

Joyce as Prophet of Infinite and Indefinite Meaning and the Reader as Scholar of *Ulysses**

Yuji MIYAMARU

Literary modernism was the first school to emerge after Romanticism that declared its principles in manifestos. Even though particular modernist manifestos did not necessarily reflect the ideals of all modernists, literary modernism can fairly be understood in general as a movement away from the Romantic ideal.¹ To gloss the principles of the modernist movement, these manifestos differentiate Modernism from Romanticism by arguing for—among other ideals—a historical point of view, the use of innovative technique, and the negation of the individual self.² In this last regard, modernism was more pronouncedly opposed to Romanticism than to Victorianism, Naturalism, or other preceding schools and values. The Modernists not only denied the primacy of individual authorial talent vis-à-vis its context in literary tradition, they actively elided the authorial self, which was of central importance in Romanticism.³

* This essay was originally written to submit as an essay to a course titled ‘Modernism and Critical Theory II’ in the postgraduate school of English, University of Kent at Canterbury, England, 2000–01. I am heartily grateful to Rod Edmond, Reader in Nineteenth Century Studies and in Post-colonial Studies, School of English, University of Kent at Canterbury, and Dr David Ayers of School of English, University of Kent at Canterbury, for reading the draft of this essay and providing me with invaluable suggestions. I also wish to acknowledge the editorial advice of Mr Michael Keezing regarding English-language usage and expression in this essay.

¹ Generally, modernist writers were critics as well as novelists and poets, and tended to provide overt clarifications of their views on literary history. Considered together, T. S. Eliot’s ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, Ezra Pound’s ‘Vorticism’, and other critical writings can be regarded as manifestos of modernism as a new literary school. Stan Smith identifies the origins of modernism in declarations by Eliot, Pound, and Yeats. Smith, *The Origins of Modernism, Eliot, Pound, Yeats and the Rhetorics of Renewal* (Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994).

² Declarations by modernist writers were helpful to critical efforts to characterize modernism. As early as 1936, for example, *Ulysses* was already valued for its objective descriptions of character. Carey wrote that ‘[i]t [the metaphor of the masses] denies them [people] the individuality which we ascribe to ourselves and to people we know’. The general modernist understanding of modernism still remains valid to some extent. David Daiches, *New Literary Values: Studies in Modern Literature* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1936), pp. 70–72; John Carey, *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880–1939* (London: Faber, 1992), p.21.

³ Eliot’s ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’ is the most famous of many writings that denied Romantic individualism as essential to literary creation. Eliot declared: ‘[t]he emotion of art is impersonal’.

Among writers of the modernist era, James Joyce (1882–1941) is one whose categorization as a modernist, though widely accepted, is problematic, both because he resisted certain characteristically modernist contemporary ideas⁴ and because his attitude toward the modernist climate was markedly objective on many occasions. However, as far as the negation of self is concerned, there is good reason to regard Joyce as a typical modernist. The title of *Stephen Hero* is ironic, and the life-sized hero in *Ulysses* represents the ancient hero in eclipse. In his autobiographical novels, or *Bildungsromane*—traditionally a genre in which the authorial self is the central concern—Joyce emphasized the ordinariness of his protagonists; by thus foregoing the dramatization of his protagonists as heroes, Joyce pointedly avoided dramatizing himself as author. Yet a contradiction emerges in view of Joyce’s achievements as an author. Joyce’s name is often mentioned as one of the greatest novelists of the twentieth century and an inestimable amount of research into his works and personal life has been conducted since his death. A critical culture has evolved in which all that Joyce’s works have accomplished is attributed to James Joyce personally; this culture asserts individualism in spite of Joyce’s own supposed anti-individualism. This culture is created at the most personal level: through the active reading that Joyce demands, the reader comes to play as important a role as that of the author. To understand how Joyce transforms the role of the reader—as well as the implications of this shift for literary authority—it will be useful to investigate the historical creation and reception of Joyce’s epochal novel *Ulysses* (1922).

