fuse." Interview by Scarlett Baron. *James Joyce Quarterly*. 14 June 2019. <https://jjq.utulsa.edu/interview-with-professor-mikio-fuse/>.

Fyffe, Richard. "Conversational Constraints: Richard Rorty and Contemporary Critical Theory." Paper presented at the Midwinter Meeting of the English and American Literature Section, ACRL. Jan. 1996. Quoted from a 10 pages long version online: <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/972/Conversational%20Constraints%20ALA.pdf>.

Gabriel, Richard. "Lisp: Good News, Bad News, How to Win Big." 2 Dec. 2000. <https://www.dreamsongs.com/Files/LispGoodNewsBadNews.pdf>.

Galindo, Caetano. [Answer to question "Are James Joyce's works overrated?".] *Quora*. 7 Aug. 2017. <https://www.quora.com/Are-James-Joyces-works-overrated>.

García, Dory, and Aaron Schuster. "Dora García. The Joycean Society." *Vdrome*. Mousse Magazine and Publishing. 2013. <http://www.vdrome.org/dora-garcia-the-joycean-society>.

Geser, Hans. "Political Correctness: mental disorder, childish fad or adavance of human civilization?." Zurich: University of Zurich. 2010. <https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/48420/>.

Gioia, Ted. "The Adventurer's Guide to *Finnegans Wake*." Website. *fractious fiction*. 5 June 2013. <http://fractiousfiction.com/finnegans_wake.html>.

Gliński, Mikołaj. "Are Quarks Made of Curd Cheese? The Link between Quantum Physics & a Slavic Food Speciality." *Culture.pl*. 27 June 2016 (2016a). <https://culture.pl/en/article/are-quarks-made-of-curd-cheese-the-link-between-quantum-physics-a-slavic-food-speciality>.

Gliński, Mikołaj. "First We Feel Then We Fall: Finnegans Wake On-screen." *Culture.pl*. 18 Aug. 2016 (2016b). <https://culture.pl/en/article/first-we-feel-then-we-fall-finnegans-wake-on-screen>.

Głowiński, Michał. "Zrobieni w Gombrowicza." Interview by Anna Gromnicka. *Wprost*, 26 (2013). 24 June 2013. <https://www.wprost.pl/tygodnik/405244/zrobieni-w-gombrowicza.html>.

Goldsmith, Kenneth. "Exchanging mail with Kenneth Goldsmith: An Interview." Interview by A. S. Bessa. *zingmagazine*. 11 (1999). <http://www.zingmagazine.com/zing11/bessa/index.html>.

Greaves, Mark. "How one Iraqi poet translated Joyce's *Ulysses* into Arabic." *4: News*. 16 Jun. 2014. <https://www.channel4.com/news/james-joyce-ulysses-bloomsday-ireland-salah-niazif-arabic>.

Griffiths, Mark D. "Doze Were the Days: A brief look at somnophilia." *Psychology Today*. 4 Feb. 2004. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/in-excess/201402/doze-were-the-days/>.

Groden, Michael. "English 9014A — Fall 2012: Introductory Notes on *Finnegans Wake*." University of Western Ontario, 2012. <https://instruct.uwo.ca/english/9014a/fwintro.html>.

Groden, Michael. "English 9096A. *James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. Fall 2013. A Selective *Finnegans Wake* Bibliography." Description of an academic course. University of Western Ontario, 2013a. <https://instruct.uwo.ca/english/9096A/bibliography.html>.

Groden, Michael. "English 9096A. *James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. Fall 2013." Description of an academic course. University of Western Ontario, 2013b. <https://instruct.uwo.ca/english/9096A/index.html>.

Groden, Michael. "Modernizing and Regularizing / Editing *Ulysses*." Powerpoint presentation attached to: English 9002A. *Bibliography and Textual Studies*." University of Western Ontario. 11 Nov. 2013 (2013c). PDF version. <https://instruct.uwo.ca/english/9002a/Nov11_9002A_Modernizing.pdf>.

Grudnik, Krzysztof. "Za siedmioma kiążkami… (Michał Larek: 'Sorytelling'." *ArtPAPIER*. 15 Nov. 2019. <http://www.artpapier.com/index.php?page=artykul&wydanie=382&artykul=7604>.

Grunbaum, Misha. "Finnegans Ache: 5 Unreadable Books." Blog post. *The Airship*. No date marked. Published in Aug. 2012. <http://airshipdaily.com/blog/finnegans-ache-5-unreadable-books>.

Hadley, Scott Manley. "*King Jesus* by Robert Graves." Review. Blog post. *Triumph of the Now*. 31 Aug. 2014. <https://triumphofthenow.com/2014/08/31/review-king-jesus-by-robert-graves/>.

Hadley, Scott Manley. "*A Shorter Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce, ed. Anthony Burgess." Review. Blog post. *Triumph of the Now*. 30 Dec. 2016. <https://triumphofthenow.com/2016/12/30/a-shorter-finnegans-wake-by-james-joyce-edited-anthony-burgess>.

Harris, William. "*Finnegans Wake*: Secret Allusion and Hidden Meaning." Webpage. No date marked. Published in 2002. <http://community.middlebury.edu/~harris/Humanities/joyceps.html>. [Archived link.]

Harris, William. "James Joyce: Was he insane…?." Webpage. No date marked. Published in 2006. <http://community.middlebury.edu/~harris/joyce.sanity.html>. [Archived link.]

Harvey, Adam. "DON'T PANIC: it's only Finnegans Wake – thunderword #5." YouTube video. 21 Oct. 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oqbEwlCh-8g/>.

Harvey, Adam. *Finnegans' Workbook: A Line Reference Guide to the Work of Joyce Scholars and Exegetes*. Started in 1994 as download from website maintained by Bill Cadbury and Donald Theall. 26 Jan. 2015 (2015a). <https://joycegeek.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/finnegans-workbook.pdf>.

Harvey, Adam. "Crossing the Deadly Line: An Overdue Rant." Blog post. *JoyceGeek: A James Joyce Blogsite*. 29 Jan. 2015 (2015b). <https://joycegeek.com/2015/01/29/deadly/>.

Harvey, Adam. "Readings from the Lunatic Fringe." Blog post. *JoyceGeek: A James Joyce Blogsite*. 6 Aug. 2015 (2015c). <https://joycegeek.com/2015/08/06/lunatic/>.

Hayes, James. "Finnegan, Begin Again: The Strange Appeal Of The World's Most Unreadable Book." *Factinate*. 3 May 2019. <https://www.factinate.com/editorial/finnegan-unreadable-book/>.

Hayman, David, ed. *James Joyce Scholars' Collection*. Online collection of texts. University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries, 2001 (ongoing). Includes the following texts (Author, alphabetically): B. Benstock 1965; Bonheim 1967; Glasheen 1977; C. Hart 1962; Hayman 1990; Joyce 1963; Mink 1978; M. Norris 1976; O Hehir 1967; O Hehir and Dillon 1977; Peake 1977; Scholes and Kain 1965b. <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/JoyceColl/Browse.html>.

Hays, Ian. "A Dedication and Tribute to Donald F. Theall. Joyce, Duchamp, and McLuhan." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 2 (2008). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v9_2/essays/hays.htm>.

Healy, Yvonne. "The Gospel According to Joyce." *The Irish Times*. 12 Dec. 2000. <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/education/the-gospel-according-to-joyce-1.1120807>.

Henebury, Paul. "Contemporary Hermeneutical Theory and Conservative Interpretation." Webpage. *Spirit and Truth*. 2015. <http://www.spiritandtruth.org/teaching/documents/articles/210/210.htm>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan. "Irish Rivers Nr. X, The Tolka." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 9 (2009). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS9/GJS9_Henkes>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan. "Before King Roderick Became Publican in Chapelizod: The origins of the origins of *Finnegans Wake*." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 12 (2012). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS12/GJS12_Henkes>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan. "2 Weeks in the Life of James Joyce." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 13 (2013). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/static/issues/GJS13/GJS13_Henkes.pdf>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "The Tulsey Town Treasure Trove: Preliminary Report on the Rediscovered *Finnegans Wake* Proofs." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 3 (2003). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS3/TulsaHenkesBindervoet>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "*Finnegans Wake*, the Corrected Text." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 4 (2004a). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS4/GJS4_RJE_Corrected_Text>.

Henkes, Robbert-Jan, and Erik Bindervoet. "Oversystematizing the *Wake*: The Quiz Chapter as the Key to a Potential Schema for *Finnegans Wake*." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 4 (2004b). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS4/GJS4_RJE_Quiz>.

Henry, Jim. "Note on 'sequel' and words derived from it like 'prequel' and 'paraquel'." Website. *Jim Henry III*. Dec. 2008. <http://jimhenry.conlang.org/review/paraquel.htm>.

Herr, Cheryl. "Blue Notes: From Joyce to Jarman." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (1999). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v2/herr/index.html>.

Hervé, Michel, trans. *Veillée Pinouilles*. French translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. 2015. <https://sites.google.com/site/finicoincequoique/>.

Hervé, Michel. "Translating *Finnegans Wake*: An Interview with Hervé Michel." Interview by Derek Pyle. *Asymptote Journal*. 6 Mar. 2017. <https://www.asymptotejournal.com/blog/2017/03/06/translating-finnegans-wake-an-interview-with-herve-michel/>.

Hill, Lisa. "Finnegans Wake, (Folio Edition) by James Joyce (with help from Tindall and Campbell) #1 Getting started." Blog post. *ANZ LitLovers LitBlog*. 21 Mar. 2017. <https://anzlitlovers.com/2017/03/21/finnegans-wake-folio-edition-by-james-joyce-with-help-from-tindall-and-campbell-1-getting-started/>.

Hise, Stephen. "The Difference Between a Writer and an Author." Post. *Indies Unlimited*. 28 June 2012. <https://www.indiesunlimited.com/2012/06/28/the-difference-between-a-writer-and-an-author/>.

Hitchcock, Spencer [spencerhitch]. "English words ratio caligulated." Webpage. iPython Notebook project for textual analysis of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. *GitHub*. 19 Oct. 2015 <https://github.com/spencerhitch/wakeNLP/commit/f6613d20ef12a73cd14440e039bc59da0ee4041a>.

Hitt, Jack. "The Strange Case of the Missing Joyce Scholar." *The New York Time Magazine*. June 12, 2018. <https://mobile.nytimes.com/2018/06/12/magazine/the-strange-case-of-the-missing-joyce-scholar.html>.

Ho, Simon. "Real purpose of academic research is to seek truth." *China Daily (HK Edition)*. 30 Apr. 2014: 9. <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/hkedition/2014-04/30/content_17475199.htm>.

Holm, Chandra, and Sabrina Alonso. "About me: Ch+Sa." *Finnegans Wake on Thursday*. Blog started in 2013 (ongoing.) <http://thursdayswake.blogspot.com/>.

