Forming ‘a Whole’

In the introduction T. S. Eliot wrote for the catalogue accompanying the 1949 James Joyce exhibition in Paris he underscored the importance of reading Joyce’s works as a whole:

Joyce’s writings form a whole; we can neither reject the early work as stages, of no intrinsic interest, of his progress towards the latter, nor reject the later work as the outcome of decline. As with Shakespeare, his later work must be understood through the earlier, and the first through the last; it is the whole journey, not any stage of it, that assures him his place among the great.\(^2\)

Eliot also wondered how anyone could write again ‘after achieving the immense prodigy of the last chapter’ of *Ulysses* (*JJ* 528).\(^3\) However, in late October, following the 1922 February publication of *Ulysses*, Joyce commenced with making notes in what is now known as VI.B.10 (Slote 2007: 5). Danis Rose and John O’Hanlon deduce in ‘A Nice Beginning: On the *Ulysses* / *Finnegans Wake* Interface’ that ‘*Ulysses* was finally abandoned and *Work in Progress* first undertaken on or about the 31\(^{st}\) October, 1922, when Joyce abruptly ended his correcting of the former and began collecting notes for the latter’ (1990: 165).

Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* morphed into an intertextual cornucopia during the following seventeen years of its composition, a period which saw many pre-book publications of what was known as ‘Work in Progress’ in print before the 1939 publication of *Finnegans Wake* (Van Hulle 2016).\(^4\) The book and the pre-book publications were engineered by Joyce’s writing mind

---

1 This research was made possible thanks to my PhD position aboard the TOP-BOF project entitled ‘Literature and the Extended Mind: A Reassessment of Modernism’, led by Dirk Van Hulle at the Centre for Manuscript Genetics, University of Antwerp. I would like to dedicate this article to Geert Lernout, Dirk Van Hulle and Ronan Crowley: thank you for teaching me the tricks of the Joyce trade.

2 Eliot’s introduction featured in *James Joyce: sa vie, son oeuvre, son rayonnement*, which was published in 1949 and edited by B. Gheerbrant and F. Faucheux.


4 In his first appendix to *James Joyce’s *Work in Progress*, Van Hulle arranges the pre-book publications according to ‘the chronology and material aspect’ and according to ‘the place in the narrative sequence’ (2016: 211-215).
that relied heavily on notetaking: he filled some fifty notebooks with jottings from external sources during the writing process of the *Wake*. These notebooks served as allies to Joyce’s creativity, becoming entrenched tools and thus genuine components of his cognition (Van Hulle 2014). His dependency on this paper workshop is apparent: not only did the notebooks function as holders for Joyce’s amassed notes, they also supported his writing process, functioning as witnesses to his dispersion of textual material. After having entered a specific note onto a draft, Joyce would systematically cross out the used phrase(s) in the notebook. Thus, his notebooks were bystanders that catalogued which material he had distributed onto the drafts and which material was left over.

In this light, and in line with developments in the field of philosophy of mind aiming to explore the reciprocity between mind, body and world, Joyce’s notebooks were the incarnation of his ‘extended mind’ (Clark and Chalmers 1998; Van Hulle 2014), in that his actions on paper functionally substituted the compositional writing actions that some authors undertake by means of internal processes such as imagining and planning. Philip Herring writes that Joyce’s hoard of notes was the ‘extension, or accomplice, of his imagination’ (1977: 37). In essence, Joyce could not have written *Finnegans Wake* if he ‘had not borrowed all the brains that he could distributed in other books, articles, pamphlets and encyclopaedia’ (Louise Barrett in Van Hulle 2016: 6). Yet, aside from the notebooks’ function as entrenched tools acting as accomplices to Joyce’s writing processes, they also played a key role in supporting, amplifying and thus ‘scaffolding’ Joyce’s text-creating abilities, as argued within Kim Sterelny’s framework of the ‘scaffolded mind hypothesis’ (2010). Richard Menary explains that ‘writing as an active and creative process is enabled by tools such as pen and paper or word processors. The written vehicles are then available for further manipulations such as restructuring, revising, and re-drafting’ (2007: 629). Joyce’s notes formed a hand-written database that functioned as a logistical filtering tool with which he could ‘decompose’ and ‘recombine’ at will (*FW* 614.34-5; Van Hulle 2016: 8).

