Literary Canon à Rebours
The Case of James Joyce

ELENA PĂCURAR

Binding too good probably. What is this? Eighth and ninth book of Moses. Secret of all secrets. Seal of King David. Thumbed pages: read and read. Who has passed here before me? How to soften chapped hands. Recipe for white wine vinegar. How to win a woman's love. For me this. Say the following talisman three times with hands folded: Se el yilo nebrakada femininum! Amor me solo! Sanktus! Amen. Who wrote this? Charms and invocations of the most blessed abbot Peter Salanka to all true believers divulged. As good as any other abbot's charms, as mumbling Joachim's. Down, baldynoddle, or we'll wool your wool.[1]

THE FRAGMENT could be chosen as Stephen's palimpsestic rendering of thoughts, which register this citational reality that the character is most familiar with; neither an accidental stumbling over the bookcart (since most of these interwoven trajectories actually make up the whole dynamics of the "Wandering Rocks" episode), nor an intentional one, Stephen's stop is probably one of the most significant moments in this timeless depiction of the book industry. A pile of apparently randomized books and titles, a collection of miscellaneous reading practices, the bookcart is the visual representation of a typically Joycean canon. Covering a wide range of literary, religious, nonfictional productions, the bookcart is set against a logic of democratic selection of reading material which leaves nothing out or includes nothing in particular. At a first (critical) glance, the titles speculate on some pseudo-/apocryphal religious accounts, always doubled by a certain doubtful element of "mystery" or "magic." The "eighth or ninth book of Moses," coming outside the canonic Pentateuch (the books of "Moses the Lawgiver," according to Gifford's notes on "Wandering Rocks" 10.844–45 (242:35–36)) and also known as "the books of Moses the Magician," are indeed an element of surprise, of mystery and legend, "secret of all secrets," "compendia of magic formulae" in Gifford's words—placed alongside symbols of Judaism, such as the Seal of King David. The meaning of such "charms and invocations" is literally lost in translation when the phonetic rendering of "*Se el yilo*" plays on the German-Spanish versions of reading "little heaven" ("Cielillo"). The author escapes no such translation misunderstanding: Peter Salanka is actually Pater (German version for Father) Salanka (possibly distorted non-Spanish for Salamanca). To these religious references are juxtaposed various elements of nonfictional, non-religious data on beekeeping, on hygiene, on travel and even elements of soft porn.

This practice of leafing through is meaningful in the context of the modernist jux-taposition of texts, all heaped around one defining axis, in this case the Biblical text, with all its derivatives, distortions, rewritings. Books that were "lost," left out or simply not mentioned interrelated with recognizable, familiar titles are all part of a Western tradi-tion of debating on (re)reading and (re)writing the canon. Debates and discussions around the literary canon generally tend to repeat the canonic notions describing both the institutional value of the canonic text and the normative logic behind the institutional-ization of such a text. Attempts at revisiting the etymology of the word *canon* are odysseys of linguistic craft themselves; from the Sumerian origin of *kanna* as *cane* (hence the impli-cations of verticality[2] to the Hellenistic adjectival value of "one who comes up to the standard"[3] and to the contemporary understanding of the literary canon as aesthetic norm, canon has witnessed multiple deconstructions and reconstructions of meaning.

Harold Bloom understands the mechanisms behind canon formation as primarily based on rewriting or revisionism; thus, "great writing" that becomes part of the literary canon cannot escape the necessity to reinvent both the past and the present and provide the new order or shape of literature. Recent criticism and research has interestingly turned to the recontextualization of Joyce's reception and to his institutionalization or canon-ization via the printing policies of the late 1960s. What Alistair McCleery's article enti-tled *The 1969 Edition of Ulysses: The Making of a Penguin Classic* published in the *James Joyce Quarterly* of fall 2008 argues is that Joyce's classicization was carefully directed by the pub-lication of the Penguin edition of *Ulysses* in 1969, following the three previous Bodley Head editions which all encouraged and introduced Joyce on the literary market of avant-garde authors. In McCleery's words: "Penguin Books in the United Kingdom delib-erately transformed *Ulysses* into a classic institutionalized within higher education; its status was underpinned by the nature of the material book—its binding, cover, size, price, series, pagination guide, afterword, and its promotion and publicity."[4]

