

JOYCE, DANTE, AND THE
POETICS OF LITERARY
RELATIONS

Language and Meaning in *Finnegans Wake*

LUCIA BOLDRINI



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED AT THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York NY10011-4211, USA www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Cambridge University Press 2001

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2001

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface 11/12.5pt Baskerville *System* 3B2 [CE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Boldrini, Lucia.

Joyce, Dante, and the poetics of literary relations: language and meaning in
Finnegans Wake / Lucia Boldrini.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 79276 2 (hardback)

1. Joyce, James, 1882-1941. *Finnegans Wake*.
2. Joyce, James, 1882-1941 - Knowledge - Literature.
3. Dante Alighieri, 1265-1321 - Influence.
4. English fiction - Italian influences.
5. Joyce, James, 1882-1941 - Technique.
6. Influence (Literary, artistic, etc.)

PR6019.09F562 2001

823'.912-dc21 00-062143

ISBN 0 521 79276 2 hardback

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	x
Introduction: In the Wake of the Divine Comic	1
Prelude: ‘Bethicket me’; or, Looking for the straight way in the wood of Samuel Beckett’s obliquity of exagmination	15
1 Working in layers	26
2 The confusioning of human races	65
3 Distilling vulgar matter	99
4 Figures of ineffability	140
<i>Notes</i>	190
<i>Bibliography</i>	215
<i>Index</i>	226

Introduction: In the Wake of the Divine Comic

L'acqua ch'io prendo già mai non si corse;
Voialtri pochi che drizzaste il collo
per tempo al pan de li angeli, del quale
vivesi qui ma non sen vien satollo,
metter potete ben per l'alto sale
vostro navigio, servando mio solco
dinanzi a l'acqua che ritorna equale.¹

(*Par* II, 7; 10–15)

Skim over *Through Hell with the Papes* (mostly boys) by the divine comic Denti Alligator

(*FW* 440.05–6)

In canto xxv of the *Inferno*, abandoning his (often only nominal) deference towards the *auctoritates* of the literary past and the mask of the unworthy follower ('io non Enea, io non Paulo sono'; 'I am not Aeneas, I am not Paul', *Inf* II, 32), Dante tells of the complex and terrible metamorphoses to which the thieves are subjected, and underscores his poetic invention by bidding Lucan and Ovid be silent, because the changes they described in their works could not stand comparison with what Dante is now witnessing – or, as we are to understand, with his own superior inventiveness:

Taccia Lucano omai là dov' e' tocca
del misero Sabello e di Nasidio,
e attenda a udir quel ch'or si scocca.
Taccia di Cadmo e d'Aretusa Ovidio,
ché se quello in serpente e quella in fonte
converte poetando, io non lo 'nvidio . . .

(*Inf* xxv, 94–9)

(Let Lucan now be silent, where he tells of the wretched Sabellus and of Nasidius, and let him wait to hear what is now being fired. Of Cadmus and Arethusa let Ovid be silent, for if he converts by his poetry the one into a serpent and the other into a fountain, I do not envy him . . .)

Dante's boastful self-appraisal in this literary duel ('socca' describes the moment the arrow is fired from the bow) achieves a double result: the poet acknowledges two of his main sources of inspiration, Lucan and Ovid, and, at the same time, marks his departure from the pagan models he is imitating and their mythical subject-matter. The principal issues are thus that of originality, understood both as temporal anteriority and as novel treatment of one's poetic material, and that of the competition with one's sources and models in order to surpass or defeat them; what is really at stake, then, is the assertion of one's own rights to authorship, the victorious reversal of Harold Bloom's notion of anxiety-laden influence into an appropriation and metamorphosis of the earlier poet, guided by an awareness of the superiority of one's poetic weapons. But those who live by literature die by literature, and Dante's success in his competition with his predecessors has transformed him into a model to be appropriated and transformed to new ends by his successors.

Joyce's relationship with Dante is to an extent comparable to the one thus sketched by Dante: by inscribing Dante's literary theories and techniques into his text, appropriating (thieving) and transforming (metamorphosing) them for his own purposes, Joyce can be said to be implicitly proclaiming his own 'Taccia Dante'. By means of this silent silencing, however, Joyce also allows Dante's voice to resound through his work, acknowledging his source and giving a clue to one of the many (and always insufficient) poetic, structural and exegetical models for *Finnegans Wake*.

