CHAPTER ONE

What We Still Don't Know About
Finnegans Wake

More than three decades have elapsed since the twelve disciples were gathered together by James Joyce and commissioned to produce their Examination Round his Factification for Incarnation of Work in Progress in an attempt to open the floodgates of critical understanding in advance of Joyce's last and most difficult work. More than two decades have passed since the finished bulk of Finnegans Wake's 628 pages was made available to readers and critics. Despite Joyce's disappointment during his last years concerning the amount and caliber of critical comment, the years after his death have produced a tidal wave from the initial trickle. Already available to the lay reader and the scholar are a "skeleton key," a "census," a "reading" of Finnegans Wake, a "concordance" (and a "dictionary" is in the offing), as well as book-length studies of literary allusions, religious significance, songs, and "structure and motif" in the Wake. Articles in scholarly publications and commentaries in popular periodicals abound, and it is not unknown for a commentator to have the same article rejected as too specialized by one periodical and too general by another, only to have it accepted by a third—the gamut is wide, the quantity abundant. Yet many of the most basic questions (especially that nagging all-inclusive one asked by the layest of lay readers: "But what is it all about exactly?") remain unanswered.

The "basic" question can well remain unanswered. William York Tindall contends that "Finnegans Wake is about Finnegans Wake," and I for one am content to let it go at that. It seems preferable to beg the question rather than beggar the work. The horror of the plea is that it calls for an answer in the proverbial "25 words
or less"! Here in the flesh is that digest reader who pathetically requests a paraphrase of *Finnegans Wake*, and it is equally pathetic to note how many critics and commentators seem perfectly willing to provide some sort of "pony." When the mutilated version of *Ulysses* was being pirated in the United States in 1927, some 167 international literary personages banded together to protest vigorously. Perhaps some such group should now assemble to attest once for always that a work of literary art cannot be paraphrased, since paraphrase is a method of reducing a work into something else, and, in the case of the *Wake*, it most often proves to be reducing toward absurdity.

The only worthwhile method of explicating the *Wake* is through augmentation, not diminution. A comparison of pages 24 through 37 of *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake* with the rest of that volume is an apt case in point: these "demonstration" pages, analyzing the first four paragraphs of the *Wake*, are highly valuable to the intelligent reader in their rather full examination of those paragraphs. The rest of the Key is usually slapdash scholarship, "boiling down" Joyce's work into insipid pap, and leaving the lazy reader with a predigested mess of generalizations and catch phrases. When otherwise competent Joyceans like Wilder and Tindall quibble about how many hours of *Finnegans Wake* reading (one thousand or one hundred) make a real *Finnegans Wake* reader, they are taking away valuable time from the "angels dancing on the head of a pin" controversy. A *Finnegans Wake* "reader" is not measured by time spent but by intelligence and information contributed toward an understanding of the work.

One of the minor irritations of *Wake* scholarship results from the chapter-title confusion indicated by the chart below. It is apparent that the book is divided into four basic parts, the first three being further subdivided into chapters (eight for the first part, four each for the second and third). That Joyce preferred to leave all these parts untitled is an author's prerogative, although he referred to them at various times in his letters and in conversation by general names (the third book he called "the four watches of
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Shaun,” chapter 8 he called “Anna Livia Plurabelle,” etc.) and gave portions of the work various titles when they were published separately. Any commentator would concede that it is preferable to have a title name rather than merely call a section “Book II, chapter iii” or “chapter ii,” yet the chart below indicates vast liberties taken by critics of renaming (hence “rewriting”) Joyce’s work. Of the three sets, Mrs. Glasheen’s is obviously the purest since almost all of her suggested titles are taken from Joyce’s indications for titles. They are basic and succinct, although one or two seem mysterious to me; the list offered by Campbell and Robinson in their Key seems pompous and overblown, although they attempted to extract actual phrases from the chapters they were titling; Tindall, coming last, like Johnny MacDougall, is most intent on being clever and original. The vast variety of suggested titles (only chapters 7, 13, and 15 indicate any possible collusion) demonstrates a critical tendency among Joyceans of “I’d rather be original than right.” Titles for the four “books” (Mrs. Glasheen abstaining in this area) are:

| Book I       | Campbell and Robinson: The Book of the Parents |
| Book II      | Campbell and Robinson: The Book of the Sons   |
| Book III     | Campbell and Robinson: The Book of the People |
| Book IV      | Campbell and Robinson: Recorso               |
|              | Tindall: The Fall of Man                      |
|              | Tindall: Conflict                             |
|              | Tindall: Humanity                             |
|              | Tindall: Renewal                              |

The chapter titles are:

| Ch. 1        | Campbell and Robinson: Finnegan’s Fall        |
| Ch. 2        | Campbell and Robinson: H.C.E.—His Agnomen and Reputation |
| Ch. 3        | Campbell and Robinson: H.C.E.—His Trial and Incarceration |
| Ch. 4        | Campbell and Robinson: H.C.E.—His Demise and Resurrection |
| Ch. 5        | Campbell and Robinson: The Manifesto of A.L.P. The Hen |
| Ch. 6        | Campbell and Robinson: Riddles—The Personages of the Manifesto |
|              | Glasheen: The Wake                            |
|              | Glasheen: The Ballad                          |
|              | Glasheen: Gossip                              |
|              | Glasheen: The Lion                            |
|              | Tindall: The Fall of Man                       |
|              | Tindall: The Cad                              |
|              | Tindall: Gossip and the Knocking at the Gate   |
|              | Tindall: The Trial                            |
|              | Tindall: The Letter                           |
|              | Tindall: The Quiz                             |
Joyce-again’s *Wake*