Joyce’s long struggle to create and publish *Ulysses* has been studied extensively. Based even on the latest dates by which he is believed to have begun work on the novel (that is, as late as 1914), it took at least eight years to bring the novel to publication in book form.⁵ The difficult, extended nature of this process complicated the history of the text. Joyce’s own manuscript, as well as copies of corrected, typed manuscripts, travelled widely during this process, and various versions have been published in different editions for many years. A serial publication in *Little Review* from 1918–20—the first publication of *Ulysses*—was interrupted by a court case that resulted in the work being found obscene. Prior to *Ulysses*

Eliot, T. S., ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, in *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot* (London: Faber, 1975), pp. 37–44 (p. 44; first publ. in 1919).

⁴ For example, Joyce refused to join the literary movement to support Irish nationalism.

⁵ A range of dates on which Joyce began work have been argued; Attridge’s *Chronology* chooses 1914, probably based on information in Richard Ellmann. Derek Attridge, *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. xii.

first appearance in book form, Joyce had already begun to sell or give away his original manuscript, after which he made further corrections on typed copies. These historical factors have made it difficult to locate and determine the status of manuscript versions of the original text of *Ulysses*.

Compounding these difficulties, the first edition of *Ulysses* to be published was prepared by Sylvia Beach, an American publisher in France whose French typesetters could not read or understand English; this rendered problematic what could have been the most reliable version of *Ulysses* (Sometimes the illiteracy of typesetters is fortunate, but not always). Furthermore, Joyce himself extensively corrected and revised *Ulysses* well into the later 1930s despite both the publication of early editions and his bad eyes. These revisions dramatically re-shaped the work, particularly in later chapters in which Joyce changed as many as half of the words.⁶ These revisions further complicate the determination (or construction) of a version which best reflects the author's intention; efforts to recover a 'correct' text from manuscripts and corrected copies have inevitably clashed with one another. In summary, both the circumstances of publication and the author's manic revisions have made it difficult to determine precisely what Joyce intended to write in *Ulysses*.

Two points of interest concerning *Ulysses* can be concluded from this brief overview of its publication history. First, that Joyce released his manuscripts to others proves that, at least for those who received them, these original manuscripts represent the most authoritative text in the author's view. Furthermore, even as *Ulysses* remains notorious for resisting the emergence of an authoritative version, it is evident that the quest for such a version must be considered to have been significant to the process of understanding *Ulysses* since its appearance, in part because of the nature of reading in the twentieth century, and in part because of the complexity of the text itself. These points provide valuable perspectives on the history of the reception of *Ulysses*.

After its publication, *Ulysses* provoked sensational reactions. In addition to polemics on its obscenity, the work met with a range of responses to its striking technique. Arnold Bennett, for example, wrote that 'someone (I read somewhere) said to Joyce: "I don't understand it." Joyce replied: "But you will." Joyce is an optimist. Human language cannot be successfully

⁶ Declan Kiberd provides a cogent summary of the relationship between the manuscripts and published texts of *Ulysses* in 'A Short History of the Text', which appears in James Joyce, *Ulysses: Annotated Student Edition*, ed. by Declan Kiberd, Penguin Classics (1922; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000), pp. lxxxix–lxxxix.

handled with such violence as he has here used to English.’⁷ Also taking a negative stance, G. K. Chesterton stated:

This unsociable quality in the intellect, which can coexist with so much superficial sociability or herding in the habits, is the most outstanding fact about really able writers in recent days. One of its manifestations is a verbal eccentricity in works of a talent that goes beyond the eccentric. It is something like the secret language that is invented by a child. *Ulysses* contains a number of very queer words; though perhaps none queerer than *Ulysses*.⁸

In contrast, Ernst R. Curtius wrote of *Ulysses*:

This huge and monstrous work should be understood and appreciated. The time is not yet ripe for a final judgement; only after decades will we be able to measure what Joyce meant for our own era—the beginning of a new literature, or a distant grand monstrosity. It is already certain that we are dealing with a work as bewildering and difficult as no other in modern literature.⁹

These opposing criticisms of Joyce’s use of language reflect the polarized responses that *Ulysses* faced in general when it first appeared. Responses fell roughly into two groups: one comprising those with confidence in their own critical viewpoints who either doubted the possibilities of Joyce’s method or attacked his work; the other consisting of those who either valued the work highly (though few of these succeeded in explaining its greatness) or recognized that the possibilities of Joyce’s method could be determined only in the future.

