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This dissertation considers *Finnegans Wake* as a deconstructive writing that exemplifies many of the textual operations that the French critical theorist Jacques Derrida attempts to define through his use of such "undecidable" terms and "non-concepts" as "différence," "dissemination," "trace," and "grafting." It argues that the *Wake* operates much like the "bifurcated writing" and "grouped textual field" that Derrida identifies as the only possible site for a deconstructive engagement of the terms and concepts of the Western metaphysical tradition, the tradition that Derrida terms phallogocentrism. The *Wake* has been an important text in the critical formulations of many contemporary theorists, and, as Derrida has recently acknowledged, his own theories of dissemination and deconstruction have been considerably affected by the *Wake* during the twenty-five to thirty years that he has been learning to read it. In drawing on Derrida's theories to analyze the *Wake*, this dissertation utilizes Derrida's terms to "re-mark" in Joyce's text, the disseminative textual operations that Derrida has marked as operative in the texts of the history of philosophy and in "so-called literary" texts like *Finnegans Wake*. In a certain sense, it renders unto Joyce's text that which has always already belonged to it.

Drawing on Derrida's investigation of speech and writing, the dissertation considers the *Wake* 's identification of itself as a fusion of speech and writing that requires a "speechreading" on the part of its
readers. It supports this consideration by employing Umberto Eco's semiotic methodology to trace the network of metonymic lexemes by which the *Wake* identifies itself as a writing for the ear as well as the eye. Next it analyzes the *Wake*'s tenth chapter as a chapter that exploits the formula $1+2+3+4=10$ and produces a writing that operates as an arithmetical textual machine which problematizes the traditional concepts of presence and being and which also works towards dislodging the phallogocentric organization of writing with such hierarchically organized binary terms as male/female and central/marginal.

In order to illustrate how the *Wake* disseminatively disrupts the binary terms by which phallogocentrism dominates thought, speech, and writing, the dissertation also considers how Joyce's text functions in an intertextual relationship with some of the writings of Blake and Shakespeare. It does this by analyzing how the *Wake* dismantles some of the philosophical paradigms operating in the Blake and Shakespeare texts and takes important signifiers from those texts in order to set them to work as signifiers of signifieds that are radically different from those in the texts of Blake and Shakespeare.
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Introduction

This dissertation examines James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* in the light of post-structuralist critical theory and, in particular, from a vantage point afforded by the deconstructive theory of writing formulated by the French philosopher and critic, Jacques Derrida. The thesis of the dissertation is that *Finnegans Wake*, as a practice of writing, is a deconstructive text which exemplifies such key textual and intertextual operations as "*différance*," dissemination, "hymeneal fusion," "triggering," and "grafting," operations that Jacques Derrida details and employs in his deconstructive strategies. The dissertation analyzes parts of the *Wake* in an attempt to show how it functions as what Derrida calls a "grouped textual field," or a "bifurcated writing" in which the hierarchically arranged terms of binary opposition that Derrida sees as the controlling terms of the Western metaphysical tradition are disrupted, inverted and reinscribed in a writing that challenges our traditional notions of the relationship between speech and writing and "the entire system attached to it."^2

It is not anachronistic to label the *Wake* a deconstructive text. Although the term did not come into vogue in critical terminology until some thirty years after its publication, Joyce's final work has had a profound impact on, and functioned as a model for, the formulation of
contemporary critical theory. As Gregory Ulmer comments, it is viewed by both Derrida and the semiotic theoretician, Umberto Eco, as the "touchstone for thinking about language in our time." There can be no doubt that the developments of Eco's semiotic theory and Derrida's practice of deconstruction owe a great deal to Joyce's innovations in language. Eco sees the *Wake* presenting itself "as an excellent model of a Global Semantic System" that "posits itself, quite explicitly, as the Ersatz of the historical universe of language." *Finnegans Wake*, he contends, "is itself a metaphor for the process of unlimited semiosis." Eco also agrees with David Hayman's assessment of the *Wake*'s pedagogical value as an "open" or, to use Roland Barthes's term, "writerly" text. Hayman believes the *Wake* is valuable because it "invite[s] the reader to perpetuate creation." Eco states:

> The search for "open" models capable of guaranteeing and founding the mutation and the growth and, finally, the vision of a universe founded on possibility, as contemporary philosophy and science suggest to the imagination, encounters perhaps its most provoking and violent representation—perhaps its anticipation—in *Finnegans Wake*.

The impact of the *Wake* upon Derrida's deconstructive theory was, until recently, a little harder to establish because, unlike Eco, Derrida has written little directly about the work. An indirect influence through the work of Philippe Sollers—the French writer whose work owes so much to the *Wake*—is apparent in *Dissemination*, but Joyce's influence upon the leader of the deconstruction movement was, as J. Hillis Miller comments, a direct if unacknowledged influence:
There is little that deconstructive theory of narrative knows about the undecidability of words or of story lines which Joyce did not already know . . . the work of Jacques Derrida has been much influenced, though rather covertly, by his reading of *Finnegans Wake* during a crucial formative year he spent at Harvard during the mid 1950s.

In 1984, however, Derrida allowed the translation and publication of an extemporary talk that he gave in Paris during November of 1982. "Two Words for Joyce" is remarkable as an example of how the major figure in deconstructive theory analyzes parts of the *Wake*, but it is, perhaps, equally remarkable in revealing how much impact Joyce's *Wake* has had on Derrida's work:

Our admiration for Joyce ought to have no limit, no more than should the debt owed to the singular event of his work . . . . You're not only overcome by him, whether you know it or not, but obliged by him, and constrained to measure yourself against this overcoming. Being in memory of him: not necessarily to remember him, no, but to be in his memory, to inhabit his memory, which is henceforth greater than all your finite memory can, in a single instant or single vocable, gather up of cultures, languages, mythologies, religions, philosophies, sciences, history of mind and of literatures . . . . [E]very time I write, and even in the most academic of pieces of work, Joyce's ghost is always coming on board.

It is important to note that the term "ghost" should not be taken as carrying connotations of shadowy, insubstantial, or unreal in a discourse organized according to the concepts of subject, reader, theme, writer, and substance; in Derrida's discourse, the term comes perhaps as close as any other to signifying a major force, in part because of Derrida's fundamental, deconstructive technique of problematizing and calling into question many of the traditional terms that writers--and particularly
"literary" writers—take for granted. The most obvious of these is "being," a term that, Derrida insists, should always be placed "under erasure" and written as Đeing\(^{(10)}\). Along with this term, all terms that are traditionally used to signify some sort of presence are suspect. "To Be," for example, becomes a problematic sign. Once capable of assuring "the West of the validity of all of its fantasies of mastery (including the mastery of its fantasies)," "to be" becomes, for Derrida, a "oneness [that] designates neither undifferentiated (con)fusion nor identity at perfect rest; the is that couples . . . must rip apart."\(^{(11)}\) Similarly, many of the terms traditionally used in the study of literature are, for Derrida, part of an "old theatrical organization [that] has become unjustifiable . . . the author, the reader . . . the actor, the characters . . . have no single, unique, fixed place . . . . Any attempt to return toward the untouched, proper intimacy of some presence or some self-presence is played out in illusion."\(^{(12)}\) "I," for example, ceases to be the signifier of a speaker and becomes, instead, a textual function, a "pure passageway for operations of substitution . . . not some singular and irreplaceable existence, some subject or 'life', but only, moving between life and death, reality and fiction, etc., a mere function or phantom."\(^{(13)}\)

For Derrida, "ghost" and "phantom" are signifiers of textual operations. Because "the outside [of the text] is the inside," and because there is no outside to the text, no final signified that will arrest the play of the sign, these terms, like all other signs, have no referent outside of language, but reference only within it:
The referent is lifted, but reference remains: what is left is only the writing of dreams, a fiction that is not imaginary, mimicry without imitation, without verisimilitude, without truth or falsity, a miming of appearance without concealed reality, without any world behind it.\footnote{14}

Derrida's statement that the "ghost" of Joyce is "always coming on board" should not be interpreted as signifying the same thing as Hillis Miller's contention that Joyce has "much influenced" Derrida. For Hillis Miller, the relationship is of one writer's influence upon another; for Derrida, it is an intertextual relationship. As Leon Roudiez states, intertextuality "has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon another, or with the sources of a literary work." An intertextual relationship involves the "components of a textual system."\footnote{15} It is defined by Julia Kristeva as

> the transposition of one or more systems of signs into another, accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position. Any SIGNIFYING PRACTICE \ldots{} is a field (in the sense of space traversed by lines of force) in which various signifying systems undergo such a transposition.\footnote{16}

While recognizing the importance of the historical event to which Hillis Miller refers, this dissertation will not concern itself directly with either Derrida's allusions to Joyce, or the establishment of a frame of reference for Joyce's influence upon the formulation of Derrida's deconstructive theory. These tasks, if they are to be undertaken, belong more properly to the biographer and the historical critic concerned with the development of ideas and the establishment of sources. The present
study is more concerned with the signs "Joyce" and "Derrida" as signifiers of different textual signifying practices that perform strikingly similar textual operations. Indeed, it is these similarities that this study will attempt to demonstrate as a justification of its deconstructive analysis of parts of Finnegans Wake. In "set[ting] to work," to use a Derridean phrase, certain of the "marks" that the Derridean text has already "set to work" ("within the text of the history of philosophy as well as within the so-called literary text"), this analysis will, in a deconstructive sense, attempt a "double mark," or a "re-marking," within that portion of the "Joyce" signifying practice signified by Finnegans Wake, of the textual operations that the Derridean text has already "re-marked" in the text of writing in general. To state the thesis of this dissertation in the terms of post-structuralist criticism: a powerful force in the textual practice of Finnegans Wake is the impulse that functions in the self-referential articulation of the text's enunciation and denotation of its own status as a decentered and open system of signification; this impulse operates in the text signified by "Derrida," and the Derridean text transposes the Wake's signifying practice into its own system, "re-marking"--as it traverses the lines of force in its own open, decentered, textual space--the textual movements and operations that are already at work within the signifying play of the Joycean text. Using "marks" from the Derridean text to signify certain operations within the play of the Wake's system of signs will thus be a "re-marking," or a "double stroke," by which the Wake's textual operations, already at work in the Derridean text ("Joyce's ghost" is already "on board"), will be folded back to mark themselves again.
Since its publication in 1939, *Finnegans Wake* has been subjected to almost every conceivable kind of literary analysis. Following the first impressive efforts by Joseph Campbell and Henry Morton Robinson to establish a "key" to the characters, plots, and themes of the *Wake*, scholars such as William York Tindall, Clive Hart, Michael H. Begnal and Grace Eckley, Bernard Benstock, and Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon, have tirelessly continued to assist Joyce's readers in their attempts at understanding the narrative and characters of the work. Bibliographic and textual scholars like James Atherton, David Hayman, Clive Hart, Thomas E. Connolly, Adeline Glasheen, Louis Mink, and Roland McHugh have established many of the sources for much of the material Joyce used in the *Wake*, and some of them have reconstructed Joyce's method of composition, demonstrating how the *Wake* was written and revised. One branch of the Joyce critical industry is devoted to compiling lexicons of the more than forty languages and dialectical variations that Joyce employed in writing the work, and with the publication of each new word list, Joyce's achievement becomes more accessible to the average reader. Studies of the *Wake* proliferate at a rate that might challenge even Joyce's "ideal reader suffering from an ideal insomnia" (120.13-14). The cumulative effect of this scholarship has been the gradual development of a fuller understanding of the *Wake*'s genesis as a novel: its plots and characters, and its narrative and thematic structures. As Margot Norris comments, it is "thanks to the patient toil of its dedicated explicators" that "the contours of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* have gradually come into focus."
While the *Wake* has occupied the attention of so many scholars in the more than forty-five years since its publication, it has also challenged many of the assumptions upon which their scholarly pursuits are based. In discussing Joyce's political use of language, for example, Colin MacCabe argues that Joyce's use of language subverts the reader's notions of the very act of reading. While we traditionally consider reading as a "passive" process, MacCabe argues, "with Joyce it becomes an active metamorphosis, a constant displacement in language." Reading as "metamorphosis" and "displacement" calls into question the aims of the traditional literary activities of interpretation and criticism:

This metamorphosis and displacement presents literary criticism with its own impossibility. Interpretation as the search for meaning must cease when both meaning and interpreter become functions of the traverse of the material of language.22

Norris also views the impact of the *Wake* upon critics and scholars as one which poses a challenge. She views the reactions to this challenge as differing responses from "conservative" and "radical" critics:

A radical interpretation would maintain that Finnegans *Wake* subverts not only the literary status quo but the most cherished intellectual preconceptions of Western culture as well.23

Until the development of structuralist and post-structuralist theory, however, writers who wished to assert a radical interpretation of the *Wake's* teleology were defeated by the lack of an intellectual framework in which to present their arguments. As a result, *Wake* criticism has
been "dominated" by "conservative" critics, who, "in contrast" to their more radical counterparts, "possess a small but scholarly arsenal." Norris catalogues this arsenal as

the stylistic and thematic conservatism of the early manuscript drafts, the inclusion of traditional, even arcane, literary material in the work, Joyce's admission that the work's structural and philosophical models are derived from [Bruno] and [Vico] and, finally, Joyce's own decidedly reactionary tastes.24

A central focus of the dispute between radical and conservative critical approaches to the Wake is the nature of the text. For the most part, those critics to whom Norris refers as conservative have persisted in approaching the Wake as a novel. Campbell and Robinson, for example, recognize the inherent difficulties in the Wake's language, but argue that the persistent reader need only pick up "a few compass clues and [get] his bearings." Then, they contend, "some of the difficulties disappear" and the Wake becomes approachable in the traditional terms of the novel form:

Then the enormous map . . . begins slowly to unfold, characters and motifs emerge, themes become recognizable . . . . As the tale unfolds, we discover that this H.C. Earwicker is a citizen of Dublin . . . . He emerges as a well-defined and sympathetic character . . . the principal action takes place in Dublin and its environs.25

Almost 20 years after this first major study, Bernard Benstock expresses his many "reservations" about it, but finds no problem with essentially a novelistic approach to the Wake: "like most revolutionary aspects
of the novel, Joyce's Revolution of the Word is actually a romance of the word." Elsewhere, Benstock terms it a "comic novel." Some ten years later, in 1975, Begnal and Eckley investigate the Narrator and Character in Finnegans Wake, and, as Benstock notes in his foreword to their studies, their fundamental assumption is that "Joyce's book is an exercise in narrative fiction, in addition to whatever else it contains . . . . [i]t is a novel with a plotline and characters, and it is organized along artistic lines of development." At about the same time as the Begnal and Eckley studies, Begnal and Senn edited a collection of thirteen essays from major Joyce scholars. While admitting that a "variety of critical stances seems to be virtually essential for dealing" with the Wake, Begnal, in summarizing the essays as a "unified body of work," reiterates the view of Finnegans Wake as a "many leveled novel." Rose and O'Hanlon's Understanding Finnegans Wake illustrates the dilemma that is evident in the novelistic view of Finnegans Wake. This study begins with the thesis that

Finnegans Wake . . . remains the least understood book of all time . . . . If [it] stands alone, unread, its surface as it were hardly scratched, this is not altogether the fault of Joyce: a good deal of the blame lies with a literary tradition which has remained too constricted and inflexible and which has resisted the incorporation into its arsenal of the accumulated wisdom, methodology and philosophy of the physical and social sciences . . . . Finnegans Wake stands as a model universe, illustrating by example, while at the same time commenting upon, a newly discovered language: the language of night or the unconscious. Rose and O'Hanlon support this thesis by pointing out that the Wake was not written in an novelistic style with a linear plot organized in chronological development with recognizable, developing characters--what
Joyce referred to as "cutanddry grammer" and "goahead plot"—but according to Freud's mechanisms of association, condensation, and displacement. Despite this helpful introduction, when they deal with the process of reading and understanding the Wake, the body of their work demonstrates the essential dilemma of a novelistic approach to it—they suspend their recognition that the Freudian mechanisms "operate at all levels throughout Finnegans Wake" and approach it as a novelistic narrative about characters involved in a plot:

On the level of its overall narrative, the book, like all books, can be viewed as a succession of events, confrontations and interactions among characters, descriptive passages, and illustrations of ideas.

As their subsequent elucidation of how the reader is to "understand" the Wake demonstrates, their relegating of the dream-work mechanisms to a secondary status leaves them no alternative but to embrace the Wake as a "novel," albeit one of "encyclopaedic power."

Fundamental to the tradition of Joyce scholars who view the work as a novel or some variation thereof is the question of the Wake's content. As Atherton points out in The Books at the Wake, the question "What is it about?" is the fundamental question of criticism on the Wake. Even Benstock, who attempts to dismiss the question as a "horror," conjuring up "in the flesh . . . that digest reader who pathetically requests a paraphrase," concedes that it is one "of the most basic questions," adding that it still, in 1965, "remain[s] unanswered." Twenty years later, we are in only a slightly better situation. Indeed, the view of the Wake as a novelistic structure seems to automatically lead to the
assumption that it must tell a story about somebody doing something. 35 This, of course, is a totally reasonable assumption, given that the structure of the novel and its mimetic narrative form is a historical descendent of the classical, heroic, epic form. 36 It is worth noting, however, that critics who argue that the work is a novel prefer its mimetic, narrative, impulse over the self-reflective modes of its discourse. Other critics—for example Tindall, who contends that the Wake "is hardly" a novel—argue that Finnegans Wake is highly self-reflective and "about Finnegans Wake . . . about putting everything down in records and interpreting them" (emphasis added). "Putting . . . down . . . and interpreting" are, of course, reading and writing. The Wake, Tindall notes, is "lacking overt narrative," or "narrative, which, leading us along, holds parts together while it offers them and fixes our attention.

Tindall's is one of those studies which Norris refers to as a "radical interpretation," and it is part of a small, but important, collection of Wake studies that this dissertation takes as the foundation for its own examination of the Wake. Starting with the collection of essays that Joyce himself encouraged—Our Exagmination Round His Factification For Incamation Of Work In Progress—these studies have set aside questions of genre and taxonomy in favour of examining what Norris refers to as "those elements of the work that resist novelistic analysis."39 These elements include the techniques of association, condensation, and displacement with which Joyce tried "to tell the story of this Chapelizod family in a new way," but, perhaps more
importantly, they also include what this study takes to be the Wake's major character: the language "that is not language in any sense of the world" (83.12).

One of the first writers to assert that the Wake is not about plot or character, in the sense that about is often used in such contexts, was Samuel Beckett:

> Here form is content, content is form. You complain that this stuff is not written in English. It is not written at all. It is not to be read—or rather it is not only to be read. It is to be looked at and listened to. His writing is not about something; it is that something itself.

For Beckett, the achievement of the Wake is linguistic. Its writing is a "quintessential extraction of language and painting and gesture" in a practice that "desophisticate[s] English." "Here," he contended, "is the savage economy of hieroglyphics . . . [the] words are not the polite contortions of 20th century printer's ink. They are alive."41

Beckett's view of the vitalism of the Wake's language was shared by Joyce's friend Eugene Jolas, who connected the developments of "the new artist of the word" with an expanded knowledge of the psychic mechanisms:

> The discovery of the subconscious . . . as a new field for magical explorations and comprehensions should have made it apparent that the instrument of language in its archaic condition could no longer be used. Modern life with its changed mythos and transmuted concepts of beauty makes it imperative that words be given new compositions and relationships.

> James Joyce . . . has given a body blow to the traditionalists.42
As the title of his article suggests, Jolas saw in Joyce's writing a "revolution of language," a process he described in terms that could also be applied to Derrida's practice of deconstruction. It is a process by which words are subjected to a "disintergration . . . and subsequent reconstruction on other planes."43

Norris points out that Jolas was a writer who was "extraordinarily sensitive" to the currents of intellectual change in approaches to language that constituted the modernist movement, and she notes that Jolas linked Joyce with the "literary experimentalists" of the time. Jolas connected Joyce with

Leon-Paul Fargue ... [who] created astonishing neologisms in his prose poems ... slashed syllables ... built new words ... and ... [left a] large place ... to the dream as a means for verbal decomposition .... The revolution of the surrealists, who destroyed completely the old relationships between words and thought .... Michel Leiris [who attacked] usefulness as an aim [for language] ... and .... etymology [as] a perfectly vain science .... Andre Breton ... [who] discovered a world of magic in the study of the dream via the Freudian explorations.44

The approaches to language that Jolas detailed in these writers are all apt descriptions of some of Joyce's techniques in the Wake.

Unlike the scholars whom Norris classifies as conservative, then, Beckett and Jolas emphasized the Wake as a linguistic achievement in which language functions not to tell a story or effect a mimetic presentation of character, but as a mythos of its own existence. Echoing, perhaps, the modernist, avant-garde, cry of art for art's sake, they see content as form in an autonomous linguistic structure fusing sound and
writing. In a passage that anticipates Derrida's philosophical investigation of language, Jolas linked language with metaphysics and argued that the use of language as a tool for the communication of non-linguistic experience is defeated by the artistic recognition of language as an autonomous structure:

The real metaphysical problem today is the word. The epoch when the writer photographed the life about him with the mechanics of words redolent of the daguerreotype, is happily drawing to its close. The new artist of the word has recognized the autonomy of language and, aware of the twentieth century current toward universality, attempts to hammer out a verbal vision that destroys space and time.45

A return to the concerns of the earlier writers was signalled in 1962 by Hart's *Structure and Motif*, a work that sees in the "doubletalk inherent in [the *Wake*]'s symbolic language" "a remarkable and often unstable duality of art-for-art's sake and personal confession."46 Hart's study demonstrates how inadequate linear and chronological paradigms of plot are for understanding the work. Instead of developing characters whose actions constitute a plot that may be linearly graphed, the *Wake*, as Hart sees it, is a series of often interchangeable binary poles "generated by cycles of constantly varied repetition--'The seim anew', as Joyce puts it." It is worth noting that this principle of differing repetitions, which Hart sees generating the "primary energy" of the *Wake*'s polarities, is not unlike Derrida's "*différance*."47 Repetition presupposes an identity of some kind between that which is repeated and its repetition; variation in the repetition introduces an element of difference into the relationship. There is thus both identity and difference involved in the process.
Norris' study is, in some ways, a continuation of Hart's attempt to establish the roots of the *Wake*'s structure. Unlike Hart's study, however, *The Decentered Universe of Finnegans Wake* draws on a considerable body of structuralist and post-structuralist critical theory. Where Hart has to formulate his own theories, as he does, for example, in analyzing the structural device of the *leitmotiv*, Norris draws on the theories of Heidegger, Freud, Lévi-Strauss, Barthes, and Derrida. The fact that Hart had to formulate his own theory by drawing on those "scattered here and there as subsidiary matters in studies of wider scope" lends support to Norris' contention about earlier critics lacking "tools for critical investigation . . . to examine . . . those aspects of [the *Wake*] that resist novelistic analysis." Their respective considerations of the *Wake* as dream reveals the critical limitations of Hart's study. Although Hart wishes to deal with what he calls the "dream-structure" as a device for linguistic organization, his reliance on novelistic paradigms leaves him no choice but to deal with it as a narrative content similar to the events recited by the narrator of a conventional novel:

"Like the anonymous narrator of more conventional 'third-person' novels, the Dreamer is omniscient; we are involved in his dream as we are involved in any narrative."

In contrast, Norris uses the theories of Lacan and Lévi-Strauss to explore the dream as a process of a psychic structure that is already involved with language. Instead of attempting to deal with the *Wake*'s dream as a linguistic representation of the unconscious structure in the
terms of form and content, she is able to explore it with the knowledge that the preconscious and the unconscious derive their status from linguistic structure:

In Clive Hart's dream layers, the unconscious is depicted as full, as content, as a repository of . . . anxieties . . . memories . . . and the totality of personal history that becomes available to the conscious mind of the subject as he simply sinks deeper into sleep. In contrast . . . Levi-Strauss and Jacques Lacan have urged the reconsideration of these psychic processes in terms of language, by distinguishing the preconscious as the storage place . . . the personal . . . lexicon . . . and the unconscious . . . as the function by which laws are imposed on this vocabulary to make it meaningful. 50

Like The Decentered Universe, Colin MacCabe's James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word draws on the theories of Jacques Lacan for its analysis of the Wake. It, too, adopts the view of the Wake as a revolutionary and subversive practice of writing, a view that was first formulated, as we have seen, by Jolas and Beckett. For MacCabe, however, Joyce's writing constitutes a political, rather than purely artistic, creative endeavour. MacCabe's study is, in fact, a much stronger restatement of the autonomy of Joyce's language than The Decentered Universe. While Norris contends that Joyce, in writing the Wake, confirmed the "impossibility of metalanguage, that is, the impossibility of making a critique in language of the epistemology embedded in language," she does not find this impossibility incompatible with representation in language. In the Wake's "bizarre distorted language," she comments, "are lodged all of Joyce's immense, but thoroughly familiar, preoccupations: the Dublin of his youth, familial relationships, sexual obsessions, bits of military and political history." MacCabe, on the other hand, while
agreeing that there is an "absence of a metalanguage . . . from [Joyce's] earliest writings," contends that representation is directly dependent on the presence of a metalanguage:

the discourse of literary criticism must always be able to identify what is represented, independently of the form of representation. This identification is only possible if the discourse of the critic is in the position to transform the text into content, and, to undertake this transformation, the relationship between the language of the text and the language of the critic must be that which obtains between an object and a metalanguage . . . . It is from the position of the metalanguage that correspondence between word and world can be established.

For MacCabe, the critical attempt to determine the meaning of the *Wake*, to establish its content and state that it is about this or that, will always be defeated by the practice of writing the reader experiences as he or she traverses the text of the *Wake*. Because the *Wake* operates as a continual deformation of recognizable etymological forms—a process it describes as "the abnihilisation of the etym" (353.22)—and a subsequent reformation of these into a series of polysemous puns, many of which combine opposing or contradictory semantic values, the reader must choose between two approaches: either attempting to identify the often disparate etymological and semantic forms that are fused into so many of the *Wake*'s textual units—in which case he or she is reading not only the *Wake* but also a product of his or her own operation upon it—or attempting to align each of the forms with an extra-textual experience and/or object, a process that results in a limiting of the *Wake*'s semiosis. Both of these possibilities are dependent on what MacCabe calls the "essential homogeneity of experience" that will afford a position from
which the elements of either textual or extra-textual experience can be defined and then aligned with each other in order to establish representation. Given the essential heterogeneity of the Wake's discourse, the task is problematic, to say the least; given that experience is also heterogeneous, it becomes impossible to define a one-to-one correspondence of representation between the work of the Wake and the world of the reader. As MacCabe notes, the Wake refuses "the subject any dominant position from which language could be tallied with experience." It is concerned "not with representing experience through language but with experiencing language through a destruction of representation."52

Like the studies by Norris and MacCabe, this dissertation will examine the Wake from the viewpoints first formulated by Jolas and Beckett. It will consider the Wake, not as a development of the novel form, but as a practice of writing that offers its readers a number of elements which, according to Norris, "resist novelistic analysis." In so doing, it will attempt to fill a gap in Wake criticism that results from what MacCabe terms "the persistant refusal of commentators to engage with the radical novelty of Joyce's work." Unlike The Revolution of the Word, however, this dissertation does not dismiss novelistic analysis of the Wake as a process by which "Joyce's texts are transformed into complicated crossword puzzles whose solution is the banal liberal humanism of the critic." Instead, it gratefully accepts and uses many of the insights into the Wake that the previous scholars and critics who have analyzed the work as a novel provide in their explication of it. At the same time, it recognizes that the difficulties which the Wake poses to its readers are many and assumes that thematic criticism and novelistic
analysis cannot, in themselves, constitute an adequate theoretical practice for meeting them. As MacCabe notes, such "literary criticism . . . cannot cope with Joyce's text [because] the [text] refuse[s] to reproduce the relation between reader and text on which literary criticism is based." This dissertation employs the theories of Derrida to analyze the *Wake* because they continually take into account the problematic nature of the reader-text relation. If, as this dissertation attempts to demonstrate, Derrida's deconstructive textual strategies do, in fact, constitute what those strategies would term a "re-marking" of the Joycean text, then their reproduction of the readertext relationship (inscribed first in the *Wake* and then re-inscribed in the Derridean text) should help facilitate an understanding of the Joycean text-Joycean reader relation that the *Wake* inscribes.

Norris places what she terms the "literary heterodoxy of *Finnegans Wake*" within the context of a major historical change in the concept of structure that Derrida defines as a "rupture," a "decentering . . . [a] thinking the structurality of structure." A result of "Joyce's attack on the traditional concept of structure," the *Wake*'s "heterodoxy" marks the work's participation in what Derrida terms the "revolutions in philosophy, in science, [and] in literature . . . . [that] can be interpreted as shocks that are gradually destroying the linear model. Which is to say the epic model." Norris' critical perspective, however, is a combination of structuralism and deconstruction, and while the philosophical orientation of *The Decentered Universe* is acknowledged as Derridean and does allow a consideration of the *Wake*’s revolutionary role, its structural analysis does not produce a reading of the work that such a philosophical perspective demands. For Derrida, such a reading
is ... a question of reading what wrote itself between the lines in the volume ... one begins ... to reread past writing according to a different organization of space .... Because we are beginning to write, to write differently, we must reread differently.

Derrida's deconstruction engages "what wrote [and writes] itself between the lines" as the "trace": "the becoming-unmotivated of the symbol ... an operation and not a state ... an active movement, a demotivation, and not ... a given structure." The trace, as Derrida's discourse continually emphasizes, is not a signifier of any thing and cannot be described in the traditional philosophical terms of presence or essence: "What the thought of the trace has already taught us," Of Grammatology states, "is that it could not be simply submitted to the onto-phenomenological question of essence. The trace is nothing, it is not an entity, it exceeds the question What is? and contingently makes it possible." Deconstructive engagement of a text requires that those signs in it which traditionally function as signifiers of presence—proper names, all forms of the verb "to be," for example—receive attention primarily as textual signifiers and secondarily as simulacra that feign the present as they participate in the production of illusion. The text functions, not as a record of extra-textual experience or as a transparent linguistic vehicle in which a 'being' expresses his or her ideas, but as an "apparatus [that] explains itself" and "also reads its explanation, which is not some discourse emanating from somewhere else that would, outside the text, come to comment, interpret, decipher ... teach, or inform about the technical secrets of its assemblage."
Norris employs Derrida's writing in order to describe the *Wake* as a "freeplay that makes characters, times, places, and actions interchangeable . . . that breaks down the all-important distinction between the self and other, and that makes uncertainty a governing principle of the work," but she does not do this until the end of her primarily structuralist analysis. As a result, there is a contradiction created between the way in which she analyzes the *Wake*'s structure and her concluding assessment of it as a decentered freeplay governed by uncertainty. This contradiction is noted by Mary Robertson, who offers the valid, albeit somewhat problematic, argument that:

The most serious problem with her book is her failure even to acknowledge that the structuralist view of myth and post-structuralist "freeplay" tend to be theoretical antagonists that can be accommodated [sic] to each other only with difficulty, if at all . . . . Norris ignores . . . the very different connotations of the word "decentered" in structuralist and post-structuralist circles . . . . although she invokes Derridean theory, [she] makes no attempt to demonstrate that Derridean figures disrupt . . . balanced structuralist figures in the *Wake*.

Nevertheless, there is much in Norris' study that is valuable to an understanding of the *Wake*. This study adopts Norris' insights on Derridean theory, and, taking what conventional scholars might call a radical approach, attempts to demonstrate the validity of her description of the *Wake*'s decenteredness through deconstructive analysis.

The next chapter of the dissertation begins a deconstructive analysis by considering the *Wake*'s extensive exploitation of paronomasias and its staging of the relationship between speech and writing. It argues that the *Wake* works toward a dislodging and overturning of the hierarchical
relationship between speech and writing, a relationship which operates as a fundamental organizing paradigm of the Western phallogocentric tradition. By staging itself as "soundconducting" (183.09) and as a "study" "as you sing it" (489.33), the Wake offers the possibility that it is to be heard as well as read. Many commentators have noted that the Wake has a strong aural element, and the next chapter considers this aural element from a deconstructive perspective. It begins by considering some of the comments on the Wake's aural qualities made by both Joyce himself and Joyce scholars. Next, it outlines the notion of linguistic autonomy that emerged in the nineteenth century and influenced modernist theories of language in order to provide an historical and philosophical context for understanding Joyce's attempt at fusing speech and writing. It then employs Umberto Eco's semiotic method for investigating the Wake as a model of the historical universe of language and applies this method in tracing out the semiotic network of lexemes with which the Wake identifies itself as writing involved with speech, an aural writing to be heard as well as read. Finally, it considers the Wake as a "soundconducting" writing operating as the kind of "bifurcated writing" that works toward simultaneously "dislodging" and "overturning" the phallogocentric categories of speech and writing. This "dislodging" and "overturning" "bifurcated" inscription is characteristic of deconstructive texts.

The third chapter of the dissertation focuses on the tenth chapter of the Wake and analyzes it from the Derridean perspective of writing as a textual operation that can function according to arithmetical principles. It begins with a general consideration of some of the more
obvious deconstructive techniques operative in this most marginal—in all
senses of the word—yet central chapter of the *Wake*. Next it outlines
how Chapter 10 operates according to the relationship between the one and
zero of ten and by exploiting the formula $1+2+3+4=10$. This formula
operates in the four sets of inscription and in the three-plus-one
arrangement of marginal and central discourse. The three-plus-one
formula also operates in the *Wake's* establishment of a deconstructive
"plupresent" tense, and Chapter Three considers the operation of the
formula in the production of this tense. Chapter Three also considers
the *Wake's* pedagogical impulse from the vantage point afforded by
Derrida's contention that "reading and writing are one . . . . reading is
writing [in a] oneness [that] designates neither undifferentiated
(con)fusion nor identify at perfect rest; the is that couples reading
with writing must rip apart." It argues that passages such as "Pose the
pen, man, way me does" (303.2-3) function not only as a simulacrum of
conversation between the two mimetically depicted brothers Shem and
Shaun, but also as immotivated symbols with which the text explains
itself and poses its own relation to its reader. In support of this
argument, it solicits the chapter at the level of the letter and examines
how individual letters function in a play of Derridean différence, as
both signs and symbols. The double function of the letters—a double
function that also operates in the *Wake's* designation of itself as a
letter in both the sense of an epistle and an individual unit of an
alphabet—produces a deconstructive "(con)fusion" of mimetic discourse
and self-reflective writing.
The function of individual texts as intertexts is an important concern of deconstructive criticism, and the fourth chapter of the dissertation examines parts of the *Wake* in order to demonstrate how the *Wake* operates as a disseminative intertext. The chapter considers two of the *Wake*’s intertextual relationships. In the first part, it attempts to define the *Wake*’s intertextual involvement with some of the writings of William Blake. After detailing some of the previous studies of the Joyce-Blake relationship and outlining the critical paradigms operative in these studies, the chapter analyzes how the *Wake* deconstructively reinscribes fragments from the Blake text into its own textual play. In the second part, the chapter focuses upon one fragment from Shakespeare's *Macbeth*—the drunken porter scene—and outlines how this fragment is disseminated in the *Wake*’s narrative of HCE and ALP. This scene is, of course, important in *Macbeth*, but the *Wake* gives it more emphasis that it has in the tale of Macbeth's tragic downfall. The fourth chapter attempts to demonstrate how the *Wake* employs deconstructive techniques in order to render what was a relatively marginal passage, in its original form, a powerful intertextual force in both the narrative of HCE and the *Wake*’s staging of the text-reader relationship.

The dissertation concludes, in Chapter Five, with a brief review of its central points and a condensation of these into a synoptic view of the *Wake* as a deconstructive text. It considers Joyce's achievement in the light of Derrida's comments on the Western tradition of writing as a metaphysical tradition organized according to the model of the line and dominated by the concepts of paternity, presence, and truth, and compares his definition of this tradition's masculinist economy with the *Wake*'s
determination of its own language as a female force. Noting Spivak's construing of Derrida's "hymeneal fable" as a "feminist gesture" and Solomon's reading of Joyce "graphically" and "insistently" "offering us ... his 'geomater'," the dissertation ends with a speculation on the possibility of reading the *Wake* as a gynocentric discourse produced by a male writer who writes from the position of the other. As Philippe Sollers states:

> in female paranoia there is a foreclosure of the word, the verb, which signs a kind of absolute impossibility of acceding to the symbolic. Joyce writes, I think, precisely from that radical negation of language. He writes and speaks in that impossible place where there ought not to be anything speaking or writing, and he brings it to highly worked speculation.

As Bonnie Kime Scott notes, in the most thorough examination of Joyce and feminism to date, there are many problems for a male writer who wishes to write from a feminist perspective. Not the least of these problems is the view held by some feminists that males are both biologically and culturally incapable of understanding and writing on feminism. In order to avoid compounding this problem by offering a male's analysis of another male's writing as a feminist text, the chapter will not analyze the *Wake* as a feminist text. Instead, it will consider some of the implications that the *Wake's* deconstruction of phallogocentrism has for the notion of gender-determined language and the logocentric ideal of the unit of the book. In particular, it will investigate the *Wake's* reinscription of language as the Divine Word of a male God. In Western Christian mythology, the "Word" is the Son of "the Alpha and Omega . . . the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to
come," and this Lord God creates the world by speaking it into existence. *Finnegans Wake* deconstructs this mythology and stages a language controlled by a female, a "gramma's grammer" (268.17), and this language spoken by ALP informs the reader that "Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be" (215.24). 66 From the perceptions afforded by Derrida's deconstructive solicitation of phallogocentrism, the *Wake* can be considered as a practice of writing that participates in certain textual operations that cannot be written or read "according to the line and the book, except by imitating the operation implicit in teaching modern mathematics with an abacus." These operations are involved not in a "simple regression toward the mythogram" but in providing the reader with "access to pluri-dimensionality" and the "delinearized temporality" of the *Wake's* "pressant" (221.17), the three-plus-one temporality of the "plupresent" examined in Chapter Three. 67

In terms of its analysis of the *Wake*, the overall organization of this dissertation reproduces a pattern of three-plus-one, or three toward one, that operates in both the *Wake* itself and in Derrida's *Dissemination*. As Chapter Three attempts to demonstrate, this pattern is discernible in the *Wake*’s tenth chapter as a mathematical exploitation of the number 10 as number derived from the series 1+2+3+4. 68 The following four chapters, for which this first chapter constitutes a sort of introductory preface, consist of three chapters that analyze the *Wake* from particular deconstructive angles and a fourth concluding chapter that draws in certain conclusions from the preceding three chapters. These angles are the *Wake*’s "(con)fuson" of speech and writing; its disseminative use of the tenth chapter's number (10) and its exploitation
of the formula 1,2,3,+4=10; and its intertextual involvement with parts of the text signed "Blake" and "Shakespeare." The fifth chapter (but in the fourth in the sequence of chapters that analyze the Wake as a deconstructive writing practice) returns to a more general consideration of the Wake's deconstructive operations and some concluding thoughts on the Wake's status as a book. This pattern was not intentionally followed as an outline but emerged during the process of writing.
Notes

1 James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (New York: The Viking Press and Penguin Books, 1982). This centennial edition is used throughout the dissertation. References to it are incorporated into the text using page and line references. 3.1, for example, refers to the first line of the third page.


Wherever possible, references to Derrida's texts are to English translations. This practice raises the problem of the value of a translated text in relation to the so-called original text. The notion of referring to an original text for greater precision is a notion that Derrida's rejection of the 'original' text before the cutting, or incision of writing, renders extremely difficult. Derrida compares this problem to the "double bind de YHWH quand, avec le nom de son choix, avec son nom, pourrait-on dire, Babel, il donne à traduire et à ne pas traduire." This "double bind" is that "il faut traduire et il faut ne pas traduire" (D'un ton apocalyptique adopté naguère en philosophie [Paris: Editions Galilee, 1983], p. 10). In referring to the English translations of Derrida's work, the dissertation follows the practice of writers like Gregory L. Ulmer whose use of Derrida's translated texts has produced what Derrida terms a "full, rigorous . . . reading [and] . . . .
faithful" interpretation. The fact that it might be possible to produce a "full" and "rigorous" reading and "faithful" interpretation while working from English translations of Derrida's French works by no means guarantees that such a reading and interpretation will be achieved. It does, however, suggest a practical way of writing from within the "double bind" of untranslatability. This double bind operates not only in an English reading of Derrida's critical theory but also in a reading of Finnegans Wake. Stephen Heath argues that the "status of non-translatability defines the totality of Joyce's text, which is already a multitude of translations." He further comments that Joyce's writing "baffles the establishment of the single equivalences between one language and another operated by translation." ("Ambiviolences," trans., I. Mahieu, Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French, eds. D. Attridge and D. Ferrer [Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1984], p. 60). This description accurately summarizes the operation of those "certain marks," or "undecidables" that Derrida has "set to work, within the text of the history of philosophy, as well as within the so-called literary text." Marks such as dissemination, for example, (a French term that shares several distinctive semantic values with the English term 'dissemination') "cannot be reassembled into a definition" in either French or English, and "in the last analysis dissemination means nothing" (Positions, p. 42 and p. 44).

To translate, or traduire, "to establish the meaning, to isolate the signified in order to pass it through the alternative signifier of another language" (Ambiviolences, p. 60). The problem for both the critical theories of Derrida and the "so-called literary text" of
Finnegans Wake is that both writing practices pay attention to the functions of the signifier at the expense of providing constant signifieds with which the signifier could exist in some sort of stable, ideal, unchanging and harmonious unity of the sign. Together, these texts offer a sort of double "double bind." As a practical response to this problem, the dissertation is written in English in order to produce a dissertation suitable for submission to a department of English. The exceptions to this are the quotations of Finnegans Wake and the setting to work within this "so-called literary text" of those Derridean "undecidables" which, like "dissemination," "différance," "hymen" and "brissure" "cannot be reassembled into a definition." These terms are retained in French as a preferable alternative to creating English neologisms or using acceptable English words in a neologistic fashion. It goes without saying that the English translations of Derrida's work have been compared with their so-called "original" "re-citations" wherever possible. In order to assist the reader, page references to Derrida's French works are provided with the appropriate page references to the translated versions of his texts. Certain key passages in which Derrida discusses his "certain marks" and "undecidables" ("certaines marques" and "indécidables") and describes their textual operations have also been provided to help the reader to compare the French and English versions of these elements of Derrida's theory that form the theoretical orientation of this dissertation.


commencer à penser que le signe est cette chose mal nommée, la seule, qui échappe à la question institutrice de la philosophie: 'Qu'est-ce que .. .?" (p. 31).


13 Ibid., p. 325; La dissemination, "pur lieu de passage livré aux opérations de substitution, n'est plus une singulière et irremplaçable existence, un sujet, une 'vie', mais seulement, entre vie et mort, réalité et fiction, etc., une fonction ou un fantôme" (p. 361).

