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According to Vico’s deviant etymological rules, *lex*, originally a collection of acorns from the oak (*ilex*) by which the swine were drawn together, became a collection of vegetables (*legumina*), then people standing for the law (*lex*). “Finally, collecting letters, and making, as it were, a sheaf of them for each word, was called *legere*, reading” once the metaphors of the law had been laid down on paper as a text(ure) of signs opening *interpretabilitas* or *interpretatio*, the interpretation of the divine laws of creation, which Vico fancifully derives from the Latin *patrare*, “to do or make, which is the prerogative of God” (NS §448) or fathers (Latin *patres*), in a symbolic interpretive gesture conferring paternity on its author. The “fathering law” (*FW* 267.F5) of Vico’s etymology, at the origin of fables (*muthoi*) and narratives, would therefore seem to define implicitly a position of lawful authority ascribable to Fatherly figures, whose opposite would be filial disobedience and the rejection of ancestral order. At the level of language, the native’s “in-lawful” embrace of the normative idiom would be rivalled by the alien tongue and dissident dialect of the “outlex.”

Yet such a neat divide conflicts with Joyce’s oscillating perspectives on language as early as the last section of *A Portrait*, when the artist frets against the tongue, at once “so familiar and so foreign,” of an alien(ating) rule and ideology on Irish ground. Setting aside the ironic time lag that separates Joyce from the less mature writing persona of Stephen Dedalus, one can still say that the latter’s disappointed flight from the island, suspended between the end of *A Portrait* and the “Telemachiad,” offers a quasi-mythological analogy to Joyce’s endeavour to soar above the stylistic canons bequeathed by his literary forefathers in order to create his own untrammelled artistic idiolect. Such a language, which will not be fully authorised until after plundering the whole spectrum of idioms, styles and discourses available in English at the turn of the twentieth century for “Oxen of the Sun,” will further dramatize the interplay between nativeness and foreignness in the dialectical coils of *Finnegans Wake*, in which both linguistic positions will be allowed to interpenetrate. Framed by the laws of *coincidentia oppositorum*, the *Wake* will feature a proto-parent of versatile foreign origins (HCE) who becomes naturalised in the course of a many-faceted migration westward, and a new “official” writing persona, an “outlex” (*FW* 169.03), outside the law of normative English (outlaw) and using foreign parts of speech, as well as an “inlaw” (*FW* 169.04) destroying the language within its limits—since, like any profane act, his desecration depends on an implicit recognition of authority—and waging a war against the English language (*FW* 178.06-07). This essay wishes to explore such a circuitous trajectory, full of ins and outs, in the light of choice moments or
thematic crossings in the later works, which will be read or gathered (legere), using the lexical and etymological tools Joyce the Son in search of his own linguistic fatherhood had learnt to adopt and adapt from Vico (among others) for his own stylistic, narrative and structural purposes.