In one sense at least, these two groups can be considered opposite sides of the same coin: both sets of attitudes offer readers choices as to whether to evaluate *Ulysses* in the historical moment, or to defer judgement to the future in favour of contingent, temporary impressions. Furthermore, neither group allows for the possibility of determining the meaning of *Ulysses*

⁷ Bennett, Arnold, ‘Comment’, in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Robert H. Deming, Critical Heritage Series, 2 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), II, 404 (first publ. in *London Evening Standard*, 19 September 1929, p. 7).

⁸ G. K. Chesterton, ‘On Joyce’, in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Robert H. Deming, Critical Heritage Series, 2 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), II, 529–30 (p. 529; first publ. as ‘The Spirit of the Age in Literature’, *Bookman* (New York), 72 (October 1930), 97–103).

⁹ Ernst R. Curtius, ‘On Joyce’s Works’, in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Robert H. Deming, Critical Heritage Series, 2 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), II, 447–51 (p. 447; first publ. as ‘James Joyce’, *Literature*, 31 (December 1928), 121–28).

in the present. Although few works (if any) have produced a sensation equivalent to that of *Ulysses*, the impact of the novel could not be clearly assessed by its contemporary critics.

In the ensuing years, the most enduring form of criticism of *Ulysses*—if any Joyce criticism can be thus characterized—has been that which focuses upon explicating the meaning of the text at the verbal level. Such criticism has offered the only possible alternative to the aforementioned polemical poles. Furthermore, whether one understands the language of *Ulysses* or not, it is clear at first glance that *Ulysses* includes a considerable number of allusions to and quotations from other works of literature either that readers and critics must research or with which they must already be familiar. Thus, the nature of *Ulysses* is such that a lack of knowledge of literature prevents the reader from understanding the text.

Hence, *Ulysses* in effect forces all of its readers to be scholars, and in reading *Ulysses* all readers become scholars. To support this scholarly form of reading, a number of references have been published on the text of *Ulysses*, of which William York Tindall's *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce* (1959), Weldon Thornton's *Allusions in Ulysses: An Annotated List* (1961), and Harry Blamires's *The Bloomsday Book* (1966; 3rd edn 1996) are only a few prominent examples. Contrary to the expectation of Cruicius, however, even decades after the appearance of *Ulysses*, scholars had scarcely begun to assess Joyce's intentions in the text; the primary thrust of critical activity continued to be the mapping of references in the text. Indeed, Bennett's rather severe criticism that '[i]t ought to be published with a Joyce dictionary' seemed to be taken literally, on a huge scale.¹⁰

Several decades were sufficient, however, for it to become generally known that the act of reading *Ulysses* is equivalent to the act of studying it. That is, *Ulysses* redefined reading as an act entailing consultation, research, and the decoding of meaning; *Ulysses* subverted leisure as an aspect of reading in favour of study. The greater the number of references that were published, the greater the scholarly effort required of Joyce's readers.

As an aside, it is worth noting that the practice of extensively alluding to other literary works is a general characteristic of modernism that can be observed in many modernist works. Since the 1970s, when circumstance afforded an increasing number of critical publications, countless reference books have appeared to explicate the language of modernist texts, comprising an important genre of academic literature.