Ch. 7  Shem the Penman  Shem the Penman  Shem  A.L.P.
Ch. 8  The Washers at the Ford  Anna Livia  Plurabelle  Children at Play
Ch. 9  The Children’s Hour  The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies
Ch. 10  The Study Period—Triv and Quad  Lessons  Homework
Ch. 11  Tavernry in Feast  The Tavern  The Tale of a Pub
Ch. 12  Bride-Ship and Gulls  Mamalujo  Tristan
Ch. 13  Shaun before the People  Shaun the Post
Ch. 14  Jaun before St. Bride’s  Jaun  Jaun’s Sermon
Ch. 15  Yawn under Inquest  Yawn
Ch. 16  H.C.E. and A.L.P.—Their Bed of Trial  Parents  The Bedroom
Ch. 17  Recorso  Dawn  New Day

I reproduce this chart here not for the sake of petty quibbling, but because this mix-up seems symptomatic of a larger confusion present in the “synopses” offered with each of these three books on the subject. These short “digests” of the most important events of each chapter have the pitiful quality of giving us the impression that the commentators, like Aesopian blindmen, were reading three different books, all oddly enough entitled *Finnegans Wake*. The fault lies not with the commentators, each of whom seems to have honestly offered what he saw as the major aspects of each chapter, but with the basic nature of “synopses.” In a work where every sentence opens a variety of possible interpretations, any synopsis of a chapter is bound to be incomplete. This tendency to offer titles and synopses is a natural one, stemming from the nature of the work itself: having to handle a vast panorama of events and personages and allusions, the working analyst attempts to offer some sort of guidelines both for himself and the reader, lest concentration on any particular part obscure its significance within the framework of the whole.

Although it is comforting to note how many new vistas into the *Wake* have been opened in recent years and how many misconceptions have been logically destroyed, it is also disconcerting to real-
ize how slow certain erroneous concepts are to die or fade away. We are involved in an area where errors have an uncanny tenacity of their own, despite the number of times requiescat in pace has been said over them. Even errors made immediately after publication and corrected by Joyce himself still crop up over twenty years later. One such is the contention made by both Harry Levin and Edmund Wilson4 that the laggard among the four old men, Johnny MacDougall, represents the province of Ulster, an error made on the basis that Ulster has been "slow" to join the rest of Ireland in breaking away from British rule. It was an intelligent error in 1939, and Joyce lauded these American critics who leaped into print with critical reviews where more angelic members of their profession feared to tread. But Joyce was quick to discredit the contention of "Ulsterman MacDougall,"5 and it now seems obvious to us that the rearguardsman should be identified with Connaught (as witness Joyce's story "The Dead"), and that the author's concern would be about intellectual and cultural backwardness to a far greater extent than political. Yet many subsequent reviewers and commentators, unheeding or unaware of the corrective, continue to refer to old Johnny as Ulster. Even the 1960 revised and augmented edition of Levin's James Joyce perpetuates its initial error.6

Another early error of long duration was to refer to Anna Livia Plurabelle as "Maggie." This error arose from the repeated use of the name and its variants in the Wake, and the attempts of critics like Wilson to arrive at the plot line of the book.7 Since Anna Livia is married to H. C. Earwicker it seems logical that she is Mrs. Earwicker (and indeed Mrs. Glasheen often refers to her as Mrs. E.). But, as Mrs. Earwicker, what is her given name? It is absurd to call her Anna Livia Earwicker; nowhere in the text is any such hybrid to be found, although manuscript draft Add MS 47473 has her sign her final letter as "Dame Anna Livia Plurabelle Earwick-er." In fact Joyce seems particularly careful to keep his H.C.E. and A.L.P. characters separate and individual as such: when the prænomen and nomen are Anna and Livia, the logical cognomen is
always Plurabelle (although the full appellation of "Anna Livia Plurabelle" is not to be found as such in the final text). This has led to the speculation that since "Mr. and Mrs. Earwicker" seems foreign as a domestic name, and since H.C.E. and A.L.P. exist as such on an archetypal level primarily, perhaps the family name of this married couple who are the "real" twentieth-century citizens of Chapelizod is in actuality Porter. This supposition is based on the common use of this name in various places throughout the *Wake* (72.3, 91.15, 104.18, 106.32, 135.7, 186.35-36, 276.L, 388.15, 560.22, 561.3, 563.24), but most often during the next-to-last chapter, where we see the Earwickers partially and perhaps fully awake in their bedroom above the pub. But this supposition carries little weight (although it seems destined to keep reappearing in articles for the next decade or so) since it presupposes accepting chapter 16 as outside the dream framework of the *Wake*, whereas it is actually still part of the dream—as witness the continuation of Joyce's "dream language"—and is merely a part of the dream closest to reality (nearest to the waking state) in the form of a cinematic scenario retelling the Earwicker story. As such it is in contradistinction to the Honorphrius* and Anita portion which succeeds it and manages to delve into the deepest part of the dream.

This still leaves us with the problem of Wilson's name of Maggie for the wife of H. C. Earwicker. If Maggie is not Mrs. E., who is she? The problem hinges on the all-important letter that has been dug up from the midden heap by the neighbor's hen, since this is where the name most often occurs (11.24, 66.19, 67.31-32, 94.16, 106.11, 23, 111.11, 15, 16, 112.28, 113.10, 116.8, 24, 120.17, 142.30, 145.2, 273.n6, 278.n6, 280.14, 20, 281.6, 14, 301.15, 302.7-8, 420.7, 458.10, 18, 459.4, 460.26, 461.28, 528.12, 615.3, 13, 31). The significance of the letter exists on various levels

* This is the spelling Joyce uses nine times in the paragraph; its alternate, Honorphrius, is used twice. The inconsistency is intended to reflect the controversy between the Semi-Arians and the accepters of the fourth-century Nicene Creed, Homoiousians and Homoousians.
(although it can safely be stated that each one is a manifestation of history: personal, political, romantic), and on a literal level the letter was apparently sent by someone in Boston named Maggie, probably a relative of the Earwickers, and addressed to them. Once read by the recipients (sometime in the past) it was discarded, only to be dug up accidentally by the hen and found by the neighbors. Thus the letter is said to contain information concerning Earwicker’s monumental indiscretion (or at least this is the interpretation placed upon it by the vindictive neighbors, the sinister McGrath and his none-too-innocent wife, Lily Kinsella). In actuality it is merely a chatty, newsy sort of family letter written by the American cousin, containing either news of or a reference to the Boston Tea Party. That historic act then becomes an aspect of Earwicker’s misdemeanor: it was illegal, performed under cover of night, and employed disguises, although rather transparent ones to all concerned; it involved tea, a shibboleth in the *Wake* for love and sex (particularly “wetting the tea”). As such the evidence is there to accuse if not convict the suspicious publican.