1. The “Barbarians” vs. Bloom the Middleman in “Cyclops”

Set more than half way along the development of the “middle style,” the “Cyclops” episode marshals the more sophisticated Ulysscean techniques to turn the aggressive clear-cut standards of the citizen’s jingoism upon itself and destabilise it from without as well as within. His bellicose claims for segregation, linguistic identity and the law of might are enforced by an unlawful English grammar which contrasts with Bloom’s orderly modest style, full of phatic phrases (to maintain communication) which the garrulous nameless narrator would no doubt construct as unmanly (U 12: 515). The contrastive narrative modes of the chapter offer a telltale mélange of stylistic mimesis and parodic antidote to the rhetorical bombast of the citizen: in ll. 454-55, part of the nameless narrator’s wording contaminates/is appropriated by Alf Bergan, a porosity of agencies in the light of which one may also see his “says I,” more than a colloquialism a miscegenation of persons that dramatises the repressed other(s) in the citizen and his like. In one of the parodic interludes, the hateful colonialist values of the Sassenach even pervade the assimilation of several foreign heroes as “tribal images of many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity” (ll. 175-76) graven on the seastones hanging from the girdle of a Homericised Irish nationalist. (His semitic bias even seems to surface unconsciously in the devocalisation of Lenehan and Mulligan’s names: l. 542.) The burlesque foreign delegation of the Friends of the Emerald Isle (l. 554ff.) is responsible for the stream of semantically cognate foreign words which, as a forerunner of peace and death or thunderword motifs in the Wake, may provide a parodic Pentecost, the interbreeding of those tongues of fire endangering the integrity of the bits of Irish idiom shored up by the fiery citizen as a symbol of linguistic demarcation. Unable to escape the alienating imposition of narrative scaffoldings, such as Homer’s, working as ironic filters, the citizen ought to take a lesson from Bloom whom he indirectly refers to as “a half and half” (ll. 1052-53), later echoed by the approving narrator’s “[o]ne of those of mixed middlings” (ll. 1658-59), before wondering what Bloom’s nation is (l. 1430; cf. also John Wyse’s question, l. 1419), and whom, we were told in one of the overwritten interludes, had “met with a mixed reception of applause” (l. 912). A travelling salesman and wandering Jew, and like the later Earwicker of foreign origin but implanted on Irish soil, Bloom enjoys a mixed status that plies between nativeness and foreignness, which Joyce had seen as the positive feature of the original cultural patchwork of his country in an early essay which the citizen is ironically made to quote, “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages” (l. 1642). Departing Bloom-Elijah is nearly beheaded by the last but not least aggressive move of the citizen, who is thus definitely turned into a barbarian, i.e. a foreigner (Greek barbaros) no better than the hangman Master Barber whom he had punningly dismissed (l. 432), saying that barbers would hang their own fathers for money (ll. 441-42). Joyce knew the etymological origin of “barbarian”/“barbarous” and the distinction between Greeks and non-Greeks or barbarians, mentioned as early as his essay on “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages,” in Bloom’s more peaceful detumescent monologue in the next chapter will
brood over Molly’s choice of him for a husband—and one could add Stephen’s affiliation with him as a spiritual father—because he is so foreign from the others (cf. U 13.1209-10), despite the claim to Irish citizenship by our “homme moyen sensuel.” Flying between genders (cf. “Circe”) and always looking for a humane compromise, our mediating, middle-aged, middle-of-the-road hero, as polytropic as his changing, translated name (virag, bloom, flower), points to the aesthetics of the golden mean of the more mature artist, with its equation between mediation and transcendence.

2. The “Babeling” as Barbarian: The Etymological Context

It is one of the consequences of the laws of coincidentia oppositorum that Finnegans Wake can equally be approached through a grand sweeping theoretical design or the minutest textual detail. My first inquiry into the overall status of the “barbarian” in Joyce’s final text will thus be anchored to one of its smallest textual-structural motifs, the polyglottal slip or fall (Latin lapsus) in the “first” thunderword, starting “bababadal-.”

Etymology teaches us that its inaugural baba- is an Indo-European root “imitative of unarticulated or indistinct speech; also a child’s nursery word for a baby and for various relatives.” This lexical entity therefore has in nucleo the family of Wakean protagonists and maps out all their possible interrelations within its linguistic microcosm. Its etymological overtones and the whole range of its polyglottal derivations crystallise into an embryonic fable, telling its own history (NS §401), which is thus tacitly retold in the interplay between the first thunderword and the whole polynarrative of the Wake:

1. Middle English babelen: to babble, which Skeat’s A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language explains as “‘to keep on saying ba, ba,’ syllables imitative of a child’s attempt to speak.”
2. Middle English babe, babie: baby.
3. Italian bambino: child, simpleton.
6. Russian balalaika, imitative of the sound.
8. Old French babine: pendulous lip, and baboue: grimace (both associated with the notion of making incoherent speech sounds).

Although there is no evidence of a direct relationship between Babel, combined with “babe” in “babeling” (cf. FW 314.02 and context), and this kernel of derivations, it is most likely that the association with “babble” has had some impact on English speakers, which thus would have made Babel a part in this etymological network. Besides, through various groupings, “barbarous” has been shown to be cognate with Babel since both came to mean a confused, unintelligible language:

barbaric/barbarous, from Latin barbar(ic)us: foreign, stange, outlandish, from Greek barbar(os): non-Greek, foreign, barbarous, cognate with Old Irish barbaracht: stammering (designation of the non-Aryan nations), from the Indo-European imitative base *barb-: to stammer, to stutter, unintelligible, with 1 *balb (Latin balbus) as a collateral base and 2 “bab: the imitative base, semantically cognate with bl:- confusion (Babel).
The etymological determinations of “bababa-” emphasise how mankind acceded to language. Located after the end of the main Ricorso, at the beginning of the Divine Age (the Age of Birth or Rebirth), the thunderword links up old age (baba, babushka; the book “closes” on ALP’s dying voice) and infancy (babe, bambino) in its inaugural babble. Its unbridled flow of sounds conveys the rise of human language with “Eve and Adam’s” (FW 3.01), the infancy of language or the language of infancy, onomatopoeic (NS §447), musical (balalaïka), unintelligible in terms of semantics, and therefore universal.12 Once the Father (Hindi babu) or Vichian God comes in, sound is constituted into meaning and the “sinse” is consummated. The fall is in the emergence of sense, the vehicle of man’s subversive ideology, especially that of the Babel generation. “bababadal-” is truly cognate with balal/bll, the Hebrew root for “confusion,” and the Wake’s sesquipedalian rendering of badaboum, the French onomatopoeia for a fall. The thunderword ends with a babel of words for “thunder” in different tongues (successively Hindi, Japanese, Greek, French, Italian, Old Rumanian, Portuguese, Swedish, Dano-Norwegian, Irish). From baby’s babble to linguistic babel or the passage from innocence to perverse experience; the universal language is lost and God’s curse on Babel in order to thwart the fulfilment of man’s treacherous ideology triggers off a profusion of national linguistic identities as well as the correlated twin notions of “nativeness” and “foreignness” (barbaros).13 which the semantic unity of the thunderword will hope to mediate by its promise of a Pentecost. Ireland may hope to provide such a Pentecostal anchoring, if not restoration, of law and order thanks to the mediating nature and mixed origin of Anglo-Irish vocables, whose essence therefore cannot be adulterated by the Wake’s all-round punning and interlinguistic coinages, and to the commingling of races and of the various breeds of invaders composing the “native” Irish stock (CW 161-2ff.).

3. Ireland’s Eternal Linguistic Triangle14

a. The myth of Babel revisited

According to a tradition reported by various historians, linguists and taken up by Joyceans, Erse is descended from the only tongue to escape the miscegenation of Babel15 and can therefore be traced by uninterrupted etymology back to the Adamic language.16 Robert M. Adams indicates Geoffrey Keating’s History of Ireland, book I, sec. XV, as the source of the relevant passage in “Ithaca” concerned with the points of contact between Irish and Hebrew, soon after the comparison of both alphabets:

their antiquity, both having been taught on the plain of Shinar 242 years after the deluge in the seminary instituted by Fenius Farsaigh, descendant of Noah, progenitor of Israel, and ascendant of Heber and Heremon, progenitors of Ireland. (Li 17: 748-51)17

Hebrew is traditionally held to be descended from the Adamic language (as in Dante’s De Vulgari Eloquentia I.5-7) and the approximate homophony between Shinar, the land of the Tower of Babel, and Seanair, where Fenius Farsaidh founded a language school,19 was enough to warrant the rapprochement between the two nations and languages. Now Finnegans Wake overturns this flattering line of descent:

The babblers with their thangas vain have been (confusium hold them!) they were and went; thugging thugs were and houhnhymn songtoms were and comely norgels were and pollyfool fiansees. Menn have thawed. (FW 15.12-15)
In this evocation of the Babelian confusion of tongues (“thangas” is built on Irish teanga: tongue), the first people that is heard speaks in Gaelic, followed by Swift’s Houyhnhnms, Dano-Norwegians and Frenchmen, and asks, “do you understand?” (“thigging thugs” or Irish tuigeann tú?). The positive answer in “Menn have thawed”—an approximate rendering of the pronunciation of Irish tá: yes, is given in “thawed”—confirms the fact that in *Finnegans Wake* the Irish appear to be the first thugs to have committed the sin of linguistic pride, a Vichian forerunner of the linguistic pride of the revivalists. Erse is the first unredeemed language, the “ersed irredent” (*FW* 484.09), which is tacitly compared with irredentist pretensions through Italian irredento: unredeemed. Mixing issues of language, politics and sexuality, all teasing the notion of lawful boundary, the text reminds us that “there is many asleeps between someathome’s first and moreinausland’s last” (*FW* 116.20-21). The fall or Wakean slip/sleep carries the dialectical tension between first and last, between home or *île* (Ireland/island) and abroad or “ex-île”” (German Ausland: abroad). But can there be a point of equilibrium?