Returning to *Ulysses*, Richard Ellmann is one of the most important scholars to shed light on the work, and his landmark scholarship serves well to distinguish between early and

¹⁰ Bennett, II, 404.

contemporary postmodern Joyce scholarship. Ellmann's chief method was to read Joyce's novels autobiographically. Despite Joyce's own anti-individualist stance, Ellmann viewed Joyce's works as reflections of the author's personal experiences. This autobiographical way of reading Joyce informs such works of Ellmann's as his biography of Joyce, entitled *James Joyce* (1959), as well as *Letters of James Joyce* (1964), and his *Joyce's Critical Writings* (1959) which he edited. Although autobiographical interest in Joyce can be traced back to the first publication of *Stephen Hero* (1944), edited by Theodore Spencer, Ellmann's works—rooted in his objections to New Criticism—inaugurated a tradition of biographical study of Joyce's works.

However, the new direction that Ellmann set can be regarded as an extension of rather than a break with the project of mapping references described above, insofar as many works in this genre comprise reader's guides to understanding the text of *Ulysses*. What Ellmann offered was another possible source of meaning for readers of *Ulysses*—Joyce's life—much as a great deal of existing criticism offered meaning in the form of guidance to literary references in the text. Given the complexity of *Ulysses*, it is no surprise that inquiry into its sources was extended to everything that surrounded Joyce, and in view of this Ellmann can be regarded as within the tradition of scholars explicating references in *Ulysses*, despite the originality of his works.¹¹

Furthermore, such works as Frank Budgen's *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses'* (1934) must be viewed as earlier attempts along the same lines, even though these book were not widely respected as serious academic scholarship due to their purported inclusion of rumours. Whether for scholarly purposes or not, such works have long gathered the details of Joyce's life; in this regard such works must be viewed as attempts by readers to understand Joyce's intentions in his texts. Furthermore, the fetishizing of Joyce's manuscripts and papers—a process that began during Joyce's lifetime and still continues today—must be viewed in a similar light.¹² Believing that something significant must be written in *Ulysses*,

¹¹ The possibility of Joyce's sources existing outside of rather than within the text had already been pointed out by Chesterton: 'James Joyce ever speaks for anybody except James Joyce. We may call this individuality or insanity or genius or what we will[.]' Chesterton, p. 529.

¹² Articles thus focusing on Joyce's texts continue to appear today; recent examples include Daniel Ferrer, 'Joyce's Notebooks: Publicizing the Private Sphere of Writing', in *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace*, ed. by Ian Wilson, Warwick Gould and Warren Chernaik (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 202–22; and Peter du Sautoy, 'Editing *Ulysses*: A Personal Account', *James Joyce Quarterly: European Perspectives*, 27.1 (Fall 1989), 69–76. This textual fetishism can amount to a Sherlockian sort of puzzle solving, as in Jean-Michel Rabaté, 'Bruno No, Bruno Si: Note on a Contradiction in Joyce', *James Joyce*

yet finding the text to be impenetrable without study, the reader as scholar has thus been driven to ascertain the sources of the work; both examination of the author's life and the fetishism attaching to his manuscripts and papers reflect the imperative to understand the original intention of Joyce that the text of *Ulysses* presents.

Returning to the scholarly realm, Ellmann wrote during a period in which academic fields formed around pivotal figures; typically, 'Joyce studies' entailed the investigation of complex chains of reference surrounding a central, defining author.

A decade after Ellmann worked, however, the postmodern approach to reading has become dominant; nonetheless, Joyce remains a relevant subject of inquiry. Jacques Derrida, the foremost theorist of postmodernism both in general and as it applies to Joyce specifically, was himself influenced by Joyce.¹³ At the centre of Derridian discourse, there frequently appear arguments concerning textuality which assign priority to how a text creates meaning in relationship to both its context and other texts, rather than to how it creates meaning within itself.¹⁴ In the Derridian view, literary activity is a playful form of word substitution that is disseminated through conveyance, translation, and mimeses. From this perspective, postmodernists have no need to discuss the wordplay of making chains of allusions as Joyce's chief interest in many of his works, because its meaning is evident: *Ulysses* is no less than an encyclopaedia of the world which can lead the reader virtually anywhere through its referential linkages.¹⁵ Nonetheless, Derrida analysed the disseminations transpiring within the text of *Ulysses* by articulating the shifts of what is affirmed by the repeated use of the

Quarterly: European Perspectives, 27.1 (Fall 1989), 31–39. Such research, however, must be regarded as falling within the mainstream of Joyce study, insofar as it generally pursues the goal of determining what Joyce himself meant in his works.