On an allegorical level, the letter is a record of universal history, written by the artist-prophet Shem (apparently at the behest of the archetypal woman A.L.P., the source of the secrets of the creation, procreation, and perpetuation of the species) and stolen by the bourgeois politician brother Shaun for the purpose of passing it off as his own in order to reap the reward of making the universal secrets accessible to and palatable for his constituents and followers. It is the final form of the letter which best demonstrates this function (615-19); here Anna Livia vindicates the archetypal man H.C.E., and the letter serves like those of Paul and Peter in the New Testament to deify the Son of Man. In this context Maggie is seen in her role as Mary Magdalene, and her two personalities (before and after salvation) provide the split personalities of the Earwicker daughter, Issy.

It is on the third level, therefore, that Maggie is most important, since the letter-writer is Issy; the recipient varies often from the “aged” lover who is in reality her father, to either the Shem-figure
or the Shaun-figure (or both), to her mirror image. When she is writing to her “lover” (either the Mark-Finn-Swift-Dodgson-Noah personification of H.C.E. or her Tristram-Dermot-young Swift brother), the tone is borrowed from Swift’s “little language” in the Journal to Stella. When the receiver is Issy herself or her other self, the split mirrors the rivalry of the two girls (whether actual or Joyce-invented): Stella vs. Vanessa, Alice Liddell vs. Isa Bowman, Iseult of Ireland vs. Iseult of Brittany. But it is apparent that the Maggie of the Wake is not mother but daughter, except in the flashbacks when A.L.P. remembers herself as her young self—“just a young thin pale soft shy slim slip of a thing then” (202.27) and “Just a whisk brisk sly spry spink spank sprint of a thing theresomere” (627.4-5). As the Census of Finnegans Wake correctly maintains, the “Maggies” of “The Mime of Mick, Nick and the Maggies” (215-59) are the plural form of Issy, and are the temptresses who lurk throughout, especially as the Raven and the Dove, the “Magdalenes,” the first two parts of the Sally-Christine split personality found in Morton Prince’s The Dissociation of a Personality. When multiplied into the Maggies of the Mime, playing the children’s game of “Colours,” they shift from two to seven, in the same relationship between the rainbow of seven colors that appeared to Noah as an omen and the two birds that he sent out from the ark, the raven and the dove.

Maggie is thus Issy, and the Maggies are the “Iseults”; Anna Livia (except in the nonliteral sense that her daughter succeeds her) is not Maggie, and the name “Maggie Earwicker” is a misnomer for her.* When Wilson first made this error in “The Dream of H. C. Earwicker” in June, 1939, it was certainly a venial one, but its continued repetition in so many critical commentaries since indicates the existence of plagiarized ideas without original thought, and a basic ignorance of Finnegans Wake and the prodigious amount of work by varied hands performed during the past two decades.

*At the risk of flailing a dead horse, attention might be called to Mrs. Antrobus in Thornton Wilder’s The Skin of Our Teeth: her name is Maggie.
Many problems exist in the nebulous area which Mrs. Glasheen delightfully calls "Who is who when everybody is somebody else." The publication of the first volume of Joyce's letters in 1957 seems to have done more to compound rather than simplify these problems. In discussing the embryonic *Wake* he refers to his "Shem-Ham-Cain-Egan" character; whereas Cain and Ham are obvious prototypes for the accused Shem, Egan seems to be a startling inclusion. There is no quarreling with the identification in the *Census* of the "Pierce Egan" who appears at 447.23 of the *Wake* as the author of "Compost liffe in Dufblin" as a nineteenth-century "English sporting writer, whose works include *Real Life in Ireland by a Real Paddy*." That this "sham" writer is a fitting mask for Shem is also obvious, but somehow this single allusion to Egan hardly seems to justify Joyce's coupling him with Cain and Ham.

Even more perplexing is Joyce's reference to "Cain-Shem-Tristan-Patrick" in a letter to Harriet Weaver dated 16 August 1924. Although all critics agree that Shem is Cain, many from Campbell and Robinson on down through the post-*Key* years have assumed that it is Shaun who is both Tristan and Patrick. The *Key* had unequivocably listed Tristan as Shaun, and labeled the St. Patrick of the *ricorso* as "Shaunish"—judgments which remained fairly standard and were reiterated often; e.g., M. J. C. Hodgart: "St. Patrick (who like St. Kevin represents Shaun) refuses to follow the sophistries of the druid (Shem)." The *Census*, appearing twelve years after the *Key*, also accepted Shaun-Patrick, but insisted that Shem was Tristram. When the Joyce letters were published a year after, the *Census*-taker had some very serious second thoughts, offering a corrigendum in "Out of My Census" (dated 1959). Accepting the hint that Shem was St. Patrick, Mrs. Glasheen went on to recognize Shem as Taff and Shaun as Butt (with various pieces of evidence offered: "Taffy Was a Welshman" identifying Shem, while Billy Budd, butter, Burrs, Buck Mulligan, and a barrel produce Shaun), but cautioned: "I am understandably leery of the confident statement and here say firmly that I cannot really read 'Buckley and the Russian General' or 'The Archdruid and St. Patrick'."
One's first temptation is to turn a leery eye at Joyce himself and attempt to pass off his casual comment of "my one bedazzled eye searched the sea like Cain-Shem-Tristan-Patrick"\textsuperscript{18} as a wholly personal one, Joyce visualizing himself in these various roles without intending that Miss Weaver (the letter's recipient) should transfer the allusion to the embryonic \textit{Wake}, but this seems hardly likely to anyone who has retrospectively followed Joyce's self-involvement in his work. Nor would an attempt to devalue the postulation as being premature (1924 being only the second year of Joyce's efforts on the book) be plausible, since dated evidence indicates that by the time this remark was written, Books One and Three were already in rough draft. But it is still conceivable that there exists in the \textit{Wake} a corresponding composite to the Shem-Cain-Tristan-Patrick mentioned—in the form of a Shaun-Abel-Tristan-Patrick counterpart.