**b. The Middle Voice of Anglo-Irish**

At first sight, not only the lexical items but also the laws of English grammar are turned inside out in *Finnegans Wake* in order to become an esoteric medium for the impression/expression of tightly knit patterns of exotic features onto/in the languages of the fictional writer as “outlex.” Yet the Anglo-Irish diction keyed to the “naturalistic” backcloth escapes the miscegenation and cross-fertilisation of idioms and establishes a “middle voice,” a linguistic medium half way between the old national moribund language of the Gaels and the barbarian law of Sassenach, thus transcending the opposition between locality and foreignness. Native Irish is dismissed as a language associated with literal-grammatical and sexual perversions (cf. the uncrossed entry in VI.B.1 45, “Gael-Gail/pervert”) which turn it into the barbarous linguistic exile of a split Irr-land or erring Erin, therefore in no position to fight against the foreign law of British English. The recurrence of the “do you understand Gaelic motif?” (cf. also “is there girlic-on-you?” *FW* 174.15; an Anglo-Irish calque on an bhfhuil Gaedhealg agat?: do you know Irish?) suggests the barbarity of the Irish language, which makes it inefficient to rebel against the language of the invader/outlander since it is itself questioned as an alien language. Yet Joyce’s dismissal of both languages and ideologies in favour of the half and half Anglo-Irish/Hiberno-English idiom is not a wholly neutral stance. Joyce opposes the unruly, because uncodified, but living language of the people to both Irish and “beurla” whose statuses hesitate between fixity—Irish as a dead language and English as the linguistic tool symbolising the inflexible British rule—and mobility—English rejuvenated by foreign graftings, after its thorough dissection in “Oxen of the Sun” and Irish (Erse) destabilised in its very essence as a means of linguistic communication and evacuated as a per-verted anal language (arse). On the contrary, the musical quality of the Anglo-Irish accents confers stability on the dialect versus the norms; while Irish is assimilated into the bulk of the other foreign languages woven into the text and English words are tainted by their hybrid combinations by foreign parts of speech which they strive to subject by imposing its grammatical laws, Anglo-Irish elements very rarely enter the composition of portmanteau words and remain uncontaminated by foreign linguistic intrusion. In the *Wake*, the fact that “Anglo-Irish is English planted on the Irish cultural and linguistic substrates” would seem to give the idiom its specificity and independence rather than the burden of a dual subjection. This independence is acquired through a revolutionary process: the phonetic hibernisation of the English bedrock as well as the preservation
of Anglo-Irish vocables, while creating a specific voice to fit the Dublin protocharacters and surroundings, counteracts the anglicisation of foreign elements and somehow displaces the implicit linguistic project, from a subversion of the law of English by “alienising” it and nationalising foreign vocables to the creation of a middle Hibernian voice per se.22 But like the father whom it stands for, English is simply always rejuvenated and purified by the pure accents and vigour of the demotic Hibernian speech. Just as the displaced father will eventually be revitalised by his sons once they in turn become a father, the attempt to debunk the linguistic norm of the invader/outlander implicitly means acknowledging its importance and somehow naturalising it as “in-lawful.”

In “Telemachus” the “poor old woman” had been exposed as the servant of her conquerors (Roman catholicism and the British empire), a view which Joyce unwittingly replayed in the “Lessons” chapter of Finnegans Wake (II.2), in which the young girl fails to acquire a voice capable of lifting her out of her subordinate position to the fathering law in the footnotes.23 There, the foul-scented ideology of the young Irish gael ready to become the servant (Irish gillie) of a foreigner (Irish gall) is betrayed in her own “girlic tongue” (FW 260.F1: girl + Gaelic + garlic), in “gael, gillie, gall. Singalingalinglying. Storiella as she is syung.” (FW 267.07-08), having connotations of lying... also on the solfa sofa of the psychoanalyst that will decipher “The law of the jungen” (FW 268.F3). The young gael is one of those oppressed voices which strive to speak through the law-abiding, law-enforcing discourse. But fighting against the norm is implicitly to recognise its forcefulness and validity and Issy is therefore forced back into the footnotes after briefly and timidly taking over power in the central column.