The obviously antagonistic shift from the avant-garde label to that of a classic followed by the inclusion of Joyce in compulsory bibliographies marks the expansion of the Joycean industry and research—the two most visible signs of institutionalization or, according to McCleery, of "the ghettoization of Joyce within the academy."[5] The status of the "classic" indicates, in McCleery's vision, the critical transition from the reception of Joyce as repre-sentative for a sort of avant-garde author to the inclusion in the series of canonic writers that make up the Establishment also capitalized as Literature.[6] Further declared "safe" or "serious," Joyce would be "sold" to a different target group: the student. In the context of an increasing number of students in the United Kingdom with their renewed sense for mod-ern classics, Joyce would reappear on the literary stage under a different packaging and with a different destination. Such strategies of recycling not only prove the changes inside the literary society and its main asset—literary canon—but also remind one of how Joyce's fiction asserts its centrality or its adequacy to a later type of aesthetics. This brings us to Eliot's warning that the "mind of Europe" is always changing and that it is only from the insides of the collective "mind" that the poet can become an object of or a subject to change.

Part of the printing process that would facilitate Joyce's reception in the academia was accompanied by the publication of critical or biographical material focused on hailing Joyce as one of the "great writers," especially Stuart Gilbert's 1931 *James Joyce's "Ulysses:"*

A Study, Herbert Gorman's 1939 biographical study entitled *James Joyce*, Richard Ellmann's *Ulysses: A Short History*[7] written as promotional appendix to the 1969 Penguin edition, not to mention his previous 1959 biography of Joyce. Such examples of canonic writings on a canonic author best illustrate the mythical construction wrapped around what seemed immediately after the publication of *Ulysses* and some thirty years afterwards as a largely unclassifiable fiction. Ellmann's canonic biography itself participates in the occasional deconstruction of Joyce's declared intentions; in discussing the choice of Gorman as biographer, Ellmann sees the writer's carefully planned instinct for critical survival. Midway between the objectivity behind any biographic endeavor and the slippery subjectivity echoing from within biographies which are acts of reconstruction or fictionalization themselves, Ellmann records both Joyce's reluctance in sharing "his-story"[8] and the author's wish to pass on a prefabricate of his own image: "Out of his consideration for himself as well as posterity, Joyce had decided that a book about his life should follow Gilbert's book on *Ulysses*. In this way he could make sure that his image, mirrored in another man's eyes, might be given the world as little distorted as possible."[9]

The "cracked lookingglass" visibility of biographies allows for much of the skepticism involved when reading Ellmann's comments on Joyce's conception of the fictional transposition of life in biography; the mirror-image of such works is a genuine yet unreliable convention itself, the distortion—a realistic detail. The semantics of Joyce's preoccupation with reception revolve around powerful words of quasi-mythical denotations: "immortality" and "posterity" configure a third temporal dimension that is not only anticipated, manipulated and somehow determined by the past, but also inaugural because not yet achieved. The canonic features of Joycean fiction cannot leave aside the issue of its canonic grounding on certain texts that have represented the most popular subjects of scholarly research and criticism ever since the beginnings of the Joyce (r)evolution: Homer, the Bible and Shakespeare—to name just three of the pillars supporting and "feeding" the text. Recent criticism also speaks about a reversal of this intertextual trajectory, according to which Homer, the Bible or Shakespeare in turn "feed on" Joyce by way of rereading, Joycean popularity and a sort of *intertextual forth-shift*. *U* offers its readers a number of occasions for speculation on the problem of time and numerous theories have much dwelled on a Viconian structure of the text, on the Bergsonian translation of the narrative or the Heideggerian conception of time in fiction, so that the present paper will only refer to the *revisitation by anticipation* of Joyce resulting from the textual mobility of the three aforementioned. "Ithaca" contains a few splendid examples of temporal reformation which prove to fail whenever a return to a preestablished, predetermined past is envisioned:

> *Why might these several provisional contingencies between a guest and a hostess not necessarily preclude or be precluded by a permanent eventuality of reconciliatory union between a schoolfellow and a jew's daughter?*
> *Because the way to daughter led through mother, the way to mother through daughter.*[10]
> *What rendered problematic for Bloom the realization of these mutually selfexcluding propositions?*
> *The irreparability of the past: once at a performance of Albert Hengler's circus in the Rotunda, Rutland square, Dublin, an intuitive particoloured clown in quest of pater-*

nity had penetrated from the ring to a place in the auditorium where Bloom, solitary, was seated and had publicly declared to an exhilarated audience that he (Bloom) was his (the clown's) papa. ...

Was the clown Bloom's son?

No.[11]

The denial of a transcendence of the past over the present is first rendered in the reciprocity of a feminine genealogy that works both ways, with equal authority and validity; the recuperation of the past into the present and vice-versa unsettles the canonic temporal precedence and sequence and it becomes symbolic for the Joycean treatment of past (canonic, "great writing" included). The "irreparability" of the past is, probably, the best pretext for a nostalgic (re)visitation of the future instead: "What saw Bloom's visual sensation? He saw in a quick young male familiar form the predestination of a future."[12]

Figures of paternity/maternity play an important role in the schemata of time management and intertextual affiliation. Syntactically interesting, the first quote stages an encapsulation of the "mother" item between the two illustrations of the word "daughter," somehow suggestive of a predominant temporal dimension (the future) that annihilates any other frame of reference. The past tense register of the second quote is also abruptly ended with a strong negation that denies any relevance of both reality and fiction. In contrast, the third quote reestablishes hope and optimism in Bloom's paternal reveries of Stephen as son, thus emphasizing the latent potential of the past under the travesty of the future. What Bloom's "visual sensation" tautologically sees is a deconstruction of the "familiar" into a series of epithets that sound more general rather than familiar, more estranged (because remotely predestined for the future), the sentence itself bearing the cadence of sequential decomposition into mostly one-syllable adjectives which rhythmically defer the prospect of this mythical annunciation of the future. The word "familiar" is postponed towards the end of a series of adjectives climatically introducing the prospect of a future instead of a past.

The familiarity of previous or ulterior writing follows a similar logic, by which canonic titles are reread as signposts of a road still not taken, yet somehow already explored. From this perspective, Joyce can be labeled as canonic due to the inaugural nature of his fiction, which is *a priori* influential for the "great writing" of Homer, the Bible or Shakespeare—the three-dimensional pedestal of Greek, Judaic and Western culture. This analysis refashions the question of time, chronology and stylistic preeminence in accordance with a recent study signed by Pierre Bayard, entitled *Le plagiat par anticipation* (*Plagiarism by Anticipation*) (Les Éditions de Minuit, 2009). The French theorist argues that beyond the accepted prototype of plagiarism, there are further versions of it, which do not necessarily respect the traditional temporal linearity, according to which a previous piece of writing may be influential for future literary productions. In Bayard's view, the uni-dimensional conception of time can also be reversed from the future back into the past, from Joyce back to Homer, the Bible or Shakespeare, in an exercise of recuperation by anticipation, of reconstruction by pre-figuration. That is why the instances of idea borrowing/stealth are not necessarily a result of respecting traditional chronology[13] and it goes beyond authorial intentionality. Bayard begins his research by alluding to the inaugural writing of Oulipo (Ouvroir