The recent publication of Clive Hart's \textit{Structure and Motif in Finnegans Wake} may well prove to be a timely aid in unscrambling the confusing conglomeration of Butts and Taffs and Tristrams and Patricks, since Mr. Hart does much to establish a concept of time-and-space in the \textit{Wake}, the movements, changes and reversals of which may offer a guide to the confused and a beacon to the lost. In discussing the Shem-Shaun polarity, Mr. Hart notes

\ldots two extremes to the function of this polarity, between which the line of development swings to and fro: when their orbits are in close proximity they war with each other and—at a moment of exact equilibrium—even manage to amalgamate, while at the other extreme there is total incomprehension and a failure to communicate, symbolised by the point of farthest separation of the orbits.\textsuperscript{19}

The meeting points, therefore, are in chapters \textit{i}, \textit{ii}, and \textit{i7} (at beginning, middle, and end), so that the structure overlapping the \textit{Wake} is the figure that symbolizes infinity. Thus, the couplings of Mutt-Jute and Muta-Juva ("the same event looked at from opposite sides"\textsuperscript{20}) as well as Butt-Taff, involve interchangeability and identity rather than antagonism and dissimilarity. This is corroborated by internal evidence in the case of Butt and Taff. The open-
ing cry of "We want Bud" (337.32) indicates the popularity of the hero and suggests Shaun, while the *Skeleton Key* maintains that the Butt-Shem figure has the characteristics of invader, and Taff those of the native defender.\(^{21}\) Also, whereas Taff is described as "a smart boy" (338.5), Butt is a "mottledged youth" (338.11), suggesting the descriptions in the Mime program of Shem as "the bold bad bleak boy" (219.24) and Shaun as "the fine frank fair-haired fellow" (200.12)—the extremity of the earlier description is certainly greatly tempered by the time the pair reach the middle chapter, but a touch of Shem is nonetheless present in Butt, and an element of Shaun in Taff. Both, incidentally, share a clerical affinity, Butt being of "clerical appearance" (338.11), while Taff is "of the peat freers" and "the karmalife order" (338.5-6). At least one key to their reconciled personalities is available in another pair mentioned just before the Butt-Taff scene, the Saxon chiefs Horsa and Hengest, both sons of the same father and therefore "hunguest and horasa, jonjemsums both" (325.17), elsewhere codified as "but Heng's got a bit of Horsa's nose and Jeff's got the signs of Ham round his mouth" (143.22-24), so that not even such opponents as Ham and Japhet are incapable of Joycean reconciliation.

Does a neutralized Butt-Taff, however, necessarily lead to a neutral St. Patrick? It becomes apparent from internal evidence in the *Wake* that both Shem and Shaun share aspects of the Irish saint, whose existence in the book, like that of St. Kevin, remains somewhat nebulous until the final chapter. It may be noted that Shem has "an adze of a skull" (169.11), while Shaun calls upon the blessings of "Haggispatrick" (404.35); Shem is identified as being in "his pawdry's purgatory" (177.4), but at another instance "Shaun replied patly, with tootlepick tact" (410.24); Shem is heard to "squeal like holy Trichepatte" (228.6), while Shaun is addressed as "Mr Trickpat" (487.23). Numerically, the Shaun-as-Patrick pattern is slightly greater (91.6, 404.35, 410.24, 411.20, 425.28, 442.36, 447.29, 472.1-2, 478.26, 484.1, 485.7-8, 486.2, 487.23, 490.14), but the Shem references seem stronger and more
apt (169.11, 177.4, 228.6, 301.30, 352.36-353.1, 424.34, 425.30, 463.1, 464.16, 479.12, 490.8-10, 564.32). Nonetheless, it should be apparent that, even with a handful of these correspondences in doubt, there seems to be a fairly well-balanced number of Patricks in Shem and Shaun.

And what of Tristram?* Of the many allusions to the name in the *Wake*, only five can be interpreted to apply to either one of the Earwicker sons with any degree of assurance. Of the four that allude to Shaun, "fairescapading in his natsirt" (388.3) links Tristan (a reversed *natsirt*) with Parnell (Shaun) since the Irish leader is reputed by a scrap of apocrypha to have escaped down a fire escape in his nightshirt when almost apprehended in a Tristan situation with his Isolde, Kitty O'Shea. A more substantial reference identifies "Trinathan partnick dieudonnay" (478.26), coupling Shaun with Patrick, Swift, and Tristan (but also with Nick, the Devil, indicating perhaps that Shaun is part Nick and part Mick). The two other allusions are to "toppling Humphrey hugging Nephew" (484.9), Tristan being Earwicker-Mark's nephew, and "Tantris, hattrick, tryst" (486.7), which again groups Tristan and Patrick with Shaun. Shem, on the other hand, is linked with Tristan and Wagner's *Liebestod* when Shaun refers to Shem swigging "a slug of Jon Jacobsen from his treestem sucker cane. Mildbut likesome!" (424.27-28); again Patrick's shamrock in *treestem* and his British name (Sucat) in *sucker* indicate that Tristan and Patrick share a duality all their own in the *Wake*. In the Yawn scene the Interrogators (as much befuddled as most critics) investigate the disintegrating corpus with every intention of finding out its identity. Aware of the Jacob-Esau switch which fooled blind Isaac, these four Aesopian blindmen are understandably suspicious: "Hood maketh not frere," they assert; "The voice is the voice of jokeup, I fear" (487.21-22). "Are you imitation Roma now or Amor now" (487.22-23), they wonder, addressing Yawn as "Mr Trickpat"

* A recent mining of Tristram information can be found in David Hayman's "Tristan and Isolde in *Finnegans Wake*: A Study of the Sources and Evolution of a Theme," *Comparative Literature Studies*, I, No. 2 (1964), 93-112.
(487.23), indicating that the body belongs to a composite Patrick-Tristan, but contains an internal dichotomy as well: between Roma (the Church of Rome represented in Ireland by St. Patrick) and Amor (the concept of chivalric love associated with Tristram).