4. The Ur-Aliens and the Lawcase of FW I.7

a. A Cursery Reading through Uralic Languages

Among the numerous fictions about the protagonists’ origins is the view of the parents as Uralians/ur-aliens (cf. FW 162.12), especially ALP as a Lap(p) (by metathesis) and HCE as a Hun and, in particular, a Finn and Scandinavian Finn MacCool.24 That Finnish is one of those languages which Joyce playfully associated with the theme of unintelligibility between peoples, born with Babel, is confirmed by two crisp comments drawn from the marginalia and footnotes in FW II.2 and separated only by a couple of pages: “Nom de nombres! The balbearians” (FW 285.L3); “Basqueesh, Finnican, Hungulash and Old Teangtaggle, the only pure way to work a curse.” (FW 287.F4). Shem’s derogatory remark in FW 285.L3 is appended to a string of numbers in Finnish from twelve to one (FW 287.17-22), announced in a preceding left-hand-margin note, “Finfinnutus of Cincinnati” (FW 285.L1), in which the c’s of Cincinnatus are replaced by f’s to bring out the Finns; its “balbearians” clearly integrates “barbarians” (and “ballbearings,” with L/R interchange). Issy’s footnote suggests that the only way to curse/insult is to use a hodgepodge of Basque (with basquaise and quiche), Finnish (with pemmican), Hungarian (with its typical goulash)—but also Cornish—which will defy understanding. Although uncrossed, the earlier conceptual note “Finlander/Finn/kitchen finnish” entered in VI.B.15 139, part of the first Finnish index (mid-Sept.-Dec. 1926), was, as it were, a thematic “pre-cursers” of Joyce’s interest for the barbaric complexities of a langue de cuisine or incomprehensible language like “Finnican,” a point which two sizeable passages, on FW 162 and 178, dealing with the complexities of Uralic grammar systems and assembled in part from the relevant index in VI.B.45 84-87, will further emphasize.27
b. The Middle Voice of Agglutinative \[\] 28

The conception of the archetypal hero as an Ur-\-alien or proto-barbarian may indicate Joyce’s wish to record the neophyte’s initial bafflement at the grammatical idiosyncrasies of Uralic languages (Finnish is dubbed a palaver in FW 325.12), and it is significant that one of the denser Uralic passages (FW 178) is to be found in FW 1.7, Shaun’s caustic portrayal of Shem’s propensity for foreignness and artificiality. Originally conceived in two parts—Shaun’s narrative description of Shem’s many vices, followed by his decision to “address myself to you” (FW 187.30-31) in a direct accusation without Shem’s defence—/\’s diatribe against his half and half of a brother was then partly recast as [‘s own confession” and the second half of the chapter turned into a dialogic lawcase in which a subtle handling of Latin cases and grammar and enunciative agencies (direct, free indirect speech, citation effects, etc.) will hint at the inevitable (con)fus ion of the “siamixed” (FW 66.20). /\’s seven “charges” (cf. the list opening 2.0 draft stage; JJA 47: 376) were thus restyled into a dramatic accusation-and-answer, then featuring the law-enforcing Justus and Musteus” (whose compliance with Justus’ uprightness is a must). The following extract will exemplify the most significant changes and additions at the junction of the two speeches, in particular the necessary second-to-first person pronounial adjustments:

Sh! Shem, you are. Sh! You are mad! <He points the deathbone and the quick are still.>

<MUSTEUS (of hisself): My fault, his fault, a kingship through a fault!> Pariah, cannibal Cain, you who oathly forswore the womb that bore you and the paps that you - I sometime sucked, you who ever since have been . . . ever haunted by a convulsionary sense of not habing been or being all that you - I might have been or <you> meant to becoming (1.7/2.7 stage; JJA 47: 480, now FW 193.27-29, 31-36) 31

The hesitancies in the recasting of second-person pronouns into first-person deictics run parallel to the heightened emphasis, in Justus’ part, of Latin inflexional grammar in order to turn the lawsuit into a case study: insertion of “obliquelike,” “pro vocative and out direct,” “and the moods and hesitensi-ies” of the deponent” 32 (JJA 47: 477; 1.7/2.7 stage) and “with the imperative of my vindicative” (JJA 47: 497; following stage). Justus wishes to substitute his own upright case as opposed to [‘s devious oblique cases (see their respective cases or types in the marginal glosses of the first half of FW II.2): his imperative accusative “[to himother)” calling [ forth (Latin pro-vocare, hence “Stand forth” in FW 187.28) to speak as the subject “of hisself” (FW 193.31) own confession and vindicate himself (“vindicative” will be later changed to a more vengeful “vendettative”). And Mercius’ reply will indeed start with “Domine vopiscus!” a vocative to the “upright one” (FW 261.23) in oblique (italic) type.