Joyce’s methods of decomposition and recombination will become apparent in the case study below that links leftovers from *Ulysses* to some of the footnotes in Book II.2 of *Finnegans Wake*. Whereas William Carlos Williams considered Joyce’s style in ‘Work in Progress’ as resembling ‘truth through the breakup of beautiful words’ (*CHI* 377), Richard Ellmann describes Joyce’s accumulation of details and his subsequent remoulding, as a process that involved the elements ‘shouldering each other aside or fusing with one another’ (*CJ* 5). By breaking up leftover words from *Ulysses*, and by remoulding them into new composites for the footnotes in Book II.2, Joyce fuelled his last work with unused elements from his previous
work. Just as inter-novel cross-connections can be established between *A Portrait* and *Ulysses*, examples of ‘anastomosis’ (*CJ* 10; Baron 2011: 62; 64) can equally be traced between *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. Michael Groden writes of *Ulysses* as a book that ‘in some aspects began as a sequel to *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and that ‘ended as a prelude to *Finnegans Wake*’ (1977: 13).

**Speculative Allusions**

As a ‘prelude’ to *Finnegans Wake*, *Ulysses* points to what was to become the core matter of the *Wake* on several occasions. When Stephen is confronted with a ‘bloated carcass of a dog’ on Sandymount Strand during the ‘Proteus’ episode (*U* 3.286), for example, his reaction is evoked as follows:

> These heavy sands are language tide and wind have silted here. And these, the stoneheaps of dead builders, a warren of weasel rats. Hide gold there. Try it. You have some. Sands and stones. Heavy of the past. Sir Lout’s toys. Mind you don’t get one bang on the ear. I’m the bloody well gigant rolls all them bloody well boulders, bones for my steppingstones. Feefawfum. I zmellz de bloodz odz an Iridzman. *(U* 3.288-293)

This passage could be considered as embodying *Finnegans Wake*’s two main protagonist amalgams, who go by the names of ALP (Anna Livia Plurabelle or Annushka Lutetiavitch Pufflovah), and HCE (or Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker, or Here Comes Everybody). While ALP stands for the river Liffey, associated with ‘flowing volubility, the transience of speech and flux’, HCE incarnates Dublin, and is ‘a founder of cities, a builder of roads, bridges, towers,

---


6 Ellmann opts for the word ‘anastomosis’ to depict similar instances of cross-connections that Joyce installed between ‘the collective past’ and Joyce’s ‘personal moment’, particularly with regard to Joyce’s efforts to link Ireland, ‘which in a notebook he rudely assailed as an afterthought of Europe’, with Greece (*CJ* 10). Baron zooms in on the term by excavating its meanings with reference to ‘Joyce, Genealogy and Intertextuality’ (2011), pointing to its definition in the *OED* which describes ‘anastomosis’ as follows: ‘Intercommunication between two vessels, channels, or distinct branches of any kind, by a connecting cross branch. Applied originally to the cross communications between the arteries and veins, or other canals in the animal body; whence to similar cross connections in the sap-vessels of plants, and between rivers or their branches; and now to cross connexions between the separate lines of any branching system, as the branches of trees, the veins of leaves, or the wings of insects’ (Lemma ‘anastomosis’, *Oxford English Dictionary* Online, [1884; 1989] 2019). Observing that the primary meaning of the word was anatomical, Baron points out that subsequent assimilations in the fields of botany and geology followed suit, suggesting that anastomosis ‘arises between things rather than springing from one single place’ and noting the term’s evocation of ‘interconnectivity, plurality, and multidirectionality’ (2011: 62; 64).
and pleasure gardens’ (Fordham in *FW* xii-xiii). Through the prism of the ‘Proteus’ passage above, ALP accords with the ‘language tide’ Stephen describes (*U* 3.288), while HCE represents ‘the bloody well gigant rolls all them bloody well boulders’ (*U* 3.291-292). This juxtaposition between nature and civilization echoes in Joyce’s remark to Arthur Power that ‘[a] living style should be like a river which takes the colour and texture of the different regions through which it flows’ (1974: 79). Recalling the Edgar Quinet citation Joyce inserted into Book II.2 of the *Wake*, Joyce’s aim to write a universal history of the world, structured around a cyclical pattern, with the last sentence of *Finnegans Wake* flowing seamlessly into the first sentence, becomes slightly less obscure, especially when compared with Bloom’s pragmatic view of a similar urban circularity:

> Aujourd’hui comme aux temps le Pline et de Columelle la jacinthe se plait dans les Gaules, la pervenche en Illyrie, la marguerite sur les ruines de Numance et pendant qu’autour d’elles les villes ont changé de maîtres et de noms, que plusieurs sont entrées dans le néant, que les civilisations se sont choquées et brisées, leurs paisibles générations ont traversé les âges et sont arrivées jusqu’à nous, fraîches et riantes comme aux jours de batailles.