If anyone is expected to recognize Tristram it is certainly Iseult, yet she seems no more certain than more objective observers. On at least two occasions Shaun claims that her letters are addressed to him: "you, sis, that used to write to us the exceeding nice letters" (431.29), and in reply to the comment: "you have your letters": "Throsends. For my darling. Typette!" (478.1-3). We should, however, remember that Shaun is a purloiner of other people's mail. Yet, one version of Iseult's love letter addresses her lover variously as "Jaunick"* (457.36), "Joke" (458.13), "Jerk" (458.15), "Jack" twice (459.27, 460.27), "joey" (460.36), "Shane" (461.25), "Jaime" (461.31), and "Juan" (461.31). Jack and Juan are obviously John (therefore Shaun), while Jaime and Jer are James and Jerry (therefore Shem); Shane can be either Shem or Shaun (but certainly implies St. Patrick since Slane was the scene of Patrick's conversion of the druid). Joke could be either Jake-Jacob-Shem or Jack-John-Shaun. Joey fails to unlock either door, while Jaunick combines John-Shaun with Nick-Shem. The confusion is compounded in Iseult's closing "Hymn" to the Tristram-Iseult chapter: "By the cross of Cong, says she, rising up Saturday in the twilight from under me, Mick, Nick the Maggot or whatever your name is, you're the mose likable lad that's come my ways yet from the barony of Bohermore" (399.25-28). And the last line of the chapter reads: "So, to john for a john, johnejams, led it be!" (399.34), johnejams echoing "John a'Dream's" (61.4) and coupling John and James, Shaun and Shem.

This ambivalent Tristram, then, indicates a basic pattern in Finnegans Wake somewhat more complex—but no less patterned—than that described by Mr. Hart's infinity shape. The Wake actually forms three arcs instead of two, as Shem and Shaun come together at four points: the opening chapters, the end of the first book, the

* Pronounced "yonic," this suggests sexual ambivalence as well.
last two chapters of the second book, and throughout the final chapter. The pattern is formed in this way: all is chaos at the opening of the cycle into which the twins are born: "A.D. 1132. Two sons at an hour were born until a goodman and his hag. These sons called themselves Caddy and Primas. Primas was a santryman and drilled all decent people. Caddy went to Winehouse and wrote "peace a farce. Blotty words for Dublin" (14.11-15). Clearly defined as Cain and Abel, the two brothers have not yet fought, and although easily differentiated between they are as innocent of conflict as the nursery rhyme rhythms of this piece indicate. In short, they are at peace, although that peace is merely a farce.

Soon after, Mutt confronts Jute, but a significant switch in roles takes place before they ever speak to each other. The Jute who is the defender is identified as a Shaun-surrogate, since he is "Comestipple Sacksoun" (15.35), and the Earwicker handyman, Mahan ("What a quhare soort of a mahan"—16.1), and Mick ("michindaddy"—16.1-2). Yet, by the time the conversation begins, this same Jute is the invader approaching the defender, Mutt; the switch is apparent from "Let us swop hats and excheck a few strong verbs weak each eather yapyazzard" (16.8-9). Which son plays Mutt and which plays Jute is of no significance at this stage, and the confusion of roles carries over into the Jarl van Hoober episode in which Tristopher and Hilary are indeed interchangeable and indeed interchanged by the kidnaping Prankquean (although a member of the Joyce family might insist that they are "Bile Beans" and "Sunny Jim" respectively). Chapter 1 ends with no clear Shem-Shaun differentiation, nor is there one in the second chapter either. We may strongly suspect that the Cad who accosts Father Earwicker in the park is cadet Shem, and that the balladmonger Hosty is Shem the Holy Ghost, but Clive Hart's assertion that the first half of the book is Shem-oriented while the second half is Shaun-oriented explains the greater emphasis on Shemmishness for these two anti-Earwickerians. It is only when the fourth chapter brings us to the trial of Festy King that an apparent split is evident between the brothers, but even here the visual similarities are
emphasized. No conviction is possible because no one can distinguish between Festy King and Pegger Festy, and the existence of a third force, the Wet Pinters, advances the confusion caused in attempting to identify the three soldiers in Phoenix Park in any mathematical way with Shem and Shaun.

By chapter 6, however, the battle lines are drawn with certainty: apparently the twelve questions are asked by Shem ("set by Jockit Mic Ereweak"—126.7) and answered by Shaun, and question 11 involves Shaun in his self-defense through his surrogates, the Mookse and Burrus, against Shem's personification as the Gripe and Caseous. The next chapter also ends with the conflict at high gear between Shaun-Justius and Shem-Mercius, but with the final chapter of Book I, night falls on the gossiping of the washerwomen, who merge into a tree and a stone while invoking the "tale told of Shaun or Shem" (215.35), which becomes a tale of "stem or stone" (216.3-4), but indistinguishable from each other in the darkness. Although very different sorts of things, the tree and the stone unite into "tree-stone" or "Treestone" (113.19) or "Trees-tam" (104.10) or finally "Tristan" (398.29). And we shall soon see that this single figure will again become the unified form of Shem and Shaun.