Hui, Phoebe. "Interview with Phoebe Hui." Interview by Enoch Cheng. *Asia Art Archive*. 1 Feb. 2011. <https://aaa.org.hk/en/ideas/ideas/interview-with-phoebe-hui/>.

iAhuasca. "The Last Word Pt.1: Philip K Dick on Finnegans Wake." Blog post. *iAhuasca*. 14 July 2016. <http://iahuasca.blogspot.com/2016/07/the-last-word-pt1.html>.

Illingworth, Dustin. "'A Certain Riddle of the Sphinx': The Enduring Mystery of the Voynich Manuscript." *Los Angeles Review of Books*, 3 Feb. 2017. <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/a-certain-riddle-of-the-sphinx-the-enduring-mystery-of-the-voynich-manuscript/>.

"In Memoriam." John Carroll University: *Faculty Notes*, 1 (2020): 9. <https://collected.jcu.edu/faculty_notes/40>.

Israel, Nico. "ENGL 76000. Nico Israel. Literature's Wake. Wednesdays 4:15PM-6:15PM. 2/4 credits." Spring 2019 English Program Course Offerings. New York: The City University of New York, 2019. <https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Doctoral-Programs/English/Old-courses/Spring-2019>.

Ito, Eshiro. "How Did Buddhism Influence James Joyce and Kenji Miyazawa?." Webpage on the website *Atelier Atui*. 2004a. <http://p-www.iwate-pu.ac.jp/~acro-ito/Joycean_Essays/J&KM_Buddha.html>.

Ito, Eshiro. "Two Japanese Translations of *Finnegans Wake* Compared: Yanase (1991-1993) and Miyata (2004)." Webpage on the website *Atelier Atui*. 2004b. <http://p-www.iwate-pu.ac.jp/~acro-ito/Joycean_Essays/FW_2JapTranslations.html>.

Ito, Eshiro. "Joyce in the Machine/Re-Joyce in the Digital Humanities." Published by the James Joyce Society of Korea, in *James Joyce Journal*, 2 (2019): 105-125. <http://www.joycesociety.or.kr/data/thesis/11206425632463.pdf>.

Jakubowiak, Maciej. "Kataglotyzm wkręcidreszcza." *Dwutygodnik*, 160 (2015). <https://www.dwutygodnik.com/artykul/5945-kataglotyzm-wkrecidreszcza.html>.

Jewell, Sara. "Star Wars and Finnegans Wake." Blog post. *Waywords and Meansigns: Recreating Finnegans Wake [in its Whole Wholume]*. 4 Jan. 2016. <http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/news-bartnicki-star-wars-finnegans-wake/>.

Jolin, Dan. "Infographic: Movie Franchise Lexicon." *Empire*. 9 Jan. 2010. <https://www.empireonline.com/movies/features/movie-franchise-lexicon-infographic/>.

Jones, Paul Anthony. "*Opus Clavicembalisticum*: The Longest Piece of Piano Music Ever Performed." *Mental Floss*. 5 July 2016. <https://mentalfloss.com/article/82377/opus-clavicembalisticum-longest-piece-piano-music-ever-performed>.

Joy, Eileen. "Faith of a Kind: Aggressive Hermeneutics, Felicitous Weak Ontologies, and the Possibility of Interpretive Communities." Blog post. *In the Middle*. 14 Mar. 2009. <https://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2009/03/figure-1.html>.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Web*. Website established online in 1999. Includes a *Webified version of James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake"*: wepages with scanned text of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, edition of 1950 (Faber). Eds. Donald Theall, and Tim Szeliga. Marked online as last modified on 4 June 2002 (2002b). <https://www.trentu.ca/faculty/jjoyce/fw.htm>. [Inactive link.]

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake Extensible Elucidation Treasury*. Search engine. Includes an electronic text of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. Ed. Raphael Slepon. Established 2005. <http://www.fweet.org/>.

Joyce, James. *Glosses of Finnegans Wake*. Website. Includes an electronic text of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. With annotations edited by Sinisa Stojakovic. Established 2006. <http://finwake.com/>.

Joyce, James. "The First Two Pages of the Filmscript for *Passages from Finnegans Wake*." Ed. Mary Ellen Bute. *Flashpoint*, 12 (2009). <http://www.flashpointmag.com/butescript.htm>.

Joyce, James. "Juto & Muto (um excerto do *Finnegans Wake*)." Trans. Caetano Galindo. Bilingual ed. with Brazilian-Portuguese (partial) translation of *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce. *Quorpus*, 3 (2019): 151-157. <https://qorpuspget.paginas.ufsc.br/files/2019/12/15-Caetano-GalindoQORPUS_V9_N3-ESPECIAL-JAMES-JOYCE_DEZ-2019.pdf>.

Jousni, Stéphane. "Incest, Lit(t)erally: How Joyce Censored The *Wake*." *Revue LISA e-journal*. 11 (2013). <https://journals.openedition.org/lisa/5466>.

Kaiman, Jonathan. "*Finnegans Wake* becomes a hit book in China." *The Guardian*. 5 Feb. 2013. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/feb/05/finnegans-wake-china-james-joyce-hit>.

Kaleva, William A. "I believe that FW was held up for publication in Australia for years because of dirty words." Review of Tindall, William York, a *Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*. Amazon.fr. 6 Jan. 2017. <https://www.amazon.com/gp/customer-reviews/R89C2W195UXV1/ref=cm_cr_arp_d_rvw_ ttl? ie=UTF8&ASIN=0815603851>.

Kay, Larry. "'A New Postmodern Condition': Why Disinformation Has Become So Effective." *Small Wars Journal*. 23 Feb. 2020. <https://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/new-postmodern-condition-why-disinformation-has-become-so-effective>.

Keating, Sara. "Ebooks: Joyce and 'Ulysses' as you've never experienced them before." *The Irish Times*. 20 June 2015. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/ebooks-joyce-and-ulysses-as-you-ve-never-experienced-them-before-1.2255958>.

Kelley, Claire. "Controversy erupts as "undiscovered" Joyce manuscript is published just in time for Bloomsday." Post. *Melville House*. 17 June 2013. <https://www.mhpbooks.com/controversy-erupts-as-undiscovered-joyce-manuscript-is-published-just-in-time-for-bloomsday/>.

Kellman, Steven G. "James Joyce for Ordinary Blokes?." Review of Kiberd, Declan, *Ulysses and Us: The Art of Everyday Life in Joyce's Masterpiece*, 2009. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 21 Sep 2009. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/James-Joyce-for-Ordinary/48427>.

Kelly, Adam. "David Foster Wallace: The Death of the Author and the Birth of a Discipline." *Irish Journal of American Studies Online*, 2 (2010). <http://ijas.iaas.ie/article-david-foster-wallace-the-death-of-the-author-and-the-birth-of-a-discipline/>.

Kera, Denisa. "The difference between psychoanalyses wake and the Finnegans Wake in the wake of new media." *CUNI – Univerzita Karlova*. 1999. <http://www1.cuni.cz/~rihad/med/joyce.pdf>.

Kidney, Eoghan. "Travelling back in time to Dublin in the 1900's thanks to a Ulysses and VR collision." Blog post. 8 June 2017. <https://www.accenture.com/ie-en/blogs/blogs-ulysses-vr>.

Killeen, Terrence. "An Irishman's Diary." *The Irish Times*. 16 Dec. 1997. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/an-irishman-s-diary-1.137904>.

Killeen, Terrence. "A flawed 'Finnegans' wake-up call." *The Irish Times*. 13 Mar. 2010. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/a-flawed-finnegans-wake-up-call-1.637453>.

Killeen, Terrence. "Tackling the "errears and erroriboose": Another Look at the Rose/O'Hanlon *Finnegans Wake*." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 13 (2013). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/static/issues/GJS13/GJS13_Killeen.pdf>.

Killeen, Terrence. "Happy returns – an Irishman's Diary on Joyce scholar Fritz Senn." *The Irish Times*. 2 Jan. 2018. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/happy-returns-an-irishman-s-diary-on-joyce-scholar-fritz-senn-1.3342036>.

Kitcher, Philip. "Life After Faith." Interview by Richard Marshall. *3:AM Magazine*. 2 Aug. 2015. <http://www.3ammagazine.com/3am/74992/>. [Inactive link.]

Koenders, Leo J. M., collector. "James Joyce – Unique Books. Artist's books from the collection of Leo J. M. Koenders." Exhibition. Fribourg: Musée Gutenberg. May 2011. Collection online: Koenders, I. *James Joyce Unique Books – collection Leo J. M. Koenders*. Website with numerous webpages. First published in 2004-2006. Republished in 2015. <http://www.jamesjoycesnotgreen.com/index.php>.

Kolakowski, Nick. "Unleashing Machine Learning on Literature's Great Works: My dreams of an ML/text startup inch toward reality." *Medium*. 14 May 2019. <https://medium.com/swlh/unleashing-machine-learning-on-literatures-great-works-1dcd664d4a59>.

Krukowski, Aleksander. "Recenzja książki *Finneganów tren*." Review. *Gildia.pl*. 2 July 2012. <https://www.literatura.gildia.pl/tworcy/james-joyce/finneganow-tren/recenzja>.

Ktownkemist. "*Finnegans Wake*: An Analysis." A comment in discussion online. *Reddit*. 24 July 2019. <https://www.reddit.com/r/AskLiteraryStudies/comments/cgmmdc/finnegans_wake_an_analysis/>.

Kucharczyk, Wojciech. "*Finneganów tren* i inne historie, czyta Wojciech Kucharczyk." Skoczów. Nov. 2012. <http://www.ha.art.pl/aktualnosci/wiadomosci/2693-finneganow-tren-i-inne-historie-czyta-wojciech-kucharczyk.html>.

Kurnick, David. "Numberiness." In: "Three Responses to "Ulysses by Numbers"" (with James F. English: "The Resistance to Counting, Recounting"; Hoyt Long & Richard Jean So: "'A Hail of Information': *Ulysses*, Topic Modeled"). *Representations*. 13 Jan. 2015. <http://www.representations.org/three-responses-to-ulysses-by-numbers/>.

Kurt, Will. "Writing *Finnegans Wake* with a Recurrent Neural Net." Blog post. *Count Bayesie*. 26 May 2015. <https://www.countbayesie.com/blog/2015/5/24/writing-finnegans-wake-with-a-recurrent-neural-net>.

Lacabanne, Raúl. *@wake # 1/6*. YouTube video. 19 Mar. 2007. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koA-NYdrAeY&t=479s>.

Laird, John. "The Key to Finnegans Wake: An Australian View. Part I." Website. 2007a. <http://www.johnlaird.net/FinnegansWake01.htm>.

Laird, John. "The Key to Finnegans Wake: An Australian View. Part II." Website. 2007b. <http://www.johnlaird.net/FinnegansWake02.htm>.