de Littérature Potentielle)—the literary group founded in the 1960s around Raymond Queneau or François Le Lionnais and including experimentalists such as Georges Perec or Italo Calvino[14]—based on the idea of constraint as the best stimulus for literary creativity. Starting from this example, Bayard goes on to theorize plagiarism by anticipation by first referring to the reasoning *à rebours* of deductive processes involved in relating one text to another, which ceases to establish the chronological causality and replaces it with its restitution of "fact to posterior fact."[15] Just for the sake of illustration, Voltaire's *Zadig* could be an anticipated plagiarism of Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*. Such a possibility is facilitated by the existence of a certain "identical voice"[16] and of a "dissimulation of borrowing,"[17] in other words, a certain style and a certain technique that can be detected through a reversed act of reading. Bayard formulates four criteria according to which plagiarism by anticipation may be identified: resemblance and dissimulation (also characteristic of conventional plagiarism), temporal inversion and dissonance. By way of temporal inversion, a certain author anti-chronologically inspires a previous one, thus producing a reversal of the balance of power between two texts that are separated by a certain period of time; this is why, the present critical framework does not necessarily privilege the past, but rather emphasizes the potential of the future.[18] Dissonance is, probably, one of the best markers of temporal inadequacy, since there are apparently displaced fragments of writing which fail to cohere with the whole,[19] therefore signaling resistance to the constraints of a context or to an imposed tradition or convention. The avant-gardism of these texts allow for critical temptations to differentiate between minor and major texts, not authors, to recognize a certain pattern/patent by anticipation. A subtype of plagiarism by anticipation is formulated by Bayard as reciprocal plagiarism defined as a "symmetrical game of influence,"[20] when two simultaneously similar and dissimilar texts bear little difference in value and influence, and are, thus, equally granted with plagiarism. This fact would in turn lead to the formal acceptance of both texts as influential and canonic, despite any chronological hierarchies.

In Joycean studies, such methodologies revolving around the critique of anticipation have rarely been launched; one notable exception is represented by Fritz Senn, who in a chapter of his *Inductive Scrutinies* entitled "Remodelling Homer," performs a similar (by anticipation, perhaps) movement in retracing Joyce through Homer, starting from the premise that: "A Wakean consciousness permits the past to be affected by the future."[21]

The mere operation of *remodelling*—with its double play on transformation and updating—suggests a repositioning of the Joycean text before the chronologically previous ones and a shift of the critical eye from one example of canonicity to another, in order "to figure out (or to feign) how Joyce influenced *them*, the classics."[22] The signs of a plagiarism by anticipation (applied here to the Joyce—Homer unfortunately named "parallelism") seem to disclose the understanding of rereading as "retroactive semantification"[23] or "delayed enlightenment,"[24] depending on the perspective of either the past or the future. Just as most of Joyce's texts are semantically meaningful (at least to a certain point) only when revisited, previous canonic writings gain more from the retroactive compatibility with later texts. In Senn's range of exemplification, special attention is given to the use of signs, *sema*, signals both in the *Odyssey* and in *U*; Odysseus has a scar, Penelope recognizes "the tokens" and Joyce's texts function mainly by the energy

of semantic construction. In Senn's words: "Semantic deviation of a phrase from its denotation is a technique that Joyce taught us."[25]

Contemporary readings of the *Odyssey* may uncover many obscure semantic items after a long practice of reading and rereading, translation and interpretation and in the process of (re)semantification, Joyce himself as author risks to become a filter in the act of textual recuperation. Joyce's works have trained the readers in various spheres of textual (re)/(de)construction and, thus, have acquired more than critical precaution. Immunity to mere semantic coincidence or connotation has led to a rediscovery of the classics as less benign; suspicion of plagiarism by anticipation reveals the existence of potential creativity that is only activated by rereading in a certain key; in the case of Homer, one possible key—a "portal of discovery" probably—for a renewed appropriation is Joyce.