(*FW* 281.4-281.13)\(^8\)

Cityful passing away, other cityful coming, passing away too: other coming on, passing on. Houses, lines of houses, streets, miles of pavements, piledup bricks, stones. Changing hands. This owner, that. Landlord never dies they say. Other steps into his shoes when he gets his notice to quit. They buy the place up with gold and still they have all the gold. Swindle in it somewhere. Piled up in cities, worn away age after age. Pyramids in sand. Built on bread and onions. Slaves Chinese wall. Babylon. Big stones left. Round towers. Rest rubble, sprawling suburbs, jerrybuilt.


Such interlinking allusions can also be considered between leftover notes from the ‘Penelope’ episode and Book I.8 of the *Wake*, particularly so regarding the passage depicting ALP bathing (*FW* 206.29-207.20), which is examined by Fred Higginson in *Anna Livia Plurabelle: The Making of a Chapter* (1960).\(^9\) Glancing through the notes France Raphaël made for Joyce

---

\(^7\) Bloom ruminates on the matter in the ‘Lestrygonians’ episode: ‘How can you own water really? It’s always flowing in a stream, never the same, which in the stream of life we trace. Because life is a stream.’ (*U* 8.93-95).

\(^8\) Quinet’s sentence is translated as follows in *FWNB*: ‘Today, as in the time of Pliny and Columella, the hyacinth disports in Gaul, the periwinkle in Illyria, the daisy on the ruins of Numantia. And while around them cities have changed masters and names; while some have ceased to exist; while civilisations have collided with one another and shattered, their peaceful generations have passed through the ages and have come up to us, fresh and cheerful as in the days of former battles’ (*FWNB*: 126 (VI.B.1.085)).

\(^9\) Higginson includes six of the eighteen stages of the paragraph that can be traced in *JJA* 48: 1A.\(^0\) First draft, February 1924, MS 47471b, fol. 76v77r; 1A.\(^1\) Second draft, February 1924, MS 47471b, fols. 84v85r & 85v86r; 1.\(^2\) Fair copy, February 1924, MS 47474, fols. 113 & 114; 1.3 Typescript, February-March 1924, MS 47474, fol. 132r; 1.4 Second typescript, June 1925, MS 47474, fol. 151r; 1.5’ Duplicate of third typescript, July 1925,
between 1933 and 1936, a period during which Joyce intermittently hired the amanuensis, it becomes clear how, in many cases, Raphaël facilitated the possibility of the transfer of textual material from *Ulysses* to *Finnegans Wake*. As Sam Slote points out, ‘[h]er primary job was to transfer unused notes from Joyce’s previous notebooks (i.e., the notes not already crossed out) into new notebooks in a larger, more legible handwriting so that Joyce might be able to use them’ (2007: 26). Raphaël herself informed Ellmann in a letter dating from 1955 that, on expressing her hope to Joyce that what she had been doing made ‘sense’, seeing as she sometimes felt that she was ‘floundering in a bog’, he apparently replied: ‘Oh well, you have understood better than most people will after it is finished’ (*JJ* 671).

The ‘bog’ of notes that Raphaël was to copy comprised some of the leftovers from *Ulysses*, which she transferred to what is known as the Buffalo MS VI.C.7 notebook. The amanuensis transcribed the notes and their headings referring to the *Ulysses* episode titles, and she also copied other captions such as ‘Theosophy’ and ‘Eventuali’, which headed the lists of entries in the *Ulysses* notebooks.

These lists can be consulted in *JJA* 41 (406-440), with VI.C.7 136-201 holding the uncrossed entries from NLI MS 36639/5A (known as VI.D.4A and dating from late 1918 to early 1919), VI.C.7 202-234 featuring the unused elements from NLI MS 36639/5B (known as VI.D.4B and also dating from late 1918 to early 1919), VI.C.7 235-254 holding uncrossed notes from NLI MS 36639/4 (known as VI.D.4C and dating from 1921), and VI.C.7 255-269 including uncrossed entries from NLI MS 36639/3 (known as VI.D.4D or the ‘Subject’ Notebook, presumably dating from autumn-winter 1917/1918). These four ‘lost’ notebooks

---

See note 98 of chapter XXXV in *JJ* (806).

11 See Crowley’s discussion on the order in which Raphaël transcribed the four *Ulysses* notebooks in “‘His Dark Materials’: Joyce’s ‘Scribblings’ and the Notes for ‘Circe’ in the National Library of Ireland” (2006: 2). See also
were acquired by the National Library of Ireland in 2002, and as Ronan Crowley points out, ‘the order of transcription is readily determined’ by means of a comparison between Buffalo MS VI.C.7 and Joyce’s original four *Ulysses* notebooks (2006: 2).