Joyce started reading Dante already when he was at school, and his interest in the Italian poet never lapsed.² Of course, Joyce was not alone: while, apart from Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries had shown scant interest in Dante's works,³ Blake's illustrations of the *Commedia*, the medievalism of the Romantics, or even more specifically, the German Romantics' writings on Dante, introduced by Coleridge into Britain, are just three instances of the Florentine's increasing prominence in the landscape of past literary masters from the late eighteenth century. Coleridge, Hunt, Shelley, Byron, all read Dante, wrote on him and borrowed from his works. Whereas the Romantics' picture of the medieval poet was often of a proud, solitary and cheerless figure and their concern was mainly with the dark but lively *Inferno*, later in the

nineteenth century Dante became for Ruskin the 'central man of all the world . . . representing in perfect balance the imaginative, moral and intellectual faculties, all at their highest',⁴ while Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites promoted an image of Dante and of his work as both highly sensual and spiritual, focusing on the poet's love and on the figure of Beatrice, and often privileging the *Vita Nuova*, which had generally been neglected until then.⁵ In the early decades of the twentieth century, Dante was a main source of inspiration for the modernists, to the extent that it has been claimed that 'Dante has dominated the imagination of [Yeats, Pound, Eliot, Beckett, Stevens, Auden] as has no other writer',⁶ while another critic has argued that 'One of the ways we could describe an aspiration of virtually all the major modernist writers in English is that they were all trying to write the *Commedia* of the twentieth century . . . there is a sense in which Yeats, Wyndham Lewis, Beckett, and Eliot, in addition to Pound and Joyce, were simply imitating the Italian, Dante Alighieri.'⁷

Why was Dante so central to the modernist project of 'making it new' (to use Pound's slogan), and why was he so relevant, in particular, to Joyce's radically new narrative technique in *Finnegans Wake*? With Dante, the Italian language achieved a semantic and lexical flexibility and range that were unthinkable before him. Bare mathematical statistics show the scope of Dante's linguistic innovation. The linguist Bruno Migliorini points out that the vocabulary of the Italian language increased from 4,000–5,000 words at the turn of the first millennium to 10,000–15,000 around 1300.⁸ Compared with this 'common language', the extension of Dante's lexicon is stunning: nearly 28,000 words, a figure that becomes even more striking if we consider the lexical range of contemporary Florentine poets: Dante's friend Guido Cavalcanti, for instance, used just over 800 words in his poetry. It is not surprising then that Dante should have earned the reputation of 'father' of the Italian language, a claim which Joyce characteristically acknowledged while simultaneously pointing both to the 'distortion' inherent in Dante's technique and in his own treatment of language, and, implicitly, to the 'metamorphosis' and 'distortion' to which his 'model' will also be subjected: 'May Father Dante forgive me', he is reported to have said, 'but I started from this technique of deformation to achieve a harmony that defeats our intelligence, as music does';⁹ nor is it surprising that Dante should be the author to whom modernists turned in their project of renewing literary language.

As we shall see in chapter 4, Dante's impressive expansion of the vernacular was not due to some kind of 'baroque' exhibitionism, but it was in fact both justified and necessary on account of his programme, famously stated at the end of the *Vita Nuova* (his autobiographical *Künstlerroman*, to use a modern term), to go beyond the immediate perceptual reality in order to say what had never been said by anyone before – in order, that is, to express the *novum*, the divine, the ineffable (*VN* XLII). Joyce's trajectory too may be said to be informed by a poetics of the *novum*: it appeared at least as early as his own autobiographical *Künstlerroman*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, cut short like the *Vita Nuova* exactly when Stephen announces his intention to forge the 'uncreated conscience of [his] race' (*P* 253). It is also central in the *Wake's* (in)ability to tell in 'nat language' (*FW* 83.12, night language, not language), through techniques that can be profitably aligned with the (in)possibility of representing the ineffable in the *Paradiso* – the 'something itself' ('DBVJ' 14) that is its subject.

But this is Dante the poet. In the first three chapters of this book I argue that Dante the theorist, concerned with a diachronic and synchronic study of the language and with the signifying structure of the polysemic text, was an equally powerful model that Joyce confronted in his construction of *Finnegans Wake*.