In "Scylla and Charibdis" the author premeditatedly abandons his characters in the library scene, where perorations on authorship and originality are delivered from different angles in pure parallactic democracy and with personalized rhetoric. The episode is a perfect demonstration of the mechanics of rereading and contemporary default. The beginning of the episode stages a cvasi-Goethean view on time and temporal sequencing: "Hold to the now, the here, through which all future plunges to the past."[26] In this initiative of reshuffling temporal linearity, the issue of canonicity is reaffirmed as the only viable element in the structure of given value: "One always feels that Goethe's judgments are so true. True in the larger analysis."[27]

The truth value resting at the core of tradition is described in the context of other mythologizing elements: "always" lending time the echoes of eternity, "judgments" replacing authorial subjectivity and endowing it with a strong overtone of Biblical justification, "larger analysis" pointing at a generally accepted frame of reference, at tradition and convention, at canon and its system of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion of whatever is (not) "true." Joyce further plays with temporal readjustment when discussing identity in post-Aristotelian fashion: "So in the future, the sister of the past, I may see myself as I sit here now but by reflection from that which then I shall be."[28]

The extension of past into future and backwards seems to draw a rough sketch of reading in general: both as reflection of past writings and refractions into the future. Such optics should guarantee a clear projection of the canon as generating both familiar and unfamiliar images, the similar and the dissimilar in reciprocal mirroring. It is by way of such arrangements that Joyce raises the question of originality and paternity when approaching another canonic writer: Shakespeare. Long hailed as Joyce's second best literary acquisition, Shakespeare's name is widely explored both in Joyce's fiction and in critical interpretation as the main vehicle for understanding how canonic centrality works. Harold Bloom's *The Western Canon* intensely discusses the relationship Joyce—Shakespeare in terms of the "agon"[29] which the two engage in and which comes closest to Bayard's notion of reciprocal plagiarism. Beyond Bloom's absolutizing assertions, one reads the critical difficulties of attributing canonic centrality to one or the other of the writers in question or canonic "paternity" as the ninth episode of *U* would translate it.

"Scylla and Charibdis" challenges paternity by confronting the two main concepts that reclaim for the writer a central position: originality and possession. In rejoining the father figure with the son figure, Joyce gives space for a dialectic performance in

the library scene, where Shakespeare is offered a leading role in his own play, in *Hamlet*. Stephen reenacts the beginning of the play, translating the ghost scene in a rhetoric of fictional and biographic descendance and highly questioning the idea of belonging:

> *Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit … To a son he speaks, the son of his soul, the prince, young Hamlet and to the son of his body, Hamnet Shakespeare, who has died in Stratford that his namesake may live for ever. Is it possible that the player Shakespeare, a ghost by absence, and in the vesture of buried Denmark, a ghost by death, speaking his own words to his own son's name (had Hamnet Shakespeare lived he would have been prince Hamlet's twin), is it possible, I want to know, or probable that he did not draw or foresee the logical conclusion of those premises: you are the dispossessed son: I am the murdered father: your mother is the guilty queen, Ann Shakespeare, born Hathaway?*[30]

In overlapping the ghost father figure with the ghostlike authorial figure,[31] Joyce weakens the solidity of both fiction and biography, while suggesting that neither is complete in rendering a valid image of the father figure. The ambiguous nature of the pronoun "he" in "To a son he speaks" tells more of the presence of a generic father, whose son could be the fictional character seeking vengeance, a biographical son long dead and no longer the symbol of future, or the reader—a successor in the completion of the textual semantics of gapped representation. The degree of semantic weakening is further expanded by epithets implying the loss of consistency: "dispossessed son," "murdered father" both reclaim the argument that a logical line of paternity or descendance is denied in Joyce's text. Moreover, the son-father relationship is reformulated in the context of temporal reversal, by the logic of which neither past nor future can be chosen as representative of perpetual transformation: "… so through the ghost of the unquiet father the image of the unloving son looks forth."[32]

Joyce's vision of heritage and possession replaces the traditional acceptance of "genealogy" as chronologically structured, and favours the synchronic over the diachronic perspective; with this in mind, the author is neither father nor son, neither past nor future, but merely part of an ongoing process of determinacy: "When Rutlandbaconsouthamptonshakespeare or another poet of the same name in the comedy of errors wrote *Hamlet* he was not the father of his own son merely, but, being no more a son, he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson who, by the same token, never was born…"[33]