When examining some of Raphaël’s transcriptions, the neatly copied headings of the *Ulysses* episodes can be found: VI.C.7-143, for example, holds a list with elements from ‘Cyclops’, holding the following items: ‘powder’, ‘Beppy’s colours for’ and ‘her vanity box’ (*JJA 41*: 408). The words ‘rings’ and ‘necklaces’ feature under a ‘Circe’ heading that starts on VI.C.7-148 and continues onto VI.C.7-149 (*JJA 41*: 410). A list of entries headlined ‘Penelope’, starting on VI.C7-159, holds the notes ‘lick in toes’, ‘pick hair’, and ‘heart armpits’ on VI.C.7-161, while the following page, VI.C.7-162, mentions ‘rubble bank’ (*JJA 41*: 413), and VI.C.7-168 includes the word ‘tapers’ (*JJA 41*: 414). Another list of ‘Circe’ leftovers on VI.C.7-169 contains the following entries: ‘rolls of hair’, ‘ruched border’, ‘hair escapes at napes’ (*JJA 41*: 415). The notes ‘blossom passionwhite’, ‘camphor’, ‘lavender’, ‘wash water’, and ‘St Jacob’s oil’ are listed on VI.C.7-218 under a ‘Penelope’ header that commences on the previous page (*JJA 41*: 427), while a ‘Circe’ entry on VI.C7-229 holds the note ‘mole cinque-spotted’ (*JJA 41*: 430). An ‘Ithaca’ entry on VI.C.7-234 features the word ‘mouldings’ (*JJA 41*: 431), while a ‘Circe’ list contains the words ‘hubbled’ and ‘lump of flesh’ on VI.C.7-252, followed by ‘pommes d’amour’ on VI.C.7-253 (*JJA 41*: 435-436). A ‘Theosophy’ header groups the notes ‘heart, gold’, ‘throat’, ‘gleaming silver, moonlight on rippling waters’, ‘rose’, ‘purple’, ‘crown’, ‘serpent pies from spine to crown’ and ‘navel’ on VI.C.7-260 (*JJA 41*: 437).

By considering these entries alongside the following passage from Book I.8, which depicts ALP while she is grooming herself, one could see some cross-connections between the leftover notes grouped under the *Ulysses* episode headings and the depiction of ALP:

First she let her hair fall and down it flussed to her feet its teviots winding coils. Then, mothernaked, she sampood herself with galawater and fraguant pistania mud, wupper and lauar, from crown to sole. Next she greesed the groove of her keel, warthes and wears and mole and itcher, with

Rose’s and O’Hanlon’s *James Joyce Digital Archive* for a ‘Chronological Table of Notebooks and Notesheets’:

12 See the National Library of Ireland Catalogue of ‘The Joyce Papers 2002, c. 1903-1928’:

Before these notebooks were acquired, Peter Spielberg’s *James Joyce’s Manuscripts & Letters at the University of Buffalo* (1962) catalogued the “Transcriptions by Mme. Raphael of “Missing” Workbooks 1.-7. In VI.C. Notebooks” (142-145), stating that ‘[t]he original notebooks from which the copies were made are not to be found in the Joyce Collection of the University of Buffalo. They may be in the possession of another collector, or they may have been lost or destroyed in the mix-up of the war years (1940-45) in Paris’ (1962: 142, emphasis in original).
antifouling butterscatch and turfentine and serpentine and with leafmould she ushered round prunella
isles and eslats dun, quincecunct, allover her little mary. Peeld gold of waxwork her jellybelly and her
grains of incense anguille bronze. And after that she wove a garland for her hair. She pleated it. She
plaited it. Of meadowgrass and riverflags, the butrush and waterweed, and of fallen griefs of weeping
willow. Then she made her bracelets and her anklets and her armlets and a jetty amulet for necklace of
clicking cobbles and pattering pebbles and rumblédow rubble, Richmond and rehr, of Irish
rhunerhinerstones and shellmarble bangles. That done, a dawk of smut to her airy ey, Annushka
Lutetiavitch Pufflovah, and the lellipos cream to her lippeleens and the pick of the paintbox for her
pommettes, from strawbirry reds to extra violates, and she sendred her boudeloire maids to His
Affluence, Ciliegia Grande and Kirschie Real, the two chirsines, with respeeks from his missus, seepy
and sewery, and a request might she passe of him for a minnikin. A call to pay and light a taper, in Brie-
on-Arrosa, back in a sprizzling. The cock striking mine, the stalls bridely sign, there’s Zam Bosy waiting
for Me! She said she wouldn’t be half her length away. Then, then, as soon as the lump his back was
turned, with her mealiebag slang over he shulder, Anna Livia, oysterface, forth of her bassein came.