But /\-Justius’ vocative accusative unconsciously exposes his division as a speaking, quoting subject. His refusal to go on following his brother through the hesitancies of the deponent, between passive form and active meaning, is belied by his request for a confession as conferre (FW 188.04), precisely a deponent saying “I confess” to an other, thus pointing to the other in him or “himother” (cf. also FW 188.01: “wetbed confession”). How would he know after all that Shem misuses foreign parts of speech (FW 173.35-36)—unless he was merely relaying malignant hearsay—if he did not have a good command of these himself, just as /\-Shaun will put his foot in his mouth and blurt out the unpronounceable thunderword of the root/rude language (see FW 424.17-22), after enthusiastically exclaiming “Greek! Hand it to me!” (FW 419.20)? Thus, even the first narrative part of FW 1.7 may be reheard as the embedded enunciations of [‘s language quoted and mimicked by /\’s voice and point of view. This is made explicit in FW 174.11-13, when
\(-\)eye scornfully reiterates -ear’s “shemful” compromises, especially “I’m yoush, see wha’m hearing?” where the “I” and “you” are split as an immediate effect of the indirect free quotation and the specific constraints of those reported words. The reference to -Caseous in \(FW\) I.6 as “the other follow” (\(FW\) 162.24, in the dense Uralic sequence) is inverted by \(-\)’s decision to stop following his brother obliquely (\(FW\) 187.28-19; a change brought in at 1.3/2.3 stage; \(JA\) 47: 419) but the hesitancy is left unsolved in Justius’ own “Shall we follow each others . . .?” (\(FW\) 191.05). \(-\)’s use of the deponent shows that his own voice is split and turned into a (grammatical) middle voice (usually expressive of reflexive or reciprocal action) joining “I” and “you”/“he,” its duality pointing to the dual subject to be accused (note for example those two concessions added to Justus’ direct address at 1.8/2.8 stage: “zwilling though I am”—German for “twin” but also willing—and “in the uterim,” which one may choose to read also as a Hebraised plural revelation of the “us” in the uterus as well as containing Latin uter: either of two \(JA\) 47: 497)). The second draft stage (January or early February 1924) had already introduced what retrospectively could be seen as a back-and-forth movement between \(-\) and [-] suggestive of the possibility of turning the monologic accusation into the first part of a cross talk: “you know me and I know you and all yr shemeries” \(JA\) 47: 382). This then distant prospect was actualised with the decision to give a chance to speak as a subject and thus to be able to address \(-\) as an object in the accusative. In response to the progression from \(-\)-[-he to [-I (hence [-]), Mercius’ treacherously submissive “My fault, his fault, a kingship through a fault” (\(FW\) 193.31-32) inaugurates a regressive movement from [-I back to the other fellow and points to the “(z)willing” indeterminacy of “a” fault in this dialectic of accused subjects. The middle voice or genus medium (Latin genus: birth, origin, kind, gender) of the deponent confiteor seals the “agglutinative Genus” (VI.B.45 91) of [-], whose combined siglum maps out the chapter’s development; in true agglutinative fashion, \(-\) is the predicate who announces before (Latin prae-dicare) ‘s cases are suffixed to him. [-] share a common origin “in the uterim” and the end of Justius’ own speech and the following transition yield the key to their common initial: “Sh! Shem, you are. Sh! You are mad! He points the deathbone and the quick are still” \(FW\) 193.27-29; cf. also “I’m yoush”), the hush that accompanies their joint signature being the hallmark of its unpronounceable middle voice, their access to their father’s divine name (HCE, reordered as CHe) once they have merged or, in linguistic terms, agglutinated (cf. “/[-] active middle passive” in VI.B.17 59; one is also reminded of Professor Jones’s “I am speaking to us in the second person” \(FW\) 161.05-06). As Justius and Mercius in this particular chapter, they also bear the joint genitive ending typical of Latin pronouns and adjectives for “same,” “self,” “any,” “which” (etc.), whether it be wrongly interpreted as the case expressing origins or rightly as the case expressing race or kind, or a joint English accusative -us. The personality complex behind the “SHEM | MUS” acrostic (I.7§1.3l- stage; \(JA\) 47: 429) and the “Semus sumus!” (\(FW\) 168.14) equation that rounded off \(FW\) I.6 are further developed here as “Sh...(i)us: we are the (h)same us.” Like the end of \(FW\) I.6, \(FW\) I.7 closes on the reaffirmation of the impossibility to distinguish between \(-\) and [-] as the text is concerned with articulating all differences in a middle voice across genders, be it that of [-], pointing the way to the deponent father of “middlesex,” as much sinned against (passive; cf. \(FW\) 523.07-09, 28 and context), the female “desponent hortatrixy” of \(FW\) 269.31, mixing passive form (Latin hortor) with active meaning (to exhort), or the mixed (le)male plural voice at the end-beginning (\(FW\) p. 628-p. 3). The Wake’s obscene licence (cf. \(FW\) 523.34) lies in its suspension between all the polarities of gendered grammar, on which Joyce’s (usually uncrossed) generic notes in the Buffalo notebooks have repeatedly tried to pattern the family nucleus: the common
or neuter (cf. VI.B.19 127: “/\ Common / [ Neuter”), the bisexual or the epicene, the active meaning and the passive form of the deponent or middle voice, which the *Wake* borrowed “from the lapins and the grigs” (FW 113.02; also a reference to the Lapps, French *lapons*, as the VI.B.45 88 unit indicates).\(^3\) With the adjunction of Latin (and Greek) inflexional grammar, the Uralic “agglagagglomerative” (FW 186.10-11; in a Munda and Tamil linguistic context) families are thematicised as languages of *casus* or fall (also German *Fall*: [grammar] case), whose fundamental *barbarity* is indicative of the guilt-laden stammer\(^5\) of any voice, albeit a *legal* voice, which cannot avoid replicating the languages of the outlex in processes of citation and accusation. Thus upright /\ ’s claim that he *cannot decline* them causes his downfall by an effect of language; his ass should be spanked too: “asapenking” (FW 186.11).