In the dynamics of continuous redefinition and repositioning, the writer has the possibility of reclaiming paternity in a different context which should allow him to glide through a history that he simultaneously generates and denies. The project of historicity redefines authorial identity in terms of change, instability and parallactic shift that brings forth a constant preoccupation for self-questioning. Stephen's recurrent interrogation of the self as being as son or poet leaves a space in a larger context of inclusion by reference to either authorship or paternity. This self-insertion in a puzzle on authorship reveals Stephen's inability to provide an answer to the basic question concerning identity:

> *That Portrait of Mr W.H. where he proves that the sonnets were written by a Willie*
> *Hughes, a man all hues...*
> *-For Willie Hughes, is it not? the quaker librarian asked.*
> *Or Hughie Wills? Mr William Himself. W.H.: who am I?*[34]

Gifford's annotations record the interesting history behind the publication of Wilde's *Portrait of Mr. W.H.*, which was later available under the title *The Riddles of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (the title itself alluding to an encapsulation of the canonic writer) and dedicated to W.H., identified as the boy actor called Willie Hughes. Scholarly temptation has drawn a wide range of possible identities for W.H., including Shakespeare, "William Himself." The same happens to Stephen in his imaginary projection as father, previously defined as "a necessary evil,"[35] where the pattern of rhetorical questions is repeated with a dramatic overtone: "Am I a father? If I were?"[36]

Criticism has intensely examined the intertextual connections between Joyce and Shakespeare and research on the subject is still a highly productive industry; Harold Bloom himself theorizes literary canon by exemplifying the dynamics of canon formation with reference to the two authors. Bloom would at times rhetorically glorify this literary legacy by attributing Shakespeare the main role in influencing Joyce, even beyond the canonic assimilation with the classics: "The reader accurately senses that the novel *Ulysses* has more to do with *Hamlet* than with the *Odyssey...*"[37]

Joyce himself manipulates this rhetoric of grandeur when featuring John Eglinton in the library scene, whose words establish Shakespeare as "creator" of literature, but in a larger paragraph ironically superimposing the paternal and/or filial appropriation of authorship: "And what a character Iago is! undaunted John Eglinton exclaimed. When all is said Dumas *fils* (or is it Dumas *père*?) is right. After God Shakespeare has created most."[38]

Even the chronological or hierarchical succession of Shakespeare *after* God betrays the conventional conception of historicity as a sequence of names and characters that occupy a precise place in the linear representation of time and the respective narrative. Joyce proceeds to the radical deconstruction of this rhetoric by either ironic treatment (the arch-mock Mulligan denouncing Shakespeare as "The chap that writes like Synge"[39]) or by doubling the rhetoric register thus fallen into mere cliché. Mulligan is fronted whenever an act of deconstruction is at stake and his deformation of Yeats's complimentary criticism of Lady Gregory and her Irish works alludes to "The most beautiful book that has come out of our country in my time. One thinks of Homer."[40] In his constant return to Shakespeare's centrality in the literary canon, Bloom reads Joyce's particular style as a defensive (if not anxious) undermining tool with which Joyce chooses to turn away from (or agonistically against) Shakespeare. *FW* should be, in Bloom's view, the best illustration of Joyce's evasion from the sphere of influence—like that of history in general—that Joyce is so obviously trying to fly by the nets of: "I suspect that just as Beckett was to turn to writing in French so as to surmount Joyce's influence on his early work, so Joyce broke with the English of Shakespeare in *Finnegans Wake*. The break was dialectical, partly inspired by Shakespearean wordplay and punning; the feast of language in *Love's Labour's Lost* is already Joycean."[41]