Lanari, Mariana. "Waywords & Meansigns—Composing with the Explosion of Language." Interview by Rebecca Hanssens-Reed. *Asymptote Journal*. 11 May 2015. <https://www.asymptotejournal.com/blog/2015/05/11/waywords-meansigns-composing-with-the-explosion-of-language/>.

Latham, Sean. "JJQ Anti-Harassment Statement." *James Joyce Quarterly*. 29 Nov. 2018. <https://jjq.utulsa.edu/jjq-anti-harassment-statement/>.

Lawrence, Casey. Series of tweets on Tim Conley's address: "Petitions Full of Pieces of Pottery" at the *Finnegans Wake at 80* symposium at Trinity College, Dublin. *Twitter*. 12 Apr. 2019. Opening tweet: <https://twitter.com/MyExplodingPen/status/1116650188838461440>.

LeBlanc, Jim. "The Closing Word of *Finnegans Wake*." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (1999a). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v2/leblanc/index.html>.

Leblanc, Jim. "*Finnegans Wake*, Provection and the Threshold of Plausibility." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 3 (2018). <https://hypermediajoyce.wordpress.com/leblanc-wake-provection-threshold-plausibility/>.

Ledwith, Sean. "Finnegans Wake, fascism, and the essential unity of the human race." *Culture Matters*. 3 Sep. 2019. <https://www.culturematters.org.uk/index.php/arts/fiction/item/3120-finnegans-wake-fascism-and-the-essential-unity-of-the-human-race>.

LeMoine, Bob. "Nailing Jelly to the Wall: Understanding Postmodernism's Influence on Library Information Science." *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 3 (2012). <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/701>.

Lerm Hayes, Christa-Maria. "Re-inventing the Literary Exhibition: Exhibiting (Dialogical and Subversive) Art on (James Joyce's) Literature." *Working Papers on Design*, 2 (2007). <https://www.herts.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0012/12324/WPD_vol2_lermhayes.pdf>.

Letzler, David. "Error, Correction, and Redundancy in *Finnegans Wake*." Paper. The 2011 North American James Joyce Conference. San Marino and Pasadena, CA. 12 June 2011. Online: <https://www.academia.edu/6045135/Error_Correction_and_Redundancy_in_Finnegans_Wake>.

Libera, Antoni. "Pisarz, którego sukces nie zmienił ani na jotę." Interview by Jacek Tomczuk. *Dziennik*, 62 (2009) / *Dodatek*. 14 Mar. 2009. <https://www.e-teatr.pl/pl/artykuly/69315,druk.html>.

Linehan, Hugh. "So, like, what's up with the Irish accent?." *The Irish Times*. 18 Feb. 2016. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/so-like-what-s-up-with-the-irish-accent-1.2539989>.

Lillington, Karlin. "Portrait of the Artist as Webmaster." *The Irish Times*. 16 June 1998. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/portrait-of-the-artist-as-webmaster-1.163564>.

Linguist-in-Waiting. "Book Review: *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce." Blog post. *Memoirs of a Traveling Linguist: Year 12*. 28 Aug. 2016. <https://www.linguist-in-waiting.com/2016/08/book-review-finnegans-wake-by-james.html>.

Lipták, Michal. "Michal Lipták's Reviews > Finnegans Wake." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake*. *Goodreads*. 3 Feb. 2018. <https://www.goodreads.com/review/show/2282690001>.

Lopez, Susie. "*Finnegan's Wake* at 80: In Defense of the Difficult On the Pleasure of Annotating One of Literature's Most Challenging Works." *Literary Hub*. 3 May 2019. <https://lithub.com/finnegans-wake-at-80-in-defense-of-the-difficult/>.

Loynd, Stephen. "How James Joyce predicted Conor McGregor's triumph in Finnegans Wake." *The Irish Times*. 15 Dec. 2015. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/how-james-joyce-predicted-conor-mcgregor-s-triumph-in-finnegans-wake-1.2467331>.

M., Ian. "Can You Tell the Difference Between Finnegans Wake and Total Nonsense?." Blog post. *union.io*. 30 Nov. 2016. <https://blog.union.io/thoughts/2016/11/30/finnegans-wake/>.

McCarthy, Patrick A. "Finnegans Wake on Film." *Flashpoint*, 12 (2009). <https://www.flashpointmag.com/pmfilm.htm>.

McCarthy, Tom. "'Ulysses' and Its Wake." *London Review of Books*, 12 (2014): 39-41. <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v36/n12/tom-mccarthy/ulysses-and-its-wake>.

McCarthy, Tom. "The death of writing – if James Joyce were alive today he'd be working for Google." *The Guardian*. 7 Mar. 2015 (2015a). <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/mar/07/tom-mccarthy-death-writing-james-joyce-working-google>.

McCarthy, Tom. "Tom McCarthy by Frederic Tuten." Interview by Frederic Tuten. *BOMB: Artists in Conversation*, 131 (2015) [2015b]. <https://bombmagazine.org/article/276933/tom-mccarthy>.

McCracken, Colin. "Shem The Penman Sings Again Introduces James Joyce's Work To a New Audience." *The Last Cinema*. 29 Feb. 2016. <http://thelastcinema.com/index.php/shem-the-penman/>.

McCreedy, Jonathan. "'Ocone! Ocone!' ALP's 3D Siglum and Dolph's 'Dainty' Diagram." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 11 (2011). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS11/GJS11_McCreedy>.

McCreedy, Jonathan. "The 'Freely Masoned' Symbols of *Finnegans Wake*." Paper delivered at ESIDIRP Conference in Skopje. 11-13 Mar. 2016. Online: <https://www.academia.edu/35804825/THE_FREELY_MASONED_SYMBOLS_OF_FINNEGANS_WAKE>.

McCreedy, Jonathan. "The Constructive Campaign of the "Museyroom" Battle Diagram: Elucidating its Features and Role within *Finnegans Wake* Criticism." *Genetic Joyce*

Studies, 20 (2020). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS20/GJS20_McCreedy>.

McGrath, Andrew. "The challenge of translating Finnegans Wake." *Melville House*. 22 Apr. 2012. <https://www.mhpbooks.com/the-challenge-of-translating-finnegans-wake/>.

MacLaughlin, Nina. "One book group, one book, 18 years." *Boston Globe*. 24 Mar. 2015. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/lifestyle/2015/03/23/one-book-group-one-book-finnegans-wake-years/6r8rU4y78oZIjXtKZOHuOP/story.html>.

McManus, Darragh. "World exclusive! Finnegans Wake nonsense!." *The Guardian*. 9 Mar. 2010. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2010/mar/09/finnegans-wake-nonsense>.

McNally, Frank. "Great Irish Wake-Off – Frank McNally on a global reading of James Joyce's most difficult book." *The Irish Times*. 5 May 2020. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/great-irish-wake-off-frank-mcnally-on-a-global-reading-of-james-joyce-s-most-difficult-book-1.4245798>.

McNeilly, Kevin. "Ugly Beauty: John Zorn and the Politics of Postmodern Music." *Postmodern Culture: An Electronic Journal of Interdisciplinary Criticism*, 2 (1995). <http://www.pomoculture.org/2013/09/24/ugly-beauty-john-zorn-and-the-politics-of-postmodern-music/>.

McQuade, James. "The illustrated *Finnegans Wake* may make more sense than the original." Article. *Melville House*. 1 Apr. 2014. <https://www.mhpbooks.com/the-illustrated-finnegans-wake-may-make-more-sense-than-the-original/>.

Maher, Rob. "Solve for 'riverrun,'." Blog post. *The Eponymist*. 9 Feb. 2014. <http://eponymistuk.blogspot.com/2014/02/solve-for-riverrun.html>.

Maimon, Ron. [Comment on the blog entry "I can justify every line of my book" by Tim Finnegan.] *Annotated Finnegans Wake (with Wakepedia)*. 25 July 2018. <fwannotated.blogspot.com/2014/10/justify.html>.

Majcherek, Janusz. "On bez niego." *Teatr*, 7-8 (2005). <http://www.e-teatr.pl/pl/artykuly/17722,druk.html>.

Malouf, Michael. "Forgin the Nation: James Joyce and the Celtic Tiger." *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studoes*, 1 (1999). <https://legacy.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v4i1/malouf.htm>.

Márai, Sándor. "Nowy Napis Co Tydzień #043 / „Dziennik", fragmenty piątego tomu (lata 1977–1989)." Polish trans. Teresa Worowska. *Nowy Napis*. 2 Apr. 2020. <https://nowynapis.eu/tygodnik/nr-43/artykul/dziennik-fragmenty-piatego-tomu-lata-1977-1989>.

Marche, Stephen. "Back in the MLA." *The Times Literary Supplement*. 7 June 2019. <https://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/back-in-the-mla/>.

Marsh, Roger. "Words and Music 4: Not a soul but ourselves……" Blog post. *the crmc blog*. cmrc. York: University of York. 28 Sep. 2015. <https://www.cmrcyork.org/blog/2015/09/words-and-music-4/>.

Mecsnóber, Tekla. "A Notion of Joyce's Time: Interpreting the diacritics of *Finnegans Wake* 124.8-12." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 14 (2014). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS14/GJS14_Mecsnober>.

Meier, Allison. "Collaging Imagery from the Delirious Confusion of *Finnegans Wake*." Article/Review. *Hyperallergic*. 7 Apr. 2014. <https://hyperallergic.com/118654/collaging-imagery-from-the-delirious-confusion-of-finnegans-wake/>.

Meier, Allison. "Setting the Puzzling Language of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* to Music." Article. *Hyperallergic*. 5 Apr. 2017. <https://hyperallergic.com/369778/setting-the-puzzling-language-of-james-joyces-finnegans-wake-to-music/>.

Meltz, Raphaël. "James Joyce et Jean-Yves Lafesse." *Le Tigre*. 2 Jan. 2003. (Updated on 19 Jan. 2012.) <http://www.le-tigre.net/James-Joyce-et-Jean-Yves-Lafesse.html>.

Mendenhall, Allen. "Cultural Marxism is Real." Online article. *The James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal*. 4 Jan. 2019. <https://www.jamesgmartin.center/2019/01/cultural-marxism-is-real/>.

Mezzabotta, Orlando. *FINNEGANS WAKE: The Ondt and the Gracehoper*. YouTube video. 17 Oct. 2011. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ABTVuYkY39I>.

Mihaly, Ryan. "Here Comes Kitty: A Comic Opera by Richard Kraft." Review. *The Improbable*. 21 May 2015. <http://www.the-improbable.com/no-5-may-2015/2015/5/19/here-comes-kitty-a-comic-opera-by-richard-kraft>.

Miyahara, Shun. "How Buckley Shot the Russian General: Historical Surface and Personal Depth in the Layers of the Realities in *Finnegans Wake*." *Machikaneyama Ronso. Literature*, 51 (2017): 83-100. Osaka: OUKA. <https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/71399/mrl_051_A083.pdf>.