¹³ Derrida is said to have stated in 1984 that 'deconstruction could not have been possible without Joyce.' Ellen Carol Jones, 'Introduction', to 'Deconstructive Criticism of Joyce', in *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*, ed. by Bernard Benstock (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988), pp. 77–79 (p. 77).

¹⁴ For instance, to support his definition of *pharmakon* in 'Plato's Pharmacy', Derrida describes textuality as a means of producing meanings from the unobservable in *logos*. Derrida writes: '[t]extuality being constituted by differences and by differences from differences, it is by nature absolutely heterogeneous and constantly composing with the forces that tend to annihilate it'. Jacques Derrida, 'Plato's Pharmacy', in *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*, ed. by Peggy Kamuf, trans. by Barbara Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), pp. 114–39 (p. 127; originally publ. as 'La Pharmacie de Platon', in *La Dissémination* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1972)).

¹⁵ Romana Zacchi explains this view clearly in 'Quoting Words and Worlds: Discourse Strategies in *Ulysses*', *James Joyce Quarterly: European Perspectives*, 27.1 (Fall 1989), 101–09 (p. 108).

word 'yes' in the text.¹⁶ Postmodern theorists as a group focused on such chains of references in the work systematically, even though this cast into doubt the existence of determinable meaning contained in the work.

In thus exercising a degree of scepticism towards the presence of meaning and the priority of speech, this new discourse might appear to oppose the biographical method inaugurated by Ellmann, whereby scholars concentrate on reconstructing Joyce's life and circumstances in clear language so as to discover meaning in his texts. However, rather than invalidating biographical study, postmodern theory seems to support it, and vice-versa. Not only did the postmodernists provide an explanation of both the use of allusions and quotations in *Ulysses* (that is, as leading the reader back to literary works of the past), and the manner in which the text refers to itself by affirmation, they also provided an explanation for the history of Joyce studies since the 1920s. Postmodernists at least explained what Joyce studies had done by repeating their way of research for half a century.

Furthermore, postmodern theory, in view of the intertextual discourse between *Ulysses*, previous texts, and Joyce's personal life, clarifies the intertextuality of Joyce and the scholar/reader. In the course of seeking out the sources to which the text of *Ulysses* refers, scholars and readers create additional texts to explain these references. Such texts further extend the Joycean chain of references as a whole, and thus their composition comprises the creation of new literary texts by scholars and readers.¹⁷ Postmodern theory exposes this process as central to the institution of Joyce studies with its ever-growing body of explanation centring on Joyce; indeed, this process deconstructs the authority of the novelist vis-à-vis the text. In revealing this process, postmodernism perhaps makes a greater contribution than it does through its specific application to Joyce's works, for no amount of textual explication could serve to delineate the linkage of scholarly activities to the Joycean chain of reference.

¹⁶ Jacques Derrida, 'Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce', in *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*, ed. by Peggy Kamuf, trans. by Tina Kendall and Shari Benstock (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), pp. 571–98 (originally publ. as *Ulysses Gramophone: Deux mots pour Joyce* (Paris: Editions Galilée, 1987)).

¹⁷ This notion that the process of tracing references in Joyce's text comprises the creation of new chains of reference like those that Joyce created was introduced by Clive Hart (though Hart is hardly a deconstructionist). Hart writes that 'Budgen's book retells the story of *Ulysses* just as *Ulysses* retells that of the *Odyssey*'. Clive Hart, 'Introduction', in *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses' and Other Writings*, by Frank Budgen, Oxford Paperbacks, 278 (1971; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. vii–xix (p. xix).