Bloom's last slippery observation fortuitously points at the reciprocal positioning of Joyce and Shakespeare rather than at a predetermined hierarchy of values and chronological justification. The same would be achieved in Robert Alter's study of *Canon and Creativity*, where he discusses the canonicity of Homer and the Bible, which he takes together in a "complementary" rather than hierarchical analytical framework.[42] Alter starts from the same premise that truth is one of the values lying at the foundation of canonic value, but goes on to argue that the modernist exploitation and expansion of canon does not necessarily stem from the truth value of a literary text, but from its mere essence, from canonicity: "What a modernist may take from the Bible is not necessarily revealed truth or theological principle; but, as I shall argue in my first chapter, the canonicity of the Bible all along inhered not only in the divine origins attributed to texts."[43]

It is not just in the textual body of the Bible that modernists can find material for grounding their own works in, but in the nature of the sacred text that adequately and energetically moulds itself on upcoming paradigms, like in a classic case of multiple plagiarism by anticipation—probably one of the most famous cases of such an authorial and authoritative writings. Conventionally labeled as "founding," the Bible passes the test of time mainly thanks to what Alter identifies as the "binocular vision" of the text, namely its simultaneously sacred and literary value. It is from the wide range of "phrases, motifs, and symbols that encode a set of theological, historical, and national values (a canon in the strict sense of the *O.E.D.*),"[44] from its literariness that post-Biblical works are inspired/anticipated by. The permeability of the Bible in various spheres of culture and historical periods, along with its "translation" into different contexts have turned the text into a source of perpetual reconfiguration; the circulation of biblical allusions has a twofold consequence which guarantees both the survival of the original text and its adaptation/adoption to/of future forms. That is why, fictions such as *Ulysses* will be read as displays of biblical material which facilitates the fictional weaving of what Alter terms "citational reality."[45] The occurrence of the Bible, Alter argues, is also visible in its literary accessibility, which gains more from a test of intertextual frequency in which Homer is chosen as the main competitor: "This difference in modes of allusion to the Odyssey and to Scripture has a mimetic logic: if Homer and the Bible are the two great texts of origin for Western culture, the Anglophone Irish in 1904, with the exception of an occasional flamboyant pedant like Buck Mulligan, did not go around quoting Homer, whereas the Bible was still a common point of reference for this Judeo-Christian society..."[46]

A critical (re)evaluation and return to the question of textual canonicity betrays, as Sanda Berce pertinently affirms, a *pretext* for "the interest in the aesthetic canon,"[47] a *revenge of the aesthetic* in the face of so many contemporary anti-positions (anti-eurocentrism being just one of them[48]). Joyce's own concern with redefining Ireland in a larger, European context is, on a backward logic, an attempt at gaining a central position in the more comprehensive cultural memory of European extraction, by first and foremost claiming the "individual memory of texts."[49]