( FW 206.29-207.20)

However, the leftover *Ulysses* notes in VI.C.7 catalogued above, many of which originate from
the set of notes Joyce jotted down in the Subject Notebook (NLI 36639/3), notes that originate
from C. W. Leadbeater’s article in ‘Force-Centres and the Serpent-Fire’ in *The Theosophist*,
were not crossed out by Joyce. Wim Van Mierlo’s discussion of the Subject Notebook
has included Leadbeater’s sentences and set the phrases Joyce noted down from the article in
bold. The words Joyce had gleaned from Leadbeater’s article that were not crossed out in the
Subject Notebook, were subsequently copied to VI.C.7 by Raphaël from VI.C.7-255 onwards.
Van Hulle writes that ‘it would be an over-interpretation to conclude that Raphaël’s
transcriptions were planned as a systematical technique of distortion’, however, he does
suggest that the team effort between Joyce and Raphaël ‘seems to indicate that he allowed some
sort of (anti) collaboration to become part of his work’ (2004: 269). The list copied onto VI.C.7-
260 (*JJA 41*: 437) comprises the following notes: ‘heart, gold’, ‘throat 16’, ‘kundalini’,
petalled chromatic white heart’ ‘serpent pies’, ‘from spine to crown’, ‘navel’, and ‘spleen’,
which are linked by Van Mierlo to the following sentences from Leadbeater’s article, which
was published in the May 1910 issue of *The Theosophist*:

The centres which are usually employed in occult development are seven, and they are situated
in the following parts of the body: (1) the base of the spine; (2) the **navel**; (3) the **spleen**; (4) the **heart**;
(5) the **throat**; (6) the **space between** the eyebrows; and (7) the top of the head.
The fourth centre, at the heart, is of a glowing golden colour, and each of its quadrants is divided into three parts, which gives it twelve undulations.

The fifth centre, at the throat, has sixteen such apparent divisions, but its general effect is silvery and gleaming, with a kind of suggestion as of moonlight upon rippling water.

The sixth centre, between the eyebrows, has the appearance of being divided into halves, the one predominantly rose-coloured, and the other predominantly a kind of purplish-blue.

The seventh, the centre at the top of the head, is when stirred into full activity perhaps the most resplendent of all, full of indescribable chromatic effects and vibrating with almost inconceivable rapidity. It is described in Indian books as thousand-petalled, and really this is not very far from the truth, the total number of undulations being nine hundred and sixty. In addition to this it has a feature which is possessed by none of the other centres – a sort of subsidiary whirlpool of gleaming white in its heart – a minor activity which has twelve undulations of its own.

As we know it, the serpent-fire (called in Sanskrit kundalini) is the manifestation on the physical plane of one of the great world-forces – one of the powers of the Logos.

(Leadbeater in Van Mierlo 2007: 9-11; words in bold linked to the Subject Notebook by Van Mierlo; words in italics, mine, linked to VI.C.7-260)

Van Mierlo points out that Joyce had made these notes after first taking down part of the title of Leadbeater’s article, namely ‘Force-Centres and the Serpent-Fire’ (2007: 9). Funnily enough, Raphäel transcribed the note ‘serpent-fire’ (which Leadbeater translates to the Sanskrit form ‘kundalini’), as ‘serpent-pies’ on VI.C.7-260. Even though this note could have formed the basis for the word ‘serpenthyme’ in the ALP passage, and despite the fact that many of the ‘Theosophy’ notes in VI.C.7 could have been transferred into the ALP passage during Joyce’s almost mechanical distribution process, they were not: these notes were left uncrossed. The evocation of ALP weaving ‘a garland for her hair’, pleating and plaiting it with sprigs of ‘meadowgrass and riverflags’, ‘bulrush’ and ‘waterweed’, and ‘fallen griefs of weeping willow’ (FW 207.1-4), could, nevertheless, be considered as the enactment of twines being fused together by means of Joyce’s writing process, especially regarding his strategy of plaiting leftovers from Ulysses into Finnegans Wake.
‘Footnotes by the Girl’: Distorted, Transposed, or Merged *Ulysses* Leftovers

In any case, aside from such speculative allusions, linkages can be established between the *Ulysses* note repositories transcribed by Raphaël and *Finnegans Wake*. When examining the struck-through entries in the VI.C.7 lists, far from demonstrating relationships of ‘anastomosis’ with the ALP section in I.8 (*CJ* 10; Baron 2011: 62; 64), there are cross-connections to be found between these VI.C.7 notes and II.2§8, a section Joyce originally called ‘The Triangle’ (*FW* 282.5-304.4). Joyce informed Frank Budgen of chapter II.2’s technicalities in a letter dating from late July 1939:

> The part of *F.W.* accepted as easiest is section pp. 104 et seq and the most difficult of all [illegible] pp. 260 et seq – yet the technique here is a reproduction of a schoolboy’s (and schoolgirl’s) old classbook complete with marginalia by the twins, who change sides at half time, footnotes by the girl (who doesn’t), a Euclid diagram, funny drawings etc.