That is, for all that readers of *Ulysses* have had to acknowledge the necessity of understanding its sources to understand the work, the means of assessing the significance of this activity were absent prior to the development of postmodern theory. Postmodernism afforded a new understanding of Joyce studies as an ideal model to explain the self-sustaining production of intertextuality that disseminates meaning. At the same time, postmodernism qualifies the existing biographical/referential approach to Joyce studies as a precisely literary activity, though an activity premised upon an untenable conception of Joyce's text as containing determinable meaning.¹⁸ Thus does postmodernism explain not what Joyce's text means, but rather what Joyce studies have been.

Postmodernism furthermore sheds light on our initial concern with the contradiction of Joyce's modernist anti-individualism and his authority. According to postmodern theory, Joyce's text has no significance independent of Joyce's life or other texts. Only the relationships between Joyce's text, its sources, and their subsequent scholarly explanations can produce meaning ascribable to Joyce's text; in view of this, postmodernism clearly supports Joyce's negation of individualism. From this postmodern viewpoint, the significance of Joyce is simply that of the person whose text constitutes the most interconnected junction in the great chain of references linking the past to the future.

Yet arguments persist for Joyce to merit special attention; chief among these for readers has been the notion that to join the Joycean chain of references is to acquire culture. The belief that culture can only be acquired with difficulty continues to be a dominant idea, and still impels action to a certain extent; Joyce is renowned among both readers and non-readers as a writer who is difficult to understand. In the great chain of reference, Joyce stands out as a well-connected junction; even in light of postmodernism, his difficulty still functions to command attention. The interest of readers in Joyce's references, furthermore, is obviously an aspect of a larger interest in literary culture, and this academic interest motivates not only academics but also common readers. That is, the postmodern subversion of the literary writer's authority over the reader has not progressed to the degree that postmodernists often suggest. Hence, by abnegating individual talent, by subsuming himself within endless chains

¹⁸ Since the arrival of postmodernists at the forefront of literary scholarship, many articles have appeared focusing on the invalidity of independent meanings discernible in Joyce's text; examples include Bernard Benstock, 'Text, Sub-Text, Not-Text: Literary and Narrational In/Validities', *James Joyce Quarterly: European Perspectives*, 22.4 (Summer 1985), 355–65; and Murray McArthur, 'The Example of Joyce: Derrida Reading Joyce', *James Joyce Quarterly: European Perspectives*, 32.2 (Winter 1995), 227–42.

of reference, and by thus positioning himself as a junction linking text to text, Joyce paradoxically assures his importance as an individual. Again, only the recognition of an intertextuality whereby no lone individual can assert determinable meaning enables Joyce's primacy.

It is worth noting that the endless process of reference making and mapping around Joyce takes the form of riddle posing and solving. In itself, this form offers another explanation for people's attraction to Joyce, as well of the endlessness of the project of reading Joyce. Furthermore, *Ulysses* in this respect bears a strong similarity to a detective novel; riddles—like detective novels—pose a challenge to be solved. Much as the reader of a detective novel, seeing the world through the eyes of a detective, searches out clues that the author has hidden in the narrative, the reader of *Ulysses* sees the world from the standpoints of Stephen and Bloom and is baffled by the impenetrability of a narrative that seems to promise to make sense. What differentiates *Ulysses* from detective novels, however, is that the reader is hardly given the solution to most of the riddles that the narrative poses. Even the punch line of 'throw it away', for instance, must be categorized as a rare case—one of only a few instances in which Joyce seems to provide a clear solution to one of his own words. In general, for all that Joyce's riddles are sufficiently enticing to compel the reader to search for their solutions, all of the reader's efforts—for example, his or her scholarly consulting of references—produce only uncertainties.