Several of Dante's works, including his treatises *De vulgari eloquentia* and *Convivio*, were available to Joyce in Dublin in either Marsh's or the National Libraries. Given the young Joyce's propensity for delving outside the mainstream literary canon (reflected in Stephen's spending his time among the dark and dusty tomes of Marsh's Library to read medieval books of the Italian Trecento, *SH* 181, and the fading leaves of Gioacchino da Fiore's prophecies,¹⁰ *U* 49) or for putting the mainstream into the service of his semi-heretic, or at least very individualistic, aesthetics, it would not be out of character if already at this early stage he had at least browsed through these less canonical, generally less well-known works by the Florentine.

I have found no clear evidence in Joyce's earlier writings of any direct uses of Dante's linguistic and literary theories; at this point, for Joyce too, Dante is still very much the poet of the *Vita Nuova* and the *Commedia*. This lack of explicit evidence should not suggest however that Joyce would not have been aware of the existence of these works and their contents. As his curriculum included the history of Italian, it is more than likely that mention would have

been made of the *questione della lingua* ('the question of the language'), an issue which in Italy – a nation politically divided until the nineteenth century and in which regional differences and desire for national unity have always constituted motives of tension – flared up especially in the Cinquecento and the Risorgimento.¹¹ In the Cinquecento in particular Dante's position became a motive for fierce debate from the moment Giorgio Trissino rediscovered and then printed a manuscript of the *De vulgari eloquentia* and brought it to the attention of his contemporaries, including Francesco Bembo (whose statement on the *Divine Comedy* appeared in one of the papers that Joyce had to take for his honours examination,¹² and whose *Prose della vulgar lingua* existed in Marsh's Library in manuscript form) and Machiavelli, who pointed out the contradictions between the treatise and Dante's practice in the *Commedia*, thus casting doubt on the attribution of the treatise, to the point that some scholars even accused Trissino of forging the work. (An Italian translation of Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia* published in Venice in 1644 and opening the first of six tomes of a large work collecting various works on the Italian language by Trissino, Bembo and several other scholars who intervened in the *questione della lingua* was also available in Marsh's Library; the National Library, apart from a number of editions and translations of the *Commedia*, also had a translation of the *De vulgari eloquentia* by Ferrers Howell¹³ and at least one of *The Banquet (Il Convito)* by Katharine Hillard, also containing the 'Epistle of Dante to Can Grande' in the appendix.¹⁴)

Joyce's life on the Continent and the ten years he spent in Trieste would have made all of Dante's works available to him. Scholarly interest in the *De vulgari eloquentia* in particular had been sparked anew in Italy by the Risorgimento, when the *questione della lingua* and Dante's position within it – debated, among others, by Alessandro Manzoni – was once again brought into focus and linked to the political issue of Italy's struggle for independence and unification, issues that the Triestine *irredentisti* would take up again.¹⁵ In the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth publications on the *De vulgari eloquentia* and Dante's other treatises continued to increase.¹⁶ In 1916 a new manuscript of the *De vulgari eloquentia* was discovered in Berlin, and it kindled again discussions on this much debated treatise, on Dante's linguistics and on the authorship of some of his works, including the *Epistle to Can Grande*.

Nino Frank claimed that Joyce's interest in Dante declined and

finally ceased as he wrote *Finnegans Wake* ('Dante's importance was to recede, and only Vico's philosophy, with its "turn" and "return," would remain part of the inspiration of *Finnegans Wake*'¹⁷), but I would argue on the contrary that Joyce's understanding of the way he could rely on and exploit Dante's works culminated with the *Wake*, and that it is possible to speak of a specifically 'Dantean poetics' of *Finnegans Wake*. By this I am certainly not trying to suggest that Joyce's use of Dante in his earlier works was 'immature' or that his 'understanding' of the medieval poet was limited. It has been pointed out that 'The Sisters' opens with a reference to the portal of Hell in the *Inferno*,¹⁸ and I have argued elsewhere that, from the start, the Dantean subtext enables Joyce to confront the aesthetic and ethical implications of his literary practice through a use of textual references that is already much more problematic than simple parody, the borrowing of a structure or a humble following in literary footsteps, and that this confrontation already implies – as is the case in all of Joyce's works, up to and including *Finnegans Wake* – a reflection on the nature of the relationship between the modern author and his precursors.¹⁹

Mary Reynolds has demonstrated in *Joyce and Dante* how subtly Joyce wove references to Dante into all his books, in order to both shape and give depth to themes as different as love, father-figures, rebirth. Yet Reynolds's thematic approach finds more suitable ground in Joyce's work up to *Ulysses*, whereas *Finnegans Wake* is discussed in general, though very perceptive, terms. As I have said, I believe that it is precisely in the *Wake* that Joyce's use of Dante becomes most pervasive and far-reaching. In the work of the Italian, Joyce could find an unprecedented and unequalled complex semiotic, structural and linguistic programme, and if plurality and polysemy are two of the main structural and thematic aspects of the *Wake*, then Dante is the obvious antecedent to look at, not only in order to go back to his works but also to parody them, 'thieve' from them, 'metamorphose', surpass and 'silence' them.