But Book Two opens with open conflict again: "the Brothers Bratislavoff" (219.14) are pitted against each other in the Mime, with the Nick figure as "Glugg" played by "Mr Seumas McQuillad" (219.22), and the Mick protagonist portrayed as "Chuff" by "Mr Sean O'Mailey" (220.11). The battle continues on into the next chapter where Kev and Dolph are at their lessons and at each other's throats. And, although the third chapter abandons the Earwicker children for the tavern scene, the Tale of the Norwegian Captain and Kersse the Tailor presents another set of opposing forces, most often identified with Earwicker confronted by his Cadversary. But the tale ends in the assimilation of the roving pirate, and the ensuing television skit offers Butt and Taff, interchangeable opponents who finally merge in Buckley to shoot the Earwickerian Russian General. Not only have the antagonistic sons
become “now one and the same person” (354.8), but they have been turned inside out and backward and upside down as well, so “till but again budly shoots thon rising germinal let bodley chow the fatt of his anger and badley bide the toil of his tubb” (354.34–36). Thus the last chapter of this book deals with the combined tree-stone again, in the chapter involving the bridal ship of “Trustan with Usolde” (383.18).

Book Three then begins the battle over again on a new level: dealing with what Joyce called “the four watches of Shaun,” the first three chapters of this book at least keep Shaun in the foreground, as he is transmuted from Shaun to Jaun via Haun to Yawn. At each stage he is faced with his brother-antagonist: as he tells the tale of himself as Ondt confronted by Shem as Gracehoper, as he attacks Shem for “his root language” (424.17), as he berates Shem for his sexual liberties (“we’ll go a long way towards breaking his outsider’s face for him for making up to you”—442.22–24—), and as he departs as Jaun and introduces his successor, “lost Dave the Dancekerl” (462.17). The disintegration of Jaun as Haun results in the Yawn-corpus of the next chapter, where so many of the Tristram and Patrick allusions are encrusted, until the last chapter of Book III brings us by the backward progress of *Wake*-time to the infancy of Jerry and Kevin. The St. Kevin who comes into prominence in the final book is thus a composite figure like Tristan, and is the result of the final pre-birth harmony of Shem-and-Shaun elements, but before the book ends, Muta and Juva (mutated and rejuvenated) * face each other at the new battlefield of Slane for the encounter of St. Patrick and the Archdruid.

In the previous two instances at which harmony concludes the brother conflict, the part of harmonizing agent was played by women: the washerwomen created the tree-stone (chapter 8); Iseult’s hymn celebrated the combined Tristram (chapter 12); and now Mamalujo, “four dear old heladies” (386.14–15), usher in

* Regarding the problem of the chicken and the egg: an examination of Biddy the hen tells us about her “volucrine automutativeness” (112.12), while “Ague will be rejuvenated” (112.20) (italics mine).
the final harmony, established finally by Anna Livia in the ricorso. The implications in the last two chapters are that the twin sons cannot be accepted at face value since they have reversed roles again. The suspicion that they were changed in their cradles as infants is beginning to develop: "The coeds, boytom thwackers and timbuy teaser. Here is onething you owed two noe. This one once upon awhile was the other but this is the other one nighadays" (561.4-6). In the last chapter, the final version of Anna Livia's letter corroborates this reversal: 'both are Timsons now they've changed their characticals during their blackout' (617.13-14), and her final soliloquy adds to the idea that their identities were never very certain:


It logically then follows that the sons in the Wake are at various instances unified into a single figure, are themselves as a pair, and are multiplied by Joyce's "inflationary" process into a trio. In the last group they are most often the Three Soldiers, therefore Tom, Dick, and Harry (an obvious threesome in "thump, kick and hurry" [285.6], but disguised as two in "tomthick and tarry" —291.7); Shem, Ham, and Japhet ("shame, humbug and profit" —582.10); the Roman triumvirate ("Oxthievious, Lapidous and Malthouse Anthemy"—271.5-6); the three "musketeers" (64.22); the brothers in Swift's Tale of a Tub ("padderjagmartin"—86.2); perhaps Pegger Festy, Festy King, and the Wet Pinter; or just A.B.C. ("Arty, Bert or possibly Charley Chance" —65.16).* As two they are the well-defined pair of hostile oppo-