Unlike detective novels, which are governed by the strict rule that in the end answers must be provided for all questions that have been raised, *Ulysses* neither provides answers nor affirms their definite existence, for the questions that the novel poses require the reader to journey outside of the text in search of whatever answers might exist. Such answers as the reader may discover, furthermore, are never more than approximate and contingent, and as such invariably spur the reader to resume searching for better ones. The questions of *Ulysses* are open in nature; in an infinite search for answers where everything is indefinite, anything can be an answer. This circularity is embodied in the history of the reception of *Ulysses*, as discussed above.¹⁹

¹⁹ This circularity was interrogated in terms of the scholarly way of reading demanded by the text soon after *Ulysses* appeared, as in the following comment by Rebecca West: '[i]t was M. Valéry Larbaud who first detected that the title of that great work was not just put in to make it more difficult, but that there exists a close parallelism between the incidents of the *Odyssey* and *Ulysses*: that Leopold Bloom is Penelope, the newspaper office is the Cave of the Winds, the brothel the Place of the Dead, and so on. This recognition plunges Mr. Joyce's devotees into profound ecstasies from which they never recover

However, it is also worth noting that most of the questions posed by both *Ulysses* and Joyce's life could be answered by Joyce himself if he were alive. That is, if Joyce, in the manner of a detective novelist, were to provide answers to his riddles—the sources of his allusions and quotations, his intentions for his metaphors, and so forth—it would put an end to most discussion of his work. It follows that the project of Joyce studies is based on the assumption that Joyce's intentions in *Ulysses* were determinate. Joyce's questions imply the existence of answers, but final answers cannot be found because Joyce's intentions are no longer completely accessible.

Yet this indeterminacy serves to commit the reader more deeply to the search for Joyce's intentions rather than to criticize them, due to the difficulty of criticism that is independent of intentionality. As a result, contrary to Joyce's own ideal, the reader can only affirm answers that he or she assumes Joyce to have determined in advance. In the structure of *Ulysses*, the authority of Joyce is thus that of a prophet whose texts are to be justified and affirmed not only as questions but also as spurs to the search for answers. This structure, again, must be understood to assert the authority of the author as an individual.

Although the reception of *Ulysses* cannot easily be attributed to any plan of Joyce's, he made another prophecy:

If I gave it all up immediately, I'd lose my immortality. I've put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant, and that's the only way of insuring one's immortality.²⁰

Clearly Joyce expected *Ulysses* to be read in the relationship with him, the author, to some extent. Furthermore, judging from his choice of the word 'professors', rather than 'critics', Joyce anticipated that *Ulysses* would be an object of academic study, even though contemporary novels were rarely regarded as worthy of serious study in that period. Moreover, it was obviously Joyce's intention to scatter riddles throughout *Ulysses*, and in order to frame these riddles as meaningful rather than nonsensical, he occasionally provided

sufficiently to ask what the devil is the purpose that is served by these analogies.' Rebecca West, 'On Joyce', in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Robert H. Deming, Critical Heritage Series, 2 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), II, 430–36 (p. 433; first publ. as 'The Strange Case of James Joyce', *Bookman* (New York), 68 (September 1928), 9–23).

²⁰ Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 535.

partial answers such as those considered in Budgen's book.²¹ It follows that it was also Joyce's intention not to provide answers to all of his questions, and this suggests that Joyce expected that, if readers were to try to understand his works, they would have to consult references in scholarly acts predicated on affirmation.

In *Ulysses*, Joyce consciously relied on intertextuality rather than the possibilities of locating meaning within his own text. In so doing, he brought readers to a new way of reading for the purpose of furthering an idea of the individual opposed to that of the Romantic ideal. Yet, it must not be ignored that the greater the emphasis Joyce scholars place on Joyce's negation of the Romantic self, the more strongly is Joyce as an individual identified as a landmark to help one commit to the entire culture. Even as the Romantic self as a subject to be resolved is denied in *Ulysses*, the self as a subject to affirm is asserted. *Ulysses* demonstrates that the traditional hierarchy of author and reader survived the transition from Romanticism to modernism, and that the author retained the privilege of choosing what to scatter in front of the reader. Since the individualism both inherent to and resulting from *Ulysses* is a consequence of Joyce's strategy to some extent, there is little support for emphasizing the denial of self in the works of Joyce or other modernists, for all that postmodernists often rely on this denial.

²¹ In this sense, in Budgen's book, which partly is Joyce's own criticism of *Ulysses*, Joyce showed some exercises to show how to read *Ulysses*.