Agglutination and the middle voice also point toward a new linguistic as well as enunciative *medium* of literary texts, to a “*tertium quid*” (FW 526.12) to which the third emerging brother, neither one nor the other but both at the same time and triune (cf. FW 526.13-14), is sometimes assimilated. As Barthes was to remark much later, from the vantage point of subsequent critical developments, about the status of writing which always holds in check attempts to identify the narratorial voice as well as the writer’s own calculated strategies:

> Seul parle quelque chose qui est comme l’*oblige* de tout sujet.\(^3\)

> La voix moyenne correspond tout à fait à l’état de l’écrire moderne: écrire, c’est aujourd’hui se faire centre du procès de parole.\(^3\)

> l’écriture est destruction de toute voix, de toute origine. L’écriture, c’est ce neutre, ce composite, cet oblique où fuit notre sujet, le noir-et-blanc où vient se perdre toute identité, à commencer par celle-la même du corps qui écrit.\(^3\)

It is perhaps in the constantly replayed divisions of the speaking, quoting, writing subject (its “ins and outs”), that the function of the Wakean “orther” (FW 397.34; cf. also FW 510.30), so familiar and so foreign, is realised. Such is the “mixed” condition towards which Joyce’s *oeuvre* gradually but steadily moved, celebrating the native as barbarous, the barbarous as native, in its happy translinguistic falls of many promiscuous returns.

Notes


2. Cf. the uncrossed notebook entry in VI.B.17 36: “[several lingua.”


4. For example, the citizen and reflecting narrator’s blasphemous violation of their own religious values (especially forceful in ll. 1812-13)—the last trigger of the citizen’s outburst of violence against Bloom was the latter’s ascription of Jewish blood to God and Christ—is given a perverse twist by bringing out the salivary connotations of their favoured euphemistic “Gob” (God) via the unholy association with the citizen’s irreverent spitting (l. 1432).

5. One of the accumulated grievances against Bloom is that he is suspected, in good antisemitic fashion, of having given the company the slip in order to cash in on the victory of the dark horse Throwaway. Joyce here seems to be working out a male replica, involving a parallactic displacement onto injured fatherhood, of the female “Ireland that eats her farrow.”

7. Several lines earlier, one of Bloom’s evocations of Gibraltar is an “[o]ld Barbary ape that gobbled all his family.” (I. 1205), an indirect acknowledgement of the etymology of “barbarian” which offers yet another variation on the trope of the devouring mother country.

8. This explanation and the following selection of derivations are taken from the appendix of Indo-European roots to The Heritage Illustrated Dictionary of the English Language, ed. William Morris (Boston: American Heritage Publishing and Houghton Mifflin, 1969) 1507.

9. It has also been suggested that “Babylon” is a corruption of “Babyland”; see Matthew J. C. Hodgart and Mabel P. Worthington, Song in the Works of James Joyce (New York: Columbia UP, 1959) 53, who refer to Iona and Peter Opie’s Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes.

10. See the Oxford English Dictionary, s. v. “Babble.”

11. Dr. Ernest Klein’s A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, unabridged one-volume ed. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971) 70, s. v. “barbaric” (the asterisks indicate hypothetical forms). Cf. FW 555.24: “rhubarbarorum” or Latin rhus barbarorum: (barbarian) rhubarb, from which the slang term used to express a babel of noises is derived.


13. For a chromatic treatment of the dialectical relationship between “inwader and uitlander” (FW 581.03) or acclimatised invader (native) and foreigner, see John Colm O’Sullivan, Joyce’s Use of Colours: Finnegans Wake and the Earlier Works (Ann Arbor: UMI Research P, 1987) 47-77.