14 Of Grammatology, p. 44; Dissemination, p. 211. De la grammaéologie, p. 65; La dissémination, p. 239.


16 Ibid. As Roudiez notes, Kristeva defines it in La Rédemption du langage poétique. Kristeva acknowledges her debt to Mikhail Bakhtin in "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" (Desire in Language pp. 62-91) where she discusses literary structure as it is "generated in relation to another structure." Kristeva deals with intertextuality as an "intersection of
textual surfaces" and argues that it is this "conception of the 'literary word'" by Bakhtin which "allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism" (pp. 64-5).


18 The following are seminal studies of the Wake that have, by and large, produced the most fruitful examinations of the work. With the exception of Tindall, they concur in accepting the paradigms of the novel as the best context for analyzing it: Joseph Campbell and Henry Morton Robinson, A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake (London: Faber and Faber, 1947); William York Tindall, A Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake (New York: The Noonday Press, 1959); Clive Hart's Structure and Motif in Finnegans Wake (Evanston: Northwestern U.P., 1962) is a brilliant structural analysis (of the Wake's motifs, leitmotifs, and geometrical patterns of organization) that makes subsequent studies of character and plot seem like a curious restatement of Campbell and Robinson's earlier study; Bernard Benstock, Joyce-Again's Wake: An Analysis of Finnegans Wake (Seattle: U. of Washington Press, 1965); Michael H. Begnal and Grace Eckley, Narrator and Character in Finnegans Wake (Lewisburg: Bucknell U.P., 1975); Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon's Understanding Finnegans Wake: A Guide to the Narrative of James Joyce's Masterpiece (New York: Garland Pub., Inc., 1982) has a promising introduction of Joyce's "newly discovered language" and use of Freud's dream-work mechanisms that leads into a paraphrase of the Wake's plot and characters.
Several scholarly studies have become indispensable reference guides to the Wake. These include: James S. Atherton, *Books at the Wake: A Study of Literary Allusions in Finnegans Wake* (London: Faber and Faber; 1959, rpt. Mamaroneck, N.Y.: Paul P. Appel, 1974); Thomas E. Connolly, *Scribbledehobble: The Ur-Workbook for Finnegans Wake* (Evanston: Northwestern U.P., 1961), an annotated edition of one of Joyce's notebooks; Clive Hart's *A Concordance to Finnegans Wake* (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1974); David Hayman's *A First-Draft Version of Finnegans Wake* (Austin: U. of Texas Press, 1963) is an impressive and accurate scholarly edition of Joyce manuscripts giving "the complete skeleton of the Wake reduced to its simplest language and arranged in its definitive order"; Adeline Glasheen's *Third Census of Finnegans Wake: An Index of the Characters and Their Roles* (Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1977) is the second revision of the most comprehensive list of names of people and places available to readers of Joyce; Louis O. Mink, *A Finnegans Wake Gazetteer* (Bloomington: Indiana U.P., 1978); Roland McHugh's *Annotations to Finnegans Wake* is, as McHugh points out, a distillation of the foregoing and the lexicons listed below and of notes and comments from a number of Joyce scholars.


23 *Decentered Universe*, p. 1.

24 Ibid.


26 *Joyce-Again's Wake*, p. 108.

27 *Narrator and Character*, p. 9.


29 *Understanding "FW"*, p. vii.


31 *Understanding "FW"*, p. xv.

32 Ibid., pp. viii and xiv.

33 *Books at the Wake*, p. 15.
The mimetic function of literature, its presentation of what Northrop Frye, using Aristotle's terms, calls a mimesis praxeos and a mimesis logou (Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays [Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1957], pp. 82-3), operates in all literary genres, according to the view of literature provided by traditional literary criticism. It is this mimetic function that Derrida problematizes in his investigation of mimesis. See esp. Dissemination, pp. 185-94.


The Decentered Universe, p. 2.


Ibid.

Norris cites parts of this passage in The Decentered Universe, p. 3; "The Revolution of Language," pp. 84-5.


Structure and Motif, p. 161; The Decentered Universe, p. 3.

Structure and Motif, p. 84.

The Decentered Universe, p. 27.


The Revolution of the Word, p. 4.

The Decentered Universe, p. 2; The Revolution of the Word, p. 3.

Derridean discourse sets "re-mark" to work in "The Double Session," in Dissemination, pp. 173-286. See, in particular, the solicitation of Mallarmé's Mimique, esp. pp. 219-24 (La dissemination, pp. 203-45). Like "hymen," "supplement," "trace," and "diffrance," re-mark has at least the double value of a syllepsis or zeugma and is one of those signs with a pivotal function. It can signify allusion or textual self-referentiality, a process in writing and/or in speech. It is an operation of the hymeneal white blank of the printed page and of the inscribed letter or mark. The hyphen joining the "re" to the "mark" functions between them to both separate and join, to confuse, in the Derridean sense of join with, and to produce a confusion or disorder.

comment about the relationship between the *Wake* and the nineteenth-century event that Derrida terms a "rupture" in the thinking of the very structurality of structure were made well ahead of their time and are still, more than ten years later, assisting scholars and students of Joyce to come to terms with the *Wake*. Robertson's critique of Norris' study was not made for some five years after Norris formulated her ideas. By that time, of course, Derrida's theories had become much more familiar to scholars. Robertson's argument is problematic in suggesting that Norris should have acknowledged the contradictions between structuralist and post-structuralist theory at a time when the latter was still being formulated.

62 See *Positions*, p. 42, and *Positions* (Fr. version), pp. 57-58.
63 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Pref., *Of Grammatology*, p. lxvi;
65 Bonnie Kime Scott, *Joyce and Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana U.P., 1984). Scott outlines these problems in "Feminist Frameworks for Joyce," pp. 1-8. As the dissertation will consider the *Wake*'s dislodging of the phallogocentric binary terms male/female and speech/writing, it should be noted that the dissertation does not contend that the *Wake* privileges writing as a female form. As will be noted in Chapter Three
(and elsewhere) the **Wake** identifies itself as ALP's letter, but the letter is not written by ALP. This task is assigned to Shem who occupies the position of a son who sustains the mother's desire and assists in 'de-sire-ing' the father by appropriating the father's pencil and penis. As a "Letter" (420.17), the **Wake** is "written of Shem" and "uttered for ALP" (420.17-18). Shem's appropriation of the father's (HCE's) pencil and penis is signified when the **Wake** states that Shem uses "earwicker's pensile" to "root" in the "outer of his lauscher" (175.9-10). Much feminist theory has pointed out that historically, writing has always been considered as a male prerogative. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar note that "because he is an author, a 'man of letters' is simultaneously, like his divine counterpart, a father, a master or ruler, and an owner" ([The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination](New Haven and London: Yale U.P., 1979), p. 7, emphasis added). The tradition that Gilbert and Gubar trace is a literary tradition which is a part of the Western metaphysical tradition that Derrida terms phallogocentrism. This dissertation argues that like Derrida's disseminative criticism, the **Wake** attempts a dislodging and overturning of the terms of binary opposition that sustain the phallogocentric domination of Western thought. This dislodging is not a simple inversion that reverses the relationship between such terms as truth/error, male/female, and speech and writing, but one that allows for the emergence of the previously higher term (and its attendant signifiers) from within the signifying play of the previously lower form and its signifiers. Thus the **Wake** identifies itself not as a subordinate written imitation of speech but as a writing that sets phonetic aspects
of language to work within writing. Similarly, ALP reigns over the textual topos as "Woeman's Land" (22.8) and the male positions are defined within this topos. It is worth noting that the Wake provides an answer to the important question posed by Gilbert and Gubar: "If the pen is a metaphorical penis, with what organ can females generate texts?" (p. 7). The Wake identifies its language as, amongst other things, the stream of ALP's urine, and its diagram of her "trickkikant" (297.9) functions as a metaphor for the text as a 'home', 'womb' and point of identification ('who me?'), a "whome of your eternal geomater" (296.30-297.1). The present study's references to the Wake's female language are made with the realization that Shem is the scribe who writes the letter but that it is ALP who generates the text by uttering it.


67 Of Grammatology, p. 87. See De la grammatologie, p. 130.

68 As Chapter Three demonstrates, the operation of this formula within the Wake's arithmetical textual machinery is central to both Derrida's deconstructive practice and Soller's comments on Joyce's meditation on the trinity. See, for example, "The Double Bottom of the Plupresent" (Dissemination, pp. 306-13; La dissémination, "Le double fond du plus-que-présent," pp. 340-48) and "Joyce & Co.," pp. 113-14.
II

Making "Soundsense and Sensesound Kin Again":
The Wake's "(con)fusion" of Speech and Writing

Joyce compared Finnegans Wake's use of the pun with the foundation of
the Catholic Church. Referring to the well-known pun on Peter and rock
(L. *Petra*; Gr. *Πέτρα*) in Christ's declaration "You are Peter, the Rock;
and on this rock I will build my church," (Mt. 16.18) Joyce told Budgen:
"The Holy Roman Catholic Apostolic Church was built on a pun. It ought
to be good enough for me."¹ Operating at the root of the Wake's
language is the paronomasia that facilitates the fusion of a masculine,
logical and linear writing with a feminine, circular, and associative
network of relations between sound and sense. The Wake does not reject
or dismiss the phallogocentric paradigms of binary oppositions but incorp­
orates them within its paronomastic language. The result of this incor­
poration is that the Wake's language operates on the very borders that
mark the limits of the Platonic conception that Derrida finds consoli­
dated in Husserl's phenomenology of the sign. In the Wake, these borders
(between male and female, life and death, conscious and unconscious,
truth and error, identity and difference, and speech and writing) become
flexible and shifting margins that operate according to the relationships
between the similarity in sound of written forms. As ALP states, "On
limpidy marge I've made me hoom" (624.15). Because the Wake stages a
language of the unconscious, any reading of it that is conducted according to the (logocentric) concepts of a subject ordered by a logical, reasonable, linear, and punctual writing will always be defeated by the text. For the unconscious, as Lacan's reading of Freud suggests, can never become fully subjectified or present to consciousness. The gap that Freud opens up in his use of the metaphor or writing to investigate the network of forces that operate in the unconscious reveals that "Discontinuity is the essential form in which the unconscious first appears to us as a phenomenon—discontinuity, in which something is manifested as a vacillation."² In terms of the Wake's writing as a staging of the language of the unconscious, this vacillation is marked in the relationships between speaking and writing, and reading and hearing. To experience this pulsing vacillation, the reader must "speechread" the Wake and read, in a double strategy, the Wake as an "epistolear" (38.23), or an 'epistle to l'ear' and 'epistle to lire.' According to the syllogistic and predicate paradigms of logic that have been used to enforce the domination of language, thought, and writing by the binary oppositions of phallogocentrism, the statement that Finnegans Wake stages a writing within speech is unreasonable or absurd. The rethinking of the categories of speech and writing that Derrida produces in his deconstruction of Husserl and Freud, however, facilitates the recognition that, in a certain sense, Finnegans Wake does achieve the dismantling of the signifiers of speech and writing and, by making much of its writing dependent of paronomasia, produces a writing against the borders between speech and writing in order to produce the "dissonance [absurdity] of a writing" encased within the phonetic relationships between spoken languages.³
The importance of speech and sound in the "sensesound" writing of *Finnegans Wake* is quite commonplace knowledge in Joyce scholarship. Joyce himself frequently emphasized that the sound of the text was as important to its meaning as was its written form, and he clearly felt that the semantic difficulties of his final work were offset by the pleasing qualities of its sound. "Lord knows what my prose means," he told his daughter, Lucia. "In a word, its pleasing to the ear . . . . That is enough, it seems to me." Many critics have commented on the *Wake*’s musical qualities, and, as Richard Ellmann notes in *James Joyce*, the work's "musical aspect . . . was one of its justifications." At times, Joyce seems to have valued this aspect of the *Wake* more than he valued its literary quality. When asked "if the book were a blending of literature and music," for example, Joyce replied, "No, it's pure music." Another example demonstrates the importance Joyce placed on the sound of the *Wake*’s puns and on the rhythms that mark its general sonority. Joyce asked his friend Nino Frank to assist in translating parts of the work into Italian. Nino thought Italian unsuitable for the *Wake*’s many puns but agreed. As Ellmann records the collaboration, Frank found himself in the surprising position of having to remind Joyce of the importance of the meaning in the passages they translated. Joyce was much more interested in the "sonority, rhythm, and verbal play," and he "seemed indifferent" to reproducing the exact sense of the original text. The difficulties Joyce endured while making a gramophone record of parts of the *Wake*’s "Anna Livia Plurabelle" chapter serve to underline the importance that Joyce placed on the experience of hearing, as well as reading, the text.
Commentators on the *Wake* were quick to recognize the importance sound plays in an understanding of the work. In *Our Exagmination Round His Factification For Incamation Of Work In Progress*, the collection of essays on the *Wake* that Joyce supervised while completing the work, Robert McAlmon called the *Wake* an "Irish word ballet" and drew his reader's attention to the importance of sound in Joyce's "prose music." Since that early essay, the knowledge that the *Wake* demands not only to be read, but also to be read aloud, listened to, and even, at certain passages, sung, has become an important tool for students attempting to find their way through the labyrinth of Joyce's "Echoland" (13.5). The *Wake* defines itself in terms that emphasize the aural and phonological qualities to be found in hearing its language. It provides a musical score for its "Ballad of Persse O'Reilly"—a title that puns on the French *perce oreille*, or ear piercer, suggesting, amongst other things, the ability of the *Wake*’s language to penetrate the ear as well as the eye—and informs the reader that its language is "soundconducting" (183.9). It also identifies itself as an attempt "to make soundsense and sensesound kin again" (121.15). One of the *Wake*’s stories is that of its own idiosyncratic "langwedge" (73.1), and this "Singalingalingy. Storiella as she is syung" (267.7-8) should be heard as well as read. The *Wake* tells the reader, "As you sing it it's a study" (489.33).

While most commentators would probably agree that sound is to some extent an important aspect of the *Wake*’s language, there have been few studies that have given any major consideration to the relationship between the phonological and semantic elements in Joyce's "speechreading" (568.31) and little, if any, consideration of the implications that this
relationship might have for an assessment of either the *Wake*'s linguistic achievements or the historical context in which these achievements could best be understood. For the most part, the vantage point from which scholarship has dealt with the heard sound-seen sense relationship has been that afforded by musicology—as in *Song in the Works of James Joyce* and *Music and James Joyce*—or, more often, a consideration of Joyce's use of the pun. It is common knowledge amongst Joyce's readers that *Finnegans Wake* contains many puns, but, as Ellmann notes in *The Consciousness of James Joyce*, the full scope of Joyce's exploitation of the pun is not always recognized. It was, Ellmann argues, "Joyce's stock in trade beyond what is generally acknowledged." The complexities of the *Wake* as a "punnermine" (519.3), or mine full of puns, are such that Anthony Burgess considers the term 'pun' inadequate to a description of Joyce's technique. It will "not really do for the word-play of *Finnegans Wake*," Burgess contends. "We need a word like--let us go further: we need the word itself--jabberwocky." Eventually, Burgess finds even Lewis Carroll's term too limited and coins the neologism "oneiroparonamastics" to indicate how important paronomasia is to the *Wake*'s "nightynovel" (54.21) depiction of a dream.

This chapter will investigate Joyce's use of the pun as a radical use of paronomasia in which Joyce manages to make a considerable part of the *Wake*'s semantic network dependent on sound. As a "puntomine" (587.8)—one of the *Wake*'s many self-defining multiple puns—the text is both a *pun to mine*, or a paronomastic "playing on words that sound alike" (*OED*, emphasis added) to be heard, and a pantomime, or silent staging of the written narration that places the Earwickers' bourgeois family mise
Joyce's use of paronomasia is a powerful force in the *Wake*'s unlimited semiosis, and, as this chapter will attempt to demonstrate, it is an integral part of the deconstructive writing that constitutes the *Wake*'s indeterminancy of meaning. The *Wake* continually posits characters who, like HCE, the father, or Shem, the author, are possible figures of authority, but, as Margot Norris has demonstrated, it also subverts the authority of these figures by a textual freeplay that "breaks down the all-important distinction between the self and the other, and . . . makes uncertainty a governing principle of the work." Shem the Penman, for example, who is both a manifestation of HCE and a portrait of the artist figure, is paronomastically displaced into a "sham" and even the command for his rejection: "Shun the Punman!" (93.13). Joyce thus employs paronomasia with something of the original sense of its Greek root, παρανομία, an attack on authority, or "transgression of law," and makes it a major device in a writing that is, in a certain sense, παρανομος, or "lawless" and "violent" (Liddell and Scott).

In order to provide a comprehensive delineation of Joyce's use of paronomasia as a successful example of a deconstructive "double writing," this chapter will begin by considering some of the problems which, as many Joyce commentators have noted, confront a traditional literary approach to the text. Next, it will outline some of the major developments in the general philosophy of writing that provided the historical content from which the *Wake*, as a deconstructive, modernist, text, emerged. Thirdly, it will employ Eco's theory on the semiotic production of metaphor in the *Wake* in order to demonstrate how the *Wake*
produces the chain of multiple puns with which it identifies itself as a practice of writing involved with speech. Finally, it will consider Joyce's radical paronomasia from the perspective of Jacques Derrida's deconstructive theory on writing in order to demonstrate how *Finnegans Wake* operates as what Derrida terms a "grouped textual field," a "bifurcated writing . . . that simultaneously provokes the overturning of the hierarchy speech/writing, and the entire system attached to it, and releases the dissonance of a writing within speech."  

Stephen Heath comments in "Ambiviolences" that *Finnegans Wake* is not so much a combining of various literary elements as a violent collision between them, a "collideorscape" (143.28) "disturbing the categories that claim to define and represent literary practice, leaving the latter in ruins, and criticism too." Heath's comments on the work's effect upon the traditional categories of literary criticism are being increasingly echoed by a number of Joyce scholars who, like Patrick Parrinder, see the *Wake* "in some ways getting more difficult, even as scholarship renders it easier to master." The problem that the *Wake* poses for such critical commentators is, in part, its evasion of the taxonomic categories with which criticism attempts to define texts in order to conserve them as objects for further investigation. There still remains a fundamental disagreement, for example, between those critics like Bernard Benstock and Danis Rose, who argue that the work is a novel, and post-structuralist critics like Heath, who deny the possibility of such categorizing on the grounds that there "is no conclusion to be reached in a reading of Joyce's text." A Derridean deconstructive assessment of the *Wake* as an example of "pluri-dimensional symbolic"
writing would dismiss the question of whether or not the *Wake* is a novel as irrelevant to a work that exceeds the category "literary,"; in fact, on the basis of Derrida's "Of Grammatology as a positive science," one might go so far as to question whether or not *Finnegans Wake* is a book.

Having worked so hard at attempting to stabilize the intrinsically unstable discourse of Joyce's final work in order to identify its plots, characters, themes, and motifs, Joyce scholars are gradually becoming aware that the concept of organic unity with which the combining of these elements in a literary work is effected may itself be inappropriate for dealing with the *Wake*. A great amount of time, for example, has been devoted to identifying and translating the more than forty languages upon which Joyce drew while composing the *Wake*; but while the expenditure of labour upon this necessary task has made the text much more readily accessible to the beginning *Wake* reader, it may also have had a concomitant effect of imposing a static structure upon the infinite semiosis that Joyce achieved in his staging of the narrative of language itself. As Heath comments:

Joyce might have prefaced *Finnegans Wake* with the remark that "the present work cannot be . . . translated . . . ." The status of non-translatability defines the totality of Joyce's text, which is already itself a multitude of translations. Crossing an immense number of languages . . . in order to open up the narrative of language, Joyce's writing baffles the establishment of the single equivalences between one language and another operated by translation. To translate is to establish the meaning, to isolate the signified in order to pass it through the alternative signifier of another language. Nothing is more monological than translation in its dependence on the compromise of the sign. The writing of *Finnegans Wake* is a writing against this logic in its attention to the work of the signifier.
The difficulties facing any commentator on the Wake's characters can readily be seen in a brief consideration of the ALP configuration that is dispersed throughout the text and serves, in part, as a generator of various signifying chains. Most Joyce scholars agree that these letters signify Anna Livia Plurabelle, the major female character of the work, the wife of HCE, and the mother of Shem, Shaun, and Issy. The attempt to deal with this female character as one might deal with a character in a novel by Dickens or even Woolf, however, is quickly undercut by the fact that ALP also signifies the river Liffey and that the text allows for no clear-cut distinction between these two signifieds. The commentator's problem is further increased by such passages as "Approach to lead our passage." (262.2), which, as Roland McHugh points out, anagramatically fuses Anna's initials with the name of Plato. Commentary on ALP as a novelistic character who symbolically depicts a river reaches the limits of its vocabulary with the realization that ALP also signifies a mountain or alp—one of the many signifieds of the HCE configuration—and that Anna Livia Plurabelle stages a microcosmic narration of both the Wake and the entire history of language. ALP, or $\triangle$, as Joyce signified the configuration in his notebooks, is, as McHugh argues in his book on Joyce's sigla, "ultimately all writings, particularly FW itself." The sequence of signs known as Anna Livia Plurabelle combines signifiers of the Wake's narrative from the initial "riverrun" (3.1) through, or "via," the "Liffeying waters of" (215.33-4) the text's river of language, to the final "the" (French lé in "Plurabelle"). As a paradigm of what Umberto Eco calls the Wake's "proposing of itself as a model of language in general," the sequence Anna Livia Plurabelle traces the linguistic
events that constitute, as Derrida points out, the "crucial hinges" in the linguistic and philosophical history of the Western world: the development of language and thought from Greek, through Latin, to the Modern languages. Anna is a pun on the Greek Ἀννᾶ and Λιβία (Liddell and Scott); Livia is the Latin feminine declension of the Roman family name Livius (Lewis and Short); and Plurabelle fuses the French forms plu, belle, elle, and le with the Latin combining form plura.

All of the signifying elements in chains such as Anna Livia Plurabelle can function simultaneously in different networks of signification, each one turning, to use Derrida's words, "on its strange and invisible pole." The Wake is a decentered text offering its readers a practice of unlimited semiosis, and, as Margot Norris notes, none of its "formal" signifying elements are "anchored to a single point of reference," or "refer back to a center." The disturbing effect for the reader who attempts to limit the text's play of signification by forcing any element to function referentially toward a particular signified is that such an attempt is "always already," defeated by the text. Commenting on Anna Livia Plurabelle as a novelistic character, a representation of a female human being, a wife and mother, is a task that will be defeated by the Wake's inscription of ALP as a continually changing river of language, a "languo of flows" (621.22). The attempt to deal with ALP as the text's language is problematic because the Wake identifies its language with the historical, linguistic universe. According to Eco, it "posits itself, quite explicitly, as the ersatz of the historical universe of language." The Wake explicitly details its textual slippage as a continual alteration in the identity of its subjects:
every person, place and thing in the chaosmos of Alle anyway connected with the goblydumped turkery was moving and changing every part of the time. (118.21-3)

The readers who feel that they have grasped the subject of meaning of any of the Wake are warned what they are dealing with:

as time went on as it will variously inflected, differently pronounced, otherwise spelled, changeably meaning vocable scriptsigns. (118.26-8)

Subjects shift and meanings change. As Colin MacCabe states:

Joyce's texts . . . refuse the subject any dominant position from which language could be tallied with experience . . . . Finnegans Wake [is] concerned not with representing experience through language but with experiencing language through a destruction of representation. 28

Joyce was not alone in his attempt to free language from the constraints imposed upon it by the demands of representation, to produce a work in which, as he stated, "[t]here are in a way no characters." 29 The production of art that "abjured externality in the name of imagination," was, as Ellmann notes, the goal of both Joyce's friend Eugene Jolas and the other artists who signed Jolas' "Manifesto: The Revolution of the Word." It's true that Joyce did not sign this proclamation of the "literary creator['s]" freedom to employ an "autonomous" imagination and free language from the external constraints of "existing grammatical and syntactical laws." He did, however, choose four of the writers who did sign to write essays on the Wake. These four--Eugene Jolas, Robert Sage,
Elliot Paul, and Stuart Gilbert—applied the aesthetic principles of their manifesto, in varying degrees, as they contributed critiques of the Wake for Our Exagmination Round His Factification For Incamination Of Work In Progress, and Joyce was quite satisfied with his work's being assessed according to these principles. He clearly wished to have the Wake presented in the terms of the manifesto because he directed most of the essays himself. As he told Larbaud, he stood behind his "twelve Marshals more or less directing them what lines of research to follow."  

The autonomy of language was not only the concern of the writers who signed Jolas' manifesto, but also of many of the writers who participated in what is now called the Modernist movement. Influenced by such diverse forces as the philosophy of Nietzsche, the symbolism of Blake, and the poetic theories developed by Mallarmé and the other French symbolists, writers like Joyce, Eliot, and Pound all focused closely upon such questions as the relationship between language and expression and the formal constraints imposed upon the writer by historical poetic conventions. Each, in his own way, attempted to free his writing from what the manifesto terms the "hegemony of the banal word, monotonous syntax, static psychology, [and] descriptive naturalism," in order to achieve what Hugh Kenner terms "Words Set Free." In a somewhat paradoxical manner, the attempt to free language from historical constraints involved a return to some of its most distant historical forms, as in Pound's investigation of the Chinese ideogram and Eliot's individualistic exploration of the Classical tradition. The return to the past, however, is always made with the insight afforded by Skeat's Dictionary: "that
meanings, arrayed in chronological sequence display a seamless intel­ligible continuity," and classical forms can be juxtaposed with their modern descendants in order to revitalize language, or as the *Wake* describes it, make the "seim anew" (215.23). The result is a language that is much more abstract than that of everyday speech even though it may contain the rhythms, cadences and idiolectic patterns of that speech within itself. Thus, two charwomen can sit and natter in the midst of Eliot's *Waste Land*, and Joyce could claim of the *Wake*: "Really it is not I who am writing this crazy book. It is you, and you, and you, and that man over there, and that girl at the next table."  

In order to place the *Wake*’s attempt at fusing speech into its written form within a historical context, it is helpful to give some consideration to the linguistic and philosophical revolution that occurred during the nineteenth century, for it is there, and not in twentieth-century Modernist writing, that the autonomy of language which Joyce emphasizes in the *Wake* emerged in what Michel Foucault calls the "beginning of the modern age." In the nineteenth century representation lost some of its control on language. Indeed, the relationship between language and representation is a major point of contrast between the linguistic philosophy of the Neo-Classical period—a period Foucault terms Classical—and that which emerged during the nineteenth century. The transparent quality that marked language's domination by the Neo-Classical concept of representation was replaced at the beginning of the nineteenth century by a growing awareness of language's density and opacity. Foucault sees the shift that occurs in the view of language
between these two periods as a part of one of the "two great discontinuities in the episteme of Western culture." The first was marked as language lost its Renaissance quality of autonomy when it was gradually subordinated by Neo-Classical representation; the second is marked by the weakening of representation as the primary means of ordering language and the growing awareness that language can function to signify itself:

The threshold between Classicism and modernity . . . had been definitely crossed when words ceased to intersect with representations and to provide a spontaneous grid for the knowledge of things. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, they rediscovered their ancient, enigmatic density . . . . Once detached from representation, language has existed, right up to our own day, only in a dispersed way: . . . for those who wish to achieve a formalization, language must strip itself of its concrete content . . . language may sometimes arise for its own sake in an act of writing that designates nothing other than itself. 35

The relationship between speech and writing--a relationship that is so important to the Wake's "speechreading"--also underwent considerable changes as the discontinuity described by Foucault effected a radical shift in the view of language, and, as the nineteenth century unfolded, the autonomy of language and the relationship between speech and writing became the focal points for the investigation of the being of language. The inquiry into the essence of language became a concern to philosopher and writer alike. In literature, the autonomy of language asserted itself with a forcefulness that recalls the Renaissance view of language's dense and opaque character:
from Hölderlin to Mallarmé and on to Antonin Artaud—literature achieved autonomous existence, and separated itself from all other language with a deep scission, only by forming a sort of "counter-discourse", and by finding its way back from the representative or signifying function of language to this raw being that had been forgotten since the sixteenth century.36

If literature functioned as what Foucault terms a "counter-discourse" in making its way back to a concept of language's autonomy, it simultaneously became involved with the philosophical and psychological discourses that focused upon language as a key to understanding the philosophical and psychological mysteries of Man's being. Thus Freud studied literature in order to comprehend the text of the Human psyche, and Nietzsche fused his philosophical inquiry with the production of literary writing.

For Nietzsche, the investigation of language is an essential part of the philosophical project, and, as Foucault points out, in the "philosophical-philological space" that Nietzsche opens, "language wells up in an enigmatic multiplicity that must be mastered." The intrinsic nature of the powers of good and evil were less important to Nietzsche than the problem of the speaker who uses the terms in order to distinguish between the self and other. "It was not," Foucault contends, "a matter of knowing what good and evil were in themselves, but of who was being designated, or rather who was speaking" in using "Agathos to designate oneself and Deilos to designate others." The importance of Nietzsche's investigations for literature, particularly for the Symbolist movement, should not be underestimated. As Foucault points out, the "great task" of Mallarmé's entire writing project is "fundamentally a reply to the question [of who speaks in language] imposed upon philosophy by Nietzsche:
To the Nietzschean question: "Who is speaking?", Mallarmé replies—and constantly reverts to that reply—by saying that what is speaking is, in its solitude, in its fragile vibration, in its nothingness, the word itself—not the meaning of the word, but its enigmatic and precarious being.

The major discontinuity Foucault finds manifest in the texts of Nietzsche and Mallarmé is one which Margot Norris links directly to Joyce's production of *Finnegans Wake* 's "literary heterodoxy" by considering the *Wake* as a part of the radical alteration in the concept of structure that occurs in the discontinuity. Derrida details this alteration in the terms of a "rupture," a "disruption," and an "'event','" and sees it occurring with a reflection upon the concept of structure itself. "The event I called a rupture," he states, "presumably would have come about when the structurality of structure had to begin to be thought." Like Foucault, Derrida considers the rupture as inextricably involved with the return of language's autonomy and the philosophical and literary manifestations of this autonomy, or the "moment when language invaded the universal problematic, the moment when, in the absence of a center or origin, everything became discourse." Referring to Derrida's account of this rupture, Norris sees the *Wake* in terms of an attack on structure:

The literary heterodoxy of *Finnegans Wake* is the result of Joyce's attack on the traditional concept of structure itself. This attack was not isolated, but belonged to an "event" or "rupture" in the history of the concept of structure.
Norris's consideration of the *Wake* in the context of this "rupture" in the historical development of the concept of structure is strengthened somewhat by three surprising similarities between Joyce and Nietzsche. The Nietzsche scholar Walter Kaufmann describes these similarities between some of Nietzsche's writings and the "cryptograms of the later Joyce," their "attitude toward religion," and their "addiction to plays on words." This is not to argue for any direct influence of Nietzsche upon Joyce, but to point out that the *Wake* 's "literary heterodoxy" is not, as Norris notes, an "isolated event," but the achievement and practice of a decentered (and decentering) practice of writing that is an integral part of the most powerful philosophical, psychological, and literary developments in the Modern period. Derrida lists the "Nietzschean critique of metaphysics ... the Freudian critique of self-presence ... and the Heideggerian destruction of metaphysics," as important examples of discourse in which decentering and the "thinking the structurality of structure" has "kept most closely to its radical formulation." To this list of examples can be appended the philosophical displacement of the subject in language, the psychological organizing of literary discourse, and the deconstructive disruption of the categories of writing and speech that Joyce achieves in *Finnegans Wake*.

Joyce's displacement of the traditional categories of speech and writing is not a simple overturning of these categories and cannot be fully understood in the terms of a dialectic process. It is tempting to see in Joyce's narrative of language, as the spoken narrative of Anna Livia Plurabelle, a simple overturning of the Renaissance view of speech
as the inferior female part of language, but the *Wake* is obviously not all to be spoken, or read aloud, off the page. The diagram ALP and the idiosyncratic pictograms that conclude the tenth chapter are obviously elements in the *Wake* that cannot be aurally experienced without being mediated through the visual apprehension of the page that must precede any oral descriptive commentary. Paradoxically, the musical score for "The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" (44)—a part of the *Wake* 's writing that appears to demand that the reader perform and hear the text rather than experience it solely by reading it on the page—contains elements such as the clef, the key signature, and other standard elements of musical notation that require visual apprehension. Furthermore, in this one part of the text where the reader might feel confident in asserting that parts of the *Wake* demand to be heard, the text subverts oral performance and aural reception. Even a cursory comparison of the note and syllable alignment of the first verse with the varying syllabic count in the subsequent verses reveals that the musical notation is not appropriate for the oral performance of the entire song. The text thus frustrates the reader's expectation by denying him or her any subject that could be correlated with an orthodox experience of music. A ballad, particularly one accompanied by music, is for performance, either alone or to accompany a dance; "The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" offers verses that cannot be so performed.

Nevertheless, much of the *Wake* does require that the reader experience it aurally. Joyce himself "defended its technique or form in terms of music," as Ellmann notes, "insisting . . . on the importance of sound and rhythm" as integral elements in the *Wake* 's "indivisibility of meaning
from form." He clearly felt that much of the *Wake*'s meaning depended on its sound, and, in responding to complaints made by people like Ezra Pound and Harriet Weaver that the *Wake* was an obscure and unintelligible work, Joyce told Claud Sykes, "It's all so simple. If anyone doesn't understand a passage, all he need do is read it aloud." The importance of the oral aspect of the *Wake* has even been noted by Walter J. Ong, a critic who strongly denies that Joyce was much influenced by traditional forms of oral literature. For Ong, the *Wake* is "very oral" because it "reads well aloud." Again, however, assertions like this require some qualification because not all of the *Wake* is "very oral." Chapter Eight in Book One, or the ALP chapter, is very oral. This is the chapter from which Joyce selected the fragment that he recorded at the Orthological Institute and the chapter in which he attempted to onomatopoeically capture the sound of flowing water, or, as he told a friend, "subordinate words to [its] rhythm." Chapter Two of the second Book, with its tripartite marginal inscriptions, typographical variations, and "drawings on the line" (308, fn.2), does not lend itself as readily to oral performance. ALP's monologue, the final passage of the *Wake*, is a passage that reads aloud very well, and it identifies itself as "leafy" (liffey or ALP) "speafing" (speaking) (619.20). The record of the court trials (572.19-576.9), with its parodic imitation of a carefully-qualified, latinate, legal style of prose, is, by way of contrast, a very difficult passage to read aloud and lacks the sonorous and melodic qualities of the final monologue.
It would be inaccurate to suggest that the *Wake* can be neatly divided into such clear examples of oral and non-oral styles. It obviously cannot. There are, for example, many puns in II.2 that depend on the similarities in *sound* between words, and the ALP chapter, no matter how successful its onomatopoeic effect, or how pleasing its sound, remains a printed and typographical transcription of written prose that can be read silently on the page, so to speak. The *Wake* is not composed of clearly distinct passages that can be neatly divided and then labelled according to the level or degree to which each passage is suitable (or unsuitable) for oral performance, and here, once again, it defeats the reader who wishes to establish a subject that would enable him, or her, to correlate the text with the extratextual distinction between spoken and written language, or between vocalized speech and the silent apprehension of written marks. Instead, the *Wake* proffers a narrative of language in which sound and sense are interwoven so tightly that they are interdependent. An example of this interweaving is provided by some of the concluding lines (236.8-18) of the section Benstock describes as the "Rainbow girls sing their paean of praise to their Sund-God, Chuff" (236.1-14).

These girls are obviously well-read polyglots, and, as this section concludes, they slip in references to Irish history (the Fomorians and Parthalon), T.S. Eliot's *Prufrock*, Blake's *Thel*, and snippets of Bog Latin (*nionon*, or heaven), German (*hin* and *her*, or there and here, and *paar*, or pair), and Italian (*parolone*, or big words). These references are deformed, however, and the "rainbow girls" obviously expect Chuff to depend on paronomasia in order to understand their song. "Prufrock," for
example, is embedded in "wib-frurocks-full" (236.13); "Fomorians" is truncated and combined in a pun with "farmer" to produce "Fomor's" (236.9); the German hin and her puns with the English "him and her"; and the name of the Irish colonizer Parthalon is combined in a multiple pun with the Italian paralone and German paar to produce "paaralone" (236.9 & 10), which also puns on the English paradoxical form, "pair-alone." The obvious importance of sound in this heavily paronomastic passage is reinforced by its use of the rhythms from the songs "The Farmer in the Dell," "Sing a Song of Sixpence," "God Rest Ye Merry Gentlemen," and "The Holly and the Ivy." The passage can, of course, be read silently on the page, but both the song rhythms and puns are fused with the written narrative and suggest that the passage should be heard as well as read. As two of the few unequivocally modern-English sentences in the passage declare: "Here are notes. There's the key" (236.11). Of course, this statement is also ambiguous: a "note" is not only a "written character or sign, expressing the pitch and duration of a musical sound," but also a "mark, sign, token, or indication of some quality, condition, or fact" (OED), and a short, written statement. The key to understanding these statements is the recognition that at least three distinct subjects are fused together in these deceptively simple sentences. The "notes" are: the letters that constitute the passage, and, indeed, the entirety of the Wake's typographical forms; the musical notes of the songs from which the rhythmic patterns of the following sentences are derived; and the various forms of ALP's note or letter, a letter which, as many commentators have noted, exists in a synecdochic relationship with the Wake as a whole. The "key" these notes provide is not only the musical key of the songs,
but also, according to the curious circularity by which the *Wake* continually "remarks" its own language, one of the "keys" to the "dreamland" (615.28) of the entire text.\(^47\)

The fusion of sound and sense in the *Wake* as a "sensesound" (121.15) practice of writing is one of the techniques by which the text effects what Heath describes as an opening up of the narrative of language.\(^48\) *Finnegans Wake* does narrate a story about the exploits of HCE and the Earwicker family, but this story is continually subordinated by both the *Wake*’s self-conscious staging of its own language and its explicit positioning of that language as what Umberto Eco terms an "Ersatz of the historical universe of language."\(^49\) The *Wake*’s fusion of speech and writing can more accurately be described with Jacques Derrida’s term "(con)fusión."\(^50\) This (con)fusion is an integral part of what Eco describes as its "proposing [of] itself as a model of language in general."\(^51\) Unlike *Ulysses* ' "Oxen of the Sun" chapter, however, where the development of language is traced in a more or less chronological order, the *Wake* operates by dismantling etymological forms from their historically determined context—a process it terms the "abnihilisation of the etym" (353.22)—and recombining them in order to set them to work in the *Wake*’s unlimited semiotic network. The fragmented forms retain their historically determined sign value but also acquire new values through their violent collision with other forms in the complex structure of the *Wake*’s multiple puns. An example of this process is the combining of the Latin *ab nihil*, or "from," "out of," "since," and "after," "nothing" (Lewis and Short), with the modern English form "annihilate," "to reduce to nothing" (*OED*, the form derives, of course, from *an-nihilo,*
"to bring to nothing" [Lewis and Short]). In the phrase "abnihilisation of the etym," the development of language out of nothing and the modern reduction of the atom to nothing are combined to provide a description of how the Wake operates by dismantling orthodox linguistic forms into their component morphemes and recombining them in its multiple puns (much as the atom is broken down and subsequently recombined into new forms). Elsewhere, the text is described as "preprovided" with a "smeltingworks" where language is melted down into "separated elements of precedent decomposition for the verypetpurpose of subsequent recombination" (614.31-35). At the narrative level, this process is manifest in the fusing together of such disparate narrative particles as the fall of the tower of Babel and the nursery rhyme "Rockabye Baby" into "Rockaby, babel, flatten a wall" (278.14).

The lack of any presentation of the linear chronological development of language in the Wake's positing of itself as a model of the historical linguistic universe is, in part, a result of Joyce's decision to attempt a writing of language as it occurs in sleep, or, as he stated, to "put the language to sleep." The Wake is a model of the historical universe of language as this language might appear in the dream world. This "dreambookpage" (428.16) language is entirely appropriate to a work that posits itself as a dream which its characters experience because the unconscious, as Jacques Lacan has suggested, receives its status from the structure of the linguistic universe. It is, Lacan notes, "the combinatorial operation [of linguistics] functioning spontaneously, of itself, in a presubjective way" that provides the structure which "assures us ... there is beneath the term unconscious, something definable, accessible
In order to simulate the functioning of language in the unconscious realm of the \textit{Wake}'s "dreamland," Joyce based much of the \textit{Wake}, as earlier noted, on the radical technique of the universal pun, and structured his depiction of the linguistic universe synchronically. Joyce had used this principle of synchrony in \textit{Ulysses}, as Hugh Kenner demonstrates, but not as extensively as he later used it in the \textit{Wake} where elements of Hebrew, classical Greek and Latin are fused with elements from old, middle, and modern English, the old forms of Church Slavonic, French, Icelandic, and Norse, and the modern forms of more than forty languages. In the \textit{Wake}, these languages exist simultaneously in a narration of the Western history of language structured synchronically, or, to use Kenner's words, according to the principle that "all that exists exists only now, and the past is real only as I imagine it." In terms of the relationship between speech and writing, the \textit{Wake}'s use of synchrony, combined with its radical exploitation of the pun--and the pun's dependence on phonetic similarity needs to be continually emphasized--enables it to stage writing as a form of language that coexists with speech in an interdependent relationship.

Umberto Eco's "The Semantics of Metaphor" provides a useful system of analysis for investigating the \textit{Wake}'s paronomasian fusion of speech and writing. Each of the puns is, as Eco notes, a multiple metaphor and a "forced contiguity between two or more words."\textsuperscript{57} "Epistle," plus "pistol," plus "toll," plus "ear," for example, produces "epistolear" (38.23), one of the many terms with which the \textit{Wake} identifies itself. The forced contiguity between the terms that are elided in this pun, however, allows for a series of different readings. The immediate
context for this term is a discussion between the Cad's wife and her "reverend, the director" (38.18-19), in which rumours about HCE's indiscretion and his meeting with the Cad in the park are spread by word of mouth along a chain of people who are obviously only too eager to disseminate the gossip. The Cad's wife is willing to inform the reverend as long as "the gossiple so delivered in his epistolear, buried teatoastally in their Irish stew would go no further than his jesuit's cloth" (38.23-4). The fact that the wife's confidant is a "reverend" who wears a "jesuit's cloth" provides an obvious explanation for the inclusion of "toll" and "epistle" in this term which is a pun on the "reverend" as an ecclesiastical "epistoler." The rumour of the Cad's meeting with HCE provides an explanation of why the news that the reverend hears concerns a "pistol" because during the park encounter HCE feels "unwishful" of "being hurled into eternity right then, plugged by a soft-nosed bullet from the sap" (35.24-6). The pun "epistolear," then, provides a neat account of the reverend as an epistoler who would be familiar with the tolling of bells and who hears about HCE's encounter with someone whom he fears might shoot him.