Mikkonen, Jukka. "Truth in Literature: The Problem of Knowledge and Insight Gained from Fiction." Penultimate draft of paper under the same title in: *Narrative Factuality: A Handbook*. Eds. Monika Fludernik and Marie-Laure Ryan. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020. 229-244. Quoted from a 18 pages long [paginated] version online; published in 2018. <https://www.academia.edu/36197661/Truth_in_Literature_The_Problem_of_Knowledge_and_Insight_Gained_from_Fiction>.

Mills, Billy. "Finnegans Wake – the book the web was invented for." *The Guardian*. 28 Apr. 2015. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2015/apr/28/finnegans-wake-james-joyce-modern-interpretations>.

Mills, Billy. "Recent Reading Five: More Short Reviews." Blog post. Including review of Bartnicki, Krzysztof, *Da Capo al Finne*, 2016. *Elliptical Movements*. 16 Apr. 2017. <https://ellipticalmovements.wordpress.com/2017/04/16/recent-reading-five-more-short-reviews/>.

Morris, Matthew. "The The Skyscraper Model: Why I think it is valuable." *Random Reviews*. 3 Sep. 2018. <http://mattrmorris.oucreate.com/uncategorized/the-skyscraper-model-why-i-think-it-is-valuable/>.

Movin, Lars. "The Wake / a Dream in Progress." Webpage on the website *The Wake*. No date marked. Published in 2007. <https://wake.dk/indexw2.lasso?d=24>.

Moyn, Samuel. "The Alt-Right's Favorite Meme Is 100 Years Old." *The New York Times*. 13 Nov. 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/13/opinion/cultural-marxism-anti-semitism.html>.

Mueller, Antony P. "The Decline of the Scholar and the Decline of Academia." Mises Institute. 16 Jan. 2019. <https://mises.org/print/45354>.

Muñoz-Alonso, Lorena. "Reading as community: Dora García and The Joycean Society." *Self Selector*. 9 June 2014. <https://selfselector.co.uk/2014/06/09/reading-as-community-dora-garcia-and-the-joycean-society/>.

Murphy, John L. "Bill Cole Cliett's «Riverrun to Livy: Lots of Fun Reading Finnegans Wake»: Book Review." Review in a blog post. *My exile in this vale of tears*. 9 Sep. 2012. <http://fionnchu.blogspot.com/2012/09/bill-cole-clietts-riverrun-to-livy-lots.html>.

Mutnick, Ally. "Lost in Transition: Northwestern visiting professor's past raises questions about hiring process." *The Daily Northwestern*. 5 May 2015. <https://dailynorthwestern.com/2015/05/05/campus/lost-in-transition-northwestern-visiting-professors-past-raises-questions-about-hiring-process/>.

Navarro, Justo. "'Finnegans Wake' para multijugador." *El Pais*. 20 July 2019. <https://elpais.com/cultura/2019/07/18/babelia/1563467437_835799.html>.

Nebnos. "Ulysses=Day : Finnegan's Wake=Night. Must one start with day?." Opening post on 27 June 2015, and later posts in discussion in 2015. *The Literature Network Forums*. <http://www.online-literature.com/forums/showthread.php?82256-Ulysses-Day-Finnegan-s-Wake-Night-Must-one-start-with-day>.

"New Online James Joyce Checklist Tracks Materials Relating to Author." News release. Harry Ransom Center. Austin: University of Texas. 15 Dec. 2008. <https://www.hrc.utexas.edu/press/releases/2008/james-joyce-checklist.html>.

Nodari, Janice Inês. "Uma aplicação da teoria do gato de Shrödinger para entender o apocalíptico e contemporâneo *Finnegans Wake*?." *Cadernos de traduçao*, 3 (2018): 183-204. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/6553628.pdf>.

Now Playing: The Exponential Future of Entertainment. Ebook. Singularity University. Published in 2019. <https://su.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Singularity-University-SU-EB-Now-Playing-Exponential-Future-of-Entertainment-EN.pdf>.

O'Brien, Edna. "Behind the masks." *The Guardian*. 12 June 2004. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/jun/12/featuresreviews.guardianreview31>.

O'Brien, Peter. "Drawing Upon *Finnegans Wake*." *Art/Research International: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, 2 (2018) [2018a]. <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ari/index.php/ari/article/view/29381>.

O'Brien, Peter. "Taking apart James Joyce's final novel *Finnegans Wake*." *The Globe and Mail*. 13-14 June 2018 (2018b). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/art-and-architecture/article-taking-apart-james-joyces-final-novel-finnegans-wake/>.

O'Brien, Richard. "Some Personal Reflections on the Story of the Irish in Australia." The Archbishop Sir James Duhig Memorial Lecture delivered in St. Leo's College, University of Queensland, on 19 Sep. 2017. Transcript: <http://www.stleos.uq.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Duhig-Lecture-transcript-2017.pdf>.

O'Connell, Mark. "Has James Joyce Been Set Free?." *New Yorker*. 11 Jan. 2012. <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/has-james-joyce-been-set-free>.

O'Hagan, Sean. "Private dancer." Review of Shloss, Carol Loeb, *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*, 2003. *The Guardian*. 16 May 2004. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/may/16/biography.features>.

Okuhara, Takashi. "Translating *Finnegans Wake* into Japanese." Senshu University: *Studies in the Humanities*, 84 (2010). Quoted from a 10 pages long [paginated] version online: <https://www.academia.edu/9803438/Translating_Finnegans_Wake_into_Japanese>.

O'Malley, Sheila. "The Books: "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" (James Joyce)." Blog post. *The Sheila Variations*. 28 Dec. 2007. <http://www.sheilaomalley.com/?p=7410>.

"On This Day… 19 August." The James Joyce Centre. 19 Aug. 2013 (2013a). <https://jamesjoyce.ie/on-this-day-19-august/>.

"On This Day… 13 November." The James Joyce Centre. 13 Nov. 2013 (2013b). <https://jamesjoyce.ie/on-this-day-13-november/>.

"On This Day… 4 May." The James Joyce Centre. 4 May 2014 (2014a). <https://jamesjoyce.ie/on-this-day-4-may/>.

"On This Day… 5 May." The James Joyce Centre. 5 May 2014 (2014b). <https://jamesjoyce.ie/on-this-day-5-may/>.

O'Riordan, Alan. "Finnegans Wake: Joyce's other work of quirky genius." *Irish Examiner*. 2 May 2014. <https://www.irishexaminer.com/ireland/finnegans-wake-joyces-other-work-of-quirky-genius-267198.html>.

O'Rourke, Bridget, and James Shaw "The Yoga of *Finnegans Wake*: Pulling on a Tantric Thread." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*. Feb. 2018. <https://hypermediajoyce.wordpress.com/the-yoga-of-finnegans-wake-pulling-on-a-tantric-thread-bridget-orourke-and-jim-shaw/>.

O'Shea, Michael J. "In Memory of Berni Benstock." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (1995). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v1/framed/oshea.htm>.

O'Sullivan, James. "*Finn's Hotel* and the Joycean Canon." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 14 (2014). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/static/issues/GJS14/GJS14_OSullivan.pdf>.

"Overview." Review of Gibson, George Cinclair, *Wake Rites: The Ancient Rituals of "Finnegans Wake"*, 2005. Website. University Press of Florida. 2005. <http://upf.com/book.asp?id=GIBSOF05>.

Pal, Rishiraj. "Sense and Absence: Politics of Nonsense in James Joyce's Later Works." Synopsis. 1 Sep. 2015. <https://shodhgangotri.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/5956/1/163_synopsis.pdf>.

"Palin's Wake." Editorial. *The New York Sun*. 26 Jan. 2016. <https://www.nysun.com/editorials/palins-wake/89428/>.

Palmer, Kent. "Husserl's *Origin of Geometry* and James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* as Nihilistic Opposites in Derrida's Introduction: An excursion into the duality of Hyper Being and Wild Being." Paper. 2015. <https://www.academia.edu/12760000/Husserl_s_Origin_of_Geometry_and_James_

Joyce_s_Finnegans_Wake_as_Nihilistic_Opposites_in_Derrida_s_Introduction_An_ excursion_into_the_duality_of_Hyper_Being_and_Wild_Being>.

Paniewicz, Siergiej. "Maszyna Finnegana." *Pinezka.pl*, 9 (2004). <https://www.pinezka.pl/opowiadania-archiwum/780-maszyna-finnegana>.

Pedone, Fabio, and Enrico Terrinoni. "*Finnegans Wake*: in italiano l'opera più magmatica di Joyce." *La Stampa*. 23 Jan. 2017 (2017a). <http://www.lastampa.it/2017/01/23/cultura/tuttolibri/nel-finnegans-wake-le-parole-sono-in-festa-e-fanno-capriole-EcliwZTfbkaEmMNqKOyxeI/pagina.html>.

Pedone, Fabio, and Enrico Terrinoni. "Giocare di sponda nella lingua del sogno. Come tradurre il *Finnegans Wake*." *Le parole e le cose²: Letteratura e realtà*: 23 Jan. 2017 (2017b). <http://www.leparoleelecose.it/?p=26238>.

Peterson, Jordan. *2017/06/28: Postmodern NeoMarxism: Diagnosis and Cure*. Recorded talk hosted by the University of Toronto's Students in Support of Free Speech. YouTube video. Published 9 July 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s4c-jOdPTN8>.

Peterson, Jordan. "There was plenty of motivation to take me out. It just didn't work." Interview by Helen Lewis. *GQ*. 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZYQpge1W5s&>.

Popova, Maria. "Uncreative Writing: Redefining Language and Authorship in the Digital Age." *Brain Pickings*. 13 Feb. 2013 (2013a). <https://www.brainpickings.org/2013/02/13/uncreative-writing-kenneth-goldsmith/>.

Popova, Maria. "Id-Grids and Ego-Graphs: A Typographic Confabulation with *Finnegans Wake*." *Brain Pickings*. 24 May 2013 (2013b). <https://www.brainpickings.org/2013/05/24/id-grids-and-ego-graphs-jacob-drachler/>.

Popova, Maria. "Umberto Eco's Antilibrary: Why Unread Books Are More Valuable to Our Lives than Read Ones." *Brain Pickings*. 24 Mar. 2015. <https://www.brainpickings.org/2015/03/24/umberto-eco-antilibrary/>.

Poprawa, Adam, and Jerzy Jarniewicz. "Przyziemna metafizyka." *biBLioteka – magazyn literacki*. 22 Aug. 2016. <http://www.biuroliterackie.pl/biblioteka/wywiady/przyziemna-metafizyka/>.

Pringle, David. "You and Me and the Continuum: In Search of a Lost JG Ballard Novel." *JG Ballard*. 1993. <https://www.jgballard.ca/criticism/jgblostnovel.html>.

"Przewodnik bibliograficzny: Urzędowy wykaz druków wydanych w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej." No. 17. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa – Instytut Bibliograficzny. 20-26 Apr. 2014. ISSN 1689-6521. <https://bn.org.pl/download/document/1399542405.pdf>.