❑

Notes

1. All references are to James Joyce, *Ulysses*. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, with an Afterword by Michael Groden, 2nd edition. (New York: Vintage, 1993), 10.844–53.
2. Cosana Nicolae, *Canon, Canonic* (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 2006), 9.
3. Robert Alter, *Canon and Creativity* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2000), 1.
4. Alistair McCleery, "The 1969 Edition of *Ulysses*: The Making of a Penguin Classic", *James Joyce Quarterly* (fall 2008): 58.
5. McCleery, "The 1969 Edition of *Ulysses*," 55.
6. McCleery, "The 1969 Edition of *Ulysses*," 69.
7. "Ellmann's "*Ulysses: A Short History*" also featured prominently in the carefully worked out and tightly controlled promotional plan for the launch of the Penguin edition." See McCleery, "The 1969 Edition of *Ulysses*," 68.
8. "As he [Gorman] proceeded, he found his subject sometimes co-operative, at other times oddly reticent; Joyce furnished Gorman with much information about some incidents, about others suggested he go to ask people in other cities, a procedure which Gorman, pressed for money, was not able to follow." See Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 631–2.
9. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 631.
10. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 17.940–4.
11. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 17.973–86.
12. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 17.779–80.
13. "... l'emprunt or le vol d'idées ne s'est pas effectué dans le sens de la chronologie tradition-nelle, mais dans l'autre sens." ("borrowing or stealth of ideas is not only performed in the sense of traditional chronology, but also in the opposite one," translation mine). See Pierre Bayard, *Le plagiat par anticipation* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 2009), 16.
14. Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 21.
15. Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 34.
16. According to Bayard, a specialized critic is able to identify behind two apparently dissimilar texts the "secret presence of an identical voice" ("la présence secrète d'une voix identique"). Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 36.
17. "Pour qu'il y ait plagiat, il ne suffit pas qu'il y ait resemblance, et donc emprunt, il faut que cet emprunt soit dissimulé" ("In order that there be plagiarism, there has to be not just resem-blance, and hence borrowing, but also a dissimulation of the borrowing," translation mine). See Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 36.
18. Especially in cases of historical or political inadequacy: "Through the act of reading, readers may discover or build their inner lives and individual thinking which are denied to them by the regime's leveling politics." Sanda Cordoş, "Clandestine Reading in Communist Romania: A Few Considerations", *Transylvanian Review* 19, 2 (2010): 72.
19. "Les passages plagiés par anticipation donnent l'impression de ne pas trouver exactement leur place dans l'œuvre où ils figurant, que celle-ci soit un livre isolé ou un ensemble de texts." ("Passages that plagiarized by anticipation give the impression of not being able to find their proper place inside the work they belong to, of being an isolated book or an assemble of texts"). Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 38.
20. "La double conséquence du plagiat réciproque est que, par ce jeu symétrique d'influences, chaque texte enrichit l'autre et même le transforme" ("The double consequence of recipro-cal plagiarism is, that, by mediation of a symmetrical game of influences, each text enriches the other and even helps to transform it," translation mine). Bayard, *Le plagiat*, 54.
21. Fritz Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies. Focus on Joyce* (Baltimore Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 111.
22. Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, 112.

23. Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, 127.
24. Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, 127.
25. Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, 126.
26. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.89.
27. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.10–11.
28. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.38305.
29. "My concern in what follows is only to continue the story of Joyce's agon with Shakespeare, whom he somehow found to be the greatest of writers (at least before Joyce) but dramatically inferior to Ibsen." See Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon, The Books and Schools of the Ages*. (New York, San Diego, London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994), 422.
30. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.170–80.
31. Later in the episode Stephen gives the definition of an author as a figure that is intrinsically part of his own fiction and rarely disclosed by fictional means only: "He has hidden his own name, a fair name, William, in the play, a super here, a clown there, as a painter of old Italy set his face in a dark corner of his canvas." Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.921–3.
32. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.380–1.
33. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9. 865–70.
34. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.523–6.
35. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.828.
36. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.860.
37. Bloom, *The Western Canon*, 417.
38. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.1027–9.
39. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.510.
40. Joyce, *Ulysses*, 9.1164–5.
41. Bloom, *The Western Canon*, 428.
42. "Christian tradition, with its strong assumption of canon in the strict sense, viewed classical Greek literature typologically as a shadowy anticipation of the exclusive and comprehensive truth that would be registered in Scripture. Joyce instead imagines an intricate coordination and complementarity between the Odyssey and the Bible." See Alter, *Canon and Creativity*, 158–9.
43. Alter, *Canon and Creativity*, 18.
44. Alter, *Canon and Creativity*, 32.
45. Alter, *Canon and Creativity*, 157–8.
46. Alter, *Canon and Creativity*, 154.
47. See Sanda Berce, *Modernity in Contemporary English Fiction* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 2002), 85.
48. Berce, *Modernity,* 83–4.
49. Berce, *Modernity,* 85.

Abstract
Literary Canon à Rebours. The Case of James Joyce

The paper aims at a theoretical revisitation of the literary canon, with a case study on James Joyce's work, whose institutionalization and canonization were the result of both receptive strategies and publishing policies. The paper also discusses a sub-element of canonicity, namely *influence*, starting from Harold Bloom's theories and ending with more recent criticism on the topic.

Keywords