As Eco demonstrates in his discussion of the term "meandertale" and "Jungfraud messonge," the multiple metaphors that compose the Wake's puns function not only at the level of the immediate narrative context in which they appear, but also as "pun-lexemes" that operate as a "metaphoric substitution for everything that can be said about the book."58 This second function is possible because each pun is supported by chains of "subjacent contiguities" that constitute the semiotic and semantic
network of the book. The lexemes that occur in these chains are associated through either a semantic or phonetic resemblance to the lexemes with which they are contiguous, and traversing these associative chains reveals that each of the lexemes can, in turn, "function as the archetype of an associative series which would lead to the recuperation, sooner or later, of the associative terminals of another lexeme." Such a network supports the Wake's status as a "model of the Global Semantic System," because, as Eco points out, it provides:

the very characteristic of a language considered as the place of unlimited semiosis . . . where each term is explained by other terms and where each one is, through an infinite chain of interpretants, potentially explainable by all others. 59

Eco's method for investigating the Wake allows the reader to trace the circular, semantic and phonetic chains that constitute the text's lexematic field and observe how the Wake's meaning is determined not only by its linear and contiguous syntactical units, but also by a circular network of lexemes that do not necessarily appear together in the sentences that comprise the linear, narrative continuum. In the narration of the Cad's wife delivering the "gossiple" to the "epistolear" of the "reverend," for example, the linear narrative provides an account of the wife of one of HCE's enemies gossiping to her clergyman about something that she has heard concerning HCE. In the circular network of lexemes that function through semantic and/or phonetic association, however, this episode is a metaphoric remarking of the entire book as the letter that is discovered in the midden heap and the words that ALP employs to pierce the ear of the fallen HCE. As the Cad's wife is
gossiping, she can be said to be dirtying, or 'dumping' 'dirt' on HCE's reputation, and this is the situation that is repeated in the opening of ALP's letter: "Dear. And we go on to Dirdump" (615.12). This salutation is repeated elsewhere as "Dear . . . and I go on to," but in the repetition the "Reverend" is suppressed for the moment and the initials "F.M." are used (280.8-12). Because these are the initials of both Finn MaCool, one of HCE's avatars, and "Father Michael" the priest whose "funferall" is described in yet another repetition of the letter (111), the reader is able to associate the two and recognize that the Cad's wife is addressing HCE in the guise of the "reverend." The Wake's identification of itself as a bible in "chinook bible" (212.33), "gospelly pewmillieu" (552.27-8), and "authordux Book of Lief" (425.20) enables the reader to recognize that in combining 'gospel' with 'gossip' in her "gossiple," the Cad's wife is repeating ALP's message to HCE and is, in this respect, identifiable with ALP. In making these associations, the reader participates in a textually determined process, or, as Eco states, "the reader of FW, controlled by the text, is in fact led into [this] game of association." These associations can be either phonetic and heard, or typographical and seen.

In order to employ Eco's method to investigate the Wake's identification of itself as a writing for the ear as well as the eye, the present examination of the Wake will trace a chain of contiguous lexemes that support the text's definition of itself as a written letter for the hearing, or an 'epistle' 'to' 'l' (Fr. la elided to l') 'ear'--an "epistolear." Eco notes in his investigation of "meanderthaltale" that there are two ways in which this tracing can be done. The first is to
follow the chains generated by the lexeme 'epistoler' (a lexeme that does not appear in the text) in order to observe the mechanisms that led Joyce to modify it to "epistolear." The second, or "inverse process," is to start with the multiple pun "epistolear" and then "trace" it back to its original components." These two paths coincide, however, and in Eco's words, "the very fact that we can conceive of two possible courses indicates" this coincidence:

it was possible to invent the pun because it is possible to read it; language, as a cultural base, should be able to allow both operations.61

As with Eco's investigation, this examination will trace the circular chain of lexemes by reasoning "in terms--however imperfectly defined--of 'association' (phonetic and semantic)," in order to map out the Wake's semantic network. Unlike Eco's study, however, the present investigation will focus primarily on metonymic terms that support the Wake's codification of its writing as an "earish" (130.19) language.62

The modification of 'epistoler' to "epistolear" produces a pun in which the lexeme 'ear' is fused with the lexeme 'epistle." 'Ear' is an important lexeme in the Wake's codification of itself as a writing inextricably involved with phonography. It frequently occurs in the text alone, and, in the puns "Earwicker," "earwakers" (351.25), "earsighted" (143.9), and "earwanker" (520.06), operates as part of the major textual units generated by the HCE configuration. In the narrative of HCE as "the big cleanminded giant H.C. Earwicker" (33.29-30), "ear" is important as a part of the lexemes that signify HCE's deafness (he is "earshot"
[426.35]) as a characteristic feature of his fallen condition. As a fallen, sleeping, giant, a "brotoichthyan form outlined aslumbered (7.20-21), HCE lies "audiurient" (23.21), or, as Joyce explained to Weaver, "long[ing] to hear," and the Wake's river of language, or "languo of flows" (621.22), has evaporated to form a cloud cover, or "Wolkencap" (23.21), over the "Hill" (23.17) of his sleeping form. His "hill begins to be clouded over," Joyce explained to Weaver, "in the effort to hear." The inability to hear is an identifying feature of HCE's fallen and sleeping condition. ALP attempts to talk to HCE--"With lipth she lithpeth to him all to time of thuch on thuch and thow and thow" (23.23-4)--but HCE's only response is staged as a curse (a pun on the German verflucht) and lament over his inability to understand her, "Hairfluke, if he could bad twig her" (23.25). HCE's hearing remains impaired, and the sound of ALP's voice fails to touch him as "Impalpabunt, he abhears" (23.25-6). As Joyce's explication of this short sentence reveals, HCE's deafness keeps him in a fallen and hopeless state: "His ears having failed, he clutches with his hand, misses and turns away hopeless and unhearing." The theme of HCE's deafness and the part this deafness plays in this fallen condition and concomitant separation from ALP is sustained by a series of puns involving the lexeme "ear," and many of these puns are developed in variations of the "Earwicker" name. As a text that attempts to combine speech and writing or "to make soundsense and sensesound kin again" (121.15), the Wake is an attempt to awaken (the pun is obviously operative in the title) the sleeping HCE, and it posits itself as a product of Shem, who possesses an "earwaker's pensile" (173.9-10;
emphasis added). Shem, as many commentators have noted, is one manifestation of HCE (since one of HCE's names is "Here Comes Everybody" [32.19], all of the Wake's characters can be considered as such) and, in a metaphor linking writing (a process that can be described as the manipulation of a pencil or other tool for inscription), Shem is appropriately described as using his pencil, or "pensile," to penetrate his own ear, or "root with earwaker's pensile in the outer of his lauscher" (173.9-10).

Whether or not HCE does wake up is a question that has sparked considerable debate, and the Wake itself, at least as it is understood at the present time, seems to support two opposing views. Following the final chapter's declaration of "Array! Surrection" (593.3-4), for example, the question "You mean to see we have just been hadding a sound night's sleep?" (597.1-2) ("see" as a pun on "say" also sustains the Wake's fusion of written sense and heard sound) could be asked by a waking HCE, which would support the view of critics, like Benstock, who see the Wake as a "comic epic" in which HCE does awaken and experience a resurrection. The final passage of the Wake, however, is the monologue in which, "speafing" (619.20), or speaking, to HCE, ALP commands him "Rise up, man of the hooths, you have slept so long" (219.25-6), and this monologue is cited by critics like Frye, who views the Wake as "the chief ironic epic of our time" because "Finnegan never really wakes up." The final version of ALP's letter (615-619) offers a possible explanation for such differences in critical opinion by positing two worlds and two versions of HCE:
Here gives your answer, pigs and scuts! Hence we've lived in two worlds. He is another he what stays under the himp of holth. The herewaker of our namefame is his real namesame who will get himself up and erect, confident and heroic. (619.9-13)

Because of the Wake's cyclical structure, whereby the final sentence leads the reader back to the beginning of the text, this "another he" will, of course, remain under the "himp of holth" or "Howth" as the "riverrun" (3.1) of the text's language always "brings us . . . back" (3.2) to the text's recitation of the "great fall" (3.30-31). In terms of the network of lexemes that sustain the identification of HCE as sleeping and consequently unable to hear ALP's voice, HCE remains sleeping.

More importantly for the present discussion, however, ALP's letter does predict that in the future, her voice will finally penetrate HCE's "earshells" (435.19) and that, upon hearing her command "Rise up, man of the hooths, you have slept so long . . . Rise up now and aruse" (619.25-9) (appropriately, the Greek form ἀνα is a contraction of ἀναστήσαι, "up! arise!" [Liddell and Scott]), "Earwicker will become "herewaker" regaining, as he "get[s] himself up," his "real namesame." This "real namesame," with its pun on the similarity in sound between the lexemes "hear" and "here," operates, in part, on a codification of the Platonic linguistic philosophy that prefers speech over writing because of its power to guarantee an immediacy and presence (of the speaker to his or her language, of the listener to the speaker, of language to the meaning it carries, and, in the Wake's pun on "hear" and "here," of HCE to ALP), an immediacy of which writing is incapable.
The lexeme "ear" also functions as an archetypal terminal in the series of lexemes that support the multiple pun by which HCE is identified with "Persse O'Reilly." As Ellmann notes, Joyce associated the word "earwig" with Earwicker, and he spent considerable time investigating the insect, "even to the point of writing the entomological laboratory of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturalle for papers on forficula." He knew of a legend in which "Cain got the idea of burial from watching an earwig beside his dead brother Abel," and incorporated the earwig's association with death and burial into the story of HCE's fall. The French term perce-oreille, or "pierce ear," appealed to Joyce, and its similarity to the name of Percy O'Reilly, "a famous player . . . in the All Ireland Polo Club," provided a pun that enabled him to give HCE yet another identity. The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" (44-47) provides a detailed account, albeit from the prejudicial perspective of "Hosty," of HCE's fall, and, like the letter discovered in the midden heap, functions as a microcosm of the Wake's narration of this lapse. The semantic link of "insect" that operates in the earwig--perce-oreille pun is, in turn, also involved in a pun on the desire of "incest" that the Wake's dream narrates. As Burgess notes:

"Earwicker," suggesting earwig, is also a begetter of symbolic entomology. [HCE] . . . feels carnal desire for his daughter, and, one thinks, also for his son Kevin, but his dream is unwilling to present him with the dreaded word incest. This has to be metathetised to insect, which encourages the dermapteral to crawl out of his surname to such an extent that this Protestant Nordic innkeeper can present himself as the Irish patriot Persse O'Reilly.
It is something of an irony, or what the *Wake*, with a lexeme generated from "ear," terms an "earny" (125.22), that the Irish avatar of HCE possesses a name that is involved in a pun on the French form of earwig, but it should be kept in mind that for all of its use of Irish history, myth, and geography, *Finnegans Wake* narrates a universal, rather than Irish-nationalist, staging of Man and language. The *Wake* is described as an "Irish stew" (190.9) twice in its narrative, but on one occasion the term is used by the nationalistic Shaun in a disparaging diatribe aimed at his brother (189.28-190.9), and, on the other, it appears as a description of the complicity between the Cad's wife and her jesuit "reverend" in their transmission of gossip about HCE's indiscretions.70 In the much-less partisan narrative of grammar (266-70) that is presented in the nightlesson chapter (II.2), the *Wake* is a stew composed of books and evening events: "Stew of the evening, booksyful stew" (268.14-15). The Irish dialectic variations of the English language provide, as Ron E. Buckalew notes, a "mind-boggling" "number of possibilities for punning and other wordplay," and Joyce certainly exploited these possibilities as much as he could in order to produce a writing in which sound is incorporated.71 Such Irish variations of the English pronunciations are important not because they are Irish, however, but because they appeal to the ear and provide, as Buckalew points out, a wide range of possibilities for punning. The *Wake* 's basic language is, as Parrinder notes, "specifically, modern English," but its paronomastic fusion of this English with forms from over forty other languages attempts to produce not an English or Irish language, but one that is both "earopean" (598.15) and "earish" (130.19).72
The French sound of the Irish name notwithstanding, the lexemes "Persse O'Reilly" stage a name that is associated with betrayal and scepticism—two terms which are very important to an understanding of Joyce's own views on Irish nationalism. The ballad that bears O'Reilly's name, for example, is a celebration of HCE's fall. HCE is called a "soffsoaping salesman" (45.29), and the song sceptically remarks on his business practices: "Small wonder He'll Cheat E'erawan our local lads nicknamed him" (46.1). The "Ballad" also gleefully describes how HCE will be ruined:

So snug he was in his hotel premises sumptuous  
But soon we'll bonfire all his trash, tricks and trumpery  
And 'tis short till sherrif Clancy'll be winding up his unlimited

[company

With the bailiff's bom at the door  
(Chorus) Bimbam at the door  
Then he'll bum no more. (46.5-11)

"O'Reilly" operates on a terminal lexeme that generates a series of lexemes which function in sceptical, questioning comments on the narrative's description of itself as a fusion of the "sound of Irish sense" and the written, or "seen," form of English:

Behove this sound of Irish sense. Really?  
Here English might be seen. Royally? One  
sovereign punned to petery pence. Regally?  
The silence speaks the seen. Fake! (12.36-13.3  
emphasis added)
The sceptical comment that such a fusion of "sound" and "seen" producing a "silence that speaks the seen" is a "fake!" might be correct, but it also contains "much earny" (125.22), or irony, that results from the function of "Persse O'Reilly" as an archetypal lexeme of contrary, or opposing, associative chains. As it is "The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" that narrates HCE's fall and subsequent burial with the other "deaf and dumb Danes" (47.24), "Persse O'Reilly" has a semantic association with HCE's deafness that is reinforced by the lexeme's function as an identity for HCE. Because "O'Reilly" cannot hear the fusion of the "sound of Irish sense" in the "English . . . seen," he can only produce the sceptical comment "Really?" and pronounce the attempt at the fusion a "Fake!". As a lexeme that signifies the Wake's ability to pierce the ear, however, "Persse O'Reilly" operates as part of the associative series of lexemes that codifies the Wake as a writing to be heard, that is written for the ear (Fr. oreille) per se (thus "Pearcy," the name Joyce found amongst the Irish polo players, is modified and given an orthographic form similar to per se). In this associative series, the comment "Fake!" functions as an exclamation of the success with which "sound" and "English . . . seen" are fused. A 'fake' is a 'phoney', and this semantic link connects the comment with the Wake's account of itself as a phonetic or "phoney" writing. Such a use of the latter word is evident on two occasions when the Wake fuses the rhythm of the song "Yankee Doodle" into its self-reflective narrative:

Flunkey Footle furloughed foul, writing off his phoney (418.2-3)

and:
yunker doodler wanked to wall awriting off his phoney (464.21-22).

While the *Wake* is encyclopedic in its listing of Irish placenames, these names are sometimes distorted in order to sustain the network of terms that produce lexemes which operate in the associative series generated by the lexeme "ear." In HCE's recollection of his association with ALP, for example, "Ireland" is fused with a fragment of the well-known introduction to Antony's eulogy in *Julius Caesar* in order to identify the *Wake*'s scene of writing, not as "Ireland," but as "Earalend" (546.33). Appropriately, HCE begins his recollection by addressing "Mr. Televox" and "Mrs Taubiestimm" (546.29), or Mr "far off" "voice" (OED) and Mrs "deaf" (G. *taub*), "brute" (G. *Biest*), "voice" (G. *Stimme*). The pun of "Taubiestimm" and *taubstumm* ("deaf and dumb") noted by McHugh allows "Taubiestimm" to be heard as an address to someone who is deaf and dumb and, therefore, capable only of reading, and not hearing, the salutation. The *Wake*'s fusion of sound and speech is further revealed by HCE's statement that he has "heard" the account of ALP's behaviour "by mmummy goods waif" (547.4; emphasis added). He has heard it from his "good wife" (who has been abandoned in HCE's fall and left like a "waif"), and the only place he could hear this account is, of course, *Finnegans Wake*. The repetition of the rhythm produced by the vowel and consonant pattern of the *Wake*'s title in HCE's stuttering "mmummy goods waif" facilitates what the *Wake* terms a "soundhearing" (237.17) by which the shared identity of *Finnegans Wake* and HCE's "mmummy goods waif" is
revealed in the sound of the text as a "murmaladen" (583.36), "sound-conducting" (183.8), "Echoland" (13.5). These terms can, of course, all be traced back to the archetypal lexeme "ear."

"Erin," the ancient name for Ireland is similarly modified in order to function in the series of lexemes generated by "ear." In the story of Jarl von Hoother and the Prankquean, Joyce adapted the Irish legend of Grace O'Malley to present another variation of the HCE-ALP story. This episode, in which the Prankquean steals Jarl's twins, is a tri-partite narrative that provides what Margaret Solomon describes as:

> the first sustained illustration of how Joyce will continually employ an inverted synecdoche—the whole representing the parts, the multiple standing for the one—to advance his homely theme of recurrent life.75

The story repeats the theme, noted earlier, of HCE's fall and concomitant separation from ALP as an event that is marked by HCE's loss of hearing. When Jarl, in the guise of "Mark the wans" (21.18), fails to answer the Prankquean's riddle and shuts the door in her face, "grace o'malice kidnapped up the jiminy Tristopher and into the shandy westerness she rain, rain, rain" (21.20-22). Jarl's response is to send her a wireless telegram in which he pleads for her return to Erin. Like the fallen HCE who laments his inability to hear ALP's voice—"if he could bad twig her" (23.25-6)—Jarl states in his telegram that he is deaf, or "deef," and his plea for the Prankquean's return is also a plea for the return of his hearing and a request for her to come within his hearing: "Stop deef
stop come back to my earin stop" (21.23-4, emphasis added). Jarl is deaf ("deef") and wishes to hear, and he wants the Prankquean to "come back to" within the range of his "earin" or hearing.

"Erse," the name for the Irish Gaelic people, is also modified to function in the chain of lexemes generated by "ear." Fusing the myth of the Arthurian legend into its narrative, the Wake presents HCE as an Arthurian figure who, upon his awakening, will lead his people: "He'd be our chosen one in the matter of Brittas more than anarthur" (375.7-8). There is, however, some doubt about HCE's capability to perform as such a leader, so a dual decision is made: to wait and see what occurs when HCE awakens and to "wake" him and see what will happen. These two are (con)fused in "But we'll wake and see." (375.8). The deafness that occurs at HCE's fall seems in part to be a result of his ears being waxed up, as the lamenting address at HCE's wake refers to him as "hive, comb, and earwax," (25.6). In the narration of the case against HCE that occurs during the funeral games, however, the condition of HCE's ears is fused into a recapitulation of his response to the maturing of his sons and a suggestion that HCE will regain the ability to hear and awaken, perhaps to lead the Erse people into freedom. The following passage refers to both his sons and his ears, and a connection between them is made in the series of puns on 'sons' and 'sins' (498.29), 'heirs' and 'here's' (316.9), 'sonne' (Fr., sound) and 'son' (569.8-9) and 'hair' and 'heir' (483.34). HCE is told "You fought as how they'd never waxen up, did you crucket? It will wecker your earse, that it will" (375.18-20). As McHugh's Annotations suggests, "woxen" incorporates the Danish vokseop, and "Wecker" is the German for alarm clock, so the passage indicates
HCE's response to his sons' growing up and his 'alarm' (he "fought" against them) at their maturing. On another level, however, "woxen" operates in a pun on 'waxen' to produce a typically Wakean fusion of opposites.76 HCE thought ("fought") that his ears would not 'waxen', or become "covered or coated with wax" (OED), but they did, and this will wreck ("wecker") his ears ("earse"), and, simultaneously, HCE "fought to regain his hearing, to have his ears "waxen" or "to advance in power" and "become gradually greater . . . to increase in potency" (OED) and allow him to awaken (G. wecken, wake, rouse, awaken). If HCE does regain his ability to hear, he can then function as "anarthur" and awaken (G. wecken) his "earse" (Erse) people and lead them as Arthur is to lead his people.

Eco's method of investigating the "Echoland" (13.5) of Finnegans Wake enables the reader to observe how the text generates a series of lexemes that function metonymically to support the metaphors which are fused together to produce the puns with which the Wake defines itself. It also allows the reader to observe how the associative lexemes function to produce the semiotic codes that determine the associations that the reader is led into making as he or she investigates the Wake's field of signification. The series of lexemes that are generated by the terminal lexeme "ear" enable the reader to follow the associative chain which supports the Wake's identification of itself as not only a written text that narrates HCE's fall, but also as an "earwitness" (5.14), or "epistle" to "I" "ear." The Wake presents HCE as a written textual configuration that generates the numerous sequences of various identities for Earwicker, but it cautions the reader, as well, to listen to the text
because HCE also functions as a writing that very explicitly identifies itself as "soundconducting" (183.9): "Hush! Caution! Echoland!" (13.5). Following Eco's mapping of the lexemes generated by the multiple pun "meanderthaltale," the interconnections produced by the chains operative in "epistolear" can be displayed in an orientive graph like the following:

The most obvious objection to be made against a consideration of Finnegans Wake as a writing that incorporates sound is that, ultimately, the work is a printed text. It exists, so to speak, on the page, and the reader is under no obligation to vocalize any of the passages that he or she reads. The basis of this objection, however, is a concept of the difference between speech and writing that needs to be examined, for it is precisely the distinction between speech and writing entailed by this concept that is disturbed by the writing practice of Finnegans Wake. The
work of Derrida is, from one point of view, a continual meditation on and writing of, and against, this distinction, and the Derridean practice of disseminative writing provides a strategy with which Finnegans Wake can be re-read and remarked as a deconstructive practice of inscription that attempts to dismantle the hierarchical distinction of speech and writing in order to reinscribe writing within speech.

As Derrida's investigation of the Platonic text in Dissemination demonstrates, the distinction between speech and writing is one sustained by a series of numerous binary terms whose hierarchical relationships dominated Western thought until the nineteenth-century and, in some areas of writing, continue to do so today. The fundamental arrangement of such binary terms as "spirit" and "body," "presence" and "absence," "truth" and "error," "male" and "female," and "speech" and "writing" reflects the Western determination of being by the ideals of spirit, truth, and presence. The second term of each binary pair is always considered as a lack, a corrupt and negative version of the first. The hierarchical privileging of the first terms results in a preference for unity, truth, spirit, mind and presence over difference, dissimulation, body, matter, and absence. In terms of language, such privileging produces the ideal of a self-present, unified meaning; and, historically, speech has been preferred as being more capable than writing of achieving this ideal. It is this ideal that Derrida terms "logocentrism" or "phallogocentrism" (because of its preferring of the masculine and its concentration on the single unit and the line).
In terms of these units of binary opposition, *Finnegans Wake* can readily be seen as a writing that subverts the logocentric ideal (although a more detailed examination of this subversion is presented elsewhere in this dissertation, a brief restatement is made here to provide a framework for the following discussion of the text's disruption of the speech/writing hierarchy). The *Wake* explicitly posits itself as a letter spoken by the female ALP to the absent (sleeping and interred) male HCE. It fuses the concept of spirit (in a theological sense) with the much more material spirit of alcohol in its fusion of water and porter and its exploitation of the etymology of whisky (Ir. and Sc. Gaelic *usquebaugh* 'water of life' [OED]; cf. 24.14 and 319.04) and *eau de vie* ('water of life;' cf. 576.03); it refuses any stable identity for its characters and declares itself a "scherzarade . . . in which the sword of certainty which would identify the body never falls" (51.4-6); it rejects the patrilinearity that dominates (as metaphor and economic control) the phallogocentric tradition as "patrilinear plop" (279.4); and its calls the concepts of unity and order into question by its function as a "being with a difference" (269.15) in which "is order othered" (613.14).

A large part of Derrida's investigation of logocentrism focusses upon the relationship between speech and writing. Derrida does not attempt a simple reversal of the two terms, as Barbara Johnson points out. Instead, he attempts to show that the very possibility of opposing the two terms on the basis of presence vs absence or immediacy vs representation is an illusion, since speech is already structured by difference as much as writing is. The very fact that a word is
divided into a phonic signifier and a mental signified . . .
that . . . language is a system of differences rather than a
collection of independently meaning units, indicates that
language is already constituted by the differences it seeks to
overcome.78

Speech can no more present, or 'make present', a unity of signifier and
signedified than can writing. Like writing, from the moment of its utter­
ance, speech is "always already" structured by difference, and, like
writing, it can provide no guarantee of a full and unified meaning. It
is worth noting at this point that Finnegans Wake explicitly disrupts the
concept of unified meaning as it makes an intertext of the title of Ogden
and Richard's The Meaning of Meaning by decapitalizing and interrupting
the rhythm of its spacing (both are important deconstructive strategies)
in order to disseminate its value as an indicator of truthful meaning.
Fusing the decapitalized title with Meinung, Minne (G., "opinion" and
"love") and mean (I. "stuttering"), it inscribes the title as "the
maymeaminning of maimoomeining." (267.3).79

The subordination of writing by speech is initiated by the develop­
ment of a phonetic alphabet. As Gregory Ulmer notes in his develop­
ment of an Applied Grammatology, it "began with phoneticization in hiero­
glyphic writing and approached completion in the phonetic alphabet."80
Derrida is emphatic in insisting that this project cannot be completed
and that the principle of a phonetic writing cannot be met in practice.
Responding to Socrates' concept of a "logos . . . above written dis­
course" in the Phaedrus, Derrida argues:
Declaration of a principle, pious wish and historical violence of a speech dreaming its full self-presence, living itself as its own resumption; self-proclaimed language, autoproduction of a speech declared alive, capable, Socrates said, of helping itself.... Self-proclaimed language but actually speech, deluded into believing itself completely alive, and violent... through expelling the other, and especially its own other... under the name of writing. But however important it might be, and were it in fact universal or called on to become so, that particular model which is phonetic writing does not exist; no practice is ever totally faithful to its principle.

The practical attempt at meeting the principle of a phonetic writing capable of signifying all of the variations in speech entails an "a priori necessary infidelity." Before discussing this infidelity, Derrida points to its "massive phenomena" in punctuation and "spacing in general." Punctuation and spacing are more than "simple accessories of writing." The function of temporal spacing in speech has the same interruptive effect that the spacing (of the letters) has in writing as it limits the play of significance at the level of the letter. At the same time, it remarks the differentiating characteristics of each inscribed letter even as it fuses the letters in a play of repetition and difference that constitutes writing's rhythm. The effect, of temporal spacing in speech, is dramatic: "That a speech supposedly alive can lend itself to spacing in its own writing is what relates it originally to its own death."82

The difference between spacing and punctuation in writing provides a fundamental distinction that is analogous to the difference between speech and writing. In speech, temporal pauses function as both spacing and punctuation. In writing, punctuation and spacing combine to regulate rhythm, but while punctuation functions as a non-phonetic inscription
(and this remarks a limit of the attempt to phoneticize writing), spacing remains a blank, an absence of inscription. *Finnegans Wake* disturbs this fundamental distinction by fusing, or "(con)fusing," punctuation and phonetic inscription. It phoneticizes punctuation in remarking its own punctuation with a phonetic duplication of the stop (G. Punkt) in "Dublire, per Neuropaths. *Punk*" (488.26; emphasis added). It also replaces the letters of the phonetic alphabet with punctuation marks in its staging of the letter as

A........!
?
?........0! (94.21-22)\(^8^3\)

In its interpretation of the four "paper wounds" of the letter as marks made by the "fork" of a "grave Brofesor" during a meal of "Thee . . . smearbread and butter . . . Him . . . and newlaidills" (124.13-14), the *Wake* stages an almost parodic example of the use of diacritical marks in the phoneticization of writing:

following up their one true clue, the circumflexuous wall of a singleminded men's asylum, accentuated by bid tso fb rok engl a ssan dspl itch ina,——Yard inquiries pointed out—that they ad bîn "provoked" ay A fork, of à grave Brofesor; ãth é's Brèak — fast — table; — acûteî profèssionally piquéd, to = introduce a notion of time [ûpon à plane (?) sù "façê'e'] by pûnc! ingh oles (sic) in iSpace?!' (124.6-12)

Valuable as it is for its attempt at reproducing the comic, cliche, "Scotland-Yard," accent of a serious-minded, but somewhat dull, criminal investigator, this passage also deploys mathematical symbols, and it is precisely such symbols that Derrida cites as examples of writing's ability to evade the domination of speech.\(^8^4\) As Ulmer notes:
The modernist aesthetics of silence and the mathematicization of science are for Derrida signs that the culture is shifting away from a paradigm based on language toward one based on writing. The humanities need not become mute, are not helpless in the face of modern science, but may find support precisely in the nonphonetic features of mathematical operations for exploring the resources of spacing in writing.

The *Wake*’s use of the mathematical signs "→" and "=" are staged in a passage which thematically addresses the shift from time to space, or the spatialization of temporality, and it is this area that Derrida often emphasizes in his deconstructive examination of the domination of writing by speech.

In his analysis of Husserl’s phenomenological theory of signs, Derrida addresses what he sees as a "reduction of language" in the development of Husserl’s theory from the *Logical Investigations* to *The Origin of Geometry*. This reduction "terminates in *The Origin of Geometry,*" a work that "confirms the underlying limitation of language to a secondary stratum of experience and ... confirms the traditional phonologism of metaphysics." Dominated by the distinction between body and soul, Husserl’s theory values language only in so far as it can contribute to the constitution of "ideal objects." Speech is invaluable because the phoneme is the "most ideal of signs," and the "apparent transcendence" of the voice is capable of making the signified (which is "always ideal in essence") "present in the act of expression." Writing is valuable only if it is reanimated by breath into the living form of speech: "writing is a *body* that expresses something only if we actually pronounce the verbal expression that animates it, if its *space* is
temporalized" (emphasis added). The distinction between speech and writing that holds speech as the original form of language is based on the ideality of speech's temporality:

What constitutes the originality of speech, what distinguishes it from every other element of signification, is that its substance seems to be purely temporal. And this temporality does not unfold a sense that would itself be nontemporal; even before being expressed, sense is through and through temporal. According to Husserl, the omnitemporality of ideal objects is but a mode of temporality.87

In this ideal phenomenological view of language, sense, as the ideal that is expressed in the living voice of language, cannot be expressed in writing, unless that writing is reanimated by the living voice and made present to the self. In the process of speaking, moreover, as self hears itself speak, it experiences an "auto-affection," a pure presence of the self to itself that Husserl considers a unity of sound, voice, and self that transcends the limits of the materiality of sound. As Derrida points out, however, it is the very temporality of speech that defeats this transcendent unity, for:

The word "time" itself, as it has always been understood in the history of metaphysics, is a metaphor which at the same time both indicates and dissimulates the movement of this auto-affection. All the concepts of metaphysics—in particular those of activity and passivity, will and nonwill, and therefore those of affection or auto-affection, purity and impurity, etc.—cover up the strange "movement" of this difference.88
Derrida sees Husserl's refusal of writing as being defeated in his acceptance that "scientific truth, ie absolute ideal objects," are found only in "statements" and that both speech and "inscription" were "indispensable for the constitution of ideal objects." As in his analysis of Plato's written denouncement of writing in Dissemination, Derrida finds Husserl's recognition of the necessary "incarnations" of speech in writing operating as a "beneficial threat" providing an "underlying motif" that disturbs and contests the "security of Husserl's traditional distinctions." In Husserl's theory of "auto-affection" as an ideal condition in which the self voices thoughts, presenting them to itself in the ideality of the signified, Derrida finds the differentiating effects of time destroying the very purity that speech's temporal nature is supposed to guarantee. He finds the possibility of writing already "dwelling within speech" and writing itself already "at work in the inwardness of thought."^89

In Husserl's theory, speech is an originary phenomena that historically precedes writing, and silent thought, or the self's inner silent voice incarnating its ideas, precedes the external utterance of these ideas. As speech precedes writing, so thought (in which the self speaks silently to itself in the present of its own interiority) precedes speaking. Writing, the incarnation of animate ideas in an inanimate form, is thus a third stage in which the presence of the self (to itself and its ideas) is lost. Finnegans Wake stages a similar paradigm, offering writing as the 'unproved' (G. unbewiesen), 'unconscious' (G. unbewusst), and 'unwise' (these terms are fused in the pun "unbewised") form of language. Deforming the Biblical passage "In the beginning was
the Word" (John I.i), which is traditionally interpreted to link Christ as the Word of God with the Genesis account of God's creation of the world through speech, the Wake posits "In the beginning is the woid, in the muddle is the soundance and thereinafter you're in the unbewised again" (378.29-30). It follows this deformation with the distinction between spoken language and thought, as the silent and ideal form of speech, in which the soul expresses itself: "You talker dunsker's brogue men we our souls speech obstruct hostery. Silence in thought! Sprech!" (378.31-2). It then comments on this paradigm as "anartful of outer nocense" (378.32-3). The paradigm is 'utter nonsense' because "silence in thought" is not a mark of the "soul" contemplating such ideal thoughts as 'abstract history' ("obstruct hostery"), but an "outer" mark of guilt or "nocense" (L. nocentia, guilt). "Souls speech" cannot "obstruct" the accusation of guilt that Hosty makes against HCE. ("The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly" that gleefully recounts HCE's sins and his fall is a good example of "Hostery.") Like Freud's theory in Inhibitions, Symptoms, and Anxiety, the Wake proffers writing as always involved with guilt. 90

The ideals of thought, of a "souls speech," or of a speech free from the guilt that is involved with writing is "a good one, ha!" (378.34). HCE's 'speech' is always marked by stuttering and the "hosetanzies, dat sure ... sullibrated word" (379.7) that characterize his guilt, and the investigation of the Wake as a writing that structures HCE's speech will always reveal this guilt: "kick nuck, knockcastle! Muck! And you'll nose it, 0 you'll nose it without warnward from we" (379.1-2).
In his analysis of Freud's theory on the structure of psychic organization and the metaphor developed in "Note on the Mystic Writing-Pad," Derrida approaches the possibility of a writing functioning within speech. As one of the general headings for this lecture reveals, Derrida places the problem of writing and speech within the context of his philosophical investigations of "The Enigma of presence 'pure and simple'":

as duplication, original repetition, auto-affection, and diﬀerance. The distinction between the mastering of absence as speech and the mastering of absence as writing. The writing within speech. Hallucination as speech and hallucination as writing.92

The goal of Derrida's analysis is Freud's representation of the "psychical content" with a "text whose essence is irreducibly graphic," and the "structure of the psychical apparatus" with a "writing machine." The fundamental thesis of the analysis is that Freud "makes what we believe we know under the name of writing enigmatic," and this thesis is developed in tracing a "strange progression" in Freud's writing:

From the Project (1895) to the "Note on the Mystic Writing-Pad" (1925) . . . a problematic of breaching is elaborated only to conform increasingly to a metabolitics of the written trace. From a system of traces functioning according to a model which Freud would have preferred to be a natural one, and from which writing is entirely absent, we proceed toward a configuration of traces that can no longer be represented except by the structure and functioning of writing.92

In developing his theory of memory, for example, Freud begins with the concept of memory as an effect of a "breaching" or "pathbreaking" (G. Bahnung) in which certain parts of the perceptive system erect barriers
against the quantity of excitation that results from the perception. The effect of this resistance is an impression of traces left upon the psyche. Memory functions as the "essence of the psyche: resistance, and . . . an opening to the effraction of the trace." By the time of the "Note on the Mystic Writing-Pad," however, Freud sees the psyche functioning like the wax tablet covered by waxed paper and a celluloid sheet that functions as a writing-pad on which one can write messages that can be erased by lifting the covering sheets away from the tablet. The celluloid sheet protects the wax paper in the same way that the surface level of the perceptive-conscious system protects the secondary level that receives eternal stimuli from the possibility of damage caused by excessive excitation. The wax tablet functions like the unconscious behind the perceptive-consciousness system and retains the traces of impressions upon the surface sheets after the impressions themselves have been erased. An examination of the wax tablet reveals a series of palimpsestual traces that are analogous to the constitution of the psyche by the memory as a system of different traces left upon the unconscious by the exertion of external forces upon the psyche.

Of particular importance to Derrida is Freud's consideration of the interpretation of dreams as the decoding of a text. In the Project, Freud states that "Dreams generally follow old facilitations," and Derrida, explaining these facilitations in the context of Freud's 1896 letter to Fliess, describing the psyche in terms of "sign" (G. Zeichen) and "transcription" (G. Umschrift), states:
Topographical, temporal, and formal regression in dreams must thus be interpreted, henceforth, as a path back into a landscape of writing. Not a writing which simply transcribes, a stony echo of muted words, but a lithography before words: metaphonetic, nonlinguistic, alogical.

Freud interprets dreams with a "decoding method (chiffreir-methode)," treating the dream-text as a "kind of cryptography (Geheimschrift)," and, as Derrida points out, speech is treated in this decoding as a "test of phonetic writing [that] is cathected and functions as a discrete, specific, translatable and unprivileged element in the overall writing of the dream. Phonetic writing as writing within writing." Conscious speech with its "logical and ideal structure" becomes subordinated by the "dream system" to which it "must submit." Speech is not absent in dreams but subordinated "on the dream stage." It still operates in dreams but it loses its domination and operates "much as captions do in comic strips, those picto-hieroglyphic combinations in which the phonetic text is secondary." The recognition of the cathexis which the phonetic text undergoes in submitting to the text of the dream facilitates a view of the "overall writing of dreams" in which phonetic writing is exceeded and speech is put "back in its place."

_Finnegans Wake_ is, of course, a text that explicitly posits itself as a dream, and its language as the language of a "dreamland" (613.28). Like the writing within speech that Derrida locates within the Freudian concept of the psychic operation in dreams, _Finnegans Wake_ posits itself as a writing in which speech can be read in much the same way that the Freudian, cathected, phonetic writing of speech can be read in the signs of the unconscious that operate in dreams. The writing of the _Wake_
incorporates a speech that the reader can reproduce, but, because it is subordinated to graphic writing, it is a speech that must be read in a "speechreading" (568.31, emphasis added). This subordination of speech by writing accounts for such variations on "Earwicker" as "Ear! Ear! Weakear!" (568.26), variations that signify HCE's inability to hear. At one level of the Wake's narrative, HCE is merely sleeping, "hadding a sound night's sleep" (597.2), and his dream is a text which, like the Freudian dream-text, incorporates speech (thus it is a "sound night's sleep" in at least two senses), but a speech that has lost its voice in its subordination by the grapheme. In much the same way that HCE hears ALP's "murmerladen" (586.36) voice "speafing" (619.20) (as opposed to 'speaking'), the reader of the text can hear the distorted speech patterns and song rhythms that are contained as inscriptions within the written text. Perhaps one of the best examples is provided by the Wake's opening "riverrun, past Eve and Adam's" (3.1). Of course, this passage announces the text as the "riverrun" of ALP's language (and thus the Wake itself) and provides a link between ALP and the River Liffey which flows past the 'Adam and Eve's' Church that is located on the bank of the Liffey in Dublin. Joyce's alteration of 'Adam and Eve's' to "Eve and Adam's," however, emphasizes, in sound, that the Wake has left behind the story of Stephen Dedalus. A vocalized reading of "riverrun, past Eve and Adam's" facilitates the linking of the 'st' of "past" with "Eve" and the 'an' of "and" (the 'd' of "and" is easily elided in reading the line). This produces a form of 'Stephen', and the 'pa' of "past" operates as a pun on the French pas, or not. The passage can thus be heard as "riverrun, pas Stephen Adam's," or a negation of Stephen Dedalus and
Adam. In encasing this phoneticized displacement of the male heroes Stephen and Adam in the "riverrun" language of ALP's inscribed letter, the Wake puts "patrilinear plop" (279.4) in its place and opens up the narrative of a discourse that moves away from the phallogocentric domination of writing by speech. It does not negate the male principle but inscribes it within a female language. HCE is narrated and inscribed within ALP's letter much as HCE's identity as the "reverend" is inscribed within, and echoed by, "riverrun."
Notes

4 *James Joyce*, p. 702.
5 *James Joyce*, pp. 703, 700. Information on Ogden's arrangement of the recording and an account of the difficulties Joyce experienced because of his eyesight are found on 617 and 637.
7 For the pun of "Persse O'Reilly" and *perce oreille* see *James Joyce*, p. 570. The pun is common knowledge in Joyce scholarship.
Joyce and His New Work" (UTQ, 9 [1939], 68-81) drew attention to the Wake's musical qualities. Edel argued that the Wake came as close to music "as prose can come."


13 "Double writing" is a term that Derrida employs to signify a practice of writing that self-reflectively 're-marks' (marks again) its own signifiers as involved in a process of signification that evades the domination by one signified that would restrict the text's semiotic play. Writing that marks itself as originary (but not original) frequently incorporates a marking of the texts that it draws within its
boundaries in its semiotic play. It re-marks these intertexts, indicating that they have previously functioned in other discourse. It thus re-writes or "doubles" the 'other' in its own textuality. For Derrida, all writing (graphic, phonetic, ideogrammatic, hieroglyphic, psychical, military, literary, philosophical, etc.), is "double writing" because there is, ultimately, no origin to which writing can refer as the original of all writing. Any text is already an intertext in which fragments of previous texts operate. Cf. Positions, p. 41, and "The Double Session" in Dissemination, trans. Barbara Johnson (Chicago: Chicago U.P., 1981), pp. 173-286. See also Positions (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1972), p. 58 and "La Double Séance" in La dissémination (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972), pp. 199-318.

14 Positions, p. 42. See Positions (Fr. version): "un champ textual ... groupé. Une écriture bifide ... qui à la fois provoque un renversement de la hiérarchie parole/écriture, comme de tout son système attenant, et laisse détonner une écriture à l'intérieur même de la parole" (pp. 58 and 57).


demonstrate in their introduction that the *Wake* operates not according to the standard principles of plot, narrative, and character, but by the Freudian principles of displacement, condensation, and substitution. Their subsequent analysis, however, presents the *Wake* in a fairly conventional, novelistic, light. One of Heath's contentions is that the *Wake* is, in a large part, inaccessible to a critic using traditional literary categories because it leaves both conventional literary practice and the terms of literary criticism "in ruins."

18 *Finnegans Wake* is, of course, a book, but as a practice of writing-thinking of the kind described by Derrida as "pluri-dimensional, symbolic," in *Of Grammatology* (trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U.P., 1976] p. 86), it also participates in the "massive reappearance of nonlinear writing." As Derrida argues, "The end of linear writing is indeed the end of the book, even if, even today, it is within the form of a book that new writings—literary or theoretical—allow themselves to be, for better or for worse, encased" (p. 86). See *De la grammatologie*: "La fin de l'écriture linéaire est bien la fin du livre" (p. 129). Derrida discusses "la linéarité" of thinking and of writing as "le refoulement de la pensée [and of writing] symbolique pluri-dimensionelle" (p. 128).


20 Roland McHugh, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U.P., 1980), p. 262 (the pages of *Annotations* have the same numbers as the *Wake*).


23 Barbara Johnson uses this phrase in her notes summarizing Derrida's view of the most forceful events in Western writing. See Dissemination, p. 182.

24 The Greek ἀνά is a term that is applicable to ALP in several of its senses. The Wake posits itself as a boat on several occasions and since it is ALP, as the language of the text, that enables the reader to be "on board" the text-as-boat, this first sense of the genitive form is appropriate. The dative "on, upon" is an accurate description of ALP as the language on, or upon the pages of, the text. Several of the accusative forms are also applicable, including the common usage of "motion upwards." It is, of course, ALP's voice that attempts to reawaken or resurrect HCE. The Greek ἀνά is particularly appropriate to ALP. It is a contraction of ἀνάστησις, or "up! arise!" and this is the message that ALP gives to HCE in her final monologue.