Pyle, Derek. "Monism, Humpty Dumpty, and Finnegans Wake: In Defense of the Arcane, Pt. 2." *Aesthetic Gallows*. 30 June 2014. <https://aestheticgallows.wordpress.com/2014/06/30/monism-humpty-dumpty-and-finnegans-wake/>.

Pyle, Derek. "Check out Waywords and Meansigns, a musical adaptation of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*." Interview by Biblioklept. *Biblioklept*. 5 May 2015 (2015a). <https://biblioklept.org/2015/05/05/check-out-waywords-and-meansigns-a-musical-adaptation-of-james-joyces-finnegans-wake/>.

Pyle, Derek, ed. *Waywords and Meansigns. Recreating Finnegans Wake [in its Whole Wholume]*. Online audio version of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. 17 parts. First edition. 4 May 2015 (2015b). <http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/listen/first-edition/>.

Pyle, Derek. "Mr. Smolin's Trippy Take on the Wake." *Grateful Web*. 21 Jan. 2016 (2016a). <http://www.gratefulweb.com/articles/mr-smolins-trippy-take-wake>.

Pyle, Derek, ed. *Waywords and Meansigns: Recreating Finnegans Wake [in its Whole Wholume]*. Online audio version of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. 17 parts. Second edition. 2 Feb. 2016 (2016b). <http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/listen/second-edition/>.

Pyle, Derek, ed. *Waywords and Meansigns: Recreating Finnegans Wake [in its Whole Wholume]*. Online audio version of James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. 131 parts. Third edition. 4 May 2017 (2017b). <http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/listen/opendoor-edition/>.

Pyle, Derek, and Krzysztof Bartnicki. "The History of James Joyce Music — Adaptations, Interpretations and Inspirations." Webpage of *Waywords and Meansigns*. 2016 (ongoing). <http://www.waywordsandmeansigns.com/about/james-joyce-music/>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "16 Reasons Why James Joyce is the Greatest Writer Ever." Blog post. *A Building Roam*. 1 Aug. 2011. <https://www.abuildingroam.com/2011/08/16-reasons-why-james-joyce-is-greatest.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "What is *Finnegans Wake*? A Mysterious Black Cube." Blog post. *Finnegans Wake!*. 7 Jul. 2013 (2013a). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2013/07/what-is-finnegans-wake-mysterious-black.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "Summaries and Guides to *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 23 Sep. 2013 (2013b). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2013/09/summaries-and-guides-to-finnegans-wake.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "Book Review (Part 3 of 4): *Joyce's Book of the Dark* by John Bishop." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 11 Feb. 2014 (2014a). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2014/02/book-review-part-3-of-4-joyces-book-of.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "Book Review (Part 4 of 4): *Joyce's Book of the Dark* by John Bishop." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 1 Nov. 2014 (2014b). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2014/11/book-review-part-4-of-4-joyces-book-of.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "On the 75th Anniversary of *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 5 May 2014 (2014c). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2014/05/on-75th-anniversary-of-finnegans-wake.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "Frank Delaney Describes *Finnegans Wake* Perfectly." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 18 Jan. 2015 (2015a). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2015/01/frank-delaney-describes-finnegans-wake.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "Anastomosis." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 19 Feb. 2015 (2015b). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2015/02/anastomosis.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "The Great Letter and the Infinite Process of Self-Embedding." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 15 Apr. 2017. <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2017/04/the-great-letter-and-infinite-process.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "*Finnegans Wake* and Child's Play." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 10 June 2018 (2018a). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2018/06/finnegans-wake-and-childs-play.html>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "The Pantheon of FINNEGANS WOKE (or Why Read *Finnegans Wake*? Testimonials from Famous Wakeans)." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 23 June 2018 (2018b). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2018/06/the-pantheon-of-finnegans-woke-or-why.html>.

Quadrino, Peter. "Binaries & Bibliomancy: *Finnegans Wake* as a Western I-Ching." Paper delivered at "Joyce Without Borders" conference in Mexico, 14 June 2019. Published online on 18 June 2019 (2019a). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fl2dAaCht6w>.

Quadrino, Peter [PQ]. "*Finnegans Wake* on the Trump-Ukraine Affair & Impeachmen." Blog post. *Finnegans, Wake!*. 18 Dec. 2019 (2019b). <https://finwakeatx.blogspot.com/2019/12/finnegans-wake-on-trump-ukraine-affair.html>.

Ramey, James. "*Pale Fire*'s Black Crown." *Nabokov Online Journal*, 6 (2012b). <http://www.nabokovonline.com/uploads/2/3/7/7/23779748/22_ramey_pdff.pdf>.

"Reading *Finnegans Wake* – a help list of books." Webpage. The Finnegans Wake Society of New York Published in 2006. <https://finneganswake.org/helpbooklist.shtml>.

Reich, Jorg. "Finnegans Wake von James Joyce – deutsche Übersetzung." Online crowdfunding project. *Kickstarter*. June 2015. <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/1752996702/finnegans-wake-von-james-joyce-deutsche-ubersetzun>.

Reisman, Karl. ""And he war" from a letter to Jaques [*sic*] Derrida." Blog post. *Fadograph's Weblog: Finnegans Wake Karl Reisman Leo Reisman*. No date marked. Published in May 2009 (2009a). <https://fadograph.wordpress.com/finnegans-wake-african-world-fulani-west-indies-dubois-garvey/and-he-war-from-a-letter-to-jaques-derrida/>.

Reisman, Karl. ""In the muddle is the sounddance." Another Introduction to the Reading of *Finnegans Wake*." *FlashPoint*, 12 (2009b). <https://www.flashpointmag.com/reisman.htm/>.

Rene, Andrey. "Языки оригинала." Webpage: О переводе "На помине Финнеганов". *Samizdat Journal*. Published 18 March 2016 (2016d). <http://samlib.ru/r/rene_a/lit.shtml#lang>.

Rene, Andrey. "NEWECTЬ." Posted on wall of: На помине Финнеганов (Finnegans Wake). *VK*. 18 Nov. 2018. <https://vk.com/pominfin?w=wall-120776727_563>.

Rennix, Brianna. "The Politics and "Pretentiousness" of Reading James Joyce." *Current Affairs*. 28 Apr. 2020. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2020/04/the-politics-and-pretentiousness-of-reading-james-joyce>.

Reyes, Michael A. "Decrypting 'Finnegans Wake': Gerry Fialka's literary detectives group is still on the case after 22 years." *The Argonaut*. 27 Sep. 2017. <https://argonautnews.com/decrypting-finnegans-wake/>.

Reynes-Delobel, Anne. "Unreadability in Question(s).": The Reception of 'Work in Progress' in *transition* Magazine (1927-38)." *Modernism and Unreadability*. Eds. Isabelle Alfandary, and Axel Nesme. Montpellier: Presses Universitaires de la Méditerranée, 2011. 231-242. Quoted from a 14 pages long [paginated] version online, published by *HAL: Archive ouverte en Sciences de l'Homme et de la Société*, 2015: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01118740v1/>.

Rich, Jeff. "Finnegans Awwwake agoin." Blog post. *The Burning Archive: Essays and Poetry Redeeming Culture*. 4 Aug. 2016. <https://theburningarchive.wordpress.com/2016/08/04/finnegans-awwwake-agoin/>.

Roberts, Adam. "Actually Reading *Finnegans Wake*." Blog post. *Morphosis*. 20 Apr. 2015. <http://amechanicalart.blogspot.com/2015/04/actually-reading-finnegans-wake.html>.

Roberts, Adam. "Pervigilium Finneganis." Blog post. *Morphosis*. 11 Feb. 2019 (2019b). <http://amechanicalart.blogspot.com/2019/02/pervigilium-finneganis.html>.

Rocco, Gregory. "Hypertextuality in Finnegans Wake." *Humanities Commons*. 2016. <https://mla.hcommons.org/deposits/objects/mla:972/datastreams/CONTENT/content>.

Roraback, Erik. "Para-Baroque Conceptual Intersections & Interventions: *Finnegans Wake*, *Gravity's Rainbow* & The Writing of the Disaster." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 2 (2004-2005). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v3/roraback2.html>.

Rose, Danis. *The New Edition of Finnegans Wake: The Editorial Methodology: A Very Brief Overview*. Houyhnhnm Press, 2010. <http://www.houyhnhnmpress.com/rationale>.

Rose, Danis, and John O'Hanlon. *A Prospectus for Finnegans Wake. James Joyce*. Houyhnhnm Press, 2010. <http://www.houyhnhnmpress.com/finnegans-wake-prospectus>.

Rosenbaum, Jonathan. "Trailer for Godard's *Histoire(s) du cinéma*." Originally published in *Trafic*, 21 (1997). Revised and updated in 2009. Quoted from a 11 pages long [paginated] version online: <https://www.academia.edu/9891222/Trailer_for_Godards_HISTOIRE_S_DU_CINEMA>.

Rosenbloom, Eric. "The Primary Editions of *Finnegans Wake*." Website. No date marked. <http://www.rosenlake.net/fw/FWeditions.html>.

Rosko, Zoran. "Sydney Goodsir Smith – Scottish "Finnegans Wake": A mock-Joycean cum Rabelaisian caper where every word you read is Smith's own coinage – it makes narrative sense, but the words are also redolent of other things, often innuendos." Blog post. *Zoran Rosko Vacuum Player*. 9 Jan. 2018. <https://zorosko.blogspot.com/2018/01/sydney-goodsir-smith-scottish-finnegans.html>.

Ruane, Medb. "The war of words over Joyce's literary legacy." *The Irish Times*. 10 June 2000. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/the-war-of-words-over-joyce-s-literary-legacy-1.280570>.

Russell, James R. "Armenian Secret and Invented Languages and Argots." Journal article. Proceedings of the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 2018. Quoted from a 55 pages long [paginated] version online: <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/9938150>.

Ryder, Sean. "Introduction." *James Clarence Mangan: Selected Writings*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2004. Quoted from a 9 pages long [unpaginated] prepublication version online: <https://aran.library.nuigalway.ie/bitstream/handle/10379/4741/INTRODUCTION_S ELECTED_MANGAN.pdf>.

Saint-Laurent, Roland. "The Shittiest Fucking Audiobook I've Ever Listened To." Blog post. *Stay Down Where You Belong*. 18 Aug. 2009. <http://rolandsaintlaurent.blogspot.com/2009/08/shittiest-fucking-audiobook-ive-ever.html/>. [Access restricted.]