Polysemy, or plurality of meanings, and linguistic plurality will accordingly be the focus of the first three chapters of this book. Dante was the first to design and apply to his own poetry a fully-fledged model of literary interpretation, which he based on the exegetical theory of the four meanings of Scriptural writing. Admittedly, the system did not work too well; as I shall argue in chapter 1, its application and parody in *Finnegans Wake* also exposes its contra-

dictions and ultimate failure. This is not to say, of course, that Joyce was exploiting a failed model in a facile show-off of literary superiority; on the contrary, the adoption of the model also involves a reflection on the nature of signification and on the deviations and distortions that the writer must face in order to achieve polysemy. If for Harold Bloom the only way forward for the later poet is to misread the precursor, and thus to be condemned to suffer from the anxiety of the latent 'guilty' knowledge of this misreading even as the process allows the successor to achieve his own greatness,²⁰ Joyce's fully conscious recycling of Dante (as well as of any other writer) shows, rather, how it is in fact the precursor that already contains, or even determines, the possibility, for the later poet, to distort his works; the operation should therefore be described not so much as 'misreading' but as a reading between the lines which will expose *any* model's limitations. This also involves an awareness of one's own unstable position, as the silencing of the earlier writer always entails the possibility of being 'silenced' in turn in the future: Dante's 'Let Ovid be silent' is counterbalanced in the following canticle by Oderisi da Gubbio's warning about the futility of taking pride in one's own artistic supremacy:

Credette Cimabue ne la pittura
 tener lo campo, e ora ha Giotto il grido,
 sì che la fama di colui è scura.
 Così ha tolto l'uno a l'altro Guido
 la gloria de la lingua; e forse è nato
 chi l'uno e l'altro caccerà dal nido. (*Purg* xi, 94–9)

(Cimabue believed that he held the field in painting, and now Giotto has the cry, so that the former's fame is dim. Thus has the one Guido taken from the other the glory of the language; and he perhaps is born that shall chase the one and the other from the nest.)

Another will always come who will overturn, displace and replace the present prevailing model – a movement that any reader of Joyce will also recognise as typical of the pattern of supersession at work in literary as well as family genealogies in *Finnegans Wake*. Interestingly the last sentence in the lines above – 'he perhaps is born' – has been interpreted as referring to Dante himself, whose name has displaced that of the two Guidos (Guinizzelli and Cavalcanti); but this also entails that Dante is guilty of the sin of pride at the same time as he describes both its futility and how it is punished and expiated. Although this apparent contradiction can be explained by saying

that, in this context, Dante may be showing that he is conscious of his own supremacy now, but also of his inevitable later displacement, one can only be struck by the frequency and the extent to which Dante's pride informs so much of his writing, a point I shall come back to in chapters 2 and 3.²¹

The same process of 'thieving' and 'metamorphosing' applies to the issue of linguistic plurality: Dante's account of the Babel episode in the *De vulgari eloquentia* (which I shall examine in chapter 2) and then, in the second part of the first book of treatise, his quest for, or rebuilding of, an 'illustrious' language (which I shall discuss in chapter 3), may have suggested to Joyce possible ways of exploiting the theme of Babel and provided a structural model of linguistic construction, but they also offered a system to be parodied and distorted into a principle for organising the plot (e.g. in the pattern that relates linguistic, alcoholic and excremental distillation – see chapter 3) and for composing the *Wake's* protean and highly unusual 'characters' (e.g. HCE as a language that rises and declines, itself to be declined and articulated in various forms). Joyce's treatment of Dante's linguistic history also allows the reader to look back at Dante as a Nimrod figure proudly attempting to reverse history by achieving what had been denied to his Biblical/mythical precursor.