25 Dissemination, p. 97. La dissémination: "Theuth . . . fait tourner le mot autour de son étrange et invisible pivot" (p. 109).

26 The Decentered Universe, p. 123.

27 Role of the Reader, p. 68.


29 Joyce to Ole Vinding. James Joyce, p. 696.

30 Ellmann presents the manifesto in James Joyce, p. 588; for Joyce's comment to Larbaud see ibid., p. 613.
32 The Pound Era, p. 102.
33 Ibid., p. 126. Kenner is quoting from Ellmann's James Joyce.
36 Ibid., p. xxii, pp. 43-44.
37 Ibid., p. xxii, pp. 42 and 305.
39 The Decentered Universe, p. 121.
41 Writing and Difference, p. 286; L'écriture et la différence, p. 412.
42 James Joyce, p. 303, emphasis added.
43 Ibid., p. 590.
44 Walter J. Ong, Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the
45 James Joyce, p. 505.
46 McHugh's Annotations, p. 236, lists these non-English terms and
the title of the songs.
47 The circular path by which the Wake's final "the" leads back to
the opening "riverrun" is well known. The circularity by which the Wake
always returns, eventually, to mark its status as a practice of writing
("envelope" [66.14], "epistol" [228.33], "letteracettera" [339.36], "pen-
product" [108.31], etc.), is, in Derrida's terms, a "re-marking" that
operates at the level of the theme, the sign, and the individual letter.
Derrida sees the spacing of writing (the Wake terms it a "paperspace"
[115.7]), the "polysemy of 'blanks' and 'folds'," functioning in a double
operation. It limits, or marks, the limit of the letter and always
returns through a certain "fold" of the blank to re-mark itself (mark
itself again): "From the moment the blank (is) white or bleaches
(itself) out, as soon as there is something (there) to see (or not to
see) having to do with a mark (which is the same word as margin or
march), whether the white is marked (snow, swan, virginity, paper, etc.),
or unmarked, merely demarcated (the entre, the void, the blank, the
space, etc.), it re-marks itself, marks itself twice." Dissemination,
pp. 251 and 258. See La dissemination, pp. 283 and 290.
48 Ambivalences, p. 60, see pp. 6-7 above.
49 Role of the Reader, p. 68.
Derrida applies this term to the relationship between reading and writing: "If reading and writing are one, as is easily thought these days, if reading is writing, this oneness designates neither undifferentiated (con)fusión nor identity at perfect rest; the is that couples reading with writing must rip apart. One must then, in a single gesture, but doubled, read and write" (Dissemination, pp. 63-4). Compare this with La dissémination: "si la lecture est l'écriture, cette unité ne désigne ni la confusion indifférenciée ni l'identité de tout repos; le est qui accouple la lecture a l'écriture doit en découdre." Thus, "il faudrait donc, d'un seul gest, mais dédouble, lire et écrire" (p. 72). Reading can be understood in terms of its relationship to the psychical mechanisms as a form of inscription upon the psyche as a "Mystical Writing-Pad" (see "Freud and the Scene of Writing" in Writing and Difference, pp. 196-231 and L'écriture et la différence, pp. 293-340). The perception-conscious system that Freud describes functions in the reading process, but, at the same time, the text, as an external force exerted upon the psyche, excites not only the perceptual system but also that part of the psychic organization which Freud describes as "\(\psi\)-neurones." These neurones "oppose contact-barriers to the quantity of excitation [and] thus retain the printed trace" (Writing and Difference, p. 201). The Wake posits itself as "That letter selfpenned to one's other" (489.33-4), and, in addressing this "other," does so on one occasion by an inversion of the terms 'reader' and 'writer': "But how transparingly nontrue, gentlewriter!" (63.10, emphasis added). This inversion is repeated in the Wake's narration of Yawn's tale: "All of asprawl he was laying ... and I can tell you something more than that,
drear writer (476.19-21, emphasis added). This inversion suggests that the \textit{Wake} operates like the double mark of Derrida's "reading is writing." Johnson translates "cette unité [qui] ne désigne ni la confusion indifférenciée ni l'identité de tout repos" as a unity that is a "(con)fusion" of reading and writing. Her application of this term implies fusion "with," or "con" (fr. L. \textit{com}, "together, together with, in combination or union") and, at the same time, difference from (L. \textit{contra}). The bracketing of "con" maintains it as a separate, double value from the value of "fusion" even as the brackets function to indicate the double values of identity and difference that are brought into contact in the "confusing" juxtaposition. Because the \textit{Wake} requires its reader to 'speak' it while reading it—"Can you \textit{rede} . . . its world?" (18.18-19, emphasis added to the G. for 'speech')—and to 'read' it as sound, "speechreading" (568.31) it with a "listener's eye" (174.18), the term "(con)fusion" seems appropriate to signify the textual relationship between written sense and "sensesound" (121.15).

51 \textit{Role of the Reader}, pp. 70-1.
52 \textit{James Joyce}, p. 546.
53 Jacques Lacan, \textit{The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis}, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978), p. 21. Lacan is, of course, an explicitly self-acknowledged disseminator of Freud's theories. The relationship between the unconscious and language cannot be overemphasized. The unconscious is "the sum of the effects of speech on a subject, at the level at which the subject constitutes himself out of the effects of the signifier" (\textit{ibid.}, p. 126). This constitution does not effect a unified subject, however, as "the subject as such is
uncertain because he is divided by the effects of language" (ibid., p. 188). The uncertainty and division of the subject is obviously relevant to the *Wake* as a text of language positing itself as a dream text of the unconscious. It explicitly posits itself as a writing of an uncertain subject, of "that identity of undiscernibles" (49.36-50.1).

54 The importance of the pun as a technique by which the unconscious reveals itself was discussed by Freud. See, for example, "Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious" in *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, trans. and ed. A.A. Brill (New York: Random House, 1938), pp. 633-708. Freud considered the pun as "one of the largest groups into which the techniques of wit may be divided" and dismissed the "low estimate in which the form of wit is held" in order to consider it as part of the "intimate connection between all psychic occurrences" (pp. 655 and 638). Joyce clearly availed himself of Freudian theories in composing the *Wake*, but the extent to which he was "influenced" by Freud is the cause for debate amongst Joyce scholars. Parrinder argues that "Joyce was surely affected by Freud's unravelling of the 'dream-work' in writing *Finnegans Wake,*" although he does not state how much or in what way Joyce was affected (James Joyce, p. 214). Ellmann's *James Joyce* does not really clarify matters. Ellmann talks of Joyce's "distaste for Freud" (p. 546) and reports Joyce's "point of honour" in insisting that he derived the "interior monologue" from Dujardin rather than Freud (p. 126), but he also points out that Joyce did possess Freud's *Traumdeutung* was published in late 1899 and available to Joyce,
"Joyce's interest in dreams is pre-Freudian" (p. 85). Joyce told Tom Kristensen "I don't believe in any science, but my imagination grows when I read Vico as it doesn't when I read Freud or Jung" (693). Fredrick Hoffman argues that *Finnegans Wake* employs "all of the devices that Freud explained in chapter seven of *The Interpretation of Dreams*" ("Infroyce," in Sean Givens, ed. *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* [New York: Vanguard Press, 1963] p. 422), and, as Parrinder comments, there "seems no reason to dissent from [his] conclusion" (Parrinder's *James Joyce*, p. 214). Both Norris (*The Decentered Universe*) and Rose and O'Hanlan (*Understanding Finnegans Wake*) detail the similarities between Joyce's compositional techniques and Freud's concepts of condensation, displacement, substitution, and overdetermination.

55 Hugh Kenner, *Joyce's Voices* (Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1978), see pp. 48-50; "more than forty" is a very conservative estimate of the modern languages Joyce used in writing the *Wake*, as McHugh's *Annotations* lists some sixty-five languages, including those mentioned here.

56 *Joyce's Voices*, p. 49.

57 *Role of the Reader*, p. 72. Joyce took advantage of the fact that existing words could be exploited for lexemes that are not justified by the etymology of the words. Thus Finnegan, the proper name of the character in the song "Finnegan's Wake," contains the Fr. fin and a pun on the English 'again.' While neither of these lexemes is justifiable in terms of historically accurate etymology, Joyce exploited them thoroughly. The modification of 'epistoler' to "epistolear" entails only the insertion of the 'a' (coincidentally, the very same insertion that
Derrida makes in altering the Fr. *différence* to *différance*); however, the *Wake* exploits the fact that 'epistoler' contains the lexemes 'pistol,' 'tol' (and, by association, 'toll') and (as the following section of the chapter attempts to demonstrate) a phonetic similarity to 'ear.' As a multiple pun, "epistolear" functions in the chain of lexemes generated by "ear," but it also operates in the narratives of HCE and the Cad and Buckley's shooting of the Russian General. As will be noted in the chapter, the lexeme 'pistol' operates in the pun on the "reverend" hearing the story in which HCE is afraid of being shot. It also operates, however, in a description of the reverend as a 'pistoleer.' The reverend who apparently agrees to buy the "gossiple" about HCE "tea-toastally" in the "Irish stew" (38.23-24) is none other than the "priest Mr. Browne" and his "secondary personality . . . Nolan" (38.26-8). It is, of course, "Father San Browne, tea and toaster" who "is Padre Don Bruno . . . was the reverend, the solidality director . . . that is the same snob . . . encountered by the General on that red-letter morning" (50.18-32). The identity of the reverend and Buckley is supported by Butt's dress in the skit on the shooting (338-53) when he appears as a "mottledged youth" of "clergical appealance" (338.11).

58 *Role of the Reader*, p. 76.
59 Ibid., pp. 76, 74, 76.
60 Ibid., p. 76.
61 Ibid., p. 74.
62 Ibid., p. 74. It should be noted that another chain generated by "epistolear" would lead to the semantic network supporting the *Wake* as a funeral celebration. 'Pistol,' for example, generates 'bullet,'
'shooting,' 'death,' and 'funeral' etc., and this chain operates in the narrative of Buckley and the Russian General (cf. f.n. 62 above) and the fall of HCE.


64 Ibid.

65 Joyce-Again's Wake, p. 216; Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1957), p. 323. In keeping with his view of literature's educational function in society, Frye is loath to see the Wake as a vision of Man trapped inside language, and, in a statement that reflects his idealistic vision of the individual imagination, Frye qualifies his assessment of the Wake. "Who then is the hero who achieves the permanent quest in Finnegans Wake? No character in the book itself seems a likely candidate; yet one feels that this book gives us something more than the merely irresponsible irony of a turning cycle. Eventually it dawns on us that it is the reader who achieves this quest, the reader who, to the extent that he masters the book of Doublends Jined, is able to look down on its rotation, and see its form as something more than rotation" (pp. 323-24).

66 The paradigm that operates is one that prefers speech over writing. If Earwicker hears ALP's voice calling him to arise, he will awaken, becoming present to ALP, as a "herewaker." This is not to argue that the Wake continually operates according to such a Platonic philosophy. Elsewhere in the dissertation, the decapitalization and literal interruption of the proper name Plato in the anagram (and Anna's
gramme) "Approach to lead our passage" (262.2, emphasis added) will be examined as an inversion of the binary terms 'male' and 'female,' 'logical' and 'alogical,' 'phallo' and 'gyno' that operate in the logocentric tradition.  
67 James Joyce, p. 570.  
68 Margaret C. Solomon, in Eternal Geomater: The Sexual Universe of Finnegans Wake (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U.P., 1969), explains that the Wake's narration of individual episodes like the discovery of the letter and the tale of Jarl van Hoother function not only as synecdochal narratives for the Wake as a whole, but also, by what she terms an "inverted synecdoche," as units that are restatements of the events that comprise them. These events--biddy's scratching at the letter, for example,--are variations on the production of the entire Wake. As McHugh points out, however, the Wake also employs a more conventional synecdoche and ALP's "letter is ultimately all writings, particularly FW itself." See The Sigla of Finnegans Wake (London: Edward Arnold, 1976), p. 113.  
69 Joysprick, p. 131.  
70 Shaun's nationalism is perhaps most fully developed in his role as St. Patrick. There, as Solomon notes "he sees only the Irish world, and it is green" (Eternal Geomater, p. 124). There is an obvious danger in a simplistic consideration of the Shem-Shaun roles, as Benstock continually emphasizes in Joyce-Again's Wake. Shaun, however, is associated with betrayal, particularly when he changes roles from Parnell to Healy in order to betray Parnell and assumes the dual role that Benstock describes as "the betraying politician and the Roman Catholic clergy hounding the uncrowned king" (p. 22). Shaun's nationalism also emerges
immediately following his description of Shem's writing as an Irish stew. In his role as Justius, he berates Shem for being "an Irish emigrant the wrong way out" and accuses him of being un-Irish: "semi-semitic serendipitist, you . . . Europasianised Afferyank!" (190.36, 191.2-4). In the Cad's wife and the reverend episode "their Irish stew" signifies both the Wake itself and the gossip that the Cad's wife will spread by telling it to the reverend. On one narrative level, this episode stages a synecdochal narration of ALP whispering in HCE's ear in an attempt to revive him. At the same time, however, it is an episode of betrayal because the reverend betrays the Cad's wife's "trusting . . . that the gossiple . . . would go no further than his jesuit's cloth" (38.20-24).


72 James Joyce (Parrinder), p. 231.

73 Ellmann points out in his James Joyce that Joyce was very sceptical about Irish nationalism. In the series of articles Joyce wrote for the Trieste paper Il piccolo della Sera, for example, Joyce's criticisms of the Vatican and the British empire are, as Ellmann states, "considerably diminished" as "Irish propaganda" because Joyce says as much against "his own people" as he does about Britain and Catholicism. Joyce also approved of James Stephens' suggestion for the organization of the Fenian movement into small groups as a move "eminently fitted to the Irish character because it reduces to a minimum the possibility of betrayal." "In Ireland," Joyce contended, "at the proper moment, an
informer always appears." pp. 255-56. See also 255-59, passim. The
articles are reproduced in James Joyce: The Critical Writings, eds.

74 Julius Caesar, III.ii.79., Shakespeare: Complete Works, ed.

75 Eternal Geomater, p. 20. Solomon makes frequent mention of Jarl
van Hoother and the Prankquean as HCE and ALP in her discussion of the
episode. See pp. 3-20.

76 Joyce's attraction to Giordano Bruno's theory of the coincidence
of contraries has been explored by many scholars. Michael Begnal, who
describes the theory as the "notion that an entity can attain to a know­
ledge of itself only through an understanding of, and fusion with its
opposite," explores the theory as it is used in the Wake in Narrator and
Grace Eckley, who co-authored the book, discusses the applicability of
the theory in the transformation of the washerwomen into the tree and
stone, "or the brothers Shem and Shaun" (ibid., p. 199). Benstock
investigates the appearances of Shem and Shaun in terms of Bruno's theory
in "The Quiddity of Shem and the Whatness of Shaun" JJQ 1, No. 1 (1963),
26-33. For an application of the theory to the Wake's structure, see
Roland McHugh's "A Structural Theory of Finnegans Wake," A Wake
Newslitter, NS 5 No. 6 (Dec. 1968), 83-87. Elliot B. Gose, Jr. traces
Joyce's earlier use of Bruno's theory in The Transformation Process in

77 See The Role of the Reader, p. 75.

78 Barbara Johnson, "Introduction" to Dissemination, p. ix.
Annotations, p. 267. The context of searching in which this pun operates—"lead us to seek, lote us see, light us find, let us missnot" (267.1-2)—signifies the process of reading the Wake in order to determine its meaning (or the 'meaning of its meaning'). The interpretive process is also signified by the double pun on 'mining': "maymeaminning," "maimoomeining" (emphasis added; as noted earlier, the Wake identifies itself as a "puntomine" or 'pun' 'to' 'mine' [587.8]). The Wake's self-reflection on its deconstruction of the signifiers with which it offers 'meaning' as "maymeaminning" and "maimoomeining" is marked (or "re-marked") in the double inscription of the possessive adjective (L. mea, G. mein). Because the Wake stages writing as a process that is involved with the operation of the phallus (writing as the violent manipulation of the pen in solitude, as a "penisolate war" [3.6]; Shem using his father's ["earwaker's"] "pensile" to "root . . . in the outer of his lauscher" [173.9-10]) and the transgression of the incest prohibition (see Burgess' comment on "insect" as a metathesis of 'incest' on p. 39 above, and Freud's comments on writing as the "performance of a forbidden sexual act," f.n. 95 below; cf. Dolph's inscription of ALP's vagina and the "lift by her seam hem and jabote a the spidsiest of her trickkikant" episode [295-297]) it re-marks writing and the production of meaning as violent (see Kev's response to Dolph's inscription—"he fight him" [303.30-31]) penetration and maiming. Meaning is achieved as "dis-figurement" or maiming—"maimoomeining."


82 Ibid.. For Derrida's investigation of spacing as the rhythm of "written character and cadence" see Dissemination, p. 178 f.f. and La dissémination, p. 204 f.f. ("Ce qui ruine la 'pieuse majuscule' de titre et travaille à la décollation du texte, c'est l'intervention régée du blanc, la mesure et l'ordre de la dissémination, la loi de l'espacement, le μορφής[cadence et caractère d'écriture], la 'ponctuation qui disposée sur papier blanc, déjà s'y signifie'.") In "The Double Session" (Dissemination, pp. 173-285) Derrida's investigation of Mallarmé stages a prolonged meditation on the operation of spacing (the 'blank,' the 'white') in writing. Derrida sees the blank space of the page as a powerful force in the determination of writing as dissemination, or the scattering of that which has often been thought of as a unified meaning accessible through thematic criticism and guaranteed by the unity of form and content, the wholeness of organic form, and the operation of the proper name. As "an example of modern criticism," thematic criticism is "at work whenever one tries to determine a meaning through a text, to pronounce a decision upon it, to decide that this or this is a meaning . . . that it is meaningful . . . posed, posable, or transposable as such: a theme" (p. 245; La dissémination, p. 276). Because the blanks (and folds) "cannot in fact be mastered as themes or meanings," their operation in the text defeats the attempt to pronounce the meaning of the text. Something will always exceed the attempt at making a final pronouncement or declaration of meaning. Spacing is obviously important in allowing the meanings of individual signifiers to be related to each
other, but spacing itself lacks "semic content" yet remains a powerful force in the text that evades description: "In the constellation of the 'blanks,' the place of the semic content remains practically empty: it is that of the 'blank' meaning insofar as it refers to the non-sense of spacing, the place where nothing takes place but the place. But the 'place' is everywhere . . . because the signifying spaces continually reproduce themselves . . . and because the semic, metaphoric, and even thematic affinity between 'white' . . . and 'blank' . . . means that each 'white' in the series, each 'full' white thing in the series (snow, swan, paper, virginity, etc.), is the trope of the 'empty' white space. And vice versa. The dissemination of the whites . . . produces a tropological structure that circulates infinitely around itself through the incessant supplement of an extra turn: there is more metaphor, more metonymy. Since everything becomes metaphorical, there is no longer any literal meaning . . . Since everything becomes metonymical, the part being each time greater than the whole and the whole smaller than the part, how could one arrest a metonymy or synecdoche? How could one fix the margins of any rhetoric?" (pp. 257-8; La disseminasion, pp. 289-90). Finnegans Wake stages the blank as a sign (as an inscribed mark and as an appending of the proper name) in the series that narrates the process of writing (in reverse) from the space to the first stroke of impression (Derrida's 'gramme,' from the Gk.γράμμα), to the formation of phonetic letter, to the word: "every word, letter, penstroke, paperspace is a perfect signature of its own" (115.7-8), emphasis added). (On the Wake's use of the process by which writing becomes printing see J.P. Riquelme's Teller and Tale in Joyce's Fiction: Oscillating Perspectives [Baltimore
and London: The Johns Hopkins U.P., 1983], pp. 18-19.) This occurs, appropriately enough, in a passage that displaces the concept of the author as a single subject with the notion of the plurality of writing's originary scene. The "hand" that manipulates the instrument of inscription may have been "one," but the "minds of active and agitated" that constitute "the identities in the writer complexus" "were more than so" (114.33-5).

83 Including the (nineteen) dots, the alphabetic (and phonetic) letters, the question mark, and the two exclamation marks, there are twenty-four discrete signs. The twenty-four letters that constitute the Greek alphabet are obviously one of the signifieds of this series, as McHugh (Annotations, p. 94) and other critics have noted. The domination of writing by speech that is manifest in the attempt to phoneticize writing is disrupted by the replacement of the phonetic letters with the non-phonetic symbols ".", "?", and "!". This is also a further (con)fusion of speech and writing because the question and exclamation marks are, of course, guides to sounding. The limits of the Greek alphabet's series from Alpha to Omega, are exceeded here by the placement of the signifier of one of the internal (between "A"lpha and "O"mega) signifieds after the final "O". Thus the interiority of the series is used to mark both the limits of the series and to exceed the series by supplementing it. Much the same deconstructive technique is employed when the decapitalized initial of the proper name "Plato" (and this name can function as a synecdoche for Greek Literature and the Greek alphabet) is placed outside of the "A" to "o" series in "Approach to lead our passage!" (262.2, emphasis added). The reverse anagram "A...t...l...o...p"
also contains the platonic name within the inscription of ALP's initials. As it is ALP's letter(s) that constitute the "passage" through the *Wake*, the text as ALP's writing can be said to exceed the limits of the A to 0 series (as considerable meditation on the pun of 'p' to 'pea' and the association between ink and urine in *Wake* commentary suggests, this excess is achieved through the fluidity of the text's language).

84 In his *Course on General Linguistics*, Saussure notes that among the difficulties of a truly phonetic writing, or what he terms a "phonological writing," is the fact that its alphabet "would probably be weighed down by diacritical marks." This is, of course, exemplified in this passage of the *Wake*. Saussure's comment is quoted in *Of Grammatology*, p. 38. See also *De la grammatologie*: "En outre un alphabet applicable à toutes les langues risquerait d'être encombré de signes diacritiques" (p. 57).

85 *Applied Grammatology*, p. 9.


87 Ibid., p. 83. See also pp. 77-87 passim. *La voix et le phénomène*, p. 93: "Ce qui fait l'originalité de la parole, ce par quoi elle se distingue de tout autre milieu de signification, c'est que son étoffe semble être purement temporelle. Et cette temporalité ne déroule pas un sens qui lui-même serait intemporel. Le sens, avant même d'être
exprimé, est temporel de part en part. L'omnitemporalité des objets idéaux, selon Husserl, n'est qu'un mode de la temporalité. Cf. pp. 87-97 passim.

88 Ibid., p. 85. On "auto-affection" see esp. pp. 78-82. La voix et le phénomène, p. 95: "Le mot 'temps' lui-même, tel qu'il a toujours été entendu dans l'histoire de la métaphysique, est une métaphore, indiquant et dissimulant en même temps le 'mouvement' de cette auto-affection. Tous les concepts de la métaphysique--en particulier ceux d'activité et de passivité, de volonté et de non-volonté et donc ceux d'affection ou d'auto-affection, de pureté et d'impureté etc.--recouvrent l'étrange 'mouvement' de cette différence. See pp. 88-92 on "auto-affection."

89 Ibid., pp. 80 and 81-2. La voix et le phénomène, pp. 90 and 91-2.

90 Jacques Derrida, "Freud and the Scene of Writing," Dissemination, p. 229; "Freud et la scène de l'écriture" in L'écriture et la différence, pp. 338-39. In Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety Freud reveals the symbolic implications that writing can have: "As soon as writing, which entails making a liquid flow out of a tube onto a piece of white paper, assumes the significance of copulation . . . writing . . . is stopped because it represent[s] the performance of a forbidden sexual act." Writing and Difference, p. 229 ("La scène de l'écriture" in L'écriture et la différence pp. 338-39).

91 Ibid., p. 197. "La scène": "L'énigma de la présence 'pure et simple' comme duplication, répétition originaire, auto-affection, différence. Distinction entre la maîtrise de l'absence comme parole et
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comme écriture. L'écriture dans la parole. Hallucination comme parole et hallucination comme écriture (p. 294).


93 Ibid., p. 201. Compare "La scene": "La mémoire ... est l'essence même du psychisme. Résistance et par là même ouverture à l'effraction de la trace" (p. 299).

94 Ibid., pp. 221-28 passim. See also "Le morceau de cire de Freud et les trois analogies de l'écriture" in "La scene," pp. 328-39.


97 Ibid., pp. 217-18. See also "La scene": "L'écriture générale du rêve déborde l'écriture phonétique et remet la parole à sa place. Comme dans les hiéroglyphes ou les rébus, la voix est circonvenue" (p. 323).
This chapter will examine parts of the tenth chapter of the *Wake* and consider it as a deconstructive practice of writing that operates very much like the "double and precisely stratified, dislodged and dislodging, writing" which Jacques Derrida describes as the kind of writing practice necessary "in a general strategy of deconstruction."¹ The thesis of this examination is that the "Night Lessons" chapter foregrounds a disseminative and deconstructive practice of writing, making it one of the chapter's "most conspicuous features," to borrow Ronald Buckalew's words. Chapter Ten then uses this foregrounding pedagogically to draw attention to the operations of the individual letters, numbers, and sigla of the *Wake* 's "Acomedy of letters" (425.24). While an individual letter, number or siglum can be involved in a signifying play at the level of the *Wake* 's narrative of the Earwicker family, it can also function as a deconstructive *gramme*, a "graphic form with a *double value*--ideographic and phonetic."² It is well known, for example, that the "E" of the *Wake* 's sigla both signifies the first letter of the name "Earwicker" and, when it occurs in the "fallen" position "¶¶" (6.32), operates as an ideogram symbolizing man's post-lapsarian existence. The number 10 of the tenth chapter functions as a signifier of the chapter's place in the *Wake*, but it also signifies HCE and ALP when they are staged as "this
upright one" (261.22), or '1', and "that noughty," or '0', "besighed him" (261.23). Critical attention has focused on Joyce's use of the kabbalah in his employment of the number 10, as this chapter will demonstrate, but little attention has been given to the chapter's four-part textual arrangement of three sets of marginal discourse and a central column as a "three plus one" exploitation of the formula "10=1+2+3+4, which is the number of the letter in the kabbalah [and] . . . the number of Mercury in astrology." The following examination will consider the chapter's exploitation of this formula in its use of the HCE and ALP textual units, its production of a "plupresent" tense, and the tripartite marginalia that constitute the "trifid tongues" which surround the central column of text in the Wake's "Columkiller" (122.26) Chapter Ten.³

Wake commentators have long known that pedagogy is an important element in the tenth chapter. Joyce himself provided his commentators with the key to its pedagogical implications when he described the chapter to Frank Budgen as the "reproduction of a schoolboy's (and schoolgirl's) old classbook."⁴ The difficulties which this "denses part of the Wake" has given interpreters suggest that Joyce may have had his tongue firmly in his cheek when he offered Budgen this deceptively simple description of the chapter, yet the notion that it is somehow connected with teaching and learning remains. Clive Hart's analysis of the Wake's structure lists pedagogy as one of the arts around which the chapter is organized, and critics like Bernard Benstock and Shari Benstock support the widely held view that the chapter presents the children Shem, Shaun, and Issy at their lessons.⁵ The following analysis takes the position that the pedagogical impulse operates not
only as an organizational principle in the chapter's mimetic presentation of a class-book filled with comments by the three children and its description of Dolph teaching the geometric inscription of ALP's vagina to Kev, but also in the reader-text relationship.

Although the *Wake* stages a universe without any one, fixed, central point of organization—a principle that much of the recent commentary on it emphasizes—it is not a closed textual universe devoid of entry points. Its "decentered universe," to use Margot Norris' term, is a decentered universe of language, and Chapter Ten provides examples of how its readers can "hike to find that pint of porter place" (260.5-6), or find a 'point' of entry that enables them to "pearse" (262.8), or 'pierce', the text as the place where the "Porter" family resides, the pub where the "pint" of "porter" is dispensed, and the "gate" which HCE, as "porter," opens. On the mimetic level of the chapter's presentation of the fictitious brothers Kev and Dolph, the line "pose the pen, man, way me does" (303.2-3) operates as Dolph's direction for Kev to follow the inscription of ALP's vagina, "the whome" ('home', 'womb', 'whole', 'hole', and 'who me') of the "eternal geomater" (296.30-297.1). On the level of the reader-text relationship, however, the passage operates as a directive to the readers, who must pay close attention to the operation of the *Wake*'s individual graphic marks--its "sigla" and letters as characters--and re-trace the ways in "which the traced words, run, march, halt, walk, stumble at doubtful pants, [and] stumble up again in comparative safety" (114.7-9). It is paying this close attention that enables the readers to situate themselves in the "passage" (262.2) of ALP's writing and "cross" (262.4) \(\triangle\)'s "upsidown bridge"
(119.28) into the "Howth Castle and Environs" of the *Wake* (3.3), where castle and family pub meet textual discourse in the squared circle of Joyce's "publocation" (71.16) and paronomasian "punplays" (233.19).

Joyce's practice of composition in the *Wake* produced a textual inscription that demonstrates several striking similarities to the more recent textual operations delineated and practiced by Derrida. As the first chapter noted, these similarities can be explained, in part, by Derrida's fascination with, and extensive knowledge of, Joyce's work. Demonstrating what Harold Bloom might call an "anxiety of influence," Derrida has stated, "every time I write, and even in the most academic pieces of work, Joyce's ghost is always coming on board." Stephen Heath's "Ambiviolences" demonstrates that Joyce's influence on Derrida—an influence that can be described as a "proper sort of accident" (269.14)—has resulted in a vocabulary that is invaluable for an understanding of the *Wake*’s deconstructive textual operations. What follows is a deconstructive investigation of *Finnegans Wake* II.2, an investigation of Joyce's "being with a difference" (269.15) through the use of some of the terms and strategies produced by Derrida's solicitation of writing as a being of *différance*.

It is well known that the tenth chapter is the most typographically unusual of the *Wake*’s chapters. Occupying 48 of the text's 628 pages, the chapter is arranged with a central body, left- and right-hand margins, and footnotes. Traditionally, the relationship of marginalia to text has been dealt with in a mimetic context and each of the tripartite marginal comments assigned to one of the three children, Shem, Shaun, and Issy. As noted above, Bernard Benstock supports this view, and states
that the "lessons begin with Shem writing left margin notes, Shaun right margin, and Issy the footnotes." Shari Benstock's more recent study, however, suggests that the Wake's continual deferment of identity, its refusal to let fall "that sword of certainty which would indentifide" (51.5), or 'identify', "the body" (51.5-6), creates a problem for the practice of assigning each of the marginal and footnote comments to a particular character. Her study begins by expanding the traditional reading of the marginal comments and footnotes as comments by the children:

Shem's notes in italics, Shaun's in full caps, and Issy's in reduced type . . . . While Shaun's commentary is notational, philosophic, impersonal, and cryptic . . . Shem's is elliptical, sarcastic, and often comic, usually possessing recognizably Irish traits . . . . Here . . . we have our first extended opportunity to hear Issy's voice.

Benstock's study attempts to maintain a mimetic reading of the marginalia as comments by the children, but after confronting of the most basic questions about the Wake: "who is who when everybody is someone else?" it concludes that establishing identities for the marginalia is problematic:

Footnotes usually identify the who, what, where, when and why imposed by the text, . . . the Wake notes differ in their persistent effort to add further guises and disguises to the already populous list of multiple identities marked by the narrative. Since there can be no one solution to the identity problem in this text, no simple answer to the question, who is it?, the notes proliferate narrative personae instead of singling out individuals.
The present consideration of the simultaneously marginal and central nature of Chapter Ten will attempt to supplement the mimetic reading of the marginal passages and footnotes as comments by Shem, Shaun, and Issy by considering them as equal marginal inscriptions involved in the *Wake*'s general deconstructive strategies of writing.

Chapter Ten can obviously be considered as one of the *Wake*'s central chapters because of its position close to the middle of the text's seventeen chapters. There are, however, several other reasons for its centrality. According to William Tindall, Chapters Nine, Ten, and Eleven constitute a unit that is "the densest part of the Wake," and, as Buckalew notes, Chapter Ten is at the center of this group. In terms of the *Wake*'s chronological organization, an organization detailed by Clive Hart, the action of Chapter Ten takes place between 9 and 10 p.m. It begins slightly less than 9-1/2 hours after the first chapter begins (at 11:32 a.m.) and 9 hours before the seventeenth chapter begins (at 6 of the following morning). In an analysis of the *Wake* as a deconstructive practice of writing, however, Chapter Ten is a central chapter because it stages a (con)fusion of all of the major sigla and symbols that are disseminated throughout the rest of the *Wake* as kernels from which the text's narrative of language is generated. Chapter Ten, for example, is the only place in the *Wake* where the sigla "\[\text{\textit{M,\&\text{\textsc{a}m,\&\text{\textsc{a}}}X,\&\text{\textsc{a}}}O,\&\text{\textsc{a}}}E\]" (299.F4) appear as a group. (These sigla are, of course, the symbols that Joyce used in his manuscript, and they are Earwicker and HCE, Anna Livia, Issy, the four old men, the title of the book, Shaun, and Shem.).
With the exception of □, which signifies the title of the *Wake*, these sigla are most frequently studied as symbols for HCE and members of the Earwicker family. Roland McHugh points out, however, that these sigla are not only "personages" but also "fluid composites" that also signify "nonhuman elements." The *Wake* itself supports a reading of them as graphic marks involved in a signifying play outside of the context provided by the actions of the Earwickers when it asks:

Why not take the former [□] for a village inn, the latter [△] for an upsidown bridge, a multiplication marking [×] for crossroads ahead, which you like pothook [∧] for the family gibbet [□], their old fourwheedler [○] for the bucker's field, a tea anyway [T] for a tryst someday, and his onsidemissing [−] for an allblind alley leading to an Irish plot in the Champ de Mors (119.27-32; sigla inserted).

Chapter Ten's staging of the sigla operates as a textual movement of *différance* by presenting symbols with differing modes of signification. □, for example, signifies both HCE and a "village inn" and is thus involved in a signification of both the text's narrative of the Earwicker family and its identification of the text as an "Inn inn" (262.26) which the reader enters through Chapter Ten's staging of the approach to the "castle" (262.5) of the text. △ signifies ALP as a female character; but it also signifies a "bridge" and, like □, operates in the tenth chapter's staging of the reader's entry into the text. The reader must "cross" (262.4) the "bridge" (262.3) (of the text's language) in order to "come to castle" (262.5) and "pearse" (262.8), or 'pierce' the text. The operation of textual *différance* in the signifying play of these sigla is underscored by the question that follows the *Wake*'s identification of
them as signifiers of a family group: "The Doodles family, \( m, \Delta, \cdot, \times, \square, \Lambda, \varepsilon \). Hoodle doodle, fam.?" (299.F4). The text asserts that they signify the "Doodles family" and then immediately questions that assertion, sustaining what Barbara Johnson calls "the specificity of [the] text's critical difference from itself."18

The "'suspension' of meaning" which results from the "simultaneous presence of contradictory affirmations" in the tenth chapter's central staging of these sigla is sustained by the involvement of the sigla in the chapter's geometry lesson.19 The chapter offers directions for the completion of two geometrical patterns. The first of these patterns begins with the construction of "ann aquilittoral dryangle" (286.19), or ALP's ("ann") equilateral triangle. The next step is to "concoct an equo-angular trillitter" (286.21-22) which, as Margaret Solomon demonstrates, entails inscribing both the phallic "tri-letter T" and the fallen E or \( \varepsilon \). The resulting figure includes five of the "Doodles family" sigla. Solomon draws it as:
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Eternal Geomater points out that in addition to the five sigla \( m, \Delta, \cdot, \times, \square \), the diagram also includes "the square which signifies the title of the book."20

The geometrical figure is not constructed according to these directions but according to those which begin with the line "\( \Lambda \alpha \)." "\( \Lambda L \)." (293.fig.), or "ann linch" (293.15). The resulting figure is the two
intersecting circles whose centres are the points at either end of the base line for the equilateral triangles "Aα," "\( \lambda \)," "P," and "Aα," "\( \lambda \)," "π" (293.fig.). ALP's vagina, or the part of her anatomy visible when she sits "cresslogged" or 'crosslegged' "like the lass that lured a tailor" (297.28-29), is one of the signifieds of this diagram but the two circles also operate as a compacted form of the symbol of infinity, the Wake's "zeroic couplet" (284.11). Clive Hart analyzes the figure and sees the symbol for infinity as the "basic structure" of the Wake:

When Joyce has cut the circles and stretched them out flat, the other nodal point falls exactly in the centre of the fabric. Represented in this way, the basic structure of Finnegans Wake thus looks like a figure 8 on its side, which forms the "zeroic couplet" (284.11) \( \infty \), or the symbol for "infinity." 21

Solomon describes the diagram as "all-inclusive" and suggests that readers can "begin to understand the way in which Joyce was able to integrate all of his structural patterns symbolically, by superimposing the E, in its proper 'bisecting' position, upon the basic two-dimensional structure" of Chapter Ten's diagram. The resulting diagram incorporates E and the "△, ⊙, . . . □, ∨, E" sigla of the "Doodles family:"
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It also operates as a "completion of the 'trillitter' mentioned on 286.22, a unification of Everyman's and Everywoman's Body with world soul, and of infinite time with infinite space." Solomon follows the instructions for constructing the "trillitter" in order to construct the figure that she superimposes upon the Wake's diagram and thus follows the chapter's instructions to "Pose the pen . . . way me does" (303.2-3).

The diagram is a central feature of Chapter Ten. According to Shari Benstock's mimetic reading, Dolph's directions for its construction and Kev's response when he understands the diagram constitute the bulk of the chapter's "story." "The 'story' the chapter tells is minimal," she contends. "Dolph explains to Kev the geometry of their mother's vagina, and when Kev understands the diagram, he strikes Dolph." From another perspective, however, the chapter stages a writing practice in which the number that signifies the chapter—10—is involved in a signifying play that accounts for the relationship between the male and female elements in the Wake's disseminative writing. The 1 and the 0 are staged as a hero and heroine, the "upright one, with that noughty besighed him zeroine" (261.23-24). From the 1 and 0 of 10, the ten questions in "broken heaventalk" about the identity of this "upright one" are generated:

But . . . is he? Who is he? Whose is he? Why is he? Howmuch is he? Which is he when is he where is he? How is he? And what the Decans is there about him anyway, the decent man? (261.27-262.1).
In keeping with the *Wake*’s continual play of différence, the staged response to these questions hints that this "decent man" is none other than HCE (or Ech, in this instance), but it simultaneously defers the answer with "Easy, calm your haste!" (262.1-2; emphasis added), a suggestion that brings to mind the *Wake*’s earlier insistent demand for its reader's "patience" (108.8).

The relationship between  and  or HCE and ALP, is a relationship of the inside to the outside. HCE cannot, of course, have any existence outside of the *Wake*’s writing and, as Chapter Ten suggests in response to the ten questions about HCE’s identity, HCE can only be experienced in a passage through ALP as the language of the text. After the admonishment, "Easy calm your haste," the chapter commands "Approach to _lead our Passage!" (263.2; emphasis added). "Our Passage" is a passage through ALP’s writing, or the *Wake* itself. At the level of the individual, alphabetic letters, "this upright one" is signified by the "i" that is inscribed within "one" in the (con)fusion of 'zero' and 'one' that produces "zeroine" (261.23). ALP is the 'heroine' zero or "0" (287.10) that contains HCE within her circular form, much as "zeroine" signifies ALP’s vaginal "0" as the "zeroine" that has the "upright one" (emphasis added) inscribed within her as "zeroine" (emphasis added). One is operative in the reader's visual perception of "zeroine," and the German "ein" is perceptible in a spoken and heard reading of "zeroine" (emphasis added). The instructions for Chapter Ten's diagram begin with directions for drawing the line "A ,"α" ,"X"L," and this line, the ends of which function as the centre for ALP’s "doubling bicirculars" (295.31), is the "upright one" in the same fallen position that E
occupies in its fallen position as \( \downarrow \). If, as Hart suggests, the "doubling bicirculars" of the diagram represent the "infinity" symbol as a signifier of the *Wake*’s structure, then the position of the "upright one" as the line "A \( \alpha \) \( \Lambda \)" is an appropriate signifier of the fallen HCE whose fall is narrated in ALP's letter and revealed in the reader's passage through it.

While Chapter Ten can be considered central because of its position as one of the *Wake*’s middle chapters and because it offers a diagram which draws together the signifying play of the *Wake*’s dominant sigla, it can also be considered marginal. The most obvious reason for this marginality is, of course, the chapter's exploitation of marginal play. Although the chapter is most often considered as a main body with two sets of marginal comments and a series of footnotes, from a deconstructive perspective, the footnotes also operate as marginal comments. The chapter can thus be considered as a play between three sets of marginalia and a main body. The relationship between the set of three marginal comments and their play with the main body provides a useful example of what Chapter Ten describes as "trifid tongues the whispered wilfulness (t’is demonal) and shadows shadows multiplicating" (281.16-17). From a mimetic perspective, the bottom marginal comments are those of a female Issy, who, like Shakespeare's 'Desdemona' ("demonal"), can be perceived as "girlish, flirtatious, and sexually provocative."25 They are also demonic, however, and function as disruptive comments that assault the main body "from [the] beelyingplace below the tightmark" (262.1) of the border between text and margin. The "tightmark" is the tidemark between land and sea, or the changing "limpidy marge" against which ALP's "languo
of flows" laps and the 'tightmark' or sign of drunkenness discussed below in Chapter Four. It is also the marginal line between central and marginal discourse that Chapter Ten exploits as it crumbles the central-marginal hierarchy. All three of the marginal inscriptions (left- and right-hand, and footnotes) "shadow" and obscure the meaning of the main text as they sustain a differentiating, and deferring, play of signification with it.

The "trifid tongues" of the tripartite marginal commentary operate as a part of what Philippe Sollers calls Joyce's "three-cleft, three-folding language." The three sets of marginal comments and the main body sustain a relationship of three towards one that Sollers describes as the result of Joyce's rigorous writing of "everything but not just anything" and his meditation on the trinity:

No surprise that Joyce ceaselessly meditated (and played) on the trinity--and were you yourselves living in a constant state of triadicity, plus one, nothing would appear more normal to you than such things . . . .

For the moment I want to stress that Joyce, by writing rigorously in this way . . . poses a new status of the one and multiple, a new law beyond, for instance, the Christian "trinity."26

In a French reading of the Wake's final and initial words, Sollers argues that in "The riverrun" (628.16-3.1) can also be heard the French-English pun "Three ver un." This relationship of three to one is a powerful force in the Wake's continual deferment of identity, and it operates in several ways: it functions in the tripartite signifying clusters ALP and HCE where each of the three letters is disseminated throughout the Wake
as textual units that generate the differing forms which sustain the continual deferral of identities for ALP and HCE; it functions in the production of the "plu-present" "time-tense" by which the Wake fuses the tenses of past, present, and future into the "violent inscription" of the more-than-present tense of its own writing; and it also operates in the tenth chapter's staging of the three sets of marginal writing that are involved in a marginal play directed towards the central body of the chapter's main text.  