Sandulescu, C. George. *A Lexicon of Romanian in "Finnegans Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 1. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2011. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu.lexicon-of-romanian-in-FW.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *A Lexicon of Common Scandinavian in "Finnegans Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 3. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012a. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-lexicon-scandinavian-fw.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *A Lexicon of Allusion and Motifs in "Finnegans Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 4. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012b. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/G.Sandulescu-Lexicon-of-Allusions-and-Motifs-in-FW.html>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *A Lexicon of "Small" Languages in "Finnegans Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 5. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012c. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-small-languages-fw.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *Literary Allusions in "Finnegans Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 11. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012d. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-literary-allusions.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *"Finnegans Wake" Motifs: I*. Joyce Lexicography, 12. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012e. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-fw-motifs1.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *"Finnegans Wake" Motifs: II*. Joyce Lexicography, 13. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012f. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-fw-motifs2.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *"Finnegans Wake" Motifs: III*. Joyce Lexicography, 14. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012g. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-fw-motifs3.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *The Honuphrius & Few Others FW Interludes Properly Paraphrased for the General Public*. Joyce Lexicography, 15. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012h. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-the-honuphrius.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *Joyce's Dublin English in the "Wake"*. Joyce Lexicography, 16. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012i. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/sandulescu-dublin-english-in-the-wake.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *Musical Allusions in "Finnegans Wake": Part One*. Joyce Lexicography, 21. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2013a. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/musical_allusions_in_FW_part_one.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *Musical Allusions in "Finnegans Wake": Part Two*. Joyce Lexicography, 22. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2013b. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/musical_allusions_in_FW_part_two.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *Musical Allusions in "Finnegans Wake": Parts Three and Four*. Joyce Lexicography, 23. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2013c. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/musical_allusions_in_FW_part_three_and_four.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George. *James Joyce's Word-Poetry: Context-Free Graphotactics of FW*. Joyce Lexicography, 102. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2014. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/Lexicon%20102.%20Poetic%20Graphotactics.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George, and Lidia Vianu. *Spectacular Acrobatics in the field of Rhetoric!: One Hundred Different Devices packed into one single FW Page by James Joyce*. Joyce Lexicography, 116. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2015a. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/Lexicon%20116%20-%20Rhetoric%20in%20Joyce.%20CLP.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George, and Lidia Vianu. *The Sayings of Brancusi, Blake, and Joyce*. Joyce Lexicography, 122. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2015b. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/The%20Saying%20of%20B,%20B,%20and%20Joyce.%20CLP.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George, and Lidia Vianu. *Translatability?*. Joyce Lexicography, 123. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2015c. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/carti/Lexicon%20123%20-%20Translatability.CLP.pdf>.

Sandulescu, C. George, and Lidia Vianu. *A Manual for the Advanced Study of James Joyce's "Finnegans Wake" in 122 volumes*. Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2016. <https://editura.mttlc.ro/Joyce%20Lexicography.html>.

Sasidharan, Shyama. "Confluence of Comic, biography and reminisce: Graphic Memoir erases the boundary of High art and popular art." *International Journal of English Language, Literature in Humanities*, 12 (2018): 1354-1361. <https://ijellh.com/OJS/index.php/OJS/article/view/6114>.

Senn, Fritz. "Genetic Fascination." *Genetic Joyce Studies*. Special Issue. 2002a. <http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJSSI/JJASenn>.

Senn, Fritz. "Zuschauen, wie die Sprache denkt." Interview by as. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*. 29 Jan. 2011. <https://www.nzz.ch/zuschauen_wie_die_sprache_denkt-1.9263766>.

Senn, Fritz. "Interview with Fritz Senn." Interview by Vitor Alevato do Amaral. *Qorpus*, 3 (2019): 171-175. <https://qorpuspget.paginas.ufsc.br/files/2019/12/18-Entrevista-Fritz-SennQORPUS_V9_N3-ESPECIAL-JAMES-JOYCE_DEZ-2019.pdf>.

Sessa, Marcello. "Trascrivere il segno nel sonno: la traduzione di "Finnegans Wake" in italiano." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake. Libro III, capitoli 3 e 4. Libro IV*, in Italian translation by Enrico Terrinoni and Fabio Pedone, Milano, 2019. *La Balena Bianca*. Blog post. 14 June 2019. <https://www.labalenabianca.com/2019/06/14/finnegans-wake/>.

Shaughnessy, Haydn. "Discovered in a digital universe." *The Irish Times*. 4 Nov. 2004. <https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/discovered-in-a-digital-universe-1.1164922>.

Sheldon, Rose Mary. *The Friedman Collection: An Analytical Guide*. William F. Friedman collection guide. 2014. <http://marshallfoundation.org/library/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2014/09/Friedman_Collection_Guide_September_2014.pdf>.

Shishkin, Mikhail [Михаил Шишкин]. "Новый русский эмигрант." Interview by Yuri Volodarsky [Юрий Володарский]. *Sho*, 2019 [Special Issue]: 38-43. <https://shoizdat.com/mikhail-shishkin-novyi-russkii-emigrant/>.

Singh, Amardeep. "Shameless Literary Tourism in Dublin: Bloomsday 2009." *Amardeep Singh*. Blog post. 18 June 2009. <https://www.lehigh.edu/~amsp/2009/06/shameless-literary-tourism-in-dublin.html>.

Slepon, Raphael. "'Fweets of Fin': Towards a Web-based Finnegans Wake Research Tool." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 6 (2006). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS6/GJS6Slepon>.

Slote, Sam. *In Utero: Genetic Inachievement in "Finnegans Wake"*. Paper delivered at the XIVth James Joyce Symposium, Seville, 1994a. <http://webger-www.uia.ac.be/webger/ger/joyce/inutero.html>. [Inactive link.]

Slote, Sam. "Sound-bite Against the Restoration." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 1 (2001). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS1/Soundbite>.

Slote, Sam. "A Second Look at the *First-Draft Version of* Finnegans Wake." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 2 (2002). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS2/GJS2Sam>.

Slote, Sam, Wim Van Mierlo, Ronan Crowley, et al. "Bibliography of Genetic Joyce." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 2008. <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/info/bibliography>.

Sławek, Tadeusz. "The Garden of Forgiveness." Abstract of an article. 2014b. <http://yadda.icm.edu.pl/yadda/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-2d692e35-1016-4c1a-a7f6-bce1358d7651>.

Słodownik, Agnieszka. "Kiedy opowieść zawodzi, czas sięgnąć po mapę." *Culture.pl*. 2 Feb. 2017. <httpa://culture.pl/pl/artykul/kiedy-opowiesc-zawodzi-czas-siegnac-po-mape>.

Smith. "Robots Reading James Joyce." *Smith Journal*. 26 Apr. 2017. <https://www.smithjournal.com.au/blogs/arts/2962-robots-reading-james-joyce>.

Smith, Dean Wesley. "The New World of Publishing: Writer vs. Author." Post. *The Writings and Opinions of Dean Wesley Smith*. 6 Jan. 2012. <https://www.deanwesleysmith.com/the-new-world-of-publishing-writer-vs-author/>.

Smoley, Richard. "From the Editor's Desk." *Quest*, 4 (2014): 2. <https://www.theosophical.org/publications/quest-magazine/4408>.

Snyder, Timothy. "Europe's dangerous creation myth." *Politico*. 1 May 2019. <https://www.politico.eu/article/europe-creation-project-myth-history-nation-state/>.

Sollers, Philippe. "Joyce, de Tel Quel à L'Infini (II)." Excerpts from three lectures given in Paris, 1975. *Pileface/Phillipe Sollers*. 11 Apr. 2007. <http://www.pileface.com/sollers//spip.php?article411>.

Sonnad, Nikhil. "The number of US students learning a foreign language has slumped." *The World Economic Forum*. 16 Apr. 2018.

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/04/fewer-and-fewer-us-college-students-are-studying-foreign-languages/>.

Spielberg, Peter, and Luca Crispi, eds. "The UB James Joyce Catalog." Buffalo, NY: University at Buffalo, SUNY, 2010. <https://library.buffalo.edu/pl/collections/jamesjoyce/catalog/index.php>.

Staley, Judd. "*Finnegans Wake*: An Annotated Bibliography of Major Criticism." The Finnegans Wake Society of New York. No date marked. Published in 2013. <http://finneganswake.org/bibliography1.shtml>.

Stefans, Brian. "Third Hand Plays: The Comedy of Encryption." *SFMOMA's Open Space*. 20 Sep. 2011. <https://openspace.sfmoma.org/2011/09/third-hand-plays-the-comedy-of-encryption/>.

Steinberg, Faith. Review of Joyce, James, *The Finnegans Wake Notebooks at Buffalo*, Eds. Vincent Deane, Daniel Ferrer, and Geert Lernout, 2001-2002. The Finnegans Wake Society of New York. 2006. [Date retrieved from the metrics of the MS Word file with the review downloaded at the source.] <http://finneganswake.org/BuffNoterev.shtml>.

Sterling, Riverend Clarence R. "1132 A.D. & Saint Brighid: Notes on Some Implications in Chapters II.4 and III.1 of *Finnegans Wake*." 2000. <http://www.rosenlake.net/fw/Sterling-1132.html>.

Steve. "The Restored Finnegans Wake—a guest post." Blog post. *Finnegans Wake in Santa Cruz*. 6 May 2012. <http://finniganswakesantacruz.blogspot.com/2012/05/restored-finnegans-wake-guest-post.html>.

Stocker, Barry. "Repetition and Circularity in Joyce and Vico." *The Philosophical Readings of Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Writers*. Eds. Marco Piazza, and Denise Vincenti. *Odradek: Studies in Philosophy of Literature, Aesthetics and New Media Theories*, 2 (2019). 183-217. <https://odradek.cfs.unipi.it/index.php/odradek/issue/view/11>.

Stojković, Mirko. "Nano-Spectacle: Playing with Monomyth." Paper delivered at a conference in Belgrad, 29-30 Oct. 2015, and published in the volume: *Media Archaeology: Memory, Media and Culture in Digital Age*. Belgrad: FDU, 2016. Online: <https://www.academia.edu/29431728/NANO-SPECTACLE_PLAYING_WITH_MONOMYTH>.

Storey, Robin. "Writer V Author – What's The Difference?." Post. *Robin Storey: Author*. 14 Apr. 2013. <https://storey-lines.com/2013/04/14/writer-vs-author-whats-the-difference>.

Szmandra, Marcin. *Finneganowizje*. Website. 2012 (ongoing). <https://finneganowizje.tumblr.com/>.

Škrabánek, Petr. "Night Joyce of a Thousand Tiers." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 1 (2003). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v3/skrabanek2.html>.

Tahourdin, Adrian. "Is 'Finnegans Wake' unreadable?." *The TLS Blog*, 9 July 2014. <http://timescolumns.typepad.com/stothard/2014/07/is-finnegans-wake-unreadable.html>. [Inactive link.]

Takács, Ferenc. "'anythongue athall': The Metathematisation of Language Identity in *Finnegans Wake*." *The AnaChronisT*, 11 (2005): 224-232. Quoted from a 12 pages

long [paginated] version online: <https://www.academia.edu/5207355/the_the_the_the_Metathematisation_Metathem atisation_Metathematisation_Metathematisation_of_of_of_of_Language_Language_ Language_Language_Identity_Identity_Identity_Identity_in_in_in_in_Finnegans_Fi nnegans_Finnegans_Finnegans_Wake_Wake_Wake_Wake>.

taogoat. "Great hardcover edition." Review of Joyce, James, *Finnegans Wake Embodying All Author's Corrections (Eighth Printing)*, 1971 hardcover edition, Amazon. 5 Oct. 2013. <https://www.amazon.com/gp/customer-reviews/R1N7JDIVZO24VW/ref=cm_cr_dp _d_rvw_ttl?ie= UTF8&ASIN=B002IY5JBQ>.