*At various instances Joyce seems to be interrupting to allow the weary reader to plead for a halt. This literal-minded reader is called "abcedmined" (18.17)—"abcedeed" (140.14), "a B.C. minding" (272.12-13), "abseses" (552.7), "Abbreaciades" (534.2), and even "antiabcedarian" (198.20). Joyce is tampering with language here at its most basic level, the "alphabites" (263.n1), the "A.B.C." (65.28). The Greek equivalent is found in "alfi byrni gamman
sites, too long considered to be always in opposition, whereas there are many instances in which they are not in conflict necessarily, nor even distinguishable from each other. Horsa and Hengest have already been mentioned in this context, and so might be: Tim and Tom; Olaf and Ivor ("an Ivor the Boneless or an Olaf the Hide" —100.25-26; with Sitric they form a threesome: "Olaf's on the rise and Ivor's on the lift and Sitric's place's between them"—12.31-32); Romulus and Remus ("robulous rebus"—12.34);
deleter etca zezerata treacla youghta kaptor lomdom noo" (568.32-33) and "ardent Ares, brusque Boreas and glib Ganymede like zealous Zeus" (269.17-18), while the Hebrew version, the "allaphbed" (18.18), is seen in "allauughed . . . baited . . . gammat" (492.4) and "Mac Auliffe . . . MacBeth . . . MacGhimley . . . MacDollett" (290.6-9). Since the third Hebrew letter stands for camel, we find "alphabeater cameltemper" (553.2-3) and a fully translated "oxhousehumper" (107.34). "Olives, beets, kimmells, dollies" (19.8-9) become ironed as "alfrids, beatties, cormacks and daltons" (19.9). The alphabet also serves as a personification of the three soldiers, "Arty, Bert or possibly Charley Chance" (65.16), and when the girl is Margareena, the rivals are "Antonius-Burrus-Caseous" (167.4). Three become one in the person of "A. Briggs Carlisle" (514.26), Dublin's Carlisle Bridge, or "Abraham Bradley King" (294.24), a former lord mayor of Dublin, also seen in "Abraham Badly's King" (421.5-6). Two instances at which the entire alphabet is paraded (plus two Greek extras to produce the monthly number of 28) are "Ada, Bett, Celia, Delia, Ena, Fretta, Gilda, Hilda, Ita, Jess, Katty, Lou, (they make me cough as sure as I read them), Mina, Nippa, Opsy, Poll, Queeniee, Ruth, Saucy, Trix, Una, Vela, Wanda, Xenia, Yva, Zulma, Phoebe, Thelma" (147.11-15) and "apple, bacchante, custard, dove, eskimo, feldgrau, hemitite, isingglass, jet, kipper, lucile, mimosa, nut, oysterette, prune, quasimodo, royal, sago, tango, umber, vanilla, wisteria, xray, yesplease, zaza, philomel, theerose" (247.35-248.2). Other listings may not run the gamut "from aab to zoo" (263.11), but include "Arm bird colour defdum ethnic fort perhaps? Sure and glomsk handy jotalpheson as well" (89.33-34); "aiden bay scye and dye" (327.34); "amreeta beaker coddling doom" (91.22); "ach beth cac duff" (250.34); "adder's badder cadder" (303.29); "aped one . . . based two . . . seed three" (314.10-12); and even "a boer constructor" (180.35). Backward they are "Carrageen moss and blaster of Barry's and Asther's mess" (184.21-22) and "this Calumnious Column of Cloaxity, this Bengalease Beacon of Biloxity, this Annamite Aper of Atrocity . . . a badbad case" (179.13-16); and a slightly scrambled "and outworn buyings, dolings and chafferingers" (597.18). Even single words like "Abbrace" (106.32) and "abracadabra" (184.26) are suspect, while the anagram of "bloody antichill cloak" (99.12) may imply Bailé-átha-Cliath, the old Irish name for Dublin.
and Saints Peter and Paul ("Sinner Pitre and Sinner Poule"—192.13). On the individual level, they unify harmoniously for a joint purpose (usually the same one that creates three out of two: to plague the father) as Buckley, Tristram, St. Patrick, St. Kevin, Hosty, and the Cad. A single-minded view of Shem and Shaun exclusively as antagonists, therefore, dismisses various important layers of significance in Joyce’s scheme in the *Wake*, two of which are probably as significant as the Bruno theme: the overthrow of the father figure and the cyclical evolution of historical patterns.

In all, the problem of identifying a *Wake* character by his associated historical or mythical prototype is often oversimplified and can be rather misleading. As Mrs. Glasheen’s chart shows, very often two of Joyce’s characters are served by a single prototype or share the characteristics of a single personage. For example, when Earwicker is the patriarch Abraham, Shaun is Isaac, the son who is chosen to inherit from his father; when Earwicker is the old Isaac, the same Shaun is the Esau who is disinherited (conversely, Shem is the disinherited Ishmael and the Blessed Jacob). The parallels in *Finnegans Wake* are never simple because Joyce’s capriciousness (intentional and logically supported) and his sense of the real complications of things always lead him to prove that parallel lines eventually meet. With this concept in mind one can answer many questions posed by Mrs. Glasheen in her chart and correct some of the answers there. Although H.C.E. is Oscar Wilde when the Irish author is the "fallen hero," it is Shem who personifies Wilde when we think of Wilde as the aesthete who mocks convention and propriety. When Earwicker is being maligned early in chapter 2, he is conceived of as "a great white caterpillar capable of any and every enormity in the calendar" (33.23-34), and the ballad that concludes the chapter labels him "Fingal Mac Oscar Onesine Bargearse Boniface" (46.20). Shem, on the other hand, is identified with the mocker and the fugitive, and as Glugg threatens to "fire off, gheol ghiornal, foull subustioned mullmud, his farced epistol to the hibruws" (228.32-34)—using Wilde’s adopted name of Sebastian Melmoth. But if Shem is author Wilde
then it is logical to assume that Shaun the Boast will claim the title also: he quotes Wilde at the beginning of chapter 13, "which bit his mirth too early or met his birth too late" (408.16-17), and soon lays claim to the title and position: "I am, thing Sing Larynx, letter potent to play the sem backwards like Oscaan wild or in shunt Persse transluding from the Otherman or off the Toptic" (419.23-25). Thus all three principal male participants in the Wake can be seen masquerading as Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde.

Another question of identity concerns the music hall pair (at least in Joyce's eyes) of Pigott and Parnell. It is apparent, as the "Who is who" chart states, that Shem is Richard Pigott to Shaun's Charles Stewart Parnell (when we think in terms of Shem as the scoundrel and "forger" and Shaun as the political figure beloved by his people). Who then is Gladstone? asks the chart's author. Here we pose a new situation. It is certainly Earwicker who is the "Grand Old Man" and Shem and Shaun are then a combined Parnell, a thorn in his thick hide as they were in Isaac Butt's. It is in this sense that Shem and Shaun as Taff and Butt combined as Buckley to shoot the Russian General, H.C.E., and also combined as Napoleon to plague the hero on the white horse, Wellington, the Iron Duke. But when Kitty O'Shea enters the Parnell picture, it is Earwicker who is Parnell, the hero destroyed by the temptress (interestingly enough both Parnell and H.C.E. are Protestants). Then again when Shaun becomes Tim Healy to betray Parnell, that Parnell seems to be Shem; Shaun's role is then a dual one as the betraying politician and the Roman Catholic clergy hounding the uncrowned king. In this context much of Jaun's vicious sermonizing takes on an added significance, particularly in the section which rails against the "lecherous" Shem:

Divulge . . . divorce into me and say the curname in undress . . . of any lapwhelp or sleevemongrel who talks to you upon the road . . . and volunteers to trifle with your roundlings for proffered glass and dough . . . without taking out his proper password from the eligible ministriess for affairs with the black fremdling, that enemy of our coun-
try, in a cleanlooking light and I don’t care a tongser’s tammany hang who the mucky is. . . . He’s a markt man from that hour [441.24-442.18].