(*LI* 405-406)

Of the seventy-nine ‘footnotes by the girl’ (*LI* 406), between *FW* 282.05 and *FW* 298.36, eighteen were fuelled by some of the leftover *Ulysses* notes that Raphaël had copied into VI.C.7. Despite chapter II.2’s ‘performative purpose’ and its ‘pedagogical theme’, the footnotes which are appropriated to Issy do not function as they are expected to (Crispi 2007: 214). Far from providing clarifying information, Issy’s footnotes were composed, in a seemingly haphazard manner, with notes that were transcribed by Raphaël under headers such as ‘Eumeus’ [sic], ‘Circe’, ‘Eventuali’, ‘Calypso’, ‘Scy. and Cary.’ [sic], ‘Ithaca’, ‘Lotuseaters’, and ‘Penelope’. Luca Crispi writes that Joyce’s process of compiling the notes in II.2 established that the author ‘was looking for lexical data to provide the material inspiration for his creative process’ (2007: 237). With regard to Joyce’s hiring of Raphaël to assist him with the overhaul from *Ulysses* notebooks to copybooks, Scarlett Baron observes the following:

> Joyce cannot have conceived of her task without foreseeing the decontextualization that it would entail, whether as a calculated aim or as an inevitable consequence. Chapter II.2 of the *Wake*, which was assembled to a large extent out of the stuff of such collaborative coincidences, constitutes an extreme example of the use to which Joyce sometimes put the incongruous juxtapositions yielded by this method. (2011: 54)
The section of Book II.2 that Joyce commenced with, a section he named ‘The Triangle’, was first drafted in 1926, and revised versions of it were published as ‘Continuation of a Work in Progress’ in transition 11 in February 1928 (Litz 1964: 147; Van Hulle 2016: 85). Following the 1928 publication in transition, the piece was published in August 1929, as ‘The Muddest Thick That Was Ever Heard Dump’ in Harry Crobie’s Black Sun Press pre-book publication entitled Tales Told of Shem and Shaun (Litz 1964: 147; Van Hulle 2016: 148). Issy’s footnotes were inserted as handwritten additions onto the marked pages of the Black Sun’s Tales Told of Shem and Shaun (JJA 53: 199-225).

The first page of Joyce’s copy of this pre-book publication, for example, has been augmented with two footnotes, the second of which is ‘But where, O where, is me lickle dig done?’ (47478-67 in JJA 53: 199; FW 282). Joyce appropriated the material for this footnote from an entry on a ‘Eumeus’ [sic] list on VI.C.7-181, namely ‘where O where is my little dog gone’, which he subsequently crossed out (JJA 41: 418):14,15 This appropriation of the leftover phrase from the ‘Eumeus’ [sic] episode for usage in II.2§8, and Joyce’s distortion of ‘where O where is my little dog gone’ to its Wakean alternative of ‘But where, O where, is me lickle dig done?’ (see 47478-67 in JJA 53: 199), is the first of eighteen instances in which unused remnants from Ulysses are crossed out and subsequently used by Joyce to compile Issy’s footnotes. Likewise, the entry ‘freewhaled’, under a ‘Circe’ header, is struck through on VI.C.7-166 (JJA 41: 414), to be transferred to the fourth footnote on FW 285, albeit as a slightly morphed alternative, namely: ‘Look at your mad father on his boneshaker fraywhaling round Myriom square’, which was inserted onto 47478-69 (JJA 53: 203).16

In a similar fashion, the crossed-out note ‘rhomboid’, featuring on a list of leftovers from the ‘Calypso’ episode on VI.C.7-199 (JJA 41: 422), provided the textual impetus for the first footnote on FW 286, namely ‘As Rhombulus and Rhebus went building rhomes one day’. Joyce distorted the noun ‘rhomboid’ by fusing it with the name ‘Romulus’ and with the proper name ‘Rome’, so that it could feature as one of Issy’s footnotes, which he added in handwriting on page 22 of the marked pages of Tales Told of Shem and Shaun (see 47478-69v in JJA 53: 204).17