Taylor, Charlie. "On Petersons 'Postmodern Neo-Marxism'." *Medium*. 18 Aug. 2018. <https://medium.com/@charlietaylor105/on-petersons-postmodern-neo-marxism-b33f6f425066>.

Temple, Emily. "10 Epidemically Overrated Books." *Flavorwire*. 24 May 2012. <https://flavorwire.com/293260/10-epidemically-overrated-books/2>.

Tesh, Mike. "'Plain English' Translation of James Joyce's Finnegans Wake Exceeds 175,000 Pages." *Gish Gallop*. 17 Oct. 2017. <https://www.gishgallop.com/plain-english-translation-of-james-joyces-finnegans-wake-exceeds-175000-pages/>.

Theall, Donald F. "Beyond the Orality/Literacy Dichotomy: James Joyce and the Pre-History of Cyberspace." *Postmodern Culture*, 3 (1992). <http://www.pomoculture.org/2013/09/26/beyond-the-oralityliteracy-dichotomy-james-joyce-and-the-pre-history-of-cyberspace/>.

Theall, Donald F. "Memory, Orality, Literacy, Joyce, and the Imaginary: A Virtual History of Cyberculture." *Postmodern Culture*, 1 (1999). <http://www.pomoculture.org/2013/09/19/memory-orality-literacy-joyce-and-the-imaginary-a-virtual-history-of-cyberculture/>.

"Thunderwords." Graphic with text and mathematical calculations. Posted by anonymous. Post 8053005 in discussion forum. *4 chan [lit]*. 18 May 2016. Archived. <https://yuki.la/lit/8052952#p8053005>.

Tolkien Gateway. s.v. "James Joyce." Online encyclopedia. Owner: Hyarion. Launched 3 June 2005. <http://tolkiengateway.net/wiki/James_Joyce>.

Topia, André. "*Finnegans Wake*: la traduction parasitée: Étude de trois traductions des dernières pages de *Finnegans Wake*." *Palimpsestes – Retraduire*, 4 (1990): 45-61. <https://journals.openedition.org/palimpsestes/602>.

Trehy, Pádraig. "Interview: Pádraig Trehy, director of 'Shem The Penman Sings Again'." Interview by Sean Finnan. *Film Ireland*. 14 June 2016. <http://filmireland.net/2016/06/14/interview-padraig-trehy-director-of-shem-the-penman/>.

Tsoi Sze Pang, Pablo. "Paralysis and Paranoia: Comparing Lu Xun and Joyce: Two Contrasted Modes of Modernism." *Working Paper Series*. Paper 109. Hong Kong: David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies, 2011. <http://lewi.hkbu.edu.hk/publications/WPS/109_Tsoi.pdf>.

Van Herbruggen, Katrin. "Notes Toward a Timeline of *Work in Progress*." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 4 (2004). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS4/GJS4_VanHerbruggen>.

Van Mierlo, Wim. "'For polemypolity's sake': Editing *Finnegans Wake* — a Consideration and Review." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 12 (2012). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/static/issues/GJS12/GJS12_Mierlo.pdf>.

Versmoren, John. "Nowth Upon Nacht." Lyrics. *The LiederNet Archive*. Ed. Emily Ezust. Added between May 1995 and September 2003. <https://www.lieder.net/lieder/get_text.html?TextId=9012>.

Vintage Bracketologist. "Finnegans Wake." Blog post. Anonymous. *James Joyce Sucks*. 1 Oct. 2016. <https://jamesjoycesucks.wordpress.com/2016/10/01/finnegans-wake/>.

Vintage Bracketologist. "The two party lines of the Ivory Tower Cabal." Anonymous. Blog post. *James Joyce Sucks*. 10 Mar. 2017. <https://jamesjoycesucks.wordpress.com/2017/03/10/the-two-party-lines-of-the-ivory-tower-cabal/>.

Wack, Gary B., and Klara Lutsky. "James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: Unlocking the Collective Unconscious." 14 Dec. 2011. <https://www.academia.edu/8845076/James_Joyce_s_Finnegans_Wake_Unlocking_the_Collective_Unconscious>.

Wade, Carol. *Art of the Wake: Exploring James Joyce's Finnegans Wake through painting and illustration*. Website with 4 webpages. Established in 2019. <https://artofthewake.com>.

Wang, Eddy, and GPT-2. "Artificial Intelligence's Rendition of *Finnegans Wake* by Eddy Wang (A Person) and GPT-2 (A Neural Network)." 2020. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qiUxBVtoF2L17kDgLV9K98HzMF4j-7HH/view>.

Wawrzycka, Jolanta. "«The memory of these migrations» (U 17.1916)." *mediAzioni*, 6 (2009). <http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF_folder/document-pdf/dossierBollettieriTorresi/wawrzycka_dossierbosinellitorresi2009.pdf>.

Weinzweig, John. "John Weinzweig Documentary." Interview by Eitan Cornfield. Canadian Composers Portrait Series, 1992. Quoted from a 13 pages long [paginated] transcript by Mara Zibens, online: <https://www.musiccentre.ca/sites/www.musiccentre.ca/files/resources/pdfmedia/weinzweig-portrait-en.pdf>. [Inactive link.]

Weir, Liam. "Joycestick VR." Blog post. 31 Nov. 2018. <https://liamweir.com/joycestick-overview>.

Weiss, Bari. "Meet the Renegades of the Intellectual Dark Web." *The New York Times*. 8 May 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/08/opinion/intellectual-dark-web.html>.

Weiss, Dan. "Understanding the (Net) Wake." MA dissertation. Dublin: Trinity College, n.d. Published online in Mar. 2001. <http://www.themodernword.com/joyce/joyce_paper_netwake1.html>. [Inactive link.]

West, Patrick. "From *Finnegans Wake* to Google Translate." *spiked*. 18 June 2015. <https://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/from-finnegans-wake-to-google-translate/17096>.

West, Patrick. "This Bloomsday, give James Joyce's unloved masterpiece a try." *spiked*. 14 June 2019. <https://www.spiked-online.com/2019/06/14/this-bloomsday-give-james-joyces-unloved-masterpiece-a-try/>.

Wheeler, L. Kip. *Literary Vocabulary: Literary Terms and Definitions*. Website with 26 webpages. 2016 (ongoing). <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms.html>.

Wiesenmayer, Theodóra. "Fugal form and polyphony in the "Sirens" episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *AngolPark*. Master webpage [*Tanulmányok*]: <http://seas3.elte.hu/angolpark/index2HU.htm>. 2009. <http://seas3.elte.hu/angolpark/Texts/tanulmanyok/WiesenmayerTheodora_Fugalformandpolyphony.pdf>.

Wikipedia. s.v. "Finnegans Wake." Entry in an online encyclopedia. English version. First edit: 2 Sep. 2002. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Finnegans_Wake>.

Wilkinson, Emily Colette, and Garth Risk Hallberg. "The Top 10 Most Difficult Books." *Publisher's Weekly*. 3 Aug. 2012. <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/tip-sheet/article/53409-the-top-10-most-difficult-books.html>.

Williamson, Nick. "I believe that James Joyce set out to…" Blog post. *The Joycean Opus Day*. 13 Jan. 2015. <http://joyceanopusday.blogspot.com/2015/01/i-believe-that-james-joyce-set-out-to.html>.

Wilson, Robert Anton. *Robert Anton Wilson reads Finnegans Wake: Shem the Penman (2014)*. YouTube video. 27 June 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oTb9oqNMma4>.

Wiśniewski-Snerg, Adam. *Jednolita teoria czasoprzestrzeni*. Warszawa: Pusty Obłok, 1990. Published online in 2003. <http://snerg.lh2.pl/dziela/jtc/jtc.html>.

Witen, Michelle. "The Mystery of the Fuga per Canonem Reopened?." *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 10 (2010). <https://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS10/GJS10_Witen>.

Wood, Michael. "Distraction Theory: How to Read While Thinking of Something Else." *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 4 (2009). <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.act2080.0048.410>.

Wróblewski, Jakub, and Katarzyna Bazarnik, project makers. *First We Feel Then We Fall: Adaptation of James Joyce's 'Finnegans Wake'*. Video. 2016. <https://www.firstwefeelthenwefall.com/>.

Wuetcher, Sue. "Event tackles 'Finnegans Wake' with reading, Joyce-themed activities." *UBNow: Campus News*. University at Buffalo. 24 Oct. 2017. <http://www.buffalo.edu/ubnow/stories/2017/10/finnegans-waves.html>.

xooxanthellae. "Guide to finding a nice hardcover edition of Finnegans Wake." Opening post in discussion. *Reddit*. 15 July 2014. <https://www.reddit.com/r/jamesjoyce/comments/2aqkc7/guide_to_finding_a_nice_hardcover_edition_of/>.

Xue, Yiwei. "A Writer Living in a Strange Land: An Interview with Xue Yiwei." Interview by Amy Hawkins. *BLARB – Blog Los Angeles Review of Books*. 14 June 2017. <http://blog.lareviewofbooks.org/chinablog/writer-living-strange-land-interview-xue-yiwei/>.

Zabaloy, Marcelo. "If I did that shamething it was on pure poise." Interview by Derek Pyle. Part 1. *MR: The Massachusetts Review*. 1 Sep. 2015 (2015a). <https://www.massreview.org/node/467>.

Zabaloy, Marcelo. "ef you now what eye mint." Interview by Derek Pyle. Part 2. *MR: The Massachusetts Review*. 4 Sep. 2015 (2015b). <https://www.massreview.org/node/469>.

Zabaloy, Marcelo. "«Los presos dicen que leen la Biblia para ser mejores. Deberían leer Ulises»: Entrevista con Marcelo Zabaloy, el traductor outsider de Joyce en Argentina." Interview by Guillermo MacLoughlin. *The Southern Cross*. 2 Sep. 2017. <https://medium.com/@thesoutherncross/los-presos-dicen-que-leen-la-biblia-para-ser-mejores-deber%C3%ADan-leer-ulises-b5832de07813>.

Zanotti, Serenella. "The Translator's Visibility: The Italian Translations of *Finnegans Wake*." Published in 2006. <http://www.mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF_folder/document-pdf/2006/dossier2006/Joyce/5%20zanotti.pdf>.

Zarrinjooee, Bahman. "James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: A Universal Culture." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, 15 (2016). <http://hjs.ff.cuni.cz/main/essays.php?essay=zarrinjooee>.

znore. "Bake And Wake 1." Blog post. *Groupname for Grapejuice*. 25 Oct. 2012. <http://groupnameforgrapejuice.blogspot.com/2012/10/bake-and-wake-1.html>.