The units ALP and HCE are, of course, dominant signifiers of major textual units in the Wake. Through a continually sustained movement of diffé'rence, however, these two three-fold groups produce a sequence of individual units that render the attempt at stabilizing and identifying their signifieds impossible. It is well-known, for example, that the attempt at reading the Wake as a novel depicting the actions of the fictitious female character "Anna...Livia...Plurabelle" (215.24) is subverted by the numerous other units that are generated by the ALP group. As Chapter Two suggested, the sequence "Anna...Livia...Plurabelle" can also be read as a condensation of the development of language from classical Greek, through Latin, to modern French. Each differing unit that is generated by the ALP group displaces the signifying value of previous units generated by it. In Chapter Ten, ALP generates an invitation for the Wake's readers to situate themselves in the text as a passage through language, "Approach to lead our passage" (262.2). This is displaced by the unit "luck's puresplutterall lucy at" (262.16) which, as the Classical Lexicon reveals, puns on the Latin for "and may perpetual light shine upon them," and, at the same time, fuses luck, as a
"pure" "splutter" of "all" or a force that 'bespatters' everything, with writing, as an operation of fate ("luck's") that "scatter[s] ink" (OED) in a disseminative practice of writing.28

The play of différance is sustained by the continually differing units generated from the HCE triad. Like those generated by ALP, the individual units generated by HCE constitute a series of different three-fold units in which the three words generated from the H, the C, and the E function in a three toward one relationship with the unit of three words in which they operate. Unlike the stable names for fictitious personages operative in traditional novels, plays, and poems, the three-fold units generated from HCE and ALP continually change. Where the "names" of characters like Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom in Joyce's earlier novels provide readers with symbols motivated toward providing a stability and identity from which the readers can experience the text, the terms generated by HCE and ALP reveal the operation of a deconstructive "trace" in which symbols become signs involved in a play of différance that renders the establishment of a consistently identifiable signified impossible.29 HCE generates "Harold or Humphrey Chimpden" (30.2) "Earwicker" (33.30), and this 'name' can be read as that of the fictitious male character described as a "big cleanminded giant" (33.24). The sigla "H.C.E.," however, also signify: "Here Comes Everybody" (32.18-19), which subverts the identification of HCE as a single character; "Hag Chivychas Eve" (30.14), which subverts the identification of HCE as a male; and "Haud certo ergo" (263.28), which subverts the identification of HCE with any "certainty" at all.30 The tenth chapter's inscription of the units generated and supported by the triad
HCE proliferates with signifiers which further subvert the attempt to establish an identity for HCE. The sequence generates signifiers of song and writing in the "emerald canticle of Hermes" (263.22). It generates the series "Hispano-Cathayan-Euxine, Castillian-Emeratic-Hebridian, Espanol-Cymric-Helleniky" (263.13-15) which brings together, amongst other things, the signifiers of differing nations and languages. It produces the command to "Honour Commercio's energy" (264.1), and it also sets HCE to work in a signification of conversation, "entre chats and hobnobs" (274.8).31

The mathematical operation by which the triads HCE and ALP are involved in what Sollers describes as a "state of triadicity, plus one" is an operation that is repeated in the Wake's establishment of a textual "plupresent." Appropriately, it is Chapter Ten of the Wake, a chapter that sets to work "the formula 10=1+2+3+4," "which is the number of the letter in the kabbalah and . . . the number of Mercury in astrology," by staging itself as a sequence of (1) right-hand margin, (2) left-hand margin, (3) footnote, and (4) main body, that opens with the (con)fusion of past, present, and future into a textual "plupresent" which is "another thing entirely than the present."32 The opening sentence of the chapter offers a meditation on presence and being as it fuses together an assertion of being--"As we there are" (262.1)--with a questioning of the place where being resides--"Where are we" (262.1). It follows this by feigning to question the past and the future for this textual "we": "are we there from tomtittot to teetootomtotalitarian" (262.1-2). This opening sentence is both question and assertion, a questioning assertion which opens up the deconstructive "surface number four," a surface which
envelops both the present ("lived," by you, in the "illusion" of one who lives, reads, speaks in the present, your eyes riveted to the classical) and its violent reinscription in the theatrical, arithmetical machine.  

The assertion "As we there are" undoes, or dislodges, the classical identification of being and presence. The "I" that can pronounce "I am here" is replaced with a "we" that is "there," in the place where it ought not to be able to pronounce its presence. From a deconstructive perspective, that which inscribes itself in this "there" is not the "voice" of the writer, nor is it some ideal, platonic mind in which reader ("you") and writer ("I") are united in a co-"presence." What inscribes itself in this "we" "there" on the page is a textual operation that feigns presence:

the "we" will no more have been just a person among others than the imperfect a simple past present. The "we" is the non-present, nonpersonal, imperfect, limitless element in which the personal present, the properness of the persons you, I, he and she, we are cutting out, cut themselves out.

Sustaining the operation of the "trace," the play of différance, Chapter Ten's "being with a difference" (269.15) feigns a past, "Where we whiled while we whithered" (260.14), a place where "we" existed while "we" died, a place and a time where "I" and "we" could perhaps state "I am," and "we are," but this past-present no longer exists. It no longer "is": "But is was all so long ago" (263.12; emphasis added). 's writing, the writing of the Wake as ALP's letter recites the sequence of past, present, future at the same time that it opens up the plupresent as an imperfect "double bottom," or "ground": "Anna was Livia is
Plurabelle's to be" (215.24). This simulacrum of a proper name is also a recitation of the "three series of tenses (1,2,3)"; the past, "was," the present, "is," and the infinitive, "to be," which points towards ALP's plurality and pluriliterality as something that will be in a future-present or is yet "to be." At the same time, this pulsating, double, inscription of possessive name and verbal tense opens onto the infinitive which signifies a verb "without predicking it on any subject" (OED), a verb without a subject to establish its tempus. An action without an acting subject, "Plurabelle's to be," returns ALP's writing to its status as an act of inscription. The "to be" functions as a double writing that simultaneously signifies the Wake's ontic status as a possessor of being and equates ALP, as language, with being itself. The "to be" is signified by the possessive apostrophe of "Plurabelle's" as something belonging to ALP, and, at the same time, the apostrophe operates as an elision of the 'i' in "is" which would equate "Plurabelle" with being in the formula 'Plurabelle is to be.' Together, the past-present "was," the present-present "is," and the future-present signified by Plurabelle as something yet "to be" constitute the "1,2,3" sequence of numbers which open onto the "new present" of the "fourth sequence," the "pluperfect" of textual machinery where "we" "sojernemus" (264.15). "Let us stay," then, where "we" 'journey', within the margins of the Wake as a writing practice that identifies itself with the general text of writing which operates both inside and outside of the borders of the book.

According to Derrida, the plupresent functions as a "total, differentiated equivocal present" that "must not be reduced to the simply present operative in the threefold series post-present, present-present,
and future-present it violently throws into question." The plupresent is a "structured, bottomless present, which is related to the double bottom that comprehends but is not the present." In Chapter Ten, this textual plupresent is opened up through the staging of the Wake's language as a "plurable" "linkless proud" (264.10). The "plurable" nature of the Wake's "Brook of life" (264.6), the ability of its river of language to pluralize in a double writing, is its "doubling" (290.16) movement between the "here" and "there" of identity and difference, a "doubling back" (290.16), or disseminative "re-marking" that occurs in a present which is simultaneously 'now' time and 'no' time: a "doubling back, in nowtime" (290.16). This (con)fusion of presence ("now") and absence (of time, of presence determined by time as a series of nows) opens up the disjuncture between "the present outside the quotation marks" and the present of when Joyce wrote, "the present of what 'he writes'." Chapter Ten stages the "duality triggered off by writing" as the continual circular movement by which its language returns to remark its own status as a "re-citation," a "recitating" (620.28) language. "Anna was at the beginning lives yet and will return" (277.12-13) re-marks and cites again "Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be" (215.24) at the same time that it comprehends the series of past, present, and future, within the plupresence of its textual machinations.

The plupresent operates as an "opening of presence" onto the "surface number four" that is "affiliated with the stage of the old representative theater." It comprehends the series of three 'present' tenses within itself and stages presence at the same time that it "denounces" it as a "'dead surface'":
This scission, this opening, this pure appearance of appearing through which the present seems to free itself from the textual machine (history, numbers, topology, dissemination, etc.) in fact denounces itself at every moment. The operation puts "illusion" into play as an effect or product. "Presence," or "production," is but a product. The product of an arithmetical operation.42

Chapter Ten stages the presence of "Ainsoph" (261.22), the "kabbalistic supreme God," precisely as a product of the arithmetical operation of inscribing an "upright one" (261.22), or '1', and a "naughty besighed him" (261.23), or '0' beside him, in order to produce the "zeroine" (261.33) which, as noted earlier, (con)fuses 'zero', 'i', and 'one'. From a mimetic perspective, this staging of "Ainsoph" and, indeed, the entire chapter, has been read by Sheldon Brivic as "the most systematic presentation of God and humanity as a unified structure in the Wake."43 From a deconstructive perspective, however, the Wake does not 'present' "God and humanity" in the "systematic presentation" of a "unified structure." On the contrary, it problematizes the very concept of 'presence' that enables such confident assertions about God and his (or her) 'presence' in the Wake to be made. The response to the ten-part question about the identity of this "decent man," for example, is, as noted earlier, a deferring insistence on patience, "Easy, calm your haste," and an invitation to experience the text not as a presentation of God, but as a passage through the female language of ALP: "Approach to lead our passage." The chapter can be read as a presentation of "God" and "humanity," or as a representative use of language in which a presumably omnipotent and omnipresent God appears in the chapter "As over all" (262.23) and "As" 'everywhere' (Du. overal), but the chapter offers
an alternative reading when it questions this assertion "As over all" and describes writing in the terms of a theatrical organization: "or be these wingsets leaned to the outwalls, beastskin trophies of booth of Baws the balsamboards?" (262.23-25). Disseminated amongst the theatrical signifiers "wings," "sets," walls and boards, are at least two signifiers of death, "Baws" (Ir. bas, 'death') and "beastskin trophies." These signifiers reflectively sustain the structure of the "old representative theater" as the "fourth surface" that is "dead like the structure of that old-fashioned theater." This old-fashioned representative theater is dead because

the consciousness that stands as spectator and consumer of the represented present or meaning--'you'--believes itself to move in the freedom of drifting, reverberating, transported, cast-off effect forever turned back or thrown away, the crust or the shell shed by a force or a 'life' that does not present itself, has never presented itself.44

Chapter Ten stages a city and people that can be 'seen' from the flowing "Eblinn water" (264.15-16) of its language, but it is a "phantom city," the "phaked" product of people who are "Philim Folk" (264.19), 'film' people, insubstantial images devoid of life and presence, ghosts who inhabit the Wake's "ghosttown" (329.25) of language. "It's haunted. The chamber" (272.19-20).

The three plus one numerical series is perhaps most obvious in the clearly discernible division of the chapter's pages into three sets of marginal comments and a central body. Again, these marginal comments are most often considered as two sets of marginal comments and a series of footnotes. While the term 'margin' is "often restricted to the margins
at the side of a page" (OED), it also signifies "that part of a surface which lies immediately within its boundary," and it is this latter value that is of interest to deconstruction. It is on the margins, borders, and boundaries of writing that deconstructive critics frequently focus their attention, and it is on a "marge," or margin, that the Wake's writing operates: "On limpidy marge I've made me hoom" (624.15). The assertion "that there are exactly three squads of candidates for the crucian rose awaiting their turn in the marginal panels of Columkiller" disseminatively functions as a sequence of signifiers which operate on the border between the inside and the outside of the text. They signify the "3 marginal panels" of the "Tunc page of the Book of Kells," a text which exists outside of the Wake, and, at the same time, they signify internally the tenth chapter's three plus one arrangement of marginal comments and central text. The Wake cites the "Tunc page of the Book of Kells" (122.23) and then re-cites "colum cille," the name by which the Book of Kells is also known, as "Columkiller." Signifiers that operate outside of the Wake are thus re-cited and set to work within the Wake, making external signifiers signify internally. The result of this (con)fusion between the inside and outside of the text is, from a deconstructive perspective, an example of how the "Outside is the Inside."  

The three to one relationship of the marginal inscriptions and the central column is visually emphasized by the italics, full caps, and reduced type in the margins and the regular type of the central column. This relationship is not a static structure, however, and, like Derrida's later investigation of the relationship between the marginal and main elements of writing, Chapter Ten draws the attention of its readers to
the ability of marginal elements to invade the territory normally reserved for central textual matters and subvert the traditional hierarchy which orders the relationship between the central and marginal elements of writing. Jennifer Levine describes this hierarchy in the relationship between marginal and central discourse, and the way in which Chapter Ten disrupts both, as she investigates the (marginal) footnotes:

Broadly speaking, the [traditional] footnote has two functions: it provides that space within which the point of origins is given, in which quotations, allusions, and repetitions of all kinds are made explicit. It poses a clear hierarchy, too, between the major discourse and the discourses that surround it: those in the past, referred to now as sources; and those in a potential future . . . . The link between them is unambiguous (traceable from a precise point in the text to a particular footnote), and the relationship is always (by the simple fact of exclusion from the main text) hierarchical. These are the expectations we bring to bear on our reading of the chapter. They will provide a structure through which we try to make sense of particular words and phrases. Instead we find, from the first footnote on, that the hierarchies slide and crumble around us. We are given neither points of origin nor explanations but are plunged in medias res, it seems, into another discourse which has no less significance (i.e., no less complex signifiers), and certainly no fewer mysteries waiting to be footnoted, than the central text to which it refers.  

Many of these comments on the (marginal) footnotes are also applicable to the right- and left-hand comments because they, too, offer "complex signifiers" and as many "mysteries" as the central column to which they refer. From a deconstructive perspective, the traditional hierarchical relationship of marginal comment and central text is dislodged by Chapter Ten's use of the three to one relationship in the establishment of a "grouped textual field" and its (pedagogical) practice of a "bifurcated writing" in which a deconstructive "biface or biphase," a "dislodged and dislodging, writing" operates.
The hierarchical subordination of marginal discourse by the dominating, central column of discourse in the traditional arrangement of the book is reproduced in Chapter Ten in the arrangement of the marginal discourse around the central column. For the most part, to a casual glance, Chapter Ten looks as though it sustains the traditional hierarchical practice of placing the dominant and central discourse in a central column and relegating supporting, subordinate, textual matters to the area of the margins. On closer inspection, however, even this grouping of the "trueprattight" (265.9), or tripartite, marginalia around the central column operates at dislodging the central-marginal hierarchical terms. This dislodging first occurs in the invasion of the central-column area by a solitary footnote (279). After dominating the chapter for 18 pages, the discourse of the central column is truncated and the central area it had previously occupied is invaded by the marginal discourse of the footnote which lodges itself in the dominant portion of the page.

Two pages after this initial assault on the main column, the right-hand margin penetrates into the territory of the central discourse with the inscription of "Interrogation." and, on the line beneath it, "Exclamation." (281.r). According to the traditional hierarchy of main text and marginalia, these signifiers should operate in a signifying play with the signs appearing alongside them in the main text. In a deconstructive dislodging, however, "Interrogation." and "Exclamation." are inscribed in a marginal position across from "And!" and "Nay, rather!" (281.28-9) respectively. "Interrogation." thus appears in a marginal position alongside the exclamatory conjunction "And!," and "Exclamation."
alongside the "Nay, rather!" that operate within the main column as a contradiction of the "And!.." A more appropriate signified for the terms "Interrogation." and "Exclamation." is found two lines above the points alongside which these terms are inscribed, in the (decapitalized) double re-citation of the title of Kierkegaard's *Enten-Eller* and Freud's dream formula "either/or equals and." The main column stages a translation of this title as "either or" and presents the possibility of a logical choice between two categories, the category of *either*, or "Each of the two" (OED), and the category of the *or*, "alternative" (OED). The disseminative play of "either or" is involved, with the contradictory "Interrogation." and "Exclamation." in a signification of the tenth chapter's technique of (con)fusing interrogative and exclamatory statements into a single sentence. As noted above, the opening sentence of the chapter inscribes both an exclamation of presence, "We there are," and a questioning of presence, "Where are we" in the sentence "As we there are where are we are we there from tomtittot to teetoototolitarian" (260.1-2). A further example of such bifurcated writing occurs in "Pot price pon patrilinear plop, if the osselation of the onkring gives omen nome?" (279.4-5). The question mark signifies that this is an interrogative statement which can be read as 'what price on patrilinear plop?', but the capital "p" (which is continually involved in a pun on the language of the *Wake* as ALP's urine, and the prankquean's "firewater"), stalls any conclusive identification of this sentence as a question in the displacement of the initial 'w' sound of 'what'.

The assault of the right-hand margin upon the central column of text is accompanied by a reduction in the width of the central column. The play between margin and central column thus operates as a kind of textual
violence in which the central discourse shrinks from the penetrating intrusion of the marginal comments. This rupturing of the border between margin and text dislodges the hierarchical relationship of central and marginal discourse, and the signifying play between "Interrogation.," "Exclamation.," and "either or." entails a signification that crosses the borders between paragraphs. "[E]ither or" is inscribed as the last lines of one paragraph and "Interrogation." is inscribed alongside the first line of the following paragraph. The result of this transgression of the borders between marginal and central discourse, and different paragraphs, and pages ("Interrogation." and "Exclamation." signify the disseminative (con)fusion of question and assertion that takes place in sentences on other pages), is a crumbling of the traditional distinction between central and marginal discourse and a softening or loosening of the rigid borders that are sustained by the phallogocentric domination of discourse. It is on a "limpidy marge" (624.15), or limp margin, that ALP, as the Wake's flowing language, its "languo of flows" (621.22), operates.

The relationship between the three sets of marginal inscriptions and the discourse of the central column is a violent relationship of writing that is released from within a grouped textual field. A deconstruction of the classical terms that enforces the series of binary oppositions by which phallogocentrism sustains its domination must be violent enough to achieve both "a phase of overturning" and the marking of "the interval between inversion, which brings low what was high, and the irruptive emergence of a new concept." It is important to recognize that "in classical philosophical opposition we are not dealing with the peaceful coexistence of a vis-a-vis, but rather with a violent hierarchy."51
From a mimetic perspective, viewing Chapter Ten's marginal comments as those of three children, the relationship of the marginalia to the central column can be read as the usurpation by the children of the parental position. From a deconstructive perspective, the relationship between marginal and central discourse stages an overturning of the classical oppositions between the inside and outside, or the central and peripheral. In terms of the domination of metaphysics by phallogocentric thought, it stages an overturning of the line and phallus (and the chain of signifiers attached to these signs) and a subsequent reinscription of them within a discourse that continually sustains an identification of itself as a gynocentric discourse. ALP is identifiable not only as a river of language, but also as the 'alp' or mountain from which this river flows, and it is, of course, beneath "mounding's mass" (8.1), ALP's 'mountain mass', that HCE is "rockbound" (7.1) and buried.

The warfare between the margins and central column is sustained throughout Chapter Ten, and it is primarily from the right margin--the position of "righting" (422.34), or 'writing', according to the Wake's "punsil" (98.30) logic--that the assaults upon the central column are made. The response of the central column to the assault made first by the footnote and then sustained in the "righthand" (289.10) margin is to fight back, as it were, and, in attempting to restore control of the central-marginal relationship to the central column, an attempt to put the "whole in applepine odrer" (287.16-17), or 'applepie order', the central column overflows its "ripis rivalibus" (287.28), or "rival banks," and usurps the marginal areas of the right- and left-hand inscriptions for some 5-1/2 pages. This assertion of the central,
phallic, text begins with the pseudo-authoritative citation of a Latin passage. This is followed with a series of references to the church, and the central text concludes with the phallic "searchlighting, beached, bashed . . . pharahead" (292.19-21) lighthouse. The border is re-established with the self-reflective passage that "you must, how, in undivided reawlity draw the line somewhawre" (292.32) and the subsequent disruptive inscription of the chapter's "doubling bicirculars" (295.31) female diagram.

Until the final page of the chapter, it seems that the drawing of the line, the central column's assertion of control over the marginal comments, has been effective and the hierarchy of central and marginal discourse re-established. On the final page, however, the central column is reduced to a thin, vertical, line of text that is truncated halfway down the page and displaced by the "NIGHTLETTER" (308.24). From a mimetic perspective, the three signs "jake, jack," and "sousoucie" (308.28) operate as signatures on "the children's night-letter to the parents." From a deconstructive perspective, they attest to a successful dislodging and overturning of the central-marginal hierarchy, and a subsequent reinscription of marginal signifiers within the signifying play of the central column. At the same time, signifiers that had previously operated within the central column are reinscribed within the marginal signification of the footnotes. The forceful phallogocentric exclamation, "you must . . . draw the line" (292.31), that occurs in the central column at the conclusion of its spatial domination of the right and left marginal areas is reinscribed amongst the "skool" "gags," or school jokes, of the final note: "And gags for school and crossbuns and
whopes he'll enjoyimsolff over our drawings on the line" (308.f.2; emphasis added). These "drawings on the line" draw on the unified and linear authority of the central text by echoing the passage in the plural exclamation of "our drawings," and they draw "on the line" in order to deplete the authority of linearity by involving themselves in a pluri-dimensional signification of "drawings on" as: multiple inscription ("our drawings"), depletion ("drawings on" as drawings over and overdrawing), and the displacement of linear, phonetic, and alphabetic inscription with the nose-thumbing gesture of the drawing that occurs off the line as . Chapter Ten's marginal play thus functions very much like the new concept of writing, that simultaneously provokes the overturning of the hierarchy speech/writing, and the entire system attached to it, and releases the dissonance of writing within speech, thereby disorganizing the entire inherited order and invading the entire field.53

The marginal play dislodges and overturns the hierarchical relationship of the centre and the margin and releases the "dissonance" of central signifiers from within the signifying play of the margins that surround this three plus one "columkiller" of a chapter.

As a "columkiller," Chapter Ten's grouped textual field operates toward dislodging the phallus ('killing the column') that dominates writing in the tradition of phallogocentrism. The dislodging of the phallus is also the dislodging of the father and an overturning of the hierarchical opposition between male and female.54 At the beginning of the chapter, much of the thematic preoccupation of the central column is
the recitation of various simulacra of the names for male figures: "Montan" (260.16), "Mr. Tumulty" (261.19), "Ainsoph" (261.23), and "Bacchus" (262.26). As the "Montan," or mountain, however, HCE is already involved in a (con)fusion with ALP. The central column also provides the supposed, historical, "assumed name" of "Ignotus Loquor" (263.2-3) for HCE, or "erst crafty Hakemouth" (263.2; emphasis added). The left-hand margin sustains this recitation of male figures. For the first two pages, it is composed primarily of passages dominated by signifiers of masculine names and qualities:

With his broad and hairy face
to Ireland a disgrace.

menly about peebles.

Swiney Todd, ye Daimon Barbar.

Dig him in the rubsh!

Ungodly old Ardrey, Cronwall beeswaxing the convulsion box (260-61; emphasis added).55

On the third page of the chapter, however, the right-hand margin stages an assault on masculine textual elements as it sets signifiers of the phallus ("Banjo," "Bantams") and testes ("bounce-the-baller's;" cf. "Bags. Balls" [264.r.h.]) to work in a passage which concludes that they
are "blown to fook" (262.r.h.). The marginal comments then pivot immediately to recounting the observation of female urination and the feminine control of copulation:

Thsight near
left me eyes when
I seen her put
thounce otay
ithpot (262.r.h.)56

In the central column, the dislodging of the male is thematically announced in "Am shot, says the big-guard" (260.6-7). It is sustained in the signification of the male as "Length withought Breath" (261.13), or "Length" 'without' "Breath." As Annotations notes, this description of the male puns on Euclid's definition of a line as a "length without breadth." "Length withought Breath" thus signifies the staging of "Ainsoph" as this "upright one" (261.22), or the vertical line of the number 1. This "upright one" is dependent for his existence on "that [female] noughty" whose respiration gave him being, or "besighed him" (261.23; emphasis added). This female sigh, however, is also the way for the female "to express desire" (OED), and, like the Prankquean's desire for Jarl, and the female desire that brings about the initial "phall" (4.15), this "noughty" female desire is both creative and destructive for the male. The "noughty" ('naughty' and 'nought') female draws the "upright one" within her, enabling him to be sustained in the "name of the father" through procreative copulating, but she also exceeds his own desire and, in her function as the "whome of [the] eternal geomater"
(296.30-297.1), produces the progeny who will succeed him. Her ambivalent desire is thus operative in the eventual de-sireing of the paternal figure.57

The fall of the male is both a phallic "phall," or loss of erection, and the death that is signified by Finn as the 'end' (Fr. fin) and the "Wake" in title of Finnegans Wake. ALP's letter, the expression of her desire, is also capable of awakening the fallen HCE and stimulating another erection that will enable the creative cycle to continue. The HCE that is revived, however, is not the same HCE who has been desired and de-sired by ALP in the past: "He is another he what stays under the himp of holth" (619.11-12). The resurrection of an HCE identical with the fallen HCE is impossible because the "primal" fall and death renders fullness of identity impossible. Fusing the prelapsarian Eden with the Latin term for 'the same', Chapter Ten posits that the first (L. primus), "primal" fall "made alter in garden of Idem" (263.20-21).58

"As we there are where are we are we there from tomtittot to teetoo-tomtotalitarian. Tea tea too oo" (260.1-3). A microanalysis of this opening sentence of Chapter Ten reveals that the deconstructive dislodging of the paternal and phallic domination of writing by phallogocentrism operates not only at the thematic level and in the chapter's central marginal interplay, but also at the level of individual alphabetic letters and their play with the spacing that surrounds them. Sheldon Brivic, who reads the Wake as a manifestation of Joyce as god, believes this opening passage "starts with a consciousness that finds itself talking to itself without knowing who or where it is . . . . As it grows aware of itself, it realizes how little is known about its
ontological status." As suggested above, from a deconstructive perspective, it is difficult to share Brivic's confidence that this passage is a mimetic presentation of a mind, but his recognition of the passage's association with ontological inquiry is important, for the passage does involve itself with spatiality and temporality, the elements with which we establish identity and repetition as fundamental features of any ontic phenomenon. As Lacan asks, "what is a thing, if not that which endures, in an identical state, for a certain time?" As a disseminative writing, the opening passage is a (con)fusion that simultaneously "couples . . . [but] must rip apart." The passage fuses letter and space, question and assertion, and offers a simulacrum of self and other, and space and time. Using Derrida's practice of cutting or incising at the site of the graft, the passage can be read, as noted earlier, as a fusion of assertion--"we there are"--and question--"where are we[?]," "are we there[?]." The movement from the assertion of being to the questioning of being achieves what Heath calls a "desubstantialized" subject. Wavering between these two poles, the text hesitates, and, in its hesitation, allows the subject of being to appear at the same time that it eradicates its trace. This movement parallels that from daylight and consciousness to night and the unconsciousness which the Wake, as "NIGHTLETTER" and "nightynovel" (308.16, 054.21), enacts. Heath comments:

The movement from morning to night is the reality of this passage across of the writing in which the subject, in the hesitation, in the demonstration of fictions and the themes that demonstration invokes--birth/death, order/chaos, etc.--is lost in its ceaseless reinscription in a totality of possibilities.
The limits that this opening passage posits for its solicitation of existence ("are we there") are "tomtittot" and "teetootomtotalitarian." These function in deconstructive terms as grafts of fragments reciting the history of the individual and the race. McHugh notes that Tom Tit Tot is the title of a folk tale "in which [a] demon's safety depends on the secrecy of his name." As such, it sustains the theme of identity and existence--the existence of the demon depends on the secrecy of name that must be 'total' (grafted into "teetootomtotalitarian"). This "tomtittot" also feigns a presenting of a male infant. A child who suckles is one who can be described as a tit tot, and, with the male proper name grafted onto tit tot, a "tomtittot." From this signification of childhood, motherly protection, and succor, the discourse moves across to death, or that which completes life, the totality of life being defined by its completion in death. Death is signified through the "teetotum" that is also grafted into "teetootomtotalitarian." A teetotum, or T totum as it was originally called, was a small four-sided disk with the letters T for totum and 'all', A for aufer or "to take off or carry away," D for depone or 'lay down', and N for nihil or 'nothing'. The last three of these semantic values are involved in a signifying play with 'death'. This disk was spun and the players lost or won according to the letter which lay uppermost after the disk had ceased spinning. Thus grafted onto totalitarian is a signifier of game, risk, play, chance, death, and, above all, of letters and their involvement in the play of chance.
Connected by the "too" that puns on 'to', a sign that operates in the infinitive case of all English verbs and as a prepositional indicator of place, the movement from "tommittot" 'to' "teetootomtotalitarian" fuses the movement from infancy to death, from security to chance, from imbibing (a 'tot' or 'dram') to Tee-totaling, and from the demonic or non-human to the human. Because the passage from life to death is valorized as serious (as opposed to 'light' or 'playful'), the opposites of serious and playful function as poles between which the discourse wavers as it illimits the boundaries which such poles traditionally define.

The rhythm, or ὑμετέρως of a text derives from "the regular intervention of the blanks, the ordered return of the white spaces, the measure and order of dissemination." The intervention of the spacing between letters both enables the letters to attain identity and limits the force of their signification by the "unfailing return, the periodic regularity of the white in the text." The rhythm or "written character and cadence" of a passage is an interplay between the identity of each letter and its repetition, and the limitation of the letter's signifying power by the white space's punctuation of the letter. This interplay becomes quite clear in the first two sentences of the Wake's tenth chapter when we examine the movement from the letter 't' and its domination of the rhythm of the first sentence to the second sentence and its erasure of the t. A meditation on this letter and the play between its overdetermination and erasure reveals the rhythm of the passage enacting, through a notable "de-inscription," the process of "caps ever," or severing the cap, that the fourth sentence of the text's main body advocates as a way to enter the text, or "hike" (260.5) into its labyrinth.
Several Joyce scholars have noted that the letter 'T' is involved in a complex network of signification in the discourse of the *Wake*. It is involved in a homophonic play with "tea"; it is a symbol for micturation and semen; and, as a symbol for the phallus, it operates within the semantic network of symbols sensitive to the codes of sexual activity. Margaret Solomon's lucid discussion of the *Wake's* "sexual universe" demonstrates that the 'T' as phallus is also related to both the tree and Holy Trinity configurations operating in the *Wake's* symbolism:

Consonance and assonance, plus the familiar punning quality so typical of Joyce, constitute grounds for suspicion that "three," "tea," "tree," and even "the" are all closely associated with the tripartite aspect of the letter "T"...the examination of each of these terms will lead to a recognition of that capital letter as a major symbol of the book.66

Bernard Benstock notes that the letter also operates in a symbolic fashion as a part of the important definite article that constitutes the *Wake's* final term. It sustains its association with the godhead in this context. Discussing the importance of "The" and "Diu" at 598.09, Benstock notes,

That both "Diu" and "The" have a missing letter suggests the lost phallus of the emasculated god, Osiris, as well as the Christ who disappeared from his tomb and was discovered to be "gone." The *Wake* significantly ends with the word "the," intended by Joyce to be an aspect of the cyclical pattern, the weak-worded ending rising up again at the beginning of the book. It is also a modulation from the strongest word in any language, the word for God, to the emasculated form which Joyce considered the weakest word in the English language.67
Involved in the play of sexual activity and emasculation then, the 'T' that dominates the opening of the tenth chapter can signify in opposite directions, functioning in much the same way that Derrida finds 'pharmakon' operating in the Platonic text: turning "on its strange and invisible pivot." In the first sentence of the tenth chapter, the 'T' is already emasculated, its power reduced to that of lower case 't': "As we there are where are we are we there from tomtittot to teetootom-totalitarian" (emphasis added). Through a homonymic play of the English language, however, near the end of the sentence it retains its status as a capital by becoming the "initial" letter of three words in a row. As if trying to assert its power over the rhythm of the sentence, the 't' begins slowly, appearing as the voiceless, breathy component in the initial sound of "there." Even in "there," however, it retains a trace of its play with the "tea-stain" and the phallus. Interrupting the possible assertion of 'As we here are', it thrusts phallogocentrically into the virginal, white space between 'we' and 'here', disrupting identity—the assertion of "we" "here"—and staining the presence of "here" by making it into the other, the place of absence, the "there." In so doing it sustains the poles of identity and difference, of presence and absence, between which the Wake's discourse moves as it desubstantializes its subject. If this should seem too improbable or too far-fetched, it is important to remember that what is being approached is a literal ("of or pertaining to letters" [OED]) meaning of the letters that comprise the letter of the Wake, and that the Wake itself knows that a "baser meaning has been read into these characters the literal sense of which decency can safely scarcely hint" (33.14).
As the sentence unfolds, the inscription of the t becomes more repetitious. It stains the whiteness of the page more often. It dominates the demonic name of "tomtittot," and, in the ultimate "teetootomtotalitarian," climaxes in a totalitarian control, a 'T'-totalitarian control. The alternation of what Derrida calls the "constellation of the 'blanks'" and the "femininity of the virgin book" with the penetrating and staining inscription of the t plays out, at the level of inscription, the "penisolate war" (a war of isolation, of the pen, and of the penis) (03.6) that is "always already" a powerful force in the narrative and symbolism of the Wake's discourse. As a symbol of the phallus, of staining, and of a male god, the t sustains a symbolism of the domination of discourse by the masculine-controlled phallogocentric power that has dominated Western metaphysics since the time of Plato. It is well worth noting that in the demonic name "tomtittot" the t occupies a guard-like position on either side of the name "om," an Eastern name for god that occurs frequently in the Wake, and that, in the next bracketing--("tit")--the t's conceal first the "i" with which the Biblical God begins his pronouncement "I am the Alpha and the Omega" (Rev. 1:8) and, then, the "o"--("tot")--which, as "Omega," signifies the limit of his domain.

While it is the masculine 't' symbol that exerts a totalitarian control in the rhythm of the first sentence, it is the double "oo" symbol of both femininity and infinity that gains control in the second. Echoing the domination of the first sentence's rhythm by the 't' and emphasizing the "tea"-'t" homonymic and symbolic relationship, the second
sentence erases the 't' as it unfolds: "Tea tea too oo." This eradication of the 't' performs a double stroke of decapitalization that thrice enacts the process of "caps ever[ing]" which the Wake teaches us as a method of reading or "find[ing] that pint of porter place." The sentence allows the "T" to appear as a double capital--of the sentence and of the word. Then, through the repetition of the word in a secondary position--"Tea tea"--the sentence reduces the power of the "T" to that of "t." The power of the symbolic "tea" is next reduced by the duplicitous, feminine "oo." This symbol signifies both the double-circle diagram (293) and the "zeroic couplet" mentioned above. It also alters the tea-t homophone and replaces the "ea" of "tea," transforming a tripartite symbol of phallus, god, and staining into a bi-polar symbol of connection or addition. It is bi-polar because it unites the male 't' with the feminine 'oo' and symbolizes both transition and addition because of the paranomasian series 'too', 'to', and 'two'. The third stroke of the decapitalization occurs with the eradication of the 't' in the final "oo." The cadence of the sentence's rhythm is thus a movement from masculine domination to feminine subversion. In its rhythmic shift from the staccato-like alternation between the consonant t and the vowels of the first sentence, the second sentence approximates a musical, authentic, cadence as it falls to the soft, phonetically monosyllabic, "oo."

What is being re-marked here is the interplay between inscription and spacing, or what Derrida's discourse observes as the "movement and structure of the . . . spacing, fold, and hymen between . . . meaning effects."74 In their disseminative operation of spacing, these
sentences function as a writing that is "the becoming-absent and the becoming unconscious of the subject," and as an operation of the "immotivation of the trace," an "active movement, a demotivation, but not as a given structure." They re-mark, in their limits, the limits which the Wake as a totality attempts to exceed. These limits are none other than those which historically function as the limits and domain of the father and of writing itself. In a passage that unites sin, paternity, civilization (itself a text and, from a deconstructive perspective, a form of writing) the Wake posits "how framm Sin fromm Son, acity arose, finfin funfun, a sitting arrows" (94.18-19). It then self-reflectively interrogates this assertion with the question that forms the foundation of the historical, philosophical, "onto-phenomenological question of essence": "What was it?" (94.20). The answer it offers is another (con)fusio of question and assertion. It both states the traditional theological answer to this question, and, through typographical displacement and a rupturing insertion, breaks the linearity of the answer:

\[ A.............! \\
?...........0! (94.21-22) \]

These letters present a double simulacrum. Through what Derrida calls a "double mark," these letters and the punctuation marks that remark both the interiority and exteriority of them, feign to present, in a double stroke, the name of the Father (he who states "I am the Alpha and the Omega" [Rev. 22.13]) and the limits of Greek writing, the source, as Derrida demonstrates, of the Platonic text and the domination of
writing's economy by the concepts of paternity, legitimacy, presence, and the model of the line or phallus. 78 Marking both the limit of the graphic resources available to the Greek writers and that of the domain of the Hebraic creator, this passage reduces the statement of the sacred name to its initials and, through a translation of A and Ω to A and 0, brings the letters marking the limits of the Greek alphabet into the orthographic domain of the Wake's basic modern-European alphabet. In severing the capital, or initial letters of the sacred name (the "caps ever" process), the Wake's discourse brings them into its own domain, allowing them to become involved in the play of ALP's writing. A is the initial of both the sacred father and Anna Livia Plurabelle, and 0 is a symbol of the father's teleology and, as Chapter Ten demonstrates, the vaginal passage of the mother. 79

Traditionally, of course, the name of the father is associated with both truth--the God of the New Testament gives the world his "only son, full of grace and truth" (Jn. 1.14)--and authority--he has the power of "granting . . . authority to men" (Mt. 9.8). The dislocative citation of the A and 0 in the Wake's discourse, however, frees these signifiers so that they can signify in a direction other than that of the divine father, authority, and truth. In Derridean terms, this gives them the status of a sign, for where they were once thought to be symbols motivated by the power of paternal protection, authority, and truth which they symbolized, the Wake, in a certain sense, limits this power and puts the symbols into play as signifiers freed from the domination of any one fixed signified. In other words, they become unmotivated. Retaining a trace of their previous function as symbols of the extent of divine,
paternal, power, they become, in the Wake's discourse, capable of also signifying the maternal name of ALP, her language, or "languo of flows" (62.22), and her reproductive capabilities. Bringing this bi-polar play into operation, the Wake's discourse illimits these signs, allowing them to reveal themselves as what Derrida calls the "trace" that is "indefinitely its own becoming-unmotivated." As a citation of a pre-text (in this case the Bible and/or the resources of the Greek writers), the Wake's putting into play of A and O remarks a source: it is also an illimitation, or play of differance simultaneously deferring the divine name of the father and inscribing it, in a fragmented or "caps ever[ed])" mark, as "A[pha] and O[mega]," while at the same time setting these signs to work in a semantic field indicially sensitive to the signifieds of femaleness, maternity, and feminine inscription. It thus inscribes the A and O as a double mark that escapes the pertinence or authority of truth: it does not overturn it but rather inscribes it within its play as one of its functions or parts. This displacement does not take place, has not taken place once, as an event. It does not occupy a simple place. It does not take place in writing. This dis-location (is what) writes/is written.

When viewed from what Dissemination calls the angle of a "certain fold," from "within the folds and the blankness of a certain hymen," the movement from the citational inscription of

A........!!
?...........O!!
to that of "As we there are where are we are we there from tomtittot to teetootomtotalitarian. Tea tea too oo" (emphasis added) can be seen as an example of the Wake's discourse remarking the "very textuality" of its own status as text, and reaching the "limits of thematic criticism itself." Thematic criticism operates on the level of the word rather than that of the letter and is incompatible with an analysis of either the play of the t, or the nature of the relationship between the A and 0 citation of the first example and its re-citation in the second. The difference between these two appearances of the A and 0, and, indeed, between the other appearances of these graphic marks that regulate a certain modal aspect of the text's rhythm (Hart's Concordance notes seven appearances of A and 0 in abbreviations alone) are, in part, a result of the ceaseless intervention of the hymen, blank, fold, or tissue and, as Dissemination notes, "the 'blank' and the 'fold' cannot in fact be mastered as themes or as meanings." The paragraph constituted by the first two sentences of the tenth chapter's main body repeats the limits which are posited, and, at the same time, interrupted and exceeded, by the citation of 94.21-22. This play will always exceed the attempt at textual mastery that thematic criticism strives to attain in its attempts to determine a meaning through a text, to pronounce a decision upon it, to decide that this or that is a meaning and that it is meaningful, to say that this meaning is posed, posable, or transposable as such: a theme.

Of course, the repetition of A and 0 is also a reciting of the limits of the letter or epistle that is in itself a trope for the entire Wake. Roland McHugh, as noted earlier, insists that "Δ's letter is ultimately
all writings, particularly FW itself. The citation of A and O, then, is a metonymic citation of all writing and a self-reflective marking of the Wake's involvement with it, or, as previously noted, of the Wake's textuality. The recitation of A and O as the limits of the alphabet and of the sentences being deconstructively solicited is not a simple repetition of these limits, for, besides the grafting of a series of different marks into the hymeneal space between the A and the O, the opening paragraph of the tenth chapter also subjects the O to a "caps ever[ing]" or decapitalization, reducing it to the ultimate o of "oo." The depletion of the capital reserve of O (by which it functions as a capital preserver of a divine, male, name ["Omega"]) allows it to be set to work as a female signifier and alters the letter's status from that of a possible symbol for the name of the divine, paternal, creator to that of ALP's signifier, capable of involvement in an infinitude of textual play. It is an example both of illimiting and of what, as noted earlier, Philippe Sollers describes as Joyce's positing of a "new law beyond . . . the Christian trinity." The limits of the alphabetic series from which the initial letters ALP are derived are A to P. This series exceeds the divine series A to O by one letter and contains both HCE and the A to O series within it.