---

14 The note ‘Where O where is my little dog gone’ on VI.C.7-181 was originally an entry in NLI 5A: 048.
15 The following link to Rose’s and O’Hanlon’s JJDA enables one to select the footnotes (which are contained in superscript) of II.2§8 in the 2010 edition, starting from ‘f107’ and ending with ‘f206’: http://www.jjda.ie/main/JJDA/F/flex/lg/lexlg.htm.
16 The note ‘freewhaled’ originates from NLI 5A: 039.
17 ‘Rhomboid’ was originally bequeathed to NLI 5A: 002.
In another instance, the note included in a list of entries under a header that Raphaël transcribed as ‘Scy. and Cary.’ [sic], namely the phrase ‘speech from dock’ on VI.C.7-223 (JJA 41: 428), was distorted by Joyce for use in the third footnote on FW 287, namely: ‘Dope in Canorian words we’ve made. Spish from the Doc.’ (see 47478-70 in JJA 53: 205).18 Aside from these peregrinations from the C.7 notebook to II.2§8, the entries under an ‘Ithaca’ header on VI.C.7-231 ‘Do you not know that we’, ‘had war Workingman is’, ‘now king’, ‘This is other’ and ‘times’ (JJA 41: 430)19, were morphed for use in the sixth footnote of FW 289, namely as ‘Do he not know that walleds had wars. Harring man, is neow king. This is modeln times’; the phrase ‘buckskin shirt’20 featured under a ‘Circe’ header on VI.C.7-165 (JJA 41: 414) was modified slightly to be included in the first footnote on FW 295 as part of the sentence ‘Sewing up the beillybursts in their buckskin shiorts for big Kapitayn Killykook and the Jukes of Kelleiney’; and the note ‘screw split the street’21, which is crossed out on VI.C.7-184 under an ‘Ithaca’ header (JJA 41: 418), was distorted in the second footnote on FW 296 in ‘I’ll pass out if the screw spliss his strut’.

During his upcycling of these leftover Ulysses notes, Joyce did not always resort to distortion before including the entries in II.2§8. Of the eighteen Ulysses-Finnegans Wake peregrinations that can be traced to Issy’s footnotes, seven of the textual transfers were distorted, nine were left more or less intact, and two transpositions involved Joyce either combining disconnected entries featuring on the same Ulysses leftover list, or merging notes from lists of two distinct Ulysses episodes.

The phrase ‘whisper waltz’ on VI.C.7-176 (JJA 41: 416)22, for example, a leftover of the ‘Circe’ episode, is one of the notes that was transposed to feature in the fourth footnote on FW 282, without Joyce altering it: ‘That’s his whisper waltz I like from Pigott’s with that Lancydancy step. Stop.’, which Joyce added on 47478-67v (JJA 53: 200). Other Ulysses leftovers which were transferred to II.2§8 without much adjustment, are the notes ‘can he always do’ and ‘all that he ever did’ on VI.C.7-222 (JJA 41: 428)23, selected by Joyce from a list of what Raphaël had copied as ‘Sey. and Cary.’ [sic] notes. These phrases were inserted as part of the second footnote on FW 287, namely ‘If we each could always do all we ever did’ (see 47478-70 in JJA 53: 205). Likewise, the leftover phrase from an ‘Ithaca’ list, ‘cleared of

---

18 The note ‘speech from dock’ was originally an entry on NLI 5B: 016.
19 Originally in NLI 5B: 023.
20 A note from NLI 5A: 038.
21 This note featured on NLI 5A: 049.
22 Originally an entry on NLI 5A: 044.
23 These phrases were originally on NLI 5B: 016.
fractions’, which is crossed-out on VI.C.7-231 (JJA 41: 430)\textsuperscript{24} was included in the first of Issy’s footnotes on FW 289: ‘That is to sight, when cleared of factions, vulgure and decimating’ (see 47478-71v in JJA 53: 207).

Joyce also delved into Raphaël’s transcriptions of the Ulysses notebooks in the VI.C.7 note repository to single out the words ‘puerile, blond large’ and ‘ears’ on VI.C.7-235 (JJA 41: 431)\textsuperscript{25} that had featured under a ‘Lotus Eaters’ header, for usage in the fourth footnote on FW 290: ‘Why have these puerile blonds those large flexible ears?’ (JJA 53: 209); he culled the ‘Eumeus’ [sic] note entry ‘sir somebody some-’ and ‘thing’ on VI.C.7-173 (JJA 41: 416)\textsuperscript{26}, and used the words without alteration in the second footnote on FW 293, as ‘O, Laughing Sally, are we going to be toadhauntered by that old Pantifox Sir Somebody Something, Burtt, for the rest of our secret striptune?’ (JJA 53: 214); the single adjective ‘flagrant’ on VI.C.7-191 (JJA 41: 420)\textsuperscript{27}, was gleaned for use in the second footnote on FW 294: ‘A vagrant need is a flagrant weed’ (JJA 53: 215); ‘of Speranza’ on VI.C.7-157 (JJA 41: 412)\textsuperscript{28}, is inserted in the first footnote on FW 297, as ‘The chape of Doña Speranza of the Nacion’ (JJA 53: 217); the phrase ‘enjoy as good as anyone’, a leftover from the ‘Penelope’ episode, that is crossed out on VI.C.7-246 (JJA 41: 434)\textsuperscript{29}, is used in the first of the Issy footnotes on FW 298, as ‘I enjoy as good as anyone’ (JJA 53: 219); and the selection of ‘Eventuali’ notes ‘neither a soul to be’, ‘saved, nor a body to be’, and ‘kicked’, which are struck though on VI.C.7-243 (JJA 41: 433)\textsuperscript{30}, are put to use in the second footnote on FW 298, as ‘Neither a soul to be saved nor a body to be kicked’ (JJA 53: 219).