14. This section overlaps in part with a larger study of Joyce’s use of Irish and Anglo-Irish, and I have condensed those points that I felt to be relevant for the scope of the present argument. See Laurent Milesi, “The Perversions of ‘Aersc’ and the Anglo-Irish Middle Voice in Finnegans Wake,” Joyce Studies Annual 1993, ed. Thomas F. Staley (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993) 98-118.

15. Grounding his statements on P. W. Joyce’s A Short History of Ireland, Fritz Senn writes, “Irish genealogies... profess to trace the descent of the several noble families from Adam—joining the Irish pedigrees on to the Scriptural genealogy of Magog, the son of Japhet, from whom Irish historians claim that all the ancient colonists of Ireland were descended.” (“All Agog,” A Wake Newsletter 9.6 [Dec. 1972]: 110-11).


17. See, for instance, Louis Gillet, “A propos de Finnegans[sic] Wake,” Babel: A Multi-lingual Critical Review 1.3 (1940): 101, who, possibly at Joyce’s prompt, writes that according to Celtic tradition, the old Finn founded a sort of Berlitz School in the plain of Sheeran to restore understanding after the confusion of languages.

18. The motif already appears in Ulysses (1.427) where similar adaptations of Irish syntactical constructions are to be found, often with a parodic intent as in “Put beurla on it,” “He is in my father,” “I am in his son” (see Brendan O’Hehir, A Gaelic Lexicon for Finnegans Wake and Glossary for Joyce’s Other Works [Berkeley: U of California P., 1967] 340).


20. In An Anglo-Irish Dialect Glossary for Joyce’s Works (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1986) 11, Richard Wall notes that the presence of the Anglo-Irish dialect is exponential throughout Joyce’s works and gives examples of how the English graphemes are “bent” to and rewritten as Anglo-Irish phonemes (17-23), which is part of Joyce’s constant translinguistic punning on written and oral forms.

21. I have dealt with this topic at greater length in “Toward a Female Grammar of Sexuality: The De/Recomposition of ‘Storiella as She Is Syung’,” Modern Fiction Studies 35.3 (Autumn 1989): 569-86.

22. Joyce had found confirmation of the Scandinavian ancestry of Finn McCool, one of the prototypes of Earwicker, in Heinrich Zimmer’s work; see Danis Rose and

23. This is also the case, for example, of (double) Dutch. See my “Dutch and Double Dutch Trouble Give in Finnegans Wake” (unpublished paper read at the International Conference on “Joyce and the Low Countries,” Antwerp, November 1992).

24. For a short explanation of this linguistic phenomenon, see O Hehir 392-93.


26. For this particular part of the argument, see also Fritz Senn’s “Joyce the Verb,” Coping with Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, ed. Morris Beja and Shari Benstock (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1989) 25-54.

27. This occurred at 1.7/2.7 stage, when the pages of This Quarter (Autumn-Winter 1925; proofs at 1.6/2.6 stage missing) were marked for the printer of transition 7 (probably Aug.-Sept. 1927). All draft codes are taken from The James Joyce Archive, ed. Michael Groden et al. (New York: Garland, 1978), hereafter JJA with volume number as indicated at the back of James Joyce Quarterly issues and with page identification.

28. Possibly influenced by “in mercy or justice” (FW 187.20-21), his name was changed to Mercius on the first set of transition 7 pages marked for the printer of Finnegans Wake (JJA 47: 514).

29. Chevrons indicate subsequent additions and vertical strokes isolating two segments of text connected by an arrow show a transformation by deletion.

30. Braces enclosing two segments of text connected by an arrow indicate rewriting by overlay.

31. The ultimate fusion of ear and eye is repeatedly suggested in FW I.7; e.g., FW 174.18, 178.36, 193.10.

32. See Klein 308, s. v. “genitive.”

33. Some of these linguistic-sexual issues have also been dealt with by Jean-Michel Rabaté in Joyce upon the Void: The Genesis of Doubt (New York: St. Martin’s P, 1991), especially 161-66 and 199-214.

34. The Hungarian for “fault” followed by a Finnish hesitancy are heard in FW 171.09-10: “hibat . . . kukkakould.”


37. Barthes, “Écrire, verbe intransitif?,” Essais critiques IV: le bruissement de la langue (Paris: Seuil, 1984) 28. This (absolute and objectless) intransitivity of the Barthesian verb confers on it its neuter aspect, i.e. neither active nor passive, according to ancient grammars.