I must clarify at this point that although this book aims to offer primarily a reading of Joyce rather than of Dante, the obscure words of *Finnegans Wake* may also throw unexpected light on aspects and implications of Dante's works that have not been given much attention, or bring into focus startling conclusions that many eminent Dantists have found difficult to accept. As I shall argue in the next three chapters, for instance, it is difficult to be aware on a first reading of the treatises of the extent to which Dante's project of linguistic redemption in the *De vulgari eloquentia* brings him perilously close to the sin of pride symbolised by the tower of Babel which he endeavours to redress, but if one goes back to the treatise and reads it in conjunction with the *Wake's* fusion of different roles (HCE and Shem, the language and the tower, the hunter and the hunted, linguistic synthesis or distillation and technique of characterisation), one arrives at an almost perverse image of a Dante who is both saviour and sinner, builder of the Tower and redeemer of Babel. To give another example, the impasse of Dante's theory of polysemy in the *Convivio* is generally read as a flaw which contributed to its abandonment, and contradictions are pointed out between the

Convivio's view of the superiority of Latin on the one hand and the *De vulgari eloquentia*'s defence of the vernacular as more noble on the other. However, if one rereads the *Convivio* and the *Epistle to Can Grande* through the prism of Joyce's last novel, one realises that Dante's contradictions and paradoxes are in fact productive, that they prove to be instrumental to Dante's project instead of limiting its validity, and that only when a later writer takes them up and pursues their implications can the reader perceive what new paths Dante's 'limits' had opened up for him and his successors. It is therefore to Joyce's credit that he did not try to speak in the 'true dantescan voice' and steered clear of the broad avenue of 'easy' imitability that, according to Eliot's questionable view, Dante's universal language allowed,²² but looked instead for the untrodden paths, taking up the challenge of the 'deep salt' and of the waters that have never been 'coursed' before, or of the 'wake' that has 'turn[ed] smooth again' (see the first epigraph to this introduction), also accepting the nourishment of Dante's 'sacred' poetry (his own 'pan de li angeli'). By following this 'uncoursed wake', Joyce may in fact have been the best imitator of Dante among the modernists, as Reed Way Dasenbrock has written²³ and the 'sole disciple of Dante' who can repeat the poet's experience in the writing activity itself, as Jacqueline Risset has observed in her fine commentary on Joyce's Italian translation of the ALP chapter.²⁴ It may be useful at this point to briefly sketch what I see as the main differences between the relationship that Joyce on the one hand, and Pound and Eliot on the other, established with Dante.

Despite Pound's claim that the poet must consciously imitate in order to be independent from his models and sources of inspiration,²⁵ the reverence with which Dante is always treated by both Pound and Eliot – the latter being the poet on whom the former bestowed the title of 'true dantescan voice'²⁶ – may suggest that a real independence was never really achieved, and that Dante always remained the standard of excellence to which the modern poet could only aspire. Notwithstanding their proclaimed anti-Victorianism, it is very much to a Ruskinian view of the 'centrality' of Dante within an organic and unified Middle Ages that both poets subscribe, as Eliot's deploring of the modern 'dissociation of sensibility' also shows.²⁷ The notion that imitation is only a stage in the poet's development and in his search for the 'lost' roots of our decaying modern culture is somewhat belied by both Eliot's and Pound's

adoption of Dante to confirm, support or justify their ideologies,²⁸ and by their all-too-faithful linear rewriting of the Hell–Purgatory–Paradise sequence (cf. the *Cantos*, to a large extent structured on the *Commedia*, as the project of a ‘restorative’ epic of the crumbling modern world which would thus be cured of its ills by the messianic poet; and Eliot’s sequence from the ‘*Inferno*’ of *The Waste Land* – or, earlier, ‘Gerontion’ – to the unified final vision of ‘Little Gidding’ in *Four Quartets*, where the lines ‘the tongues of fire are in-folded / Into the crowned knot of fire / And the fire and the rose are one’²⁹ clearly evoke the vision of God and of the rose of the blessed in the last cantos of Dante’s *Paradiso*).