This alpha series from A to P also dislodges, and overturns, the proper name of "Plato," the sign that signifies both the historical writer and, as Dissemination demonstrates, one of the textual foundations for the phonocentric, paternal, and idealistic domination of Western writing by the phallogocentric tradition. The passage that commands the
reader "Approach to lead our passage!" (262.2) operates in the displace-
ment of the answer to the ten questions about the identity of "Ainsoph, 
this upright one" (261.21). Instead of providing an answer to the 
questions about this "decent man" (262.1), the Wake admonishes the reader 
to be patient, "Easy, calm your haste!" (262.1-2), as noted earlier. In 
a play of differance, the text then displaces the question of male 
identity with the command for the reader to "lead," or "engage or take 
part in" (OED), the Wake's discourse as the movement, or "passage," of 
ALP's language. The limits defined by the first and last initial letters 
of "Approach to lead our passage" are, precisely, those of the series A 
to P. Inscribed and contained within these limits is the anagram 
"A...t...l...o...p" that reinscribes the proper name "Plato" in a 
decapitalizing and disrupting re-citation of it. This anagram 
demonstrates how Anna's disseminative grammê dislodges the sign of the 
(male) proper name that operates at the foundation of the phallogocentric 
tradition and reinscribes it so the male/female hierarchy is disrupted 
and overturned. The power of the Platonic, male, proper name is erased 
and its power limited as it is reinscribed within a signifier of female 
desire and language. The capital letter 'P' that signifies the status of 
Plato as a proper name is severed ("caps ever") and (con)fused with a 
signifier of ALP's 'p' and "pee." ALP's liquid language, her "languo of 
flows" and expression of desire, thus disseminates the Platonic name and 
the power of ALP's "gramma's grammar" (268.17) puts "patrilinear plop" 
(279.4), phallogocentric shit, in its "Pot" (279.4) place.
Defecation is always involved with creation in the *Wake*. As the Latin passage recounting Shem's production of ink reveals, however, both urination and faecal excretion are required to produce the ink with which Shem writes the letter expressing ALP's desire. Delineating "one of the paradoxes that *Finnegans Wake* asks us to explore," Levine discusses what it means to "defecate and then to push the chain." She relates the cycle of eating, defecating, nourishing the earth and feeding it "so that we may once again eat, digest, and defecate" to language as a cycle of absorption, "recycling, repetition, quotation". The *Wake* does not deny the necessity of the male in the creative process but overturns the male/female hierarchy and re-writes the creative cycle from the vantage point of looking at the process as one that takes place through the creative female and her ability to stimulate the male to activity and deplete him within it.
Notes


'Being' and 'being'. "Ontically . . . Dasein is not only close to us . . .: we are it, each of us, we ourselves. In spite of this . . . it is ontologically that which is farthest" (p. 127, n. 21). Derrida's translator quotes from *Being and Time*, trans. J. Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 36-37. See also *Marges de la philosophie* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1972): "La Dasein en vérité n'est pas seulement ce qui nous est ontiquement proche ou même le plus proche--nous le sommes nous-même. Pourtant, en dépit ou plutôt en raison de cela, il est ontologiquement le plus lointain" (p. 152, n. 14). The present chapter argues from the position that, like Derrida's deconstructive soliciting of Being, the *Wake* problematizes the very notion of presence that is often used in the determination of Being as an absolute presence.

11 Joyce-Again's *Wake*, p. xx.

12 "At the Margin of Discourse," p. 211. The term "identifide" also signifies "indent," which carries amongst its semantic values the process by which "deeds" between parties with "mutual covenants" have "their tops or edges indented for identification and security" and the printing procedure "to set back (from the margin) the beginning of (one or more lines)" (*OED*; emphasis added). Both values can, of course, be related to the establishment of identity. In the case of indenture, agreements between identifide parties are secured and made recognizable; in the case of printing, the form of a paragraph (or other typographical unit) is made recognizable.


Structure and Motif, p. 17.


Annotations notes the sigla as signifieds of this passage.

Barbara Johnson, *The Critical Difference: Essays in the Contemporary Rhetoric of Reading* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins U.P., 1982), p. 5. As Johnson notes, difference, Derrida's différence, is "not engendered in the space between identities; it is what makes all totalization of the identity of a self or the meaning of a text impossible." (pp. 4-5). It should be noted that "fam." is an abbreviation of both "family" and "familiar." The passage functions on one of the (con)fusions of assertion and question that are considered in more detail later in the chapter. It asserts that the sigla signify the "Doodles family" and then uses the abbreviation "fam." and the question mark to question this assertion. This provides yet another example of the *Wake* maintaining what Johnson terms "the text's critical difference from itself." The text-reader relationship is also sustained in the "Doodles Family" footnote by the pivotal operation of "fam.?" This sign can be read as a question for the reader about his or her familiarity with the sigla and their textual operations.
The Critical Difference, Ibid.. The involvement of the sigla in Chapter Ten's staging of an entry passage into the Wake is discussed in the following chapter's discussion of Macbeth's drunken porter scene and its intertextual relationship with the Wake.

20 Margaret Solomon, Eternal Geomater, Fig. 1, p. 105. I am deeply indebted to Solomon's study of the Wake's geometry. It remains the most thorough analysis of the subject to date.

21 Structure and Motif, p. 130.

22 Eternal Geomater, p. 110.

23 "At the Margin of Discourse," p. 211.

24 Annotations notes that there are ten questions and relates Joyce's use of this number to the kabbalah. "Ainsoph" is the "kabbalistic supreme God" and the ten questions are equivalent to the "10 sephiroth of the kabbalah" (p. 261).

25 "At the Margin of Discourse," p. 211.

26 "Joyce & Co.," pp. 113-14.


29 On the erasure of stable identity, see Derrida's discussion of the trace as the becoming unmotivated of the symbol, Of Grammatology, pp. 47 and 50-51 (see De la grammatologie, pp. 69 and 74-5).
A Classical Lexicon translates "Haud certo Ergo" as "not at all certainly."

HCE (and the tripartite sequences of words it generates) exemplifies the three toward one relationship that Sollers identifies, but it also leads to a consideration of the one in the three toward one relationship as a fourth term. HCE consists of three individual letters which, together, constitute a unit that can be considered as the fourth element in a series. The Wake itself refers to "Harold or Humphrey Chimpden's occupational agnomen" (30.2-3). McHugh's Annotations interprets "agnomen" as "a to-name," but it is also the term for a "second cognomen or fourth name" (OED; emphasis added). From a deconstructive perspective, the "occupational" function of the HCE and ALP triads is the generation of differing units composed of three discrete elements which produce a fourth term composed of the three elements which constitute it. From a certain angle, this circular logic sustains, at the level of the letter and the word, the circular structure of the Wake. On the mathematical operation of the sequence 1234 in textual operations see Dissemination, esp. pp. 306-13, and La dissémination, pp. 340-48.

Dissemination, pp. 314 and 308. See La dissémination, (p. 342). The kabbalistic formula 1+2+3+4=10 does not, of course, structure the entire chapter, but it is set to work in the four opening paragraphs. The first three paragraphs lead up to the (fourth) paragraph which begins by announcing the Kabbalistic supreme God, or Ain-soph (see Annotations, p. 261). These paragraphs constitute a sequence of 1, 2, 3, 4, leading to the staging of the Ainsoph as the number 10, or "upright one" with a "noughty," or nought beside him.
33 Ibid., p. 311. See La dissemination: "Le plus-que-présent da la sequence quatrième enveloppe donc à la fois le présent ('vécu', par vous, dans l'-'illusion' de celui qui vit, lit, dit, au présent, les yeux rivés sur la scène classique) et sa réinscription violente dans la machine arithmétique et théâtrale" (p. 345).

34 Ibid. The statements 'I am there' or 'We are there' are not, strictly speaking, logical because 'I' and 'we' are traditional signifiers of presence. From a deconstructive perspective, however, 'I am there' is a logical statement of the reader's identification with "I" as a textual passageway, or signifier of a textual operation. As noted below, the Wake's statement "we are there" is followed by a decapitalizing of the 't' which allows for a re-reading of "there" as a word (con)fused with 'here'. From a deconstructive perspective, the voice that utters "I" on the page is an illusion because presence does not appear in writing except as a textual operation. The there/here (con)fusion is a part of the Wake's problematizing of presence.

35 Pluriliteral: a "root consisting of more than three letters" (OED).

36 As noted earlier (fn. 10), the distinction between "being" and "Being," between the realm of the "Onto-" and the "ontic," is one which Heidegger continually makes in Being and Time, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962). Derrida invokes both this distinction and Heidegger's analysis of Being's temporality in an explanation that relates the "threefold" tenses of past-present, present-present, and future-present to the "fourfold" "plupresent":
To destroy the privilege of the present-now (Gegenwart) always leads back, on the Heideggerian pathway, to a presence (Anwesen, Anwesenheit) that none of the three modes of the present (present-present, past-present, future-present) can exhaust or terminate, but which on the contrary, provides their playing space, on the basis of a fourfold whose thinking entirely informs what is at stake in our question. The fourfold can be maintained or lost, risked or reappropriated - an alternative always suspended over its "own proper" abysm - never winning except by losing (itself). It is the text of dissemination.

(Margins Of Philosophy, p. 132, n. 34). See Marges de la philosophie:

Détruire le privilège du présent-maintenant (Gegenwart) reconduit toujours, sur le chemin heideggerien, à une présence (Anwesen, Anwesenheit) qu'aucun des trois modes du présent (présent-présent, présent-passé, présent-future) ne peut épuiser, terminer, mais qui en assure au contraire l'espace de jeu, depuis un quatre dont la pensée forme tout l'enjeu de notre question. La quarte peut être gardée ou perdue, risquée ou réappropriée, alternative toujours suspendue au-dessus de son 'propre' abyme, ne gagnant jamais qu'à se perdre. C'est le texte de la dissemination" (p. 158, n. 19).

37 A Classical Lexicon offers "let us sojourn, let us stay" for the artificial Latin "subdiurnemus." The term "sojurnemus" has 'journey' and 'us' functioning in its fusion of semantic values. McHugh notes, "△'s writing is ultimately all writings" (Sigla of FW, p. 113). A logical corollary of McHugh's statement is that reading within the Wake's borders also entails reading outside of them. This is one aspect of the Wake's marginal status.

38 Dissemination, p. 309. See La dissémination: "Ce present total et différencié, équivoque, qu'il faut donc se garder de rabattre sur le présent simple qu'il remet violemment en jeu; ce présent structuré et sans fond, en rapport avec le double fond qui comprend le présent et qui n'est pas lui, le Drama le nommait 'plus-que-présent' (pp. 343-44).
Annotations provides the translation of the Cz. proud as 'stream'.

Dissemination, p. 309; La dissémination, p. 344.

Ibid. On the "vulgar concept of time" as a series of presences dominated by the concept of the "now" see "Ousia and Gramme: Note on a Note from Being and Time" in Margins of Philosophy. See esp. "The Closure of the Gramme and the Trace of Difference," pp. 63-7. See also "ousia et grammè: note sur une note de Sein und Zeit," esp. "La clôture du gramme et la trace de la différence" (Marges de la philosophie, pp. 73-78).

Dissemination, pp. 307 and 308. La dissémination, p. 341 and: "Cette coupure, cette ouverture, cette pure apparence de l'apparaître par laquelle le présent semble se libérer de la machine textuelle ('histoire', nombres, topologie, dissémination, etc.) se dénonce en fait à chaque instant (p. 342).


Dissemination, p. 307-08; La dissémination, p. 342.

Annotations provides the information on the Book of Kells (p. 122) and reveals that "crucian rose" signifies, among other things, the Latin crucifixerant that occurs on Plate 124R of the Book of Kells in the ornamental text "Tunc crucifixerant XPI cum eo duos latrones." See The Book of Kells Forty-Eight Pages and Details in Colour From the Manuscript in Trinity College Dublin, selected and intro. Peter Brown (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1980), p. 5. "Columkiller" is a polysemous signifier with several semantic values. The present study considers only
its value as a description of Chapter Ten's truncating of its central textual column.

46 Of Grammatology, p. 44, and De la grammaatologie: "Le dehors le dedans" (p. 65).


48 Positions, p. 42, and Positions (Fr. version), p. 57.


50 Annotations offers the reading of "Pot price" as "what price" (p. 279). For an extensive analysis of the symbolic value of P and its pun on 'pee', see Eternal Geomater, pp. 19-20 et passim.

51 Positions, pp. 42 and 41, and Positions (Fr. version), pp. 57 and 56.

52 Joyce-Again's Wake, p. xxi.

53 Positions, p. 42. See Positions (Fr. version), (p. 58). The examination of the marginalia-central text relationship is considered here from a deconstructive perception of how the central column comes to be truncated on the final page. From the conservative view afforded by Hayman's A First-Draft Version of Finnegans Wake, it might seem unlikely that "Columkiller" (122.26, see N. 45 above) signifies this truncation. It should be remembered, however, that Joyce's method of composition was slow, accretive, and only gradually integrative. It is thus a plausible hypothesis that "Columkiller" contributed to Joyce's discovery of the final form for Chapter Ten's last page.
"Plato's Pharmacy" (Dissemination, pp. 63-171) examines Theuth's relationship with King Thamus within Plato's *Phaedrus*. Speech operates as the legitimate son of the father; writing is the bastard brother of speech. (See *Phaedrus*, 276 a-b, quoted in Dissemination, p. 148.) From the position of the king, "the holder of the phallic scepter, the desire of writing is indicated, designated, and denounced as a desire for orphanhood and patricidal subversion" (p. 77). As Derrida reveals, the entire essay is "nothing but a reading of *Finnegans Wake*" (p. 88, n. 20).

The concern here is with signifiers of masculine textual elements. It should be noted, however, that some of these names are already involved in dislodging the male/female hierarchy. "Swiney Todd" is involved in a signifying play with both the murderous barber who killed his (male) clients and the tale of Circe, who, of course, turned men into swine. "Bacchus" (262.26), the male god who was torn apart by women, is also involved in dislodging the male/female hierarchy. "Ignotus Loquor" (263.3) is a deconstructed form of 'Ignatius Loyola' but, as both the Classical Lexicon (p. 224) and Annotations indicate, it also signifies 'unknown I speak' (L. *ignotus loquor*). It thus participates in dislodging the identity/difference phallogocentric hierarchy.

As Solomon notes, Tea is "not only feminine urine but also male semen." It also signifies a "kind of mutual fertility connected with the sexual act." There are also "regenerative connections between tea and . . . firewater whisky." (Eternal Geomater, pp. 78-80). The main point Solomon makes is that tea "pertains to both sex and micturation" (Ibid., p. 7). The *Wake* puns on "tea" as the masculine 'T' or "threehatted ladder" ('three-headed letter') that has its "head in thigh under a bush"
(89.31). Putting tea in the pot ("otay ithpot") thus symbolizes copulation, but it is a female who puts the tea in the pot. Because "pot" is a bi-sexual symbol, putting tea in the pot can also refer to homosexual copulation, as Solomon notes (see p. 80 and p. 83).

Lacan explores the operation of desire and the expression of male desire as the desire to sustain "the name of the father" in The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978). See pp. 12, 34, 48, 113, 148, 263, and 281. As an expression of ALP's desire, the letter in which she expresses her desire for HCE, the Wake, of course, explores female desire as the source of both HCE's "erection" and "phall." ALP produces Shem who appropriates HCE's "pensile" ('pencil' and 'penis') and, in his guise as Dolph, uses it to inscribe the diagram of the mother's vagina. He begins this diagram by first drawing a straight line which then becomes enclosed within the female figure.

Of course, this passage can be read as signifying the establishment of an altar in the garden of Eden, but because of the (con)fusión of "alter" and "altar" and "Eden" and "Idem," this reading will always already be affected by a play of difféance.


Dissemination, p. 64; La dissémination, p. 72.
"Ambiviolences," p. 38. Heath suggests that "Joyce's irony" could preferably be replaced by the term "hecitency," a term that is more suitable for signifying the writing strategies of the Wake. While irony is "elaborated from a stable position to which it constantly refers in its critic of deviations from that position," the Wake creates the "absence of any position, an indifference which is . . . an illimitation, a perpetual movement of difference (in the very moment of hesitation) in which the subject is no longer visible, is dispersed in the writing" (p. 37). Many commentators have noted that the Wake continually plays on "hecitency" as a signifier of forgery and betrayal because of its historical function in Richard Piggot's forged letter, which was used in the betrayal of Parnell. The Wake posits itself as a forgery written by "Shem" the "Sham" and, as a sham and forgery - "Every dimmed letter in it is a copy" (424.35) - it sustains, at the level of writing, the betrayal and constant displacement of the subject.

Annotations, p. 260.

OED and Lewis and Short.

Dissemination, p. 178.

Eternal Geomater, p. 59. "Night Lessons on Language" points out that in Irish pronunciation, the dental affricates /tʰ/ and /ʃʰ/ are "one pair of sounds" that replace the two pairs /t/, /θ/, and /d/, /ʃ/ found in "Standard British and American." "Three" and "tree" thus sound similar in Irish pronunciation.

Joyce-Again's Wake, p. 100. Quoted in Eternal Geomater, pp. 81-2.

Dissemination, p. 97; La dissémination, p. 109.
Capital: "of words and letters: initial" (OED).

"We" as a present ("here") subject cannot logically assert itself as "there." As a passageway for textual operations, however, "we" is continually inscribed 'there', on the page. The Wake's assertion "we are there" is, from a deconstructive perspective, a re-marking of "we" as a textual inscription and an overturning of the binary terms we/they, here/there, inside/outside, presence/absence, etc.

The Wake continually puns on alphabetic letters and the letter or epistle that Biddy discovers in the midden heap. The Wake lists individual sigla and letters encyclopaedically (119-123, for example) and constantly draws attention to the operation of the individual letters that comprise its words.

Dissemination, p. 257 and p. 259; La dissémination, p. 289 and p. 291.

See "Night Lessons in Language" for the "double-0 symbol" as a sexual signifier of ALP and creation (pp. 114-15). As a combining form "oo" derives from the Gr. "εφ egg, ovum" (OED).

Dissemination, p. 251; La dissémination, p. 283.

Of Grammatology, p. 69 and p. 51; De la grammatologie, p. 100 and p. 74.

Ibid., p. 75; p. 111.


In the drawing on p. 293, the circle is only a part of the inscription and must be doubled into the "zeroic couplet" (284.10) before the A-L-P triangle signifying the vagina can be established; nevertheless, the O symbol remains a feminine symbol of "that noughty ... zeroine" (261.23-4).

Of Grammatology, p. 47; De la grammatologie, "la trace est indéfiniment son propre devenir-immotive" p. 69.

Dissemination, p. 193. La dissemination: "cette double marque se soustrait à la pertinence ou à l'autorité de la vérité: sans la renverser mais en l'inscrivant dans son jeu comme une pièce ou une fonction. Ce déplacement n'a pas lieu, n'a pas eu lieu une fois, comme un événement. Il n'a pas de lieu simple. Il n'a pas lieu dans une écriture. Cette dis-location (est ce qui s') écrit" (p. 220).

Ibid., p. 246. Derrida uses these terms as "undecidables," or signs that attempt to evade the weight of the concept. He warns, however that they do not escape the law by which "every signifier in the series is folded along the angle of [the] remark" (p. 252). See La dissemination: "c'est dans le pli et le blanc d'un certain hymen que se remarque la textualité du texte" (pp. 276-77); see also, "Chaque signifiant de la série est plié à l'angle de cette remarque. Les signifiants 'écriture', 'hymen', 'pli', 'tissu', 'texte', etc., n'échappent pas à cette loi commune et seule une stratégie conceptuelle peut momentanément les privilégier en tant que signifiants déterminés voire en tant que signifiants, ce qu'à la lettre ils ne sont plus" (p. 284).

Ibid., p. 246; La dissemination: p. 276.

Ibid.
This chapter has considered the overturning of both the male/female and central/marginal hierarchies as an important element in Chapter Ten's marginal play. It has considered the marginal qualities of Chapter Ten from a deconstructive perspective. A valuable consideration of the marginalia in terms of the historical and bibliographic development of the chapter is provided in Hayman's *A First-Draft Version of Finnegans Wake* (Austin: U. of Texas, 1963). The *James Joyce Archive* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978) affords an understanding of how the central text-marginalia relationship developed during the composition of the chapter. *JJA 52*, for example, shows the inclusion of the marginalia in the handwritten manuscript (pp. 58-79) and Joyce's revisions to the central text and marginalia in the typescript sent to H.S.W. on 29 March, 1935. The first preparations for the chapter are found in the Buffalo Notebooks VI.B 12 (*JJA 31*) and VI.B 21 (*JJA 34*).
This chapter will consider *Finnegans Wake* as an intertext. It will focus on parts of the *Wake* in which fragments of other texts are cited, or "re-cited," and examine how these fragments are disseminated and "set to work" within the *Wake* as a disseminative practice of writing. In keeping with the dissertation's general thesis that the *Wake* is a deconstructive text, the consideration of the *Wake*'s inter-textual citations will utilize some of the terms, or "certain marks," that Derrida has "set to work, within the text of the history of philosophy, as well as within the so-called literary text," in order to re-mark (or mark again what the *Wake* has already marked) the *Wake*'s deconstruction of other texts, and fragments from those texts, that it reinscribes within its own margins. The chapter will focus on two examples of the *Wake*'s inter-textuality: in the first part it will examine some of the many fragments of the Blake text that are disseminated throughout the *Wake*; in the second part it will concentrate primarily on how the *Wake* deconstructs and disseminates the drunken porter scene from Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and makes what is a relatively marginal passage in the so-called 'original' text operate as one of the "keys to dreamland" (615.28), or a "password" (262.7), that enables readers to enter the labyrinth of the *Wake*'s universe.
The relationship between Joyce and Blake has been the subject of a considerable body of scholarship, much of which has attempted to quantify the amount of influence that Joyce's knowledge of Blake's work exerted upon his writing of both *Ulysses* and the *Wake*. Motivated, in part, by the obvious admiration for Blake that manifests itself in Joyce's Trieste lecture on De Foe and Blake, Richard Ellmann and Morton D. Paley examine Blake's work as an important influence in *Ulysses*, and Karl Kiralis defines it as a "basic source" for *Finnegans Wake*.² Harry Levin notes some of the general similarities between the two authors, and both Northrop Frye and Robert Gleckner detail similarities between Blake's narrative of the fall of Albion and "that other giant form, Finnegan," similarities that Anita Gandolfo describes in terms of the *Wake's* "obvious cosmological resemblances to Blake's mythic system."³ As Gandolfo notes in "Whose Blake Did Joyce Know and What Difference Does it Make?", these studies deal with the Joyce-Blake relationship primarily in terms of general resemblances, specific allusions, and verbal echoes.⁴

Gandolfo introduces a note of caution into the attempt at determining how much Blake's work influenced Joyce, particularly in the context of Joyce's writing of the *Wake*. There are obvious general similarities between the narratives of Albion and Finnegan, but specific textual examples of Blake's influence on Joyce are very difficult to establish because, as Gandolfo states, "it is perhaps impossible to isolate influences in the prose of the *Wake*."⁵ A similar caution about attempting to establish the precise amount of direct influence Blake's work had on Joyce is provided in James Atherton's *The Books at the Wake*. Atherton
warns that any similarities between Blake's myth of Albion and the cosmology of *Finnegans Wake* may owe as much to similarities in the general cosmological interests of Joyce and Blake as to any wholehearted adoption of Blake's particular cosmology by Joyce. As Gandolfo states in discussing Hazard Adams' belief in the importance of Blake's work to an understanding of the *Wake*:

> it is possible to assert, as Hazard Adams' has done, that "an understanding of Blake is probably as useful as any other single thing to an understanding of Joyce's epic" without there being any direct influence of Blake.  

Previous studies of the Joyce-Blake relationship have attempted to establish Blake's influence on Joyce by detailing such things as allusion, imitation, and echo, and such detailing is an essential and traditional tool for readers who wish to understand the development and presentation of any writer's ideas. As Vincent Leitch notes, when "it finds its way into a current text, a chip or piece of an older monument appears as source, influence, allusion, imitation, archetype, or parody," and as these fragments are established as borrowings from earlier works, the "educated reader or critic recognizes and attends to these effects of literary history and tradition." One result of this process is the establishment of contexts within which the later work can be understood and appreciated. In terms of the relationship between Joyce and Blake, however, such contexts are undermined by the ways in which the *Wake* incorporates fragments from the Blake text. Such undermining is demonstrated in Gleckner's investigation of how the *Wake* incorporates the proper name "Blake." As Gleckner notes, the *Wake* fuses the value of this
sign as a proper name with a thorough exploitation of the etymology of the now-obsolete adjective, 'blake.' The passage in which "Blake" occurs disseminates forms such as "pale," "bleak," "black," and "white" that are, as Gleckner demonstrates, etymologically related to "blake":

He will be quite within the pale when lordbeeron brow he vows him so tosset to be of the sir Blake tribes bleak while through life's unblest he rode backs of bannars. Are you not somewhat bulgar with your bowels? Whatever do you mean with bleak? With pale Blake I write tintingface. O, you do? And with steelwhite and blackmail I ha'scint for my sweet an anemone's letter with a gold of my bridet hair betied (563.11-18, emphasis added).

While this passage does incorporate the proper name 'Blake' in an obvious allusion to the writer, it also decapitalizes the proper name: "With pale Blake I write" (emphasis added). The decapitalized proper name is then operative as a deconstructive "trigger" that sets in motion the chain of signification that exploits the etymology of the adjective "blake." In a disseminative "double" inscription, the text cites the proper name and then re-cites (or re-marks) it, in its decapitalized form, as a simultaneous citation of both the name of the writer and the adjective that provides the various related terms that are disseminated throughout the passage. The fusion, or (con)fusion, of the proper name with the adjective provides an example of how writing originates with the "constitutive erasure of the proper name . . . in arche-writing, within, that is, the play of difference." "Blake," as a proper name, or what Derrida terms "the unique appellation reserved for the presence of a unique being" (the "being" of the Romantic poet, Blake, and/or the 'body' of his works) can never signify the full presence of either the writer, or the texts that bear his proper name, in the Wake.
Inscribing a fusion of the decapitalized proper name and the adjective, the *Wake* stages a "bifurcated" writing, and any attempt at isolating the signifier "blake" and re-investing it with the value of presence (of Blake, or his work, in the *Wake*) will "always already," be undermined by the writing of the *Wake* as a "being with a difference" (269.15) (and a systematic series of differences, a play of *différance*) from the Romantic poet and his texts. The *Wake* itself remarks the difference between the possibility of Blake's presence at the *Wake* (a presence which Derrida's profound meditations on being in the texts of Nietzsche, Freud, and Heidegger have led readers to recognize as an impossibility) and the impossibility of this presence ever being anything more than what Derrida terms "the original myth of a transparent legibility present under obliteration" by feigning an assertion of correlation between its narrative "I" and Blake--"With pale blake I write"--and then staging a questioning of this assertion--"0, you do?" (563.15-16). The assertion and questioning of it constitute the two poles of a (possible) presence and an absence that operate in the *Wake*’s intertextual relationship with the Blake text in much the same way that the polarities of sleeping and death, and waking and celebration, operate in the title *Finnegans Wake*.

Gandolfo adds to Gleckner's investigation of "blake" by suggesting that the "twin associations, black and white" which Gleckner traces in the etymology of "blake" "will remind every reader of *Finnegans Wake* of those contrary brothers Shem and Shaun, 'the fine frank fairhaired fellow of the fairy tales, who wrestles for topholes with the bold bad bleak boy' (*FW*, 22)." In so doing, she attempts to enlarge Blake's influence upon Joyce as a context for reading the *Wake*:
This information about the derivation of "blake" must have delighted Joyce, who certainly saw the happy coincidence of form and content in learning that Blake's very name reflected his dualistic system; and the textual evidence shows that Joyce consciously used the association.

Gandolfo performs an interpretive task like the one that Leitch describes as the "isolation of demonstrable data and the use of established techniques of empirical evidence [to] guide the limiting production of history and tradition." She posits Blake's influence upon Joyce within the context of literary history and attempts to demonstrate how both writers belong to the same literary tradition, a tradition that provides yet another context for understanding the *Wake*. Gandolfo's addition to Gleckner's study of the etymology of "blake" helps to enlarge what appear as the "ever-expandable" "rings of context surrounding the text." The *Wake* 's deconstructive intertextuality, however, subverts the very contexts that Gandolfo's study establishes. Its "(inter)textuality," to use Leitch's words, "undermines such contextualization."

Both "Blake" and "blake" are overdetermined signifiers in the *Wake*. Both operate as signifiers of the Romantic poet, but this signification is exceeded by the dissemination of other semantic values in the signifying play of the passages in which they occur. In the passage "With pale blake I write tintingface," for example, the *Wake* sustains the signifying system that narrates its own production as a written text that has been set in type and printed. As Gleckner's analysis demonstrates, the *Wake* exploits "blake" as a form of the Middle-English *blak* that is derived from a term for "ink" and was altered by Chaucer to "blake" in *Troilus*. While "pale blake" does inscribe a decapitalized
form of the proper name of the Romantic poet, it also signifies the production of the *Wake* as a writing with ink. This semiotic network is sustained by "tintingface," a pun on *Tintenfass* (G. 'ink-pot' and 'inkstand'), and by the sentence, "And with steelwhite and blackmail I ha'scint for my sweet an anemone's letter . . ." (563.16-17), which sustains the *Wake*’s identification of itself as a letter written by Shem for ALP and sent to HCE. Through a semantic and phonetic association, the pun on *Tintenfass* also triggers off the chain of signifiers with which the *Wake* narrates the history of printing:

and Gutenmorg with his cromagnon charter, tintingfast and great primer must once for omniboss step rubrickredd out of the wordpress else is there no virtue more in alcohoran. For that . . . is what papyr is meed of, made of, hides and hints and misses in prints (20.7-11, emphasis added).

The difference between "tintingfast" and "tintingface" signifies, amongst other things, a difference between writing and print. One of the semantic values of "face" is "to cover the surface with some specified material" (OED), a process that is applicable to both writing and printing. Printing, however, enables ink to be applied "fast," or in a manner that renders it less susceptible to smudging or alteration than ink applied in writing with an old fashioned pen.

This is not to dismiss the value of Gandolfo's commentary on the *Wake*, nor to attack the validity of her assertions based on "Blake" as a signifier of the Romantic writer, or her arguments for the importance of this signification to a particular reading of the *Wake*. The comparison of her contextual reading with some of the *Wake*’s intertextual operations
is made merely to outline some of the difficulties that the Wake, as a disseminative and deconstructive intertextual practice of writing, offers to the attempt at a contextualizing and subjectifying interpretation of its semiotic play. To assert, as Gandolfo does, that "Blake" signifies the proper name of the Romantic poet and his work entails a suspension of the sign as a signifier of the Irish tribe from Galway that other commentators have noted as a signified of "Blake tribes." The problem is succinctly summarized by Philippe Sollers, who states that "when you catch one meaning, there are always two others hiding in the shadow." The Wake informs its readers that "every word will be bound over to carry three score and ten top-typical readings through the book of Doublends Jined" (20.14-16), and while this can be read as an hyperbole, its re-citation of the phrase from the nursery rhyme "How many miles to Babylon?" suggests that there may be at least "three score and ten" "swayful pathways" (244.27) leading the readers to the "craggy road for rambling" (244.24) to the Wake's "waters of babalong" (103.11). The attempt at contextualizing one particular path into the Wake at the expense of another is defeated by the disseminating effects of intertextuality within the text's polysemous play.

Gandolfo's approach to Blake in the Wake is based on sound historical research, and it attempts to reconstruct Joyce's knowledge of Blake in order to provide a context for reading those parts of the Wake in which allusions to Blake and his work seem to operate. In order to do this, her study necessarily has to set aside the disseminative and decapitalizing depletion that is effected by the movement from "Blake" to "blake" and which facilitates the (con)fusion of the proper name with an exten-
sive exploitation of the historical etymology of the adjective "blake." Because the *Wake* explicitly posits itself as a staging of the unconscious operations of language, however, some consideration should be given to those differentiating effects of signification by which the text evades the attempt at a conscious and subjectifying contextualization of its signifiers based on historical methods of research. The results of failing to do this are outlined by Leitch:

> If the ultimate horizon and context of every literary work is cultural history, this history is understood to include unconscious as well as conscious materials and constraints. To reconstruct or otherwise restore all such material and patterns is patently impossible. When established, they serve to limit, protect, and explain. Such severe reductions amount to facile deception. Historical research necessarily sets borders around textual dissemination and simplifies critical reading.

A brief consideration of Derrida's "Double Session" reveals that "intertext" cannot be contained as a concept within the historically determined area defined by such terms as influence, borrowing, reference, allusion, and echo, as they are used to define the relationship between one writer and another.20 To write about one author imitating, alluding to, borrowing from, or echoing, another is to write within the framework of a linguistic theory based on an intrasubjective transmission of language determined by the concept of the writer as an authoritative controller of meaning (subject) in language. The traditional triad of writer, text, and reader, as a triad of subjects is undermined as a conceptual formation by deconstructive critics:
Reexamining "author," "reader," "text," "language," and "history," deconstructors turn up a barely realized realm, a cultural unconscious perhaps, a reservoir of traces which manifests itself as an infinite universal discourse that (un)grounds all conceptual formations.21

As Derrida's "Hymen: INTER Platonem et Mallarmatum" and its accompanying, (con)fusing double inscription of passages from Plato's Philebus and Mallarmé's Mimique reveals, the juxtaposition of 'inter' and 'text' produces a semantic value of 'inter' for which "between is not . . . enough."22 What is needed is the double value of the sign 'hymen':

"Hymen" (a word, indeed the only word, that reminds us that what is in question is a "supreme spasm") is first of all a sign of fusion, the consumation of a marriage, the identification of two beings, the confusion between the two . . . . But it does not follow, by virtue of this hymen of confusion, that there is now only one term, a single one of the differends.23

As a hymeneal fusion, 'intertext' brings two or more texts together within the text of writing in general. One text does not contain the other as a text may be said to contain words, forms, patterns, or echoes of other texts. Instead, the intertext operates between the two texts at the same time that it "eliminates the exteriority or anteriority" that supports them as independent identities. It eliminates the "independence, of the imitated, the signified, or the thing."24

A disseminative question to be asked of the Joyce-Blake intertext is what stands between Blake and Joyce as textual signifiers. In general terms, the answer to this question includes history (one marked by
geography, temporality, nationality, violence, and warfare), two different practices of writing that share an identification of writing with warfare and excrement, and the difference between a phallogocentric and gynocentric textual organization. These terms are involved in the simultaneously identifying and differentiating practices of writing signified by "Joyce" and "Blake." The definition of the intertext, "Hymen: INTER" Blake and Joyce, the re-marking, or re-citing, of fragments from the Blake text that are already remarked and recited in the Joyce text, entails a temporary suspension of "Joyce" and "Blake" as proper names in order to observe them as textual signifiers of differing writing practices.

The Marriage of Heaven and Hell posits two poles between which its narrative shuttles back and forth as it weaves a tale of writing. The poles are sustained by the differences between a narrative persona who willingly visits hell, "delighted with the enjoyments of genius" and an angelic Swedenborg who "has not written one new truth" but "all the old falshoods [sic.]." The text is a violent attack upon all angels in general and particularly upon Swedenborg, who vainly thinks himself "wiser than seven men" because he is a "little wiser" than the monkey that he carries "about for a shew." Jerusalem, the narrative of the fall and rise of Albion (the mythic, nationalistic figure who many commentators have compared with HCE), sustains a similar polarity as it stages a violent struggle between imagination and selfhood that is narrated in an equally violent language. Its violent "Thunder of Thought & flames of fierce desire" stages writing as nothing less than an inscription of the voice of God speaking in "thunder and in fire!"
Speaking through the "Saviour" who dictates to the male narrative persona (the triad comprises a sort of boy's or men's club), the divine voice utters the epic and is eventually modulated into the presumably softer voice of "England who is Britania" that pierces "Albions clay cold ear" and restores him to life.  

The *Wake* fuses the antagonistic Swedenborg and the protagonistic Albion into "Swed Albiony, likliest villain of the place" (137.7). A historical reading of this passage would read "Swed Albiony" as an allusion to Blake's work and utilize it as evidence of Joyce's borrowing from Blake and his knowledge of Blake's work. A deconstructive reading of the passage attends to "Swed Albiony" as a repetition of fragments from the Blake text, but a repetition which depletes the capital reserve of the divinely-inspired heroic males and of the Blake-text's economy that was sustained by both the status of Albion as an inspired, heroic character in whom "spake . . . The Universal Father" and the protagonist-antagonist valorization of the inspired, National hero, Albion, and the false prophet, Swedenborg. Furthermore, two signs that dominate the Blake text by their position as central signifiers are reduced, in the Joyce-Blake intertext, to marginal signifiers of only one possible identity for HCE that occurs among the numerous signifiers of alternating identities that are catalogued in the disseminative, thirteen-page question on "Finn MacCool" (139.14) as the "secondtonone myther rector and maximost bridgesmaker" (126.10-11). "Swed Albiony" is a product of the two textual operations that Derrida terms a "Scission [La Coupure]" and a "Graft" (une greffe). A castrating ("acted out or feigned") cut of the
pen makes an incision into the narrative of Albion and severs the signifier from the textual play in which it had participated in the Blake text and grafts it onto a series of signifiers for HCE. "Albion the mildest son of Heaven" is reinscribed as "Albiony, likliest villain in the place." The proper name Swedenborg is cut, reduced to "Swed," and grafted onto "Albiony" to produce a simulacrum of a proper name. The signifiers that are incised from the Blake text do not cease to signify that text, but retain, within the hymeneal fusion of the Blake-Joyce intertext, the power to signify both the site from which they were removed and the text onto which they are grafted. "Each grafted text," Derrida explains, "continues to radiate back toward the site of its removal, transforming that, too, as it affects the new territory."

A passage that repeats the rhythm of the song "The Holly and the Ivy," provides another example of both the textual operations of the scission and the graft and of the intertextual reinscription of fragments from Blake's "The Book of Thel": "Thej ollly and thel ivelvy, thou billy with thee coo" (236.13-14). In this passage, "holly" and "ivy" are reinscribed as "jolly" and "lively." The 'j' of jolly is then severed and grafted onto the definite article, and, in a doubling, or what the Wake terms a "doublin" (3.8), of the cut and graft, the 'l' of lively is severed and grafted onto the second definite article. The originary "Holly and the Ivy" remains discernible beneath the effects of these operations, and even after the scissions and grafting, the passage functions in accordance with the principle of the "palimpsests" with which the Wake defines itself (182.2). These cuts and grafts do not entirely erase the values of the forms which they interrupt, and the
effects of 'jolly' and 'lively', and beneath them, 'holly' and 'ivy', continue to function, albeit in a limited and restricted manner, from beneath the surface that bears witness to the textual transformations that have been wrought upon them. This is because, as noted earlier, the grafted text does "radiate back toward the site of its removal," and because it is "defined (thought) by the operation and ... at the same time defining (thinking) as far as the rules and effects of the operation are concerned." The cuts and grafts interrupt the signifying effects of 'jolly' and 'lively', but the rhythm and cadence of the passage remains both jolly and lively as "olly" and "ively" continue to signify the originary "olly" and "ivy" of the song.

The scission and graft that transforms 'the lively' into "thel ively" effects the appearance of a fragment from the title of "The Book of Thel." This short narrative from the Blake text recites Thel's inquiry into the fate of all living things. After a series of conversations with beings contentedly resigned to their mortality and a vision of "her own grave plot," Thel spurns the opportunity to live as a mortal, and, "with a shriek," she flees "back ... into the vales of Har." Thel's refusal to live as the Lilly, the Cloud, and the Worm live, her refusal to be, in a certain sense, lively, is repeated at the level of the signifier in the disseminative decapitalizing of 'lively'. The severing of the 'l' effects a signification of 'ivy' through the phonetic similarity between "ively" and 'ivy'. "Thel ively" re-stages Thel's retirement from mortal existence and her desire to remain concealed within the vales of Har at the same time that it interrupts 'lively' as a signifier of life and triggers off the intertextual signification of "Thel."
The intertextual signification of "Thel" is sustained by the subsequent reinscription of "thou" and "thee": "thou billy with thee coo" (emphasis added). "Thou" and "thee" are scattered throughout "The Book of Thel" and function as markers of Thel's discussions with mortal beings. This passage also inscribes a decapitalized, familiar contraction of Blake's first name, William. Like the decapitalization of "Blake" in the passage examined earlier, the decapitalizing of "Thel" and "Billy" functions to place the proper names under erasure, thereby disseminating their power as subjects capable of dominating and controlling the originary text in which they were inscribed. The function of the capital letter in the title or proper name is to guarantee the signifying power of the title over the text and the proper name over that which functions as its signified in order to ensure identity, to ensure that this or that text or person is interpreted or read according to the power of the subject. The power of the capital letter functions as a part of the capital of the textual economy upon which the subject draws in its attempt to define and sustain identity. To interpret "The Book of Thel" is to strive to apprehend, through historical reconstruction, the meaning of text (as subject matter) that was produced and stored within the text as its capital by the author-as-subject. The scission, or cut, that the Wake performs as it decapitalizes, or "caps ever[s]" (260.4), however, "ruins 'the pious capital' of the title" and the proper name, depleting the capital of the textual economy that can be stored under the heading of the subject, and disseminating it, scattering it throughout the Wake's polysemous play. In the Joyce-Blake intertext, 'William Blake's' "The Book of Thel" is reinscribed as "billy," "blake," and "thel," and
its narrative of a melancholic and troubled soul fleeing a life of mortality is disseminated in the rhythm of "The Holly and the Ivy," one of the many 'lively' and 'jolly' songs performed at the funeral celebration of the Wake.

The scissions or cuts performed to decapitalize the proper names 'Billy', 'Blake', and 'Thel' and render them as "billy," "blake," and "thel" are signified by the two signifiers that occur as the first and last terms of the passage "thej olly and thel ively, thou billy with thee coo" (emphasis added). The signifier "thej" functions as, amongst other things, a phonetic contraction of 'the edge', which has the semantic value of: "The thin sharpened side of a cutting instrument or weapon. Hence b. A cutting weapon" (OED), and "coo" operates as a pun on the French coup, or "blow" and "stroke" (Fr. "coup [ku], n.m. Blow, stroke, hit, thump, knock, stab, thrust, wound;"). The "thel," "thou," "billy," and "thee," fragments from the Blake text, are thus reinscribed between margins composed of two terms that signify the very operations through which the Joyce-Blake intertext is brought into the Wake's disseminative, semiotic textual play.

The passage "thou Billy with thee coo" also stages a simulacrum of interlocution that feigns to address Blake as "billy." As Derrida demonstrates in his discussion of the "attending discourse," that which performs the addressing is "not an 'author,' a 'narrator,' or a deus ex machina" but a textual "I" that is "both part of the spectacle and part of the audience":

an "I" that, a bit like "you," attends (undergoes) its own incessant, violent reinscription with the arithmetical machinery: an "I" that, functioning as a pure passageway for operations of substitution, is not some singular and irreplaceable existence, some subject or "life," but only, moving between life and death, reality and fiction, etc., a mere function or phantom.

On the stage of the Wake's text, the interlocutionary address to "billy" proffers itself "plupresently . . . so as to deconstruct the 'illusion' or error of the present." 'William Blake' can never signify a living existence or presence within the Joyce-Blake intertext. It functions as a surface effect, a signifier of its status as a trace of presence. Cut off from the living presence of the historical person that it once signified, it now operates as an indicator of a particular practice of writing in which writing is an act of violence. "William" is reinscribed as "billy," and this "billy" is both a trace of the once proper name and a signifier of the pen as a 'billy' or "club" (OED) with which the proper name suffers the castrating "coo," or coup, of "violent reinscription."

Elsewhere in the Wake, "billy" is fused with "coo" to produce a pun on bellicose, and, as noted below, the trace of Blake's name is retained in a staging of writing as warfare and fighting.

Writing as warfare is a central metaphor that is developed in the Blake text, where the task of artistic production is staged as mental warfare, and the pen is identified with the sword:

I will not cease from Mental Fight
Nor shall my Sword sleep in my hand:
Till we have built Jerusalem,
In Englands green & pleasant Land.
In the *Wake*, the identification of writing and warfare is repeated in a passage that triggers off the Joyce-Blake intertext through the fusion of "billy" and "coo" in "billycoose":

Here say figurines billycoose arming and mounting.
Mounting and arming bellicose figurines see here.
Futhorc, this little effingee is for a firefing called a flintforfall. Face at the eased! O
I fay! Face at the waist! Ho, you fie! Upwap and dump em, ace to ace (18.33-6).