Zyjeski, Jeff A. "The importance of Ireland to Joyce… and the importance of Joyce to Ireland. Brief musings on James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, and Irish History." Blog post. Z-Web. <http://zekeweb.iwarp.com/Wake.htm>.

Žižek, Slavoj. "Poetry-in-the-Round with Slavoj Žižek (October 24, 2018)." Lecture delivered in Seton Hall University. Published online on 1 Nov. 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ieGCqd_hoSQ&>.

Music, audiobooks, and performance:

Ball, Patrick. *James Joyce. Finnegans Wake. Excerpts Read by Patrick Ball, Celtic Harp*. Audio CD. Celestial Harmonies, 1997.

Bedford, Patrick. *Finnegans Wake by James Joyce. Read by Patrick Bedford. Directed by Hilton Edwards.* Extracts selected by Niall Montgomery. Presented by Arthur Luce Klein. Vinyl. Spoken Arts, 1963.

Cusack, Cyril, and Siobhan McKenna. *James Joyce. Finnegans Wake. Siobhan McKenna and Cyril Cusack Reading Anna Livia Plurabelle and Shem the Penman*. Vinyl. Caedmon Records, 1959.

Erdman, Jean, dir. *The Coach with the Six Insides*. Dance-drama based on James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. Recorded on VHS. Kent, CT: Creative Arts Television, 1999.

Fouéré, Olwen. *riverrun*. Stage performance/live reading of passages from James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. The Emergency Room and Cusack Projects Ltd. Premiered in Galway: Druid Theatre, Galway Arts Festival, 2013.

Healy, Patrick. *James Joyce. "Finnegans Wake"*. Audiobook. Dublin: Rennicks Auriton, 1992.

Kucharczyk, Wojciech, arranger. *Bowie's Gone Live*. Arranged *Finnegans Wake*-derived compositions by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Bytom: Kronika, 22 Jan. 2016.

Kucharczyk, Wojciech, arranger. *Post-Joyce Variations*. Arranged *Finnegans Wake*-derived compositions by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Warszawa: Zachęta, 16 Feb. 2017.

Norton, Jim, and Marcella Riordan. *James Joyce. Finnegans Wake. Read by Jim Norton with Marcella Riordan*. Abridged by Roger Marsh. Audiobook. Naxos AudioBooks, 1998.

Ostalski, Michał, perf. "*A Redivivus of Paganinism*": *Variations on a Text by Joyce upon Lutosławski's Variation on a Theme by Paganini*. Live piano performance of *Finnegans Wake*-derived composition by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Częstochowa: Gaude Mater, 19 Oct. 2013.

Wilson, Robert Anton. "Robert Anton Wilson on *Finnegans Wake* and Joseph Campbell." Interview by Faustin Bray and Wallace Brian. Audio CD. Mill Valley: Sound Photosynthesis, 1988.

Films:

Buszewicz, Michał, dir. *Finnegans Wake / Finneganów tren*. Enactment of a passage from James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* in the translation by Krzysztof Bartnicki. Film with subtitles from the original text. Produced in Kraków, 2014. Premiered in Dublin on 14 May, 2014.

Bute, Mary Ellen, dir. *Passages from James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. Film. Based on the Mary Manning play. New York: Expanding Cinema, 1965.

García, Dora, dir. *The Joycean Society*. Documentary film. With: Fritz Senn, Sabrina Alonso, Ron Ewart, Tad Lauer, Hansruedi Isler M.D., Mary Moore, Seamus Hughes, Janos Biro, Walter Albrecht, Andrea Matha, Marc Emmenegger, Gabi Schneider, Sylvia Herzig, Andreas Flückiger, Dora García, Jan Mech, and Geert Lernout. Belgium: Auguste Orts, 2013.

Other sources:

Kordes, Reimer, breeder. *Anna Livia*. Orange-pink rose. Exhibition name after James Joyce's name for the river Liffey. Germany, 1985.

Tschumi, Bernard, architect. *Joyce's Garden*. Project. London, Bernard Tschumi Architects, 1976.

Abbreviations:

FDV = Joyce, James. *A First-Draft Version of "Finnegans Wake"*. Ed. David Hayman. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

FH = Joyce, James. *Finn's Hotel*. Ed. Danis Rose. Dublin: Ithys Press, 2013.

FOE = *Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber & Faber, 1961. (Reissue of 1929 edition.)

FW = Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber & Faber, 4 May 1939. The prototext.

FWP = Joyce, James. *Work in Progress*. The title of FW *in statu nascendi*. 1922-1939.

JJA = Joyce, James. *The James Joyce Archive*. 63 volumes. Eds. Michael Groden, Hans Walter Gabler, A. Walton Litz, and Danis Rose. New York: Garland, 1977-1980.

JJC = Brockman, William S., and Alan M. Cohn, eds. *The James Joyce Checklist*. 1963. Searchable database online since 2008 (ongoing).

Zusammenfassung der Dissertation

„Finnegans Wake als ein Wissenssystem ohne Grundbegriffe: Ein Vorschlag gegen das Kompetenzparadigma in der so genannten Joyce-Industrie".

von Krzysztof Bartnicki

Die vorliegende Dissertation zum Thema „*Finnegans Wake* als Wissenssystem ohne Grundbegriffe: Ein Vorschlag gegen das Kompetenzparadigma in der so genannten Joyce-Industrie" verfolgt das Ziel, das Paradigma der hierarchischen Deutungskompetenz in Frage zu stellen, die in der sogenannten Joyce-Industrie weit verbreitet ist, wobei unter Joyce-Industrie eine akademische Gemeinschaft zu verstehen ist, die sich professionell, d.h. gegen Bezahlung, mit dem wissenschaftlichen Studium des James Joyce zugeschriebenen Textes „Finnegans Wake" („FW") beschäftigt. Die Dissertation besteht aus vier Hauptteilen: der Einführung und drei Kapiteln, mit anschließenden Beilagen und der Bibliographie.

Die Einführung bietet folgende Beschreibung des Wissenssystems über FW: Nachdem 1939 das erste Buch mit dem Titel „Finnegans Wake" und dem Namen von James Joyce auf dem Umschlag veröffentlicht wurde, und später von seinen post-Joyce-Varianten gefolgt wurde, steht heute der Name „FW" für eine epistemische Sackgasse. Diese besteht darin, dass je mehr Behauptungen über FW aufgestellt werden, desto unsicherer die Bezugnahme auf FW wird, aber um sie zu beheben, muss man erst umso mehr Behauptungen aufstellen. Nachdem die Exegeten von FW ein Übermaß an Daten erzeugt hatten, beraubten sie sich selbst ihrer Grundbegriffe, d.h. fundamentaler, undefinierter Begriffe, deren Bedeutung sich durch Intuition offenbart. Folglich ist die Bedeutung jeder Behauptung über FW (einschließlich dieser) zunächst vage. Diese bleibende Eigenschaft – mit anderen kombiniert, z.B. der Ununterscheidbarkeit zwischen Lesern und Nichtlesern – macht den Text von 1939 einzigartig. Andererseits aber gewann der Text seine Eigenart unnötigerweise: Wäre seine Sprache als unbekannt etabliert worden, so würden die semantischen Effekte des Textes recht gewöhnlich erscheinen.

Der quantitative Faktor, der mit dem Umfang der FW-Exegese zusammenhängt, macht es jeder schlüssig begründeten hermeneutischen Kompetenz unmöglich, zu behaupten, dass FW als Text in der Literatur (im herkömmlichen Sinne des Begriffs) ein privilegierterer Referent ist als jeder andere Referent. Es gibt keine schlüssig begründete hermeneutische Kompetenz, den optimalen Referenten unter den Quellentexten (d.h. dem

Prototext von 1939 und seinen späteren Varianten) zu nennen. Es gibt keine schlüssig begründete hermeneutische Kompetenz, die die Ansprüche in eine Rangordnung zu bringen vermag, z.B. durch Angabe von Fehlinterpretationen. Mit anderen Worten: Es gibt keine einheitlichen Kriterien für die Festlegung einer Hierarchie der hermeneutischen Kompetenz über FW als einen literarischen Text. Die bestehenden Modelle hierarchischer Kompetenz sind entweder extraliterarisch (d.h. sie befassen sich nicht primär mit FW als literarischem Text) oder inkonsistent.

Zu den inkonsistenten Modellen gehören solche, die sich auf verschiedene Argumente (z.B. Autoritätsargument, Argumentum ad populum) stützen. Andere inkonsistente Modelle verwenden Ergometrie (Einstufung von Ansprüchen nach dem Arbeitszeitaufwand), intellektuelle Ästhetik (z.B. Einstufung von Ansprüchen nach ihrem Idiom oder Stil), formale Marker (z.B. Einordnung von Ansprüchen nach dem akademischen Grad des Befürworters), aber sie erklären nicht, wie man Konflikte zwischen Exegeten auf dem gleichen Niveau in einer Hierarchie beurteilen soll. Sie erklären auch nicht, wie man Ansprüche (i) die—zusätzlich zu ihrer anfänglichen Vagheit—nicht vergleichbar sind, und (ii) die scheinbar gleichwertig sind, aber mit unterschiedlichen Mitteln gemacht werden, und (iii) die scheinbar unterschiedlich sind, allerdings mit gleichwertigen Mitteln gemacht werden, kategorisieren soll.

Diese Beschreibung des Systems stellt das Paradigma der hierarchischen hermeneutischen Kompetenz in Frage, das in der Joyce-Industrie angenommen wurde. In ihrer Hierarchie ist die akademische Interpretationskompetenz im Durchschnitt überlegen. Drei wichtige Grundsätze wurden in der Joyce-Industrie aktiv gefördert: (i) das Textprinzip, das besagt, dass FW ein prosaischer Text ist, ein Musterbeispiel der Literatur; (ii) das Autorenprinzip, das besagt, dass der Text das Werk von James Joyce ist; und (iii) das Sprachprinzip, das besagt, dass die Sprache des Textes Englisch ist.

Gegen den Text und die Autorenprinzipien stellt Kapitel 1 FW als eine weitgehend polyauktoriale und polytextuelle Polyreferenz dar. In Kapitel 2, in dem das Sprachprinzip diskutiert wird, wird die Position vertreten, dass die Sprache des Quellentextes unbekannt ist. Da Kapitel 3 das akademische Paradigma der Kompetenz diskutiert und es als inkonsistent bezeichnet, bietet es auch eine Antwort auf die Frage, warum die Joyce-Industrie akademische Kompetenz als überlegen vorgeschlagen hat: Die primäre Motivation war nämlich extraliterarisch. Die Dissertation ruft dazu auf, das Paradigma zu revidieren, indem die Industrie den Vorteil ihrer Kontrolle über die literarische Interpretation von FW bennent oder ihre extraliterarische Motivation zugibt.