Joyce’s use of Dante (as of any other source) is rarely informed by the deference shown by his two contemporaries. Although it has been claimed for instance that the structure of the short story ‘Grace’ is indebted to that of the three *cantiche* of the *Divine Comedy*,³⁰ even here the model is ironised, its inadequacy as a linear plot of ‘salvation’ exposed. Joyce’s eclecticism, and the relevance that Vico’s cyclical pattern acquired in his last work, enabled him both to forgo the teleology of the *Inferno*-to-*Paradiso* pattern (or, for that matter, the opposite view of contemporary culture as being in a process of ineluctable decline that required messianic intervention) and to play off any model against any other, so as to show that if they can all be equally valid, they are also equally ‘debunkable’. If Dante was a source for Joyce, he was, as I have suggested above, one which encouraged plurality, and this would already be enough to offset the priority of any single model – including Dante himself – and undermine its univocal use. It is this radically eclectic and playful relationship to ‘parent’ texts that best distinguishes Joyce’s literary practice from that of his fellow-modernists. After all, the quotation from *Finnegans Wake* I have chosen for my second epigraph shows what kind of (comic) operation Joyce performs on Dante: the reference appears to be to *Inferno* XIX, where a pope, soon to be followed by others, is thrust head down into a hole in the ground with his feet sticking out and kicking up in the air. Joyce’s ‘Papes’ echoes the distorted words uttered by Pluto in *Inf* VII, 1 (where the word ‘pape’, in turn evoking both ‘pope’ and ‘father’, is associated with ‘Satan’) and thus creates a further pun that would have undoubtedly delighted Dante. If we apply this image back to the *Wake*, Joyce may be said to be turning Dante and his works (and the literary canonical tradition) upside down in a comic and irreverent parody; yet Dante, who displays traits

that may associate him to Lucifer, is himself a divine ‘father’ and poet who produced an imperishable and divine ‘comedy’.

Joyce’s use of earlier writers also points to the necessity to reconsider the theoretical frame within which the critic must work. The reader cannot be bound by any single model of literary interrelationship, whether one wants to call it imitation (as the conscious practice of literary borrowing and transformation, in the sense described by Pound – not dissimilar from the Renaissance concept and practice – and adopted by Dasenbrock³¹), influence (as in Harold’s Bloom’s theory, to cite the best known but also the most controversial), or intertextuality (as in the original theoretical programme, outlined in particular by Kristeva and Barthes, of a textual relationship which reverses or rejects the traditional critical model of literary-historical filiation). It is Joyce’s practice in the first place that invalidates any such neat categories, and while all these theories will offer insights into the *Wake*’s relationship with Dante or any other writer, none will suffice on its own.

Dasenbrock has convincingly defended the case for the use of the term ‘imitation’, and to a large extent I share his claim that literature is made by conscious agents whose imitations are deliberate and intentional acts.³² To be more precise, I agree with the assumption that the writer makes conscious choices; but I cannot share Dasenbrock’s hostility towards the concept and what he calls ‘the language of intertextuality’,³³ which in his case goes as far as banning the words ‘intertextuality’ and even ‘text’ from his book. Indeed, *Finnegans Wake* probably best demonstrates Barthes’s claim that the text is a tissue of quotations whose nature therefore is to be always already an intertext,³⁴ and that it is an autonomous entity cut loose from the intentionality of its author, programmed in such a way as to generate unpredicted meanings and textual connections that the reader has every right to discover or to establish in his/her own ‘writing’ of the text (to take up Barthes’s distinction between the ‘readerly’ and the ‘writerly’ text, which arose in conjunction with the emergence of the concept of intertextuality³⁵). I have already suggested above that reading Dante’s works through the *Wake* enables us to discover in them aspects that a non-intertextual, traditional source study would not reveal, and it is especially in the fourth chapter, where I discuss Dante’s and Joyce’s attempts to deal with the problem of the ineffable and of the unspeakable, of what cannot but also ought not to be said, that I shall try to ‘write’ the *Wake*

and the *Paradiso* at the same time as I read them, so that the critical discourse becomes an intertextual *parcours* that weaves the two texts together in a 'single' one spanning several centuries and in which, from this perspective at least, chronology is ultimately irrelevant.

But the theory of intertextuality banishes the link of textual filiation from its vocabulary, whereas in reading Joyce's works one cannot but notice the omnipresence of the father/son theme, often expanding into the theme of generation as well as into an exploration of family relationships more at large, and which operates also at the level of the literary relationship ('May father Dante forgive me') and would therefore seem to require the critic to turn to Bloom's oedipal framing of the theory of influence. However, Bloom's oedipal conflict can rarely be resolved victoriously for any successor, and his claim that poetic influence may make poets more, not less original (though not necessarily better)³⁶ is somewhat belied by his later statement that the dynamics of influence inevitably leads to the 'diminishment' and 'decline' of poetry.³⁷ In *Finnegans Wake* the son always displaces the father, even if it is only in order to be displaced again in turn; thus the burden of the oedipal link – 'anxiety' – seems to fall always on the father/precursor rather than on the son/successor, while the process of appropriation and distortion (thieving and metamorphosis, to return to the context of *Inferno* xxv) proves to be always an intentional and fully conscious one. I shall return to this confrontation in chapter 3, in the context of my analysis of the father/son battle of Sebastopol, a battle which also affects and informs the treatment of the earlier text and which therefore seems once again – even in its setting, 'the battle' – to evoke Bloom's framing of the theory.