It is therefore equally true that, depending upon the context, if the motif is that of the brother conflict, Shem and Shaun are Pigott and Parnell, Parnell and Healy, Parnell and Gladstone, as well as Gladstone and Disraeli.

The coincidence of names is thus of great importance. Joyce obviously delighted in every such coincidence, but, since he selected his material, we must assume that no name finds its way into the *Wake* by accident, without first having passed through the author. The existence of two Isouls was apparent grist for Joyce’s multiple-level mill and fits his scheme of things perfectly. But two Tristrums required searching, and the existence of Sir Almeric Tristram in Irish history, particularly in connection with Howth, offered Joyce a second level for many allusions involving the interaction of political invasion with “amorous” invasions—the marrying and settling down of the invader, planting roots and defending his new homeland. Time after time in the *Wake* a single name opens two or more possibilities: Oscar can mean the grandson of Finn MacCool or the famous literary son of “Speranza,” Lady Wilde; Noah is both the Biblical figure, whose night of drunkenness provides an important parallel for the division of the sons, and Sir Noah Guinness, the brewer of nineteenth-century Dublin; Arthur implies both the legendary king who is a parallel for both Finn and Mark of Cornwall and the Duke of Wellington, as well as another Guinness; Mark is the gospeler, hence Marcus Lyons, the uncle of the amorous Tristram, and Mark Twain; Oliver is both the friend of Roland and the Cromwell who invaded Ireland; Isaac is the Biblical patriarch, Parnell’s predecessor Butt, and Swift’s pseudonym Bickerstaff. And so the list develops and expands, until the reader realizes that even Michael offers a set of possibilities, that the Archangel who is the Mick-prototype for Shaun is not the same character as the “Father Michael” who figures in the Letter, and may well have been an early lover of Anna Livia, although
only two overt indications are apparent and neither indicates that the Michael in question is actually "Father" Michael, but "Michael Arklow" (203.18) and "Michael vulgo Cerularius" (573.4). That Earwicker may be his own predecessor as Anna Livia's lover is suggested by his characterization as "Mr Makeall Gone" (220.24), another Michael to contend with. It has been noted in many critiques of the Wake that the Gaiety Theatre impresario of Joyce's day, Michael Gunn, provides an important model for Earwicker, but most important because the various versions of his name in the Wake underscore him as God (the one above suggests creator and destroyer): "Duddy Gunne" (104.8), suggesting God the Father, also "dead and gone"; "gunnfodder" (242.10); "Gonn the gawds" (257.34); "Master's gunne" (531.4-5); "Diu! The has goning at gone" (598.9). The Michael Gunn who is God the Father would logically produce the Archangel Michael to fight his battle in heaven against Lucifer.

The greatest confusion in this area concerns characters named Tim and Tom, since both names offer a variety of echoes separate from each other and related to each other. That "Thomas" means "twin" in Hebrew is significant in relation to Shem and Shaun, but hardly serves to differentiate between them. The "Tom" of "Tom, Dick and Harry" (at least a score of these are apparent in the Wake—8.26-27, 19.27-28, 55.15, 90.3-4, 285.6, 291.7, 313.26-27, 316.5, 322.9, 325.34, 329.3, 337.30, 351.1-2, 354.32, 376.26, 410.35-36, 425.25, 485.11, 506.1-2, 575.26, 578.6-7, 597.6—not including those closer to "Shem, Ham and Japhet") again indicates one of the brothers when they expand into the trio of soldiers who spy on Earwicker and the girls in the park. As such this Tom is Kipling's soldier, Tommy Atkins, as well as Twain's Tom Sawyer, the pun on whose surname also reveals the proverbial "peeping Tom" of Godiva fame. To this list may also be added "doubting Thomas," although I can find no specific reference to him in the Wake. All of these Toms and Thomases fit one or both of the sons of Earwicker, but do not cover Joyce's own characters, Treacle Tom and Toucher Tom (the two may well be one and the
same person), although their nefarious personalities may also disclose them to be Shemites of a sort.

Tim, on the other hand, more often seems to identify Earwicker, since Tim Finnegan is a predecessor or prototype of H.C.E., but Tim Healy, who also figures occasionally in the *Wake* ("Healiopolis," 24.18; "timocracy," 291.8; etc.), may indicate either Shaun in his conflict with Parnell, or more often Earwicker as the successful politician and head of the household ("Uncle Tim's Caubeen"—622.7). But most often I suspect both Tim and Tom to imply the Egyptian God-Creator, Atem or Tem or Mut, whose expectoration on the dunghill created Man; thus: "he could call himself Tem, too, if he had time to? You butt he could anytom" (88.35-36). This leads to the conjecture that Earwicker as master-builder Tim Finnegan and mankind-creator Atem and Father Time or Cronos subdivides himself into his children, the "anytoms," who as "Tom, Dick and Harry" expand into Everyone. This is borne out in

Length Without Breath, of him, a chump of the evums, upshoot of picnic or stupor out of sopor, Cave of Kids or Hymanian Glattstoneburg, denary, danery, donnery, domm, who, entirely as he continues highlyfictional, tumulous under his chthonic exterior but plain Mr Tu- multy in muftilife, in his antispences as in his recognisances, is, [Dominic Directus] a manyfeast munificent more mob than man [261.13-22].

The danger, therefore, of thinking in terms of a single Tim-Tom figure, or even separate but clearly defined Tim and Tom, becomes manifold as we realize the multiplicity of allusions these names conjure up and the variety of possibilities that can result from them. A remote clue to the sameness of Tim and Tom may be extracted from *A Portrait of the Artist* where Simon Dedalus calls the curate with, "Tim or Tom or whatever your name is" (AP 95).*

When dealing with the Earwicker children it is important to appreciate what appears to be an "inflationary" or "augmentation" or "exaggeration" approach taken by the author. On the largest scale

---

* Echoes: "Mick, Nick the Maggot or whatever your name is" (399.26-27); "Pat Whateveryournameis" (479.12).
the two boys and a single girl ("little Porter babes