"Futhorc" in this passage is a pun on the runic "futhark" alphabet, but it also fuses together the Scandanavian god of thunder, Thor, and the fiery figure of revolution from the Blake text, Orc. Orc is associated with both fire and thunder in the Blake text, and appears in the east so that his face is a "Face at the eased" or 'east'.

In general terms, the Joyce-Blake intertext is itself a scene of violence. Besides decapitalizing fragments from the Blake text through the techniques that deconstruction terms the scission, the *coup*, or cut, and the graft, *Finnegans Wake* overturns some of the fundamental principles of organization in the Blake text. The Blake text, for example, posits its language, as noted earlier, as the divine utterance of a male God whose son, a male "Saviour," dictates to an inspired male persona:

This theme calls me in sleep night after night, &
ev'ry morn
Awakes me at sun-rise, then I see the Saviour over me
Spreading his beams of love, & dictating the words of
this mild song.
This language admits of a certain "variety in every line, both of cadence & number of syllables," but the variety is organized according to the concept of a unified subject in which wholeness is achieved through the appropriate placement of the parts: "Every word and every letter is studied and put into its fit place." The triadic pattern of writer, text, and reader, is organized according to the paradigm of three distinct, unified, and singular subjects in the Blake text. The text explicitly posits itself as the "penproduct" (108.31), to use a *Wake* term, of a single author who controls the language that he employs to such an extent that "every letter" is under his control. The writer inscribes a unified and complete "consolidated work" dictated by a single male speaker and addressed to a singular "Reader: [lover] of books: [lover] of heaven." Each of these terms—dictator, writer, consolidated work, and reader—functions to sustain the very notion of the conscious and subjective control of language that the deconstructive critic "solicits" and "shakes" as she, or he, "disperses the determining subject and denies the centering consciousness, voiding the grounds of contextual history." Such dispersal, denial, and voidance, operates in the intertextual, "Hymen: INTER" Blake and Joyce.

In contrast to the Blake-text's positing of itself as a writing practice organized according to the principle of the unified, and unifying, subject, the *Wake* deconstructively operates to disperse and disseminate the subjectifying terms of writer, language, text, and reader. As noted in chapter two, the *Wake* (con)fuses the terms reader and writer by feigning to address the reader as "gentlewriter" (63.10) and "drear writer" (476.21), thereby overturning the traditional terms by
which the text often stages an address to the reader. When it does stage an address to the reader using the more conventional term, it does so in the plural, as in "lay readers and gentilemen" (573.35, emphasis added) and "rockcut readers" (551.31, emphasis added). In describing its writer (as subject), the _Wake_ suggests that while a singular hand wrote, the forces behind that hand are not a singular subject but a plurality of forces. While the "hand" that held the pen "was one," the "minds of active and agitated" that constitute the "identities in the writer complexus" are "more than so" (114.33-5, emphasis added). This dispersal of the writer as a monadic entity that is capable of fully controlling the language that it produces also manifests itself in the well-known, self-reflective narrative by which the _Wake_ defines itself as a letter from ALP to HCE that is written by ALP's son Shem and discovered by the female hen, biddy, as she scratches at the surface of the midden heap in which the letter lies buried. The possibility that Shem could be identified as the singular author of the text is negated by Shem's continual shifts in identity. At one point, for example, Shem is displaced by his 'other' identity as Diarmaid, and "Diremood is the name is on the writing chap of the psalter" (125.21-3). Elsewhere, it is denied that Shem is the centering consciousness responsible for the letter's composition. In response to the question that might clear up the question of authorship--"Say, baroun lousadoor, who in hallhagal wrote the durn thing anyhow?" (107.36-108.1)--the text stages several possible answers. Amongst them is the following:
Anyhow, somehow and somewhere, before the bookflood or after her ebb, somebody mentioned by name in his telephone directory, Cocclanius or Gallotaurus, wrote it, wrote it all down, and there you are, full stop. (118.11-14)

Finally, there remains the autonomous power of language to produce its own signification even as it is employed by an individual speaking and/or writing subject. As noted in Chapter Two, the concept of language's autonomy emerged in Mallarmé's answer to Nietzsche, and it became a major part of both Modernist literary theory and deconstructive textual practice. It is not surprising, then, that in the *Wake*’s staging of possible identities of authorship, there occurs at least one inscription that proffers language itself as the power behind the letter, behind "that letter selfpenned to one's other" (489.33-4, emphasis added).

It is well known that the *Wake*’s multilingual puns make it extremely difficult to establish what particular language is operating at any one time. This is because there are frequently several languages in simultaneous operation. One result of the *Wake*’s fusion of a multiplicity of languages is the dispersal of different languages as subjects that can be correlated with extra-textual experience. The variety of lexicons and word studies of particular languages that identify the various semantic values operative in the *Wake*’s multilingual puns demonstrate that the critical task of categorizing and subjectifying the various forms fused, or (con)fused, into the *Wake*’s linguistic "smeltingworks" (614.31) entails a stabilization that is defeated when the reader turns from the lexicon or word study back to the *Wake*’s "anythongue athall" (117.15-16) language. The difference, and différence, "INTER" Blake and Joyce, in this respect, is the difference between a linear inscription and a
palimpsestual overlay. On those rare occasions when the very nationalistic Blake text incorporates a non-English language, it does so in a linear sequence by inserting a Greek or Hebraic word or phrase between its English forms. In the marginal inscriptions surrounding "The Laocoon," for example, the inscriptions over the father's head are inscribed in a vertical yet linear fashion:

The Angel of the Divine Presence
מַלְאךָ אֵל הָעֵדֶּחֶךָ
He repented that he had made Adam
(of the Female, the Adamah)
& it grieved him at his heart

In the Wake, the inscription of individual letters is linear, but differing languages are fused so that they appear simultaneously. One of the best-known examples is the Wake's repetition of the phrase "well, how do you do today, my dark gentleman?" and variations of it. At one point, the Wake stages itself as a teapot, or "teacan" in which its liquid language, its "languo of flows" (621.22), is "simmering" (247.14). This English tea passage is infused with a Greek translation of the "dark gentleman" phrase, *μεν, τί κανέτε σέμερον, ὁ εμοῦ μαυρὸ κυρίο* as "Men, teacan a tea simmering, hamo mavrone kerry 0?" (247.14). To read this passage is to read at least two languages simultaneously. The English stages a feigned address to a plurality of readers, "men," and self-reflectively notes the movement of its language; the transliterated Greek re-stages the vocative inquiry into the well-being of the singular "dark gentleman," or "μαυρό κυρίο."
The dispersal of the various identities of the Wake's "writer complexus" and the dissemination of the multilingual puns that destabilize the various languages that the Wake (con)fuses are two forces that contribute to the text's deconstructive and decentering practice of writing. A third, and equally powerful force operates in the continual displacement of the differing, and sometimes contradictory, terms with which the Wake identifies itself. These terms void each other and undermine the possibility of establishing any one dominant metaphor that could subjectify the very identity of the Wake. Where the Blake text invariably defines itself as a practice of writing performed as a spiritual act with the goal of expanding the reader's perceptions of the spiritual world, the Wake continually stages itself as a joke. The Blake text identifies itself as performing the divine will of a male creator who "Acts & Is, in existing beings or Men"; the Joyce text stages itself as an extended punning joke. The Wake's "voice is the voice of Jokeup" (487.22); the fall of Man is treated as the "first joke of Willingdone, tic for tac. Hee, hee, hee. (9.14-15); and the reader's "mutton leg" gets "musclebound from being too pulled" (64.32-3). In part, this joke is played on the reader who attempts to answer the question, what is the Wake? The language of the text is a river, but its alphabet is both a bed of laughter and a river bed, an "allaphbed" (18.16). The text is a letter found in a midden heap, but it is also the middenheap, or "midden-hide of objects" (19.8) itself. It is a "cubehouse" (5.14), a "lifeboat" (321.14), a "stew" (190.9), a factory, or "smeltingworks" (614.31), and a "singear clutchless" (609.1) "chaunting car" (55.24). The Wake thus signifies itself as a discourse written in "anythongue athall," or any
tongue at all, and as a text that is 'anything at all' since the language of the Wake's tale constantly erases the possibility of essential being. In Derridean terms, it places the signification of being (essence, nature, and identity, etc.) under erasure. 47

In terms of sexual organization, the Joyce text overturns the traditional, phallogocentric preferring of male over female that the Blake text sustains. The Blake text is centered on the male principle, and presents the female as a secondary "emanation" which, in the ideal, eternal world depicted by the Blake text, has no independent existence. In the Book of Urizen, for example, the appearance of Urizen's emanation, as an independent entity, produces a shudder of horror: "All Eternity shuddered at sight/ Of the first female now separate." The response of the heroic male, Los, is pity for this female severed from the delights of existence subordinate to her male: "But Los saw the female & pitied/ He embrac'd her." In a characteristic depiction of the female, the Blake text posits the female's response to Los's kind-hearted attempts at comforting her as emotional, and, because she refuses male comfort, she is cruel and perverse: "she wept, she refus'd/ In perverse and cruel delight." 48 A similar valorization is repeated in Jerusalem where an intertextual inscription from Revelation conflates "Babylon the great, the mother of whores" and the figure of the dragon to produce

A Double Female . . . within the Tabernacle,
Religion hid in War, a Dragon red & hidden Harlot
Each within other, but without a Warlike Mighty-one

They became One with the Antichrist & are absorbd in him 49
When the female in the Blake-text is not cruelly and perversely attempting to achieve an independent existence from the male or merging with the Antichrist, she clings to her male in death as England, Albion's emanation, does: "England a Female shadow as deadly damps/ Of the mines of Cornwall and Derbyshire lays upon his bosom heavy." Where England is awoken by the (male) "Breath Divine," she first faints "seven times on the Body of Albion" and then immediately accepts the blame for her husband's fall into death:

O pitious Sleep O piteous Dream! O God O God awake  
I have slain

In Dreams of Chastity and Moral Law I have Murdered  
Albion! Ah!

In Stone-henge & on London Stone & in the Graves of  
Malden

I have slain him in my sleep with the knife of the  
Druid England

O all ye nations of the Earth behold ye the Jealous  
Wife.

The valorization of the female as a weak and dependent emanation of the male who becomes a cruel, perverse, and evil force when she attempts to function independently of him is a dominating theme of the Blake text. The attitude it expresses towards females signifies the male impulse to control and dominate the female by satisfying, and thus limiting, her desire:

In a Wife I would desire  
What in whores is always found  
The lineaments of Gratified desire
When a female is made the focal point of the narrative of "The Book of Thel," her inability to face death marks her as much weaker than the male. In Milton, for example, the male willingly descends to "redeem" his "sixfold Emanation" even though he will "perish" in doing so. In contrast, Thel cannot bear the thought of death and "with a shriek" runs back into the Neoplatonic realm of Har where she can exist without facing mortality.  

In the Joyce text, particularly in the Wake, but also, to a certain extent, in the jouissance of Molly's soliloquy in Ulysses, the phallogocentric preferring of the male in the binate male-female oppositional relationship is nullified by a dislodging and reinscription of the binary terms in such a way that the previously higher term (and the chains of signifiers that it triggers) is set to work within the margins of a framework organized according to the operations of the previously lower term. This is analogous to the "double and precisely stratified, dislodged and dislodging, writing" that Derrida posits as a deconstructive writing, and the binary opposition of male and female is overturned in the Wake in a movement similar to that which chapter two outlined as the Wake's overturning of the traditional, Western metaphysical domination of writing by speech.  

At a fundamental level of the Wake's narrative of HCE's and Finnegan's lapse (into sleep and/or death), this dislodging is re-marked in the Wake's identification of its writing as ALP's "mamafesta" (104.04) (and this term itself exemplifies the dislodging of 'Man' from manifesto and the subsequent inscription of a female term in its place). As a 'manifesto', the Wake manifests ALP's desire for the fallen and absent HCE. Her desire is to have Earwicker as a "Herewaker"
(619.12), an awake male in her presence. She desires HCE as "confident, and heroic" and (in all senses of the word) "erect" (619.14). ALP's letter, as Margaret Solomon has explained, is a sexual letter, and the desire it expresses is sustained by the series of phallic substitutes functioning as the 'other' by which desire is sustained.  

HCE's fall and Finnegan's fall from the ladder both involve loss of the phallus. Before the fall "Bygmester Finnegan['s]" ability to penetrate ALP is staged as "Wither hayre in honds tuck up your part inher" (4.29) which may be read as 'with her hair in hands' "tuck up your part' 'in her', and the phallus is presented as "a skyerscape . . . eriginat-ing from next to nothing . . . hierarchitectitiptitiploftical" (4.36-5.2), engaged in the rhythmic satisfaction of desire: it has a "burning bush abob off its baubletop and with larrons o'toolers clittering up and tombles a'buckets clottering down" (5.2-3). The fall itself is presented in terms of the effects of alcohol preventing the completion of the tower:

Phill filt tippling full . . . . (There was a wall of course in erection) Dimb! He stottered from the latter. Damb! he was dud. Dumb! (6.7-9)

The loss of the phallus becomes, as Solomon notes, a major motif in the possibility of HCE's resurrection. Resurrection is presented in terms of re-erection. HCE will be "healed cured and embalsemate, pending a rouseruction of his bogey (498.33-499.1; emphasis added). Following the demise of HCE, ALP expresses her desire through Shem, who appropriates his father's phallus and uses "Earwicker's pensile" to write the
letter in which ALP expresses her desire. Unlike the Blake text, with its demand for a gratified female desire that will not threaten the male, and its presentation of independent female will as cruel and perverse, the Joyce text of the *Wake* stages a language that is identifiable with limitless female desire. This desire is sustained in the absence of the father and through the writing of the son. In inscribing the fall of HCE, ALP's desire is involved with the de-sire-ing of the Father. HCE's fall is a phallic "Phall" (4.14), and HCE functions as the unattainable 'other' by which ALP's desire sustains itself as it expresses itself through the son's control of his father's "pensile." This overturning of the phallogocentric domination of writing that is found in the Blake text also manifests itself in the *Wake's* modification of the four-fold diagram inscribed in *Milton*. In the Blake text, the universe is depicted as four overlapping circles whose lines of circumference meet concentrically at the centre of a model of the mundane shell. Each of these circles represents one of the four male zoas, and the egg-shaped symbol inscribed within them constitutes a world divided between the males, Adam and Satan. In the "nightlessons" chapter of the *Wake*, this arrangement is repeated, but the centre of the circles constitutes the well-known inscription of the triangle $\triangle APB$. Where the Blake text uses a graphic symbol of four circles to inscribe a universe arranged according to the principles of male domination, the Joyce text inscribes two circles centered upon the female triangle. The effects of this re-inscription can be comprehended by a comparison of the two diagrams which reveals that a major alteration the Joyce text performs is the severing of two circles--an appropriate modification for signifying the dislodging of phallogocentric domination.
The intertext, "Hymen: INTER" Shakespeare and Joyce, is a much more powerful intertext than the Blake-Joyce intertext. In part, this is because of the much greater saturation of the Wake's signifying system by fragments from the Shakespeare text. Adaline Glasheen remarks on the importance of Shakespeare's works for an understanding of the Wake in terms of biography and influence. She believes Joyce was influenced by Shakespeare to such an extent that he wrote Finnegans Wake about his dramatic predecessor. "Finnegans Wake," she contends, "is about Shakespeare," and "Shakespeare is the matrix of Finnegans Wake." 57 Vincent Cheng, the author of the most thorough study on Shakespeare and Joyce to date, agrees with Glasheen's assertions, and he uses her definition of matrix as a "womb or mold in which something is shaped or cast" to define the Wake's use of individual plays and thereby enlarge the Shakespearean context for reading Finnegans Wake: "By Glasheen's own definition of matrix," Cheng argues, "the scaffolding of FW is in fact a multiplex." Cheng's study describes this multiplex as composed of three major matrices, Hamlet, Macbeth, and Julius Caesar. Hamlet is "foremost" among these matrices because it provides the basic pattern for the organization of HCE and his family. HCE is old King Hamlet, Shem is the prince, Issy functions as Ophelia, and Shaun is a combination of Laertes and Polonius. Macbeth and Julius Caesar function as the other two matrices because they are the "most alluded to" in the Wake. 58

Like the studies of Blake considered at the beginning of this chapter, those of Cheng and Glasheen produce a context for reading the Wake. Both attempt to demonstrate that Joyce's admiration for, and knowledge of, Shakespeare's works account for the frequent allusions to
them in the *Wake*. Cheng, in particular, is concerned with establishing both Shakespeare and his works as powerful presences in the *Wake*, and *Shakespeare and Joyce* attempts to prove "beyond doubt the centrality and omnipresence of Shakespeare, of the Shakespearean cannon, and of the dramatic metaphor in *FW." Cheng's study provides a useful catalogue of the ways in which the *Wake* incorporates fragments from the Shakespeare text. It classifies them as quotations and allusions that fit into four categories: "variants on the name of Shakespeare"; "variants on the titles of Shakespearean plays"; "other quotations, parodies and allusions"; and "indirect, lesser-known, and less obvious echoes and quotations from the plays."59

More importantly for the present consideration of the *Wake* as a deconstructive writing practice, Cheng's study points to some of the problems of attempting to contextualize the Joyce-Shakespeare relationship. In part, these problems stem from the *Wake* 's destabilization of identity. The proper name 'Shakespeare', for example, occurs in the *Wake* only in such deformations as "Shakefork" (274.L4), "Shaggspick" (177.32), "Shakespill" (161.31), and "Shakhisbeard" (177.32). Cheng deals with such destabilization from a contextual point of view and describes the forms that result from deformation as "obscure" allusions which attest to Joyce's "elusive" methods: "Shakespearean allusions in the *Wake*," he states, "are not bright apples hanging from low boughs, ripe for easy plucking." "Joyce's methods are often obscure and elusive." Because the *Wake* often (con)fuses different signifiers together in order to produce what Cheng terms a "multiplex allusion," or a "conflation of many allusions," contextualization of the *Wake* 's re-marking of fragments from
Shakespeare's works can be accomplished only by suspending those parts of the "multiplex allusions" which do not signify the Shakespeare text. The proper name, 'Shakespeare', for example, is inscribed in the Wake through a disseminative play of difféance. The proper name is solicited, in the deconstructive sense of "shaken" (from the L. "sollus whole, entire + citus, ciere to put in motion" [OED] cf. sollicito, "to disturb, stir, agitate, move . . . . to stir, put in lively motion, move violently," [Lewis and Short]) and then disseminatively scattered or spilt throughout the text. "Shakespill" thus operates not only as a trigger to set the Shakespeare-Joyce intertext in motion, but also as a signifier of the techniques by which the proper name is erased in order that the practice of writing signified by the sign "Joyce" can take place. Contextualizing "Shakespill" by treating it as an allusion to Shakespeare, or a variation on that name, entails setting aside its signification of the very writing practice by which the originary proper name experiences the "fall" and "expulsion into the exteriority of the sensible here below" in favour of attempting a historical reconstruction that might invest "Shakespeare" with something of its historical signification.

Like the investigation of the Blake-Joyce intertext in the first part of this chapter, the following study of the Shakespeare-Joyce intertext will, as far as possible, avoid contextualizing in favour of observing the hymeneal fusion of fragments from the Shakespeare text as they are set to work within the "Joyce" writing practice of Finnegans Wake. It will restrict itself primarily to tracing the dissemination, the 'shaking' and 'spilling', of one fragment from the Shakespeare text--Macbeth, Act 11, scene iii, 11.1-75, or the drunken porter scene--and
detailing some of the deconstructive techniques by which this passage is disseminated in the *Wake* and used to guide the reader into his or her reading of it. Cheng states that "the reader doesn't learn about Shakespeare in Joyce's allusions to Shakespeare; he learns about Joyce." In a deconstructive analysis, the reader doesn't learn about Joyce, the man who wrote; she, or he, learns about Joyce as a practice of writing that undermines contextualization.

As noted above, and in the third chapter, the "nightlessons" chapter, II.2, is as much a lesson in the *Wake* 's night language for the reader as it is a representation of a classbook and a mimetic staging of lessons for the children, Kev, Dolph, and Issy. With its marginal inscriptions demonstrating the *Wake* 's exploitation of borders and marginal play, its directions for apprehending the passage through which ALP's "languo" "flows," and its staging of the "bridge" that the reader can "Cross" in order to "pearse" the "castle" of the text, (262.3-8), the chapter stages the directions for the reader to follow in order to cross the threshold of the *Wake* 's "Inn" (262.25) and participate in the simultaneous mourning and celebration of HCE's simultaneous presence and absence: HCE is dead; long live HCE. "Pose the pen, man, way me does" (303.2-3), the chapter directs, and this direction that Dolph gives to Kev is also a staged (and stage) direction to the reader who wishes to read the text as a practice of writing, or to understand ALP's letter as what McHugh terms "ultimately all writings, particularly *FW* itself."62

The nine chapters that precede the lessons chapter, have, in part, been a preparation for the lessons chapter. They have disseminated tea, pee (urine), porter, whisky, semen, ink, and water, as lexemes supporting
the liquidity of ALP's language, and fragments of the drunken porter scene from Macbeth have been (con)fused with the narrative of HCE and ALP. One effect of this disseminative (con)fusion is the over-determination of the signifier "porter" to the point where its occurrence in the tenth chapter triggers off the Shakespeare intertext, the signifieds of ALP's language, HCE's function as a porter, the porter that is dispensed in the "Mullingcan Inn" (64.9), and the Porter family. The question "And howelse do we hook our hike to that pint of porter place?" (260.5-6), thus becomes a question of how the reader can make his, or her, way ("hook" carries amongst its semantic values "to bend" and to "Move with a sudden twist or jerk" [OED]) into the text where ALP's language flows, the Porter family resides, porter is dispensed, and HCE operates as a porter. Appropriately, the tenth chapter stages an invitation to "Approach to lead our passage" (262.2), and this "passage" leads to the "castle" and a "knock" that restages the positions of Lennox and Macduff as they stand before Macbeth's castle, seeking their king. Like these loyal servants, the reader who enters into the Wake's castle finds there has been a lot of drinking ("porter," in all senses, has been consumed), a case of impotence that led to a "Phall," (4.15), a death, and a strong expression of female desire.

Cheng's study notes the first "allusion" to the drunken porter scene occurring in the "request for a fully armed explanation" (51.23-4) of Earwicker's fall from the "porty" (51.23). The intertextual operation of the scene is triggered off earlier, however, in the episode of Jarl van Hoother and the prankquean. The important signifier "porter" does not occur in this episode, but HCE, in the role of Jarl, functions as both
the inhabitant of the "homerigh, castle and earthenhouse" and the porter-like doorkeeper who responds to the prankquean's questions by closing the "dour" in her face with a resounding "Shut!" (21.19). The drunken porter intertext is triggered off in this episode by the repetition of a certain mathematical pattern and, at the thematic level, a restaging of the signifiers of intoxication, impotence, and female desire.

In Macbeth, the porter who responds to the knocking on the gate structures the speech he makes while responding to the knocking by counting the knocks. His counting punctuates his speech and divides it into five sections: an initial response to the knocking in which the porter imagines himself as the "porter of hell-gate," and four questions on the identity of the person, or persons, knocking. More importantly, the porter's counting of knocks establishes a pattern of four groups divided into three, two, three, and two: "Knock, knock, knock .... Knock, knock .... Knock, knock, knock .... Knock, knock." The prankquean episode stages a precise repetition of this knocking pattern but, in a deconstructive dislodging, overturns the signifiers that are grouped within its parameters. The prankquean's response to Jarl's refusal of her advances is to kidnap the "jiminy Tristopher" (21.21) and return to "Woeman's Land" (22.8) where she sustains the power of her desire, both sexual and political, by "raining" (22.18) and 'reigning' on the land. The signifiers of her desire are grouped in precisely the same mathematical configuration as the porter's "knock[s]." The prankquean first "rain, rain, rain," (21.22), or 'ran' from the castle; then she starts "to rain and to rain" (21.31); next, she "rain, rain, rain" (22.9); and, finally, she starts "raining, raining"
(22.18) once more. Both the porter's "knock" and the prankquean's "rain" are signifiers of desire. In Macbeth the knocks signify the desire of Lennox and Macduff to attend to the king's needs and serve him as loyal subjects; in the Wake, the prankquean's rains signify her desire to be served by Jarl. When Jarl fails to answer the prankquean's riddle, she expresses her power by kidnapping and running ("raining") back to the land where she sustains her 'reign' until Jarl meets her demands.

As Solomon demonstrates, the prankquean episode is structured on a tripartite pattern that reflects the "three-times-is-a-charm" motif that "runs like a musical theme--with variations throughout the book." This three-part structure is "associated with the structural system of cycles" that provide an important foundation for the Wake's narrative organization:

> the Viconian rhythm of three ages and ricorso, the units of three tones and an interval, three attacks and a pause, three surges and a change, and the fairytale pattern of three tries and a magic 'opening'.

In its staging of this three-part pattern, the prankquean episode also repeats a pattern that operates in the drunken porter scene. This first part of the second act's third scene divides the revelation of the king's death to Macduff into three sections: the porter's speech and his opening of the gate, Macduff's request for the king; and the peripeteiac moment of Macduff's three-fold cry, "O horror! horror! horror!". This first part of scene iii also stages three entrances that punctuate the action prior to Macduff's realization of the king's death: the entrances of the porter, Macduff and Lennox, and Macbeth. Macduff's conversation
with the porter, moreover, consists of three questions: an inquiry into why the porter sleeps so late; the request for information on the effects of drinking; and the question "Is thy master stirring?". The porter's discourse sustains the three-part pattern as it names the "three things" of which drink "is a great provoker": "nose-painting, sleep, and urine." 66

At the thematic level, the prankquean episode sustains the relationships between desire, drinking, impotence, and urination, which Macbeth's porter develops as he tells Macduff that drinking provokes "sleep and urine" and "provokes the desire but takes away the performance." 67 Like the interior of Macbeth's castle, Jarl's "homerigh, castle and earthenhouse" is cold, and this coldness is linked to Jarl's infertile sexual desire. The first two times that the prankquean visits Jarl, he is masturbating, and the first staging of his actions link the masturbation with a cold lack of desire for a more productive sexual activity. He is "laying cold hands on himself" (21.11; emphasis added). The second time that the prankquean visits, things have warmed up a little, but Jarl still prefers "shaking warm hands with himself" (21.36) to satisfying the prankquean's desire, and this time, Jarl's lack of desire for the Pee Queen is linked to a drunken impotence, for Jarl has his "heels drowned in his cellarmalt" (21.35). The link between desire and urination is, as Solomon demonstrates, sustained by the prankquean's urination that brings Jarl "water in addition to fire." 68

While the prankquean episode restages patterns of organization and thematic concerns that are both operative in the drunken porter scene, it undermines the scene as a context for reading the prankquean episode by a
play of différance in which signification is simultaneously differentiating and deferring. Like the drunken porter scene, the prankquean episode stages a narrative that revolves around the issue of crossing a border or threshold. In both instances, characters stand before the doorway to a castle and express their desires. In both the drunken porter scene and the prankquean episode, the interior of the castle is cold, the inhabitants are drunk, and desire is a fruitless force. In the drunken porter scene, however, it is a female desire, that of Lady Macbeth, which dominates the interior of the castle, and a male desire, that of Lennox and Macduff, which seeks to penetrate into the castle. In the prankquean episode, this organization is reversed, and a female desire expresses itself outside of the castle while a comparatively ineffectual male desire operates within. In Macbeth, female desire is a malevolent force responsible for death, destruction, and instability within the realm; in the prankquean episode, female desire is threatening, but when the prankquean succeeds in luring Jarl "out through the pikeopened arkway of his three shuttoned castles" (22.33-4), the ensuing copulation results in the creative production of "the first peace of illiterate porthery" (23.9-10). When Macbeth obeys the demands of female desire, the result is tragedy and its attendant destruction of political stability; when Jarl is obedient to the prankquean's demands, his "hearsomeness" (G. gehorsam, obedient) results in a happy populace as it "felicitates the whole of the polis" (23.14-15). In listening to the voice of (the prankquean's) female desire and joining with her to produce the first 'piece' of 'pottery' and 'poetry', Jarl participates in establishing artistic pursuits as a peaceful alternative to war, and these pursuits function in the fecundating of a harmonious social body.69
The sign "porter" provides a fruitful example of how the *Wake* establishes an intertextual play between its narrative of HCE and the drunken porter scene from *Macbeth*. As a signifier operating within the *Wake*’s textual economy, it signifies, as noted earlier, the proper name of those "very nice people," "The Porters," "who care for nothing except everything that is all-porterous." (560.22-3; and 31). At the same time, it also signifies HCE's role as a gatekeeper, or porter, (a role he sustains in his guise as Jarl); the "Reid's family" (and 'reads' family) "stout" (52.4-6) that is served at (the *Wake* as) the "Mullingcan Inn" (64.9); the single "porty" (51.24) and plural "poorters" (64.9) who guard the Inn and the "stonehinged gate" (69.15); and ALP's pee, or urine, which is, in turn, a signifier of both female desire and the ink used in writing. As Solomon notes, from a contextualizing perspective, porter "is a loaded word in the book, referring always to doorkeeping as well as to ale and to other things." 70

While "porter" operates within the *Wake*’s staging of the Porter family and its narration of writing in general, it also functions as a marginal term that operates on the border between the Shakespeare text and the Joyce text, (con)fusing these texts to such an extent that a rigid demarcation between them becomes impossible to sustain. From a contextual perspective, *Macbeth* is a written work that operates outside of the *Wake*’s margins. It is a distinctively separate work composed by a different author. Within the *Wake*’s margins, however, "porter" operates as a written "trace" that retains its status as a signifier operative within the borders of the Shakespeare text. In the episode where the "free boardschool shirkers" (51.11) ask for the "fishabed ghootstory"
(51.13) of HCE, for example, HCE operates as a signifier of the story itself—the "haardly creditable edventyres of the Haberdasher (51.14; emphasis added)—and the porter, or "porty" (51.24) who is requested to provide "a fully armed explanation" (51.24). This episode restages the identification of Macbeth's porter as a "devil-porter" of "hell-gate" by identifying "porty" as "paused . . . amid the devil's one duldrum" (51.32-4), or in the devil's ".dumps" or "low spirits" (OED).

Like those of the drunken porter, HCE's low spirits are the result of excessive drinking. When HCE is caught with a "most decisive bottle of single" by the "town guard at Haveyou-caught-emerod's temperance gateway" (63.16-18), he explains with a stutter that "he had had had o'gloriously a'lot too much . . . to drink" (63.20-22). Again, HCE functions as the porter, or "boots" (63.34), and is awoken by a "mortalily hammering . . . against the bludgey gate" (63.33-4). "Beelzebub," the signifier inscribed within the drunken porter's demand for the identity of the knocker on the gate, is re-inscribed, in an example of textual difference, when HCE, as the porter, "boots" (53.34), decides that the "battering babel allower the door" is "not in the very remotest like the belzey babble of a bottle of boose" (64.9-11; emphasis added). Functioning as a textual "trace," the signs "porter," "the devil's one duldrum," the "hammering . . . against the bludgey gate," "belzey babbler," and "too much . . . to drink," operate in the "ghoatstory" of HCE's "edventyres" as signifiers of HCE's condition and actions, but they also trigger the porter from Macbeth in the signifying play of this narrative, and he haunts HCE's "ghoatstory" like a phantom or disseminative "trace." These signs do not signify the drunken porter scene as a
signified outside of their textual borders, they bring it within the margins of HCE's narrative so that the "meaning of the outside [is brought, as 'this', within the margins of the inside, and bracketed, as 'it' is here, between the margins of these double commas and brackets, and set to work as meaning 'that'] was always present within the inside, imprisoned outside the outside, and vice versa." From a deconstructive perspective, then, the drunken porter scene from Macbeth is not alluded to, or echoed, by the Wake, but brought within the margins of the Wake where its signifiers are set to work within the narrative of HCE. The "outside," to use a Derridean phrase, "is the inside." 

As it is set to work within the narrative of HCE's "hammering ... against the bludgey gate," the effects of "Beelzebub," as a proper name, are suspended. In Macbeth, the name occurs in the porter's request for identity: "Who's there, i' the name of Beelzebub?" Its status as a signifier of the Devil is supported by the porter's references to "hell-gate," "the other devil's name," and his identification of his role as a "devil-porter." In the Wake, however, the power of this sign to function as a proper name is interrupted by the effects of a disseminative spacing and decapitalizing that operate in the re-inscription of "Beelzebub" as "belzey babble," and make the singular proper name a plural signifier that is grafted into the Wake's staging of an unconscious language. As a signifier of the proper name of the Devil, a signifier capable of being studied under the heading of the subject, "Beelzebub" becomes absent and absorbed into the Wake's narration of the "unconsciounce" (623.25). Its re-inscription thus exemplifies the effects of spacing as writing that Derrida describes as "the becoming-absent and the becoming-unconscious of the subject."
Both "porter" and "belzey babble" operate as textual "grafts" and "hinges." As grafts, they exemplify how the *Wake* is disseminatively written, because "to write means to graft. It's the same word." The signs are, of course, grafted onto the page, but they are also "scions," slips which, through the cutting operation of the pen, have been removed from the Shakespeare text of the drunken porter scene and grafted into the *Wake*’s narrative of HCE, where they trigger off the Shakespeare-Joyce intertext as they continue to "radiate back toward the site of" their removal, which is the Shakespeare text of the drunken porter scene. As "hinges" (Fr. "brisures"), they exemplify the "différance" and "articulation" at work within the intertextual re-inscription of signifiers from the Shakespeare text that are set to work within the *Wake* as it triggers off the "Hymen: INTER" Shakespeare and Joyce. "Porter," as a "hinge," marks the Shakespeare text as network of signifieds that is absent in the *Wake* even though signifiers, in the form of textual fragments from the drunken porter scene, already at work in the Shakespeare text, are re-inscribed with ALP's staging of HCE. As a porter, HCE signifies a textual process. The triad serves a textual (con)fusion, a process of fusing various signifieds together and remarking the "impossibility that a sign [in this case, "porter"], the unity of a signifier and a signified, be produced within the plenitude of a present and an absolute presence." 

HCE serves the process of writing as a play of *différance*, and, consequently, operates as a "process server" (63.32) in sense different from that which an interpretation of HCE as a novelistic character would produce. HCE is the gateway, the "Haveyou-caught-emerald's temperance
gateway" (63.18-19; emphasis added) at which HCE is "seized . . . by the
town guard" (63.18). HCE is also the force that is "mortally hammering
. . . against the bludgey gate" (63.33-4), and the porter, or the "boots
about the swan" (63.35) who is woken from a dream of "wealthes in mormon
halls" (64.4-5) by the "battering babel allower the door and sideposts"
(64.9-10). As HCE also attempts to "open . . . a bottlop stoub," or
'bottle of stout' ("a strong variety of porter" OED), by "hammering his
own magnum bonum" (63.32-3) against the gate, it is possible that HCE
also signifies the bottle of stout, or porter, as well as the "gateway,"
or "sideposts" upon which the bottle is hammered. As the Wake states,
"our mutual friends the fender" (a "large piece of timber placed as a
guard" OED) "and the bottle at the gate seem to be implicitly in the same
bateau." (65.35-6).

In the nightlessons chapter, as noted at the beginning of the second
part of this chapter, "porter" functions as an over-determined sign. It
retains the trace of its operation as a signifier within the drunken
porter scene, and, at the same time, sustains its pluri-dimensional
signification of HCE, Jarl van Hoother, the Porter family, and the
metonymic chain of lexemes that support the liquidity of ALP's language.
This "loaded word," to use Solomon's term, functions as a trigger which
sets off both the Shakespeare-Joyce intertext, and the machinery of at
least four different stories in the Wake: the story of the initial
"phall" when HCE as "Phill filt tippling full" and "stottered from the
ladder" only to have a "barrowload of guenesis" stout (porter) hung "hoer
his head" (6.8-10, and 27) as he is stretched out for his wake; the story
of Jarl, who acts as a porter and a door in the prankquean episode; the
tale of "porty" "executing . . . empties which had not very long before contained Reid's family . . . stout" (52.1-6); and the story of HCE as the "gateway," the knocker on the gate, and the porter, or "boots" who is awoken by the "battering babel" (63.19 and 34, 64.9-10). Because porter also signifies urine—the prankquean's "porter pease"—it is inextricably involved with the Wake's staging of writing and copulation, the two activities that Freud associated in his investigation of the unconscious:

As soon as writing, which entails making a liquid flow out of a tube on to a piece of paper, assumes the significance of copulation . . . it is stopped because [it] represents the performance of a forbidden sexual act.77

As Solomon notes, in the prankquean episode "the woman's 'piss-word' . . . opens the gate and provokes the man to thunderous creativity: the slamming of the secret door behind which procreation begins." This "piss-word" is found in the riddle that links the "Peequeen" (508.26) with the porter or "firewater" that "is the cause of man's fall" and a "symbol of the renewing firewater—whisky for Tim Finnegan."78 Urine is, of course, also the liquid that Shem uses to create the "indelible ink" (185.26) with which the "continuous present integument" (186.1) of the Wake is written.

The question "howelse do we hook our hike to that pint of porter place?" (260.5-6) triggers off all of the signifieds of porter and stages a basic question about entry into the place where porter is dispensed (as ink, as urine, and as stout), the Porter family resides, and HCE serves as a porter. This place is, of course, the Wake itself. To "hook our hike" to that place, the "nightlessons" chapter states, "we" (and this
"we" functions as a doubled "I" that, a bit like 'you', attends (undergoes) its own incessant violent re-inscription within the arithmetical machinery (79) need to apply the lesson that it has taught on how to "caps ever" (260.4). "We" also need the power to "hike" to the "pint of porter place." In short, "we" need the "will" (260.4) to write, the "will" of "Shikepower" (47.19; emphasis added) so that "we" can apply the pen, as an implement for cutting and grafting, and "s ever" the "s" in a remarking of "hikespower" as a signifier already at work within the already defaced names of Shakespeare. "We" need to obey the textual command: "Pose the pen, man, way me does" (303.2-3).

In its command for its reader (the "I" that "undergoes its own . . . violent reinscription") to "Cross" (262.4), or "pass" (OED) into the linguistic aporia of its "nat langwedge" ('not', 'night', and 'knot'), the Wake places its readers ("us") in a position very much like that occupied by Lennox and Macduff as they stand before Macbeth's castle in search of their king, Duncan. 81 It offers the "upper" "bridge" (262.3) of ∆'s writing ("an upsidown bridge" [119.28]) and instructs the readers ("us") to "Cross" this "bridge," (as "you" and "I" are crossing ["passing," "traversing" OED] it now, here, on this page, where "you" read this placing of a cross in these letters that "lay across" (OED, this line) in order to "[t]hus come to castle" (262.5). Let "us" "knock" (262.6) then, "you" and "I," like Macduff and Lennox, but "we" are already being interrupted by a figure 1 that hangs over "our" "knock" (262.5), and, from the other side of the marginal line separating "our passage" (262.2) through this central column, "we" read "Yussive smirte and ye mermon anserwth from his beelyingplace below the tightmark,
Gotahelv!" (262.Fl). This double writing (con)fuses "you" and "I" ("Go on reading, but watch out for this, which should have already started to make your head spin: that each separate fragment is only readable within the well-calculated play of an extremely numerous recurrence and in innumerable polysemy\(^8\)). It erases the proper name Joseph Smith, the man who claimed to have seen God and Christ; it accuses "us" of being 'so smart'; it fuses the proper name under erasure with the proper name of the Mormon religion that the historical figure signified by the (already absent) proper name founded; it takes us back to Maurice Behan's dream "that he'd wealthes in mormon halls" (64.4) and, from that dream, to outside the \textit{Wake} and the (now erased) song title "I Dreamt That I Dwelt in Marble Halls"; it fuses a simulacrum of a proper name with a signifier of a mythical, male 'merman' and (con)fuses a plural subject ("Yussive smirte and ye mermon") with the singular pronoun "his"; it takes us below the "tightmark," intoxicating "us," makes us "tipsy" (\textit{OED}) with a writing that is "tight," "difficult to deal with" (\textit{OED}), "closely packed . . . terse, concise, condensed" (\textit{OED}); and it curses "us" with 'Go to Hell' and sets this curse to work in a play of \textit{differance} with the blessing 'God Save' (G. \textit{Gott Heil}).

For the purpose of our consideration of the drunken porter scene and its intertextual relationship with "our passage" into the \textit{Wake}, this footnote is important because it triggers an intertextual signifying play with \textit{Macbeth}'s drunken porter scene. The "beelyingplace" place is both a textual and intertextual place where the simulacrum of the proper name, 'Beelzebub', is involved in a further erasure from "belzey babble" (64.11) to "beelying" (emphasis added). Where "belzey babble" retains,
albeit in an altered form, the consonant and vowel patterns 'be', 'el' (condensed into 'bel'), 'ze', and 'bub' (altered to 'bab') of Beelzebub's four syllables, the "beelying" of "beelyingplace" drops both the 'ze' and 'bub' syllables and produces a lexeme that is both trisyllabic ('bee', 'ly', 'ing') and quadrasyllabic ('be', 'el', 'ly', 'ing'). At the same time that "beelying" further erases the trace of 'Beelzebub', however, it strengthens the intertextual signification of the drunken porter scene by setting the scion, or slip, from Beelzebub ("beel") to work in a signification of the textual scene as a scene, or "place," of dissimulation and fiction, a "lying" "place." The drunken porter scene is an equivocal scene of 'lying' because the porter lies late in bed after drink gave him "the lie" and Macbeth lies and prevaricates in the equivocal "Not yet" with which he answers Macduff's question, "Is the King stirring, worthy thane?" Macbeth knows, of course, that Duncan is lying dead and cannot stir.