Bloom's model of literary influence cannot work for Joyce on at least another account. Bloom's interest lies in poets as poets – or strong poets as strong poets, and strong poets' poems as strong poets' poems; even when he can state that his theory concerns 'relationships *between* texts' (rather than texts on their own, and than poets as individuals),³⁸ it still remains true, as Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein have pointed out, that Bloom's theory is absolutely non-referential and that for him the subject-matter of the poems is only the 'backdrop' for the acting out of the 'central drama of poetic influence'.³⁹ Joyce's imitation/displacement of his precursors, including of course Dante, is on the contrary played out and fought on the battleground of specific literary structures, themes, stylistic and

linguistic choices, and is therefore always referential and rooted in the nature of the subject-matter. It is first and foremost on the ground of the form, content and poetics of Dante's texts, and not from under the shadow of his towering figure, that Joyce engages with his predecessor in order to elaborate his own linguistic poetics in *Finnegans Wake*.⁴⁰

This leads me to two related points: the first is that Joyce's use of earlier texts always entails a reflection on the process of writing and of textual creation as well as on his own relationship with his sources: the reasons for and the implications of a certain choice, the positioning of himself and of his texts within a specific literary tradition and within literary history, i.e. *in relation to* and *as a relation of* other writers (I shall come back to the thematisation of the literary in the context of familial relations, especially in chapters 3 and 4); this process is part of the elaboration of a poetics 'in progress', a poetics, that is, continually worked out as the texts are written, subject to permanent revision and which implies that no work stands on its own in the writer's *oeuvre*. Secondly, when I say, as I did earlier, that it is possible to speak of a specifically 'Dantean poetics of *Finnegans Wake*', I am suggesting not that the *Wake* was written according to a notion of poetics arrived at, practised or theorised by Dante and which Joyce adhered to, but that there is a poetics of *Finnegans Wake* (a conception of the relationship between language and literature, and between theme, structure and style, as well as of the scope of the literary work, and of how a text signifies) which is comparable to the poetics of Dante's works (also constantly 'in progress') and which I believe Joyce recognised and actively engaged with by reading and 'raiding' Dante, 'writing' Dante, exploiting both the words and the gaps left by his texts, in a process best expressed by the words of *Finnegans Wake* itself: 'The prouts who will invent a writing there ultimately is the poeta, still more learned, who discovered the raiding there originally' (*FW* 482.31–2). The poet's invention of language ultimately coincides with a practice of writing as reading, and of reading as plundering, thieving and metamorphosing of his sources.⁴¹ Yet this is only one possible path, one of the many poetics of *Finnegans Wake*; the *Wake's* plurality of inspirations/raidings are another reason why Bloom's theory is ultimately inadequate for Joyce: no son will suffer from any oedipal anxiety when he has too many fathers.

This eclectic conception of literary interrelations – or, more

specifically, this poetics of literary relations – also enables the critic to avoid the trap Beckett warned his readers of in his 1929 essay ‘Dante. . . Bruno. Vico. . Joyce’: the danger of the ‘neatness of identifications’, of trying to ‘stuff’ the work of one into the ‘pigeon-hole’ of the other (‘DBVJ’ 3–4), or into rigid categories devised by the critic him/herself. Although Beckett was the first to deal at some length with Joyce’s use of Dante in his jocoserious and often outrageous essay, the importance of ‘Dante. . . Bruno. Vico. . Joyce’ lies not so much in its chronological priority or in its content but in its technique: as in the case of the typically modernist unreliable narrators, Beckett’s unreliable critic may not tell the truth, but can still tell us a lot on Joyce’s unreliable imitations. Reading Beckett on *Work in Progress* is probably the best introduction to reading *Finnegans Wake*, and that is why I have chosen to enter the forest of Joyce’s relationship(s) with Dante by the crooked path of Beckett’s essay.