During the process of compiling Issy’s footnotes for II.2§8, Joyce even combined unconnected notes from the Ulysses ‘Eventuali’ leftovers to form a new composite in Finnegans Wake. The phrases ‘slashed the pill’ on VI.C.7-220 (JJA 41: 427), and ‘lifted the pellet’ on VI.C.7-219 (JJA 41: 427)\textsuperscript{31}, are fused to create the third footnote on FW 283, namely ‘Slash-the-Pill lifts the pellet. Run, Phoenix, run!’ (see both VI.C.7.220 in JJA 41: 427 and 47478-68 in JJA 53: 201).

Aside from combining unconnected notes from the same list featuring in the VI.C.7 copybook, Joyce also merged notes that were leftovers from two distinct Ulysses episodes,

\textsuperscript{24} A note that featured on NLI 5B: 023.
\textsuperscript{25} These words featured on NLI 4: 005.
\textsuperscript{26} Originating from NLI 5A: 043.
\textsuperscript{27} Originally noted on NLI 5A: 054.
\textsuperscript{28} From NLI 5A: 033.
\textsuperscript{29} A note originating from NLI 4: 022.
\textsuperscript{30} Originally on NLI 4: 018.
\textsuperscript{31} Both entries ‘slashed the pill’ and ‘lifted the pellet’ were originally entries on NLI 5B: 014.
fusing separate notebook entries to form one footnote. The leftover ‘Circe’ note ‘fox him’ on VI.C.7-230 (*JJA 41*: 430)\(^{32}\), and the ‘Calypso’ note ‘leggy colt’ on VI.C.7-235 (*JJA 41*: 431)\(^{33}\), are combined to form the fifth footnote on *FW* 289, namely ‘Fox him! The leggy colt!’ (see 47478-71v in *JJA 53*: 208).

**Tracing Joyce’s Art by ‘Floundering in a Bog’**

These inter-novel cross-connections between *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* establish the ‘work in progress’ of what Eugène Jolas called Joyce’s ‘novelty of a poly-synthetic language’ (*CHI* 381), a process which A. Walton Litz described as follows:

> Joyce lived through an age in which the traditional forms of mind and society had become problematical, perhaps even illusory. As a stay against this chaos he fell back on the arbitrary forms created by language, and it is no wonder that as we trace his art from *Dubliners* through *Finnegans Wake* words cease to be signs or symbols of external reality and become dynamic units which create a new vision of reality.
> (1964: 123)

By appropriating leftovers from *Ulysses* to disperse throughout Issy’s footnotes in II.2§8, Joyce fuelled the section with remnants dating from as early as the Subject Notebook (autumn-winter 1917/1918). The marked pages of *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*, which were ‘possibly revised at various times between 1934 and 1937’ according to Groden et al. (*JJA 53*: 197), were augmented by means of Joyce’s handwritten insertions of Issy’s footnotes. This process was probably facilitated by his employment of Raphaël between 1933 and 1936: her neat handwriting offered the copied notes from which Joyce could garner material, twenty years after he had first jotted down the textual material himself.

The selection of notes, drafts, and published texts that I have examined in this article, and the inter-novel cross-connections that this ‘stockpile of words’ exhibits (Baron 2012: 259), respond to Eliot’s urge to consider ‘the whole journey’ of Joyce’s oeuvre (1949: n. pag.). By considering Joyce’s writing mind, which was ‘extended’ (Clark & Chalmers 1998) by means of his ‘impedimenta’ (*LI* 172), and ‘scaffolded’ (Sterelny 2010) by means of his jotted down notes which in turn fuelled his creative processes, I hope to have illustrated, with respect to the linkages between *Ulysses* and Issy’s footnotes in *Finnegans Wake*, how Joyce’s writing mind created ‘the whole journey’, with help from Raphaël’s ‘floundering in a bog’ of leftovers.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{32}\) Originally featured on NLI 5B: 022.

\(^{33}\) A note bequeathed to NLI 4: 004.

\(^{34}\) See note 98 of chapter XXXV in *JJ* (806).
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