Macduff and Lennox enter Macbeth's castle expecting to find Duncan. From one perspective, they are searching for the identifiable, true, paternal, divinely inspired and ruling figure whose existence guarantees the health and well-being of Scotland and its citizens. As Macbeth demonstrates, the happiness of the country is dependent on the existence of a king who can be identified as "The Lord's anointed temple." Macduff's lament emphasizes the relationship between the existence of a true king and the well-being of the country:

O nation miserable,
With an untitled tyrant bloody-scepter'd
When shalt thou see they wholesome days again.
The identity of Duncan provides a stable focal point for the rituals and laws of Scotland, and, as a loyal servant whose social position is defined in relationship to Duncan, Macduff is happy to perform his "limited service" as one of Duncan's subjects. The death of Duncan destroys the socially harmonious identity of the country and turns the loyal servant Macduff into a blood-thirsty seeker of revenge for Duncan's death. According to the paradigm of values listed in *Macbeth* as "the King-becoming graces," Macduff is justified in seeking to destroy the evil consequences of Macbeth's "vaulting ambition," an ambition that sustains his wife's desire. The *Wake*, however, sets the Macduff/Macbeth struggle to work in the signification of a game, and, "below the tightmark" of the marginal border, overturns the preferring of Macduff that Shakespeare's play sustains in its staging of Macbeth's unjustified usurpation of power and Macduff's subsequent avenging of Duncan's death: "I loved to see the Macbeths Jerseys knacking the spots of the Plumpduffs Pants" (302.Fl). In *Macbeth*, the hierarchical relationship of Macduff/Macbeth sustains the phallogocentric, hierarchical preferring of God, male, truth, justice, and loyalty, etc., but the *Wake* sustains the proper name of the "Macbeths," alters 'Macduff' to "Plumpduffs" (an alterity that erases the proper name), and prefers the "Macbeths" over the Plumpduffs." This inverting re-inscription of the Macduff/Macbeth hierarchy is also sustained in the signification of clothing that sets the "Macbeths" to work as the higher garment, or "Jersey," and "Plumpduffs" as the lower garment, or "Pants."
To return to "our passage" through the writing that stages our entrance into the "castle" of the text in the Wake's central column, "we" enter the text looking for the identity of the paternal HCE, but, like Macduff and Lennox, when we "pearse" (262.8), or 'pierce', the "publoca-
tion" (71.16), we find that HCE, like Duncan, is already dead from his "phall." He lies 'dumb' on his 'bed' and all "we" can do is recite, and re-read (and re-write) the exclamation of astonishment "well, all be dumbed!" (262.9). When we are in this "Inn inn!" (262.26), we are in a passage of language that is the expression of ALP's female desire, and the "password" (262.7) that we needed to enter is also the "piss-word," or urine of the "Pee Queen." It is urine that stimulates Jarl to come out of his castle and perform the defecation that "always stands for creation" in the Wake, and it is urine that enables Shem to produce the ink with which he writes the letter that sustains ALP's desire in expressing it. From the angle opened up by the Wake's continual play on the relationship between water, firewater, ink, and pissing as passing through ALP's "languo of flows," the answer to the question "Where are we?" (260.1) is simply 'urine', or, 'you're in' ("fancy you're in her yet" [171.28]), "livesliving being the one substrance of a streams-
becoming" (597.7-8).
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Orc's connection with the east is based on his youthful and sun-like qualities. He is a revolutionary character. In "America" he appears as "morning gins to break" to "stamp" the "stony law . . . to dust." (Complete Poetry and Prose, p. 54). In "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell," he appears as a "fiery crest" "to the east" (ibid., p. 41). Like "thor" the signifier with which "orc" is grafted, Orc also signifies thunder. In "America," he burns as "the Demon red" and "In black smoke thunders" (ibid., p. 55).

41 Complete Poetry and Prose, p. 146.
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44 "The Laocoon" is reproduced in The Complete Poetry and Prose, pp. 272-5. Erdman translates the Hebrew as "Angel of Jehovah" and the Greek as "Serpent-holder." This engraving illustrates that the Blake-text also operates deconstructively. In the inscription "He repented that he had made Adam/ (of the female, the Adamah)," for example, the notion of the male as the original and preferred force, a notion that dominates the sexual organization of the Blake text, is set aside by the parenthetical comment "(of the female, the Adamah)." For the most part,
however, the Blake text is not as self-reflectively disseminative as the Joyce text. While there is already a play of differance, an operation of arche-writing, at work in the Blake text, it is more marginal than the Wake's explicit positing of its language as a language operating on a "limpidy marge" (624.15), or, flexible border.

46 Other variations on the phrase include "Sdrats ye, Gus Paudheen" (332.32) (R. zdravstvuyte godspodin), 'how do you do, Sir?'); "Kenny's thought ye, Dinny Oozle!" (332.33) (I. conas ta tu a dhuine usal, 'how are you, gentle sir?'); and "Houdian Kiel vi fartas, mia nigra sinjoro?" (160.31-2) (Esp. hodiau kiel vi fartas mia nigra sinjoro?, today how do you fare my black sir). The translations of this phrase have appeared in numerous lexical studies of the Wake's non-English languages. McHugh's Annotations presents the most comprehensive catalogue of them.

47 Derrida derives the technique of crossing out words, placing them sous rature ('under erasure'), from Heidegger's Zur Seinfrage, a letter to Ernst Junger that attempts a "speculative definition of nihilism." Heidegger argues that "a thoughtful glance ahead into the realm of "Being" can only write it as \( \text{Being} \). This is to "ward off the habit of conceiving [it] as something standing by itself." Derrida employs the technique to draw attention to the fact that while this term is frequently (mis)used, it remains as a signifier of the fundamental object of philosophical investigation. Yet Philosophy has not finished answering the question 'what is being', and any thoughtful use of the term must take cognizance of this incompleteness. Derrida uses the Heideggerian technique to draw attention to the distinction between being as a concept and a signifier. The attempt to make being present in
language is the history of writing, and an attempt doomed to failure by the fact that being and presence in language can never fully present (make present) the being or presence of the writer except as a textual practice. From a deconstructive perspective, any statement using the forms of 'to be'--the statement *Finnegans Wake* is (a book, a novel, a text, by Joyce, about language, about ALP, etc.), for example--must give consideration that the "is that couples . . . must rip apart." (Of Grammatology, pp. xiv-v, cf. xvi-vii; Dissemination, p. 64).

53 Positions, p. 42. Positions (Fr. version), p. 58.
Solomon points out that ALP's complaint "you never wet the tea!" (585.31), refers to the "lost ability" of HCE and ALP "to propropogate" (Eternal Geomater, p. 78). "T" is, as Solomon demonstrates, an ambivalent symbol, referring to both ALP's "tea," or urine, and to HCE's penis. As the "book of kills," the Wake is about the dismemberment of God, and, as Solomon points out, it incorporates the story of Isis and Osiris into the manifesto title, "How to Pull a Good Horuscoup even when Oldsire is Dead to the World" (105.28-9).
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Shakespeare and Joyce, pp. 10-11. On soliciting and shaking the text, see "Force and Signification" in Writing and Differance, p. 6. Writing as an "expulsion" and "fall" is explained in Of Grammatology, p. 13. See De la grammatologie, p. 25.


Many studies have contributed to defining the 'watery' or liquid association of ALP's "languo of flows." Amongst them are Clive Hart's *Structure and Motif in Finnegans Wake* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern U.P., 1963), which identifies whisky with the Holy Ghost; *Eternal Geomater*, which provides perhaps the most extensive analysis of the relationships between porter, pee, ink, semen, whisky, tea, and water; and Bernard Benstock's *Joyce-Again's Wake*, which links tea with the ALP's final "the" and delineates the 'T'-'P' (and "tea"-"pee") relationship.

Macbeth, II. iii. 3-18.

Eternal Geomater, p. 4. Solomon also provides a detailed analysis of the three-fold pattern of the Jarl-prankquean episode on pp. 6-8.

Macbeth, II. iii. 1-70, passim.

Macbeth, II. iii. 31-3.

Eternal Geomater, p. 9. Solomon notes that the pee-queen's visits result in a gradual rise in temperature. She points out that Jarl "is the door ('dour') as well as the porter, the doorkeeper" (p. 9), and that in wetting against the door, the prankquean is attempting to stimulate Jarl's desire.

While writing can be considered a peaceful alternative to war, it is, from a deconstructive perspective, a violent alternative, because the domination of writing by phallogocentrism is a forceful limitation of writing as "pluri-dimensional symbolic thought" (*Of Grammatology*, p. 86). In the series of binary terms that sustain the preferring of one term over the other (good/bad; inner/outer; spirit/matter; light/dark; speech/writing, etc.), the upper term governs the lower term by a violent
suppression. The question of whether or not writing (and other so-called "artistic" production) is preferable to war begs the question of the difference between them. Derrida contends that we say 'writing' for all that gives rise to inscription in general, whether it is literal or not and even if what it distributes in space is alien to the order of the voice: cinematography, choreography, of course, but also pictorial, musical, sculptural 'writing'. One might also speak of athletic writing, and with even greater certainty of military or political writing in view of the techniques that govern those domains today. All this to describe not only the system of notation secondarily with these activities but the essence and content of these activities themselves (Of Grammatology, p. 9). See De la grammatologie, p. 19.

Joyce placed much emphasis on war in writing the *Wake* and the entry into the *Wake* as the "Willingdone Museyroom" (8.10) and the narrative of Buckley and the Russian general provide two examples of how the text presents its writing as involved with warfare. To enter into the "Willingdone" is to enter into a war museum and a "room" in which the "muse" of inspiration operates. It is also to walk onto the battlefield of Waterloo where 'Wellington' can be seen on his horse, Copenhagen: "This is Willingdone on his same white horse, the Cokenhape" (8.16-17). Joyce described writing the *Wake* as declaring war: "What the language will look like when I have finished I don't know. But having declared war I shall go on 'jusqu' au bout'." (James Joyce, p. 581).

70 *Eternal Geomater*, p. 9; emphasis added. In her riddle to Jarl, the prankquean identifies herself with both "porter" and pee as she asks why she is "like a poss of porter-pease" (21.17-18), or porter 'pees'. It is worth noting that "Mullingcan" carries several semantic values that
provide lexemes to support the _Wake_ as the "Mullingcan Inn." "Mull" carries the semantic values of "rubbish," "a promonotory or headland," a "muddle or mess," "to crumble," and "to make (wine, beer, etc.) into a hot drink" (OED). These values are applicable to the _Wake_ as a midden heap, the hill of Howth, and the narrative of the tower's fall, and a "can" in which beer, or "porter" is heated.

71 In his Annotations, McHugh notes that the name of the boots in Charles Selby's _The Boots at the Swan_ is Jacob Earwig. Like HCE, he is deaf. He impersonates a policeman; HCE impersonates a "process server" (63.32).

72 On the "trace," a difficult term in Derrida's theory because it "is nothing" and "exceeds the question What is?", see _Of Grammatology_, pp. 66, 70, 75, and 93. I have made the bracketed insertion in the quotation from Derrida to demonstrate the deconstructive technique of always bringing the reader's attention back to the site of inscription, and remarking the signification of a hymeneal (con)fusion with practice. The terms "this" and "that" are set to work both inside and outside the brackets so that their signifying function crosses the border of the brackets. They are marked and remarked by the double `,`, to indicate their function as a "hinge" or "brisures" (_Of Grammatology_, pp. 65 and 69; _De la grammatologie_, p. 96 and p. 102) that signifies a particular 'meaning', (as in 'this' or 'that' meaning) and, simultaneously, signifies the so-called Derridean meaning that resumes after the parenthetical interruption. "This" and "that" thus work on the margin, to use a Derridean term, and signify both the "inside" and the "outside" (see _Of Grammatology_, p. 44).
Of Grammatology, p. 44. De la grammatologie: "Le dehors et le dedans" (p. 65). This deconstructive perspective is supported by McHugh's recognition that ALP's letter is "ultimately all writings" (Sigla, p. 113).

Macbeth, II. iii. 1-20. Of Grammatology, p. 69; De la grammatologie, p. 96. On the effects of spacing, see Of Grammatology, pp. 65-73, and Dissemination, pp. 252-67. See also De la grammatologie, pp. 95-103, and La disseminazione, pp. 283-294.

On the "graft" see Dissemination, pp. 355-58; on the "hinge," or "brisure," see Of Grammatology, pp. 65 and 69. The quotation on the impossibility of a sigla's production with the "Plenitude of presence" is a citation from Of Grammatology, p. 69. See De la grammatologie: "La brisure marque l'impossibilité pour un signe, pour l'unite d'un signifiant et d'un signifié, de se produire dans la plenitude d'un présent et d'un présence absolue" (p. 102).

On the identification of the "boots" and HCE, see note 70 above. Annotations interprets the Latin "Magnum bonum," as 'great good'. As there is an attempt at penetration (of the gateway), the magnum bonum may signify both the head and the tip of the penis. The latter signification is supported by the prankquean episode where Jarl is eventually aroused by the pee queen's "porter-pease," or porter pees, and attempts to satisfy her desire in the ensuing copulation. The removal of the top of the "bottlop stoub," or bottle of stout, would enable the porter to flow. As porter signifies both urine and semen because of the metonymic chain 'water', 'ink', 'tea', 'porter', etc., the flow of porter can signify both urination and ejaculation. As Solomon comments, "sex, with Joyce, is always 'mixturated'" (Eternal Geomater, p. 22; cf. p. 78).
77 Freud's comment appears in "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety." Quoted in Derrida's "Freud and the Scene of Writing," Writing and Differance, p. 229. While Derrida refers to this passage, he points out that it concerns the "archi-trace as erasure: erasure of the present and thus of the subject," a concept of "trace" that "must be radicalized and extracted from the metaphysics of presence which still retains it" (ibid.). Spivak summarizes Derrida's caution that "the institution of grammatology through the recognition of systematic "repression" of writing throughout the history of the West cannot be taken as a psychoanalytic endeavor on a macrocosmic scale" (Of Grammatology, p. xlvii).

78 Eternal Geomater, pp. 50 and 9.

79 Dissemination, p. 335. La dissémination, p. 361. See note 38 above.

80 The technique of "caps ever"-ing is discussed as a deconstructive technique in the last chapter(3).

81 On aporia as a conundrum and a knot in language, see "Ousia and Gramme: Note on a Note from Being and Time" in Margins of Philosophy, pp. 39-40. See Marges de la philosophie, p. 43.

82 Dissemination, p. 327. La dissémination: "Lisez encore, en viellant toutefois à ceci, qui a dû commencer à vous faire tourner la tête: que chaque fragment ne devient lisible que dans le jeu calculé d'une fort nombreuse récurrence et d'une innombrable polysémie" (p. 363).

83 Macbeth, II. iii. 1-52, et passim.

84 Ibid., II. iii. 73.

85 Ibid., IV. iii. 102-5.
But I have none: the king-becoming graces
As justice, verity, temperance, stableness,
Bounty, perseverance, mercy, lowliness,
Devotion, patience, courage, fortitude.

Ibid., I. vi. 27. Lady Macbeth is, of course, the "spur" that "pricks the sides" of Macbeth's "intent."

87 Eternal Geomater notes that "password" puns on "the woman's pissword" (p. 50). It provides an analysis of the relationships between water, whisky, porter, ink, urine, and female desire to which the present chapter is indebted. Solomon points out that the passage into the Wake is troped as "crossing of the female river" and "genital union between man and woman." She also translates the "Amnis Limina Permanent" sequence generated from ALP as "All," "fetal membrane," and "threshold" (pp. 50-51).
Conclusion

This final chapter will complete the three-plus-one series of chapters devoted to analyzing the *Wake* from a deconstructive perspective, a series that began with Chapter Two's consideration of the *Wake*'s disseminative (con)fuson of speech and writing. It will begin with a brief summary of the areas that the previous chapters have covered. Next, it will weave together some of the textual threads from the material of those chapters in a consideration of the *Wake*'s deconstructive overturning of one of the powerful hierarchical binary terms of the phallogocentric tradition: that of the signifiers 'male' and 'female'. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a brief synopsis of Derrida's comments on the unity of the linear form of the book in which writing is traditionally encased and a consideration of the implications that his comments might have for an understanding of the double pattern of the *Wake*'s simultaneously linear and cyclical patterns of organization, a double pattern that disrupts the traditional concept of the book as a unified form with a beginning, middle, and end.

The three previous chapters have considered parts of *Finnegans Wake* from some of the various vantage points afforded by Derrida's critical theories. In particular, these considerations have been made from the viewpoints of three primary angles that Derrida's investigations have
opened up: the relationship between speech and writing (and between the chains of signs attached to these two terms); the operation of writing as a mathematical textual machine that exploits the formula 1+2+3+4=10 and the implications of this operation for the Wake's mise en scène of its male and female textual positions as an "upright one" with a "noughty," or 'nought', "besigned him" (261.23-24); and the relationship between texts and their 'pre-texts' as an intertextual relationship that undermines the conventional contextualizing of historical, bibliographical study.

Chapter Two used Eco's semiotic theory to supplement Derrida's deconstructive perspective in order to examine the Wake as a "speech-reading" writing, a practice of writing in which the sound of the Wake's language as it is spoken aloud and heard by the reader/listener plays an important part in the reader's experience of the text. The Wake demands to be read and heard: it requires both visual and auditory apprehension, or what Heath has termed an "optical listen."² The chapter considered the Wake's powerful exploitation of paronomasia as one of the tools that the text employs in a textual strategy of dislodging the terms by which phallogocentrism maintains the speech/writing hierarchy. Through a writing practice operating on the principles of similarity in sound, visual similarity in typography, and the substitutability of both visual and aural/oral linguistic elements, the Wake produces a (con)fusion of speech and writing that begins to make "soundsense and sensesound kin again" (121.15-16), bringing together the 'sound' (heard) 'sense' of speech and the 'sound' ("solid," "firm," and "substantial" [OED]) sense of writing. In so doing, it disrupts the historical and philosophical
preference of speech over writing as a means of guaranteeing goodness, truth, and presence, a preference manifest in philosophy from Plato to Husserl.

The third chapter focused primarily upon Chapter Ten of the Wake and analyzed some of the ways in which the "nightlessons" function as an arithematic textual machine that exploits the number of the chapter (10) by staging masculine and feminine textual elements as the two mathematical signifiers (1 and 0) that constitute the number 10. It also considered the Wake's use of the formula 1+2+3+4=10 and the Viconian three-plus-one arrangement (derived from the sequence 1, 2, 3, 4) that operates in the generating sequences ALP and HCE, in the chapter's three sets of marginal discourse and central column, and in the production (both inside and outside of Chapter Ten) of a "plupresent," or more-than-present, textual tempus. The chapter noted that the Wake itself defines Chapter Ten as a "Columkiller" (122.26), and it analyzed some of the ways in which the "trifid tongues" (281.16) of the tripartite marginal commentary participated in dislodging and overturning the traditional hierarchy between (dominating) central discourse and marginal commentary. As the present chapter will attempt to demonstrate, this dislodging and overturning of the central-marginal hierarchy is a deconstructive strategy that has important implications for both the male/female hierarchy and the "spinal column" of the book, the "phallic column" that functions not only as a topos from which the so-called proper names of the author and title attempt to exert a signifying control upon the book but also, by drawing on the text's signifying play, as a "column woven according to the thread of the work."
The aim of the fourth chapter was to define the *Wake*’s intertextual relationships with two sets of writing that have been the focal points for a considerable body of Joyce scholarship and to demonstrate some of the ways in which intertextuality defeats contextuality. Unlike much of the previous work devoted to Joyce’s relationship to Blake and Shakespeare, the intertextual study in Chapter Four did not concern itself with the works of Shakespeare and Blake as sources or possible contexts for *Finnegans Wake*; instead, it concentrated on analysing the *Wake* as a disseminative text made possible, in part, by the erasure of the proper names "Blake" and "Shakespeare" and the decapitalizing play of *différence* that recites those names as "bill" "blake" and "will" "Shapesphere" and "shakespill." An additional purpose of the analysis was a consideration of the *Wake* as an operation of the deconstructive double writing that dislodges 'male'/'female' as hierarchically operative terms of binary opposition. Like the second and third chapters, Chapter Four detailed some of the ways in which the *Wake* attempts to subvert the domination of thought, speech, and writing by the phonocentric and phallogocentric "repression" of "pluridimensional symbolic thought." To this end (and writing toward this ending chapter), it attempted to detail how the *Wake* dismantles and then reinscribes Blake’s male, dominant, heroic, and divinely-inspired, central figure of narrative and turns what is a relatively small episode in *Macbeth*’s staging of the evil effects of female desire into a central element of ALP’s pluridimensional exploitation of the sign "porter."
The phallogocentric preferring of the male over the female that the Wake dislodges is sustained in the discourses of both Christian theology and classical philosophy. In the myths of the creation of the world and the salvation of its inhabitants, the narrative of the Bible prefers the male figure over the female in assigning the positions of creator, and saviour, to the Divine Father and His Son. The God who "in the beginning . . . created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1.1) is a male god, as is his son Jesus Christ who "In the beginning was the Word . . . the Word [that] was with God, and the Word [that] was God" (John 1.1). The prior position assigned to the male as the creator of the world is sustained in the account of God's creation of the first human: "So God created man in his own image and in the image of God created he him" (Gen. 1.27). The female is created second, and the Biblical narrative implies that she is created so "that the man should not be alone" (Gen. 2.18). The woman is created from "one of [Adam's] ribs" (Gen. 2.22) and thus becomes what the Wake ironically describes as Adam's "cutletsized consort" (255.29). In the Biblical narrative, it is not long before the female reveals her ability to use her own will and initiative, and when she sees that a "tree is good for food . . . pleasant to the eyes . . . and a tree to be desired to make one wise," she takes "the fruit thereof," eats it, and gives some "unto her husband" to eat (Gen. 3.6). This leads to a re-marking of the female position as a secondary position. When Adam is confronted by his angry creator, he places the blame for the transgression on the woman and, at least in the English translation of the narrative, seems to imply that he would have remained an innocent and obedient servant of his creator had he not been given the woman:
And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat (Gen. 3.12).

The creator's response confirms the female position as secondary and subordinate as he condemns her to a life of sorrow and suffering in conception:

I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and they conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee (Gen. 3.14).

In the Classical Platonic text, and particularly in its division of language into (internal) thought, speech, and writing, the position of the female is almost totally dispensable. With regard to the relationship between female and language, the text of Plato is quite similar to that of the Bible. In the Bible, a male god creates the world by speaking it into existence. He brings the animals that he creates to his male creature, Adam, "to see what he would call them" (Gen. 2.19), thereby giving the male the power of language, the power to give "names to all cattle . . . to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field" (Gen. 2.20). As noted earlier, the Son of God is identified as the divine "Word," and it is only the power of the divine male logos that has the ability to create, to destroy, and to save. Only rarely does the Bible refer to the relationship between the female and language. When it does, the relationship confirms the female position as secondary and subordinate. In discussing the gift of speaking in tongues, for example, Paul tells his (male) addressees:
Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church (I Cor. 14.34-5).

In the Phaedrus, where the Platonic schema for language is extensively delineated, language is described in terms of the metaphor of the family. Drawing in the Egyptian myth of Theuth as the god of writing, Plato depicts speech as the living part of language, the *logos* issued from the father. As a subordinate character, Theuth presents writing to the fatherly figure of the king who "has been kind enough to admit [Theuth] to his counsel," but because the king is the father of speech, Theuth must present writing as secondary to speech. Only as a "*tekhne*" and a "*pharmakon*" can he offer writing to the "king, father, and god who speaks or commands with his sun-filled voice." Elsewhere in the Phaedrus, Socrates confirms the primary position of speech and, sustaining the familial metaphor, he distinguishes between speech as *adelphon gnosion*, a legitimate discourse above question, and writing as a bastard brother, a discourse which is not *gnosios* and which belongs outside of the family proper:

Socrates: But now tell me, is there another sort of discourse, that is brother to the written speech, but of unquestioned legitimacy (*adelphon gnosion*)? Can we see how it originates, and how much better and more effective it is than the other?

Phaedrus: What sort of discourse have you now in mind, and what is its origin?
Socrates: The sort that goes together with knowledge and is written in the soul of the learner (hos met' graphetai en tei tou manthanontos psuchēi), that can defend itself (dunatos men amunai heautōi), and knows to whom it should speak and to whom it should say nothing.

Phaedrus: Do you mean the discourse of a man who really knows (tou eidotos logou), which is living and animate (zōnta kai empsukhon)? Would it be fair to call the written discourse only a kind of ghost (eidōlon) of it?

Socrates: Precisely.6

As Derrida's extensive exploration of the Platonic text reveals, in the familial metaphor for language, "the good (father, sun, capital) is . . . the hidden illuminating, blinding source of logos and speech is the father's dutiful and legitimate son."7 The logos of the divine father is inscribed in the soul of the learner, and, as speech, receives the rightful inheritance to which a dutiful and legal son is entitled under the nomos, or law, and name of the father. Writing is not "well born." It lies outside of the law and cannot be recognized by the father. It is against the law, or para nomos, a position that the Wake fully exploits. Language is thus an affair of fathers and sons. Of the female (mother and/or daughter) "nothing is said."8 This scene of Plato's depiction of language "has never been read for what it is." In order to rectify this lack, Derrida summarizes "what is at once sheltered and exposed in its metaphors: its family metaphors." Like the Biblical account of God, Christ, Adam and language, Plato's account of language is all about fathers and sons. It is about bastards unaided by any public assistance, about glorious, legitimate sons, about inheritance, sperm, sterility. Nothing is said of the mother, but this will not be held against us.9
In its dislodged and dislodging "double writing"—a writing that "goes doublin . . . all the time" (3.8-9)—Finnegans Wake as ALP's letter, a female letter, dismantles the binary terms of male/female and speech/writing that are hierarchically organized as instituting phallogocentric terms in both the Bible and the Platonic text. It does this, as noted in Chapter Two, through the extensive exploitation of paronomasias that has the effect of dislodging speech as the higher and dominating signifier in the binary term speech/writing and by positing writing, rather than speech, as the primary position in language. ALP's letter, as noted in Chapter Two, is "ultimately all writings," and when ALP 'speaks' from within her gynocentric discourse, she does so from within the position of writing, from the writing on the 'leaf' of the page:

\[\text{Soft morning, city! Lsp! I am leafy speafing. Lpf! Folty and folty all the nights have falled on to long my hair. Not a sound, falling. Lispn! No wind no word. Only a leaf, just a leaf and then leaves (619.20-23; emphasis added).}\]

It is important to experience the Wake both aurally and orally, but as Chapter Two attempted to demonstrate, the importance of "speech-reading" the Wake is not a result of Joyce attempting to sustain the subordination of written language by speech, but of his production of a writing that extensively exploits the similarities in written words which "sound alike" ("paronomasia" [OED]) and which, according to the reader's decision, can be either spoken aloud as a "soundscript" (219.17) or read silently so that the written "silence speaks the scene" (13.3). The
notion that the *Wake* sustains the privilege of speech over writing and functions as a book "to be heard rather than read" is incorrect. As Stephen Heath comments:

> Nothing could be more false. Leaving aside the evident objection that no reading aloud could possibly reproduce the graphic distribution of the text (that, for example, of the "Night Studies" section) or the play of letters, there is no reading aloud that can pass "for inkstands" and "for instance" together: the reading must choose; in other words, it creates a context.10

The *Wake* will always defeat the reader's choice in performing either a silent or "aloud" reading. It does not reproduce speech; it offers itself as a "ceaseless confrontation of writing and speech." The reader may choose either a silent or spoken reading of the *Wake*'s language, but the *Wake*'s writing continually defeats the context that such a decision creates. The reader can vocalize "riverrun past Eve and Adam" (3.1) as 'reverend pas (Fr. not) Stephen, Adam', but the *Wake*'s writing wavers on the border between this vocalized reading and its written form, and "in the wavering of this . . . movement the context [that the reader's decision creates] falls derisively apart."11 The fact that the *Wake*'s writing can be vocalized to produce divergent phonetic forms that are significantly different both from each other and from the graphic forms that generate them emphasizes the originating status of its writing.12

The *Wake*'s disruptive dislodging and overturning of the phallogocentric hierarchy of speech and writing is continually involved with its dislodging and overturning the male/female binary terms. In both the Platonic schema of language and the biblical recitation of the relation-
ship between gender and language, it is the male who utters the spoken form of language that is preferred over writing. The "Platonic schema . . . assigns the origin and power of speech, precisely of logos, to the paternal position."13 The Bible assigns the origin and power of the speech with which the world is created to the male god who is the father of both Christ and "Word" and the humans whom this "Word," or logos, has the power to save. In both the Christian and the Platonic myths, the originator of speech is the (male) father. This primary and originating position is thus a double position of the paternal male and spoken language. As Chapter Three attempted to demonstrate, it is precisely this double preferred position of speech and the male that the Wake disrupts as it recites itself as ALP's letter and sets the series of letters from alpha to omega (letters that signify the limits of both the Greek alphabet, the Platonic alphabet, and the Biblical creator) to work within the play of ALP's signifying series from A to P. Dislodging 'man' and reinscribing it as "mam," the Wake identifies itself as ALP's "untitled mamafesta" (104.4). It also re-writes a part of the Christian prayer to "Our Father Who art in Heaven" as a prayer celebrating ALP's position as the 'mother' (T. ana):

In the name of Annah the Allmaziful, the Everliving, the Bringer of Plurabilities, haloed be her eve, her singtime sing, her rill be run, unhemmed as it is uneven! (104.1-3).

ALP's position is the female position that begins and ends the book. The Wake opens with an announcement of its language as the "riverrun" (3.1) of ALP's "languo of flows" (621.22); it concludes with ALP reciting
her solitary journey "A way a lone a last a loved a long the" (628.15-16). Because of the circular gynocentric pattern by which these final words form the first part of the Wake's opening sentence, each of the five major lexemes in this concluding passage operate to modify the initial announcement of ALP's flowing language. The "way" or 'path' of the Wake's language is the "way" of ALP's "riverrun" journey. Her journey is a "lone" journey, a "last" journey, a "loved" journey, and a "long" journey. Because this last series of lexemes returns the reader to the Wake's initial page, however, it is not a final journey but a journey that will end, or "Finn" (628.14) only to begin "again" (628.14). Like the universe of languages of which it is an ersatz, ALP's language has not one beginning but a series of "beginnings" (597.10) and these beginnings are found in her endings: "Anna was, Livia is," but "Plurabelle's" yet "to be" (215.24).

As Chapter Three explained, "Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be" dislodges the identification of the male god as "the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come" (Rev. 1.9). In the Wake, the primary and dominating position of the Lord who proclaims "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and last" (Rev. 1.11) is assigned to ALP and her alphabetic series from A to P, a series that exceeds the alpha to omega series with the addition of ALP's "pee" letter. As noted in Chapter Four's discussion of the Prankquean episode, it is ALP in her guise as the Prankquean who possesses control over the sexual reproductive process. The desire and control which she expresses as her "rain" (stimulating urine/fire-water and political 'reign') over "Woeman's Land" (22.8-9) signifies an ambivalent power. As the "pee-queen," ALP desires Jarl and expresses
this desire as she makes "her wit foreninst the dour" (21.16). Margaret Solomon points out that this "wit," or 'wet', is both sexually stimulating language and urine (a "password" and 'pissword') and the threatening firewater that leads to the "phall," and fall, that can either render the male impotent or kill him. ALP's desire for HCE--the desire that she expresses in her liquid language--can either urge him to "get himself up and erect (619.13-14) or laughingly inform him that he is to fall again: "Hohohoho, Mister Finn, you's going to be Mister Finnagain!" (5.9-10).

In the word's of Macbeth's porter, ALP's desire for HCE "makes him, and . . . mars him" (III.ii.37). It can make him desire her, and it can de-sire him. Unlike Eve, then, who is cursed so that her "desire shall be to [her] husband, [who] shall rule over [her]" (Gen. 3.16), ALP assumes the primary position and "rains," or 'reigns', over HCE in a textual topos of "Woeman's Land." Philippe Sollers succinctly summarizes ALP's dominant textual position as:

First, the feminine position: ALP, Anna Livia Plurabelle. Position one and multiple, but principle of unification. Anna Luna Pulchrabelle. A flux of multiplicities (rivers) but unitary, the one as she the same in its variations. Bizarre, isn't it, the one which is there the a which is the masculine one which is the as she.

As Sollers notes, ALP's position is not only a primary and dominating position but also one that is flexible enough to inscribe the signifying play of the male within ALP's signifying network. Because the "first" position of the Wake is ALP's female position and because the Wake has the double or "bicircular" pattern signified by the diagram in Chapter Ten, ALP's discourse, her "letter," can be read as a gynocentric discourse.
This dissertation has attempted to demonstrate that *Finnegans Wake* is a practice of writing in which the reader can trace many of the textual operations identified by Jacques Derrida as disseminative, or deconstructive, textual operations. It has argued that unlike the more conventional literary forms that attempt to provide the reader with stable and unified positions (subject, narrator, character, point of view, unified plot) from which she, or he, can experience the text and then relate this experience to her, or his, extra-textual experience, *Finnegans Wake* continually subverts the reader's expectations by de-contextualizing and de-subjectifying its language. The operations of the subject in language, be it in the form of author, topic, narrator, character, or series of incidents, motivate the operations of language toward establishing a unified position from which the reader can experience textual operations. Characters and settings in a novel can change and develop, but the operations of the proper name, the stability of mimetic *topoi*, and the continuity of plot provide a unity which ensures that the development of characters and the alteration of places does not disorient the reader. In contrast to such a unifying series of operations conducted according to the function of the subject in language, *Finnegans Wake* offers itself as a series of displacements, substitutions, and condensations that continually defeat any attempt at summarizing what the *Wake* is about. If, for example, the reader attempts to use the concept of character to comprehend the *Wake*'s continually changing language, she, or he, must follow several different characters at the same time. There is a character who can be identified as Anna Livia Plurabelle, but this character is simultaneously a human female, a bridge, a flowing river,
and a narrative of language. ALP will not afford a stable position from which the reader can experience the text because it is a triadic textual unit which continually generates different three-part units that are involved in a differentiating and deferring textual play. Furthermore, the \textit{Wake} uses both individual alphabetic letters and the space, or "paperspace" (115.7) between them as characters, and it continually plays on a variety of textual elements (humans, animals, numbers, punctuation marks, mathematical symbols, epistles, columns, marginal commentaries, natural and artificial objects, and animate and inanimate beings) that can function as characters.

Samuel Beckett contended that the \textit{Wake} "is not about something; it is that something itself,"\footnote{Beckett, Samuel. \textit{Wake} (1984) 15} and some thirty-five years after this somewhat tautological statement, Margot Norris set out to demonstrate the implication of Beckett's comment by using the theories of Freud, Heidegger, and Derrida in an analysis demonstrating that the \textit{Wake}'s universe has no one, fixed, central point from which its reader can experience its language. As Chapter Two attempted to show, the \textit{Wake}'s letters and words function not as motivated symbols but as an "active movement" of "demotivation" that sets writing to work as a disseminative "game within language."\footnote{Norris, Margot. \textit{The Wake} (1989) 17} The \textit{Wake} sets its graphic marks to work as signs in which the reader can observe the "becoming-sign of the symbol." As noted in Chapter Three, A and O, the symbols traditionally motivated toward the theological revelation of the Lord become pluridimensional signifiers of ALP, the letter, and the \textit{Wake} itself. The \textit{Wake} sets these signs to work in a pluridimensional play with at least three different signifieds. It thus affords its reader the opportunity to attend to the
operations of a disseminative trace that assists in the emergence of a pluridimensional writing that subverts the domination of writing by the model of the line.

The phallic column of the book that traditionally bears the proper names of the author and the title is one example of this model of the line at work as the column of the spine assists the proper names in exerting an authoritative power to dominate that which is enclosed within the book. As Chapter Three noted, however, within the +k's "column-killer" (12.26) Chapter Ten, a war is waged against the power of the phallic column and, by the end of that chapter, the central column is reduced to a thin line reciting the numbers from one to ten (the number of the chapter) before it is truncated halfway down the page so that its central textual domain can be usurped by the (previously) marginal discourse. An assault upon the external phallic spine and its titular proclamation is also launched from within the +k by the series of alternate titles that begin with the announcement that ALP's "untitled mamafesta . . . has gone by many names at disjointed times" (104.4-5). This announcement is followed by some three pages of the "many names" that have served as titles for ALP's "mamafesta" and which function as simulacra for the title -gans +k. These simulacra, or alternate titles, function as supplementary titles that are dangerous to the "proper name" -gans +k because they can replace it. They threaten the security of the title's proper name.

The very concept of the book as a unified structure is placed in question by the +k's textual operations and pluridimensional signifying play. Like Derrida's investigation of the "history of the philosophical
text" and "so-called literary text," *Finnegans Wake* is "situated at the juncture" of "the book and the text." The operations of the deconstructive "undecidables" and "non-concepts" ("trace," "hymen," "graft," or "greffe," "cut," or "coupure," and "spacing" of the "whites," or "d'espacement de blancs," etc.) which the dissertation has "re-marked" in the text of the *Wake* are the operations of a "violence" that "denudes the surface of the text." This violence is "necessary" and responds "to a violence that was no less necessary": any book's "encyclopedic protection of theology and of logocentrism against the disruption of writing, against its aphoristic energy." 19

The "idea of the book" is, from a deconstructive perspective, the "idea of a totality, finite and infinite, of the signifier." This "totality of the signifier," however,

cannot be a totality, unless a totality constituted by the signified preexists it, supervises its inscriptions and its signs, and is independent of it in its ideality. The idea of the book, which always refers to a natural totality, is profoundly alien to the deconstructive sense of writing. 20

In the *Wake*, the disseminative operations of the signifier are continually involved in a signifying play that disrupts the concept of the sign as an ideal unity of signifier and signified. This disruptive play can be traced in the series of lexemes generated from the term "ear" that Chapter Two mapped out. The paronomasian variations generated from "ear" include "Earalend" (546.33), "european" (598.15), "earn" (125.22), "earsequack" (221.09), "Earwicker" (33.30 and *passim*), and "herewaker" (619.12). These terms are involved in a signifying play that continually
defeats the attempt at reconstituting a preexistent (total) signified for
the term "ear" because they produce a forced contiguity between signi-
fiers that do not share common signifieds outside of the Wake.
"Earalend" puns on both 'Ireland' and the phrase "lend me your ears;"
"earopean" puns on 'ear' 'open' and 'European'; "earny" puns on 'irony';
"earsequack" on an 'Irish', or 'erse' "pretender to medical knowledge" (OED) and an 'earthquake'; "Earwicker" puns on the insect and is involved
in the numerous triadic terms generated by HCE; and "herewaker" opens
into the endless series of puns on 'here' and 'ear', 'awake' and
'asleep', and 'life' and 'death'. While it might be possible to utilize
such categories as countries, geographical locations, anatomical parts,
rhetorical tropes, physical events, and philosophical categories as
totalizing signifieds for some of these terms, it does not seem likely
that all of the variant signifiers generated from "ear" could share
common preexisting and totalizing signifieds. Given that some of these
terms open up philosophical, theological, and scientific questions that
are still the focal points for current investigations in these areas (the
determination of being as presence, the nature of resurrection, the
nature and cause of an earthquake), the possibility seems very unlikely.

The relationship between a central column of discourse and its
attendant marginal commentary is an important relationship in the concept
of the book as a unity and totality. Dominating the book's interiority,
the central column is conventionally the scene for the presentation and
development of the central idea, the controlling and powerful...
and marginal (or attending) discourse, the central phallic column dominates the page inside the book much as the external spine, scene of the proper name and titular inscription, dominates the book's exteriority. The internal central column has a "textual motion . . . [that] is of the sort . . . that becomes 'accelerated with a uniform rotation in a place parallel to the axis of the column.'" \(^{21}\) \textit{Finnegans Wake} destroys the power of the central column in its tenth chapter. Its marginal play becomes a central force, a three-toward-one displacing and dislodging writing that eventually truncates the central phallic column, and the tripartite "drawings on the line" (308.12) deplete its ability to keep the subverting marginal discourse in its place.

The external column of the \textit{Wake}'s spine is also assaulted. The totality of the book should provide a unifying "given structure," but \textit{Finnegans Wake} provides at least a double structure. Reading the \textit{Wake} from its first page (3) to its last (628), one reads a linear sequence of seventeen chapters. Following the \textit{Wake}'s invitation to read the final incomplete sentence as the beginning (and completing) part of its first (incomplete) sentence, one continues reading Chapter One as the continuation of Chapter Seventeen and does not reach the end of this final chapter until the final concluding line of "The Ballad of Persse O'Reilly:" "(bis) That's able to raise a Cain" (47.29). With this second reading, the number of chapters in the \textit{Wake} is not seventeen but sixteen. The \textit{Wake} thus has both sixteen and seventeen chapters. At stake is HCE and the reading that "will resurrect his corpus" (47.27), or "raise" both the "body of a man [HCE] or animal [earwicker]" (OED), and the "complete collection of writings" (OED) that constitute the \textit{Wake}'s disseminative
tissue. The *Wake*’s double and "doublin" (578.14) structure wavers between reciting HCE's fall and raising ("to cause or compel a person to rise [OED]) "his corpus." It demands at least a double set of readings: a reading that will take cognizance of its straight linear pattern of seventeen chapters and a reading of sixteen chapters that will continue beyond the end of the book and back through the initial chapter to the end of the "Ballad." In this second reading, one has to join the *Wake*’s final sentence to its first. To do this in a literal ("of or pertaining to letters" but also "matter-of-fact . . . without metaphor" [OED]) sense means not only to close the book and re-open it at the beginning but also to fold back the final page so that it is positioned next to the opening page. The resulting breaking of the spine would give an added dimension to ALP's plaintive words "my leaves have drifted from me" (628.6). It would also provide a very physical demonstration of the lessons that Derrida might well have learned from his thirty years of reading the *Wake*: in "The End of the Book and the Beginning of Writing," "The Outside X the Inside."
Notes

1 Chapter One was an introductory chapter concerned with detailing previous criticism and providing a general outline of some of the areas that the dissertation would cover. The deconstructive analysis of the *Wake* began properly with Chapter Two.


5 *Dissemination*, p. 86. See *La dissémination*: "Dans le Phèdre, le dieu de l'écriture est donc un personnage subordonné, un second; un technocrate sans pouvoir de décision, un ingénieur .... Celui-ci a bien voulu le recevoir en son conseil. Theuth présente une tekhnè et un pharmakon au roi, père et dieu qui parle ou commande de sa voix ensoleillée" (p. 98).

ion (pp. 164-179). The passage quoted from Phaedrus (Phèdre) appears on p. 171. Derrida refers to "l'édition Budé du Phèdre" by L. Robin. One of Derrida's central concerns is the history of the translations and interpretations of Plato, and he refers to Robin's La Théorie platonicienne de l'amour (P.U.F., 2e edit., 1964) where "on trouvera un riche bilan" "sur l'histoire des interprétations du Phèdre ... et sur la probléme de sa composition" (La dissemination, p. 74, n. 3).

1) read the passage silently;
2) attempt to reproduce the written form phonetically as 'greet' 'scoot' 'duck'-'ings' 'and' 'thug'-'ery'; or
3) attend to the nominative forms embedded in the passage and "speechread" it as 'great Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray'.

In reading the passage "greet scoot, duckings and thuggery" (177.35), for example, the reader can:
Dissemination. See also La dissémination: "la permanence d'un schéme platonicien qui assigne l'origine et le pouvoir de la parole, précisément du logos, à la position paternelle" (p. 86).


Of Grammatology, pp. 51 and 50; De la grammatologie, pp. 74 and 73.


Of Grammatology, p. 18. See De la grammatologie: "L'idée du livre ... est la protection encyclopédique de la théologie et du logocentrisme contre la disruption de l'écriture, contre son énergie aphoristique ... Nous dirons que la destruction du livre ... dénude la surface du texte. Cette violence nécessaire répond à une violence qui ne fut pas moins nécessaire" (pp. 30-31).
20 Ibid.


22 Of Grammatology, pp. 6-26 and p. 44. De la grammatologie: "La Fin Du Livre Et Le Commencement De L'Ecriture" (pp. 15-41) et "Le dehors est le dedans" (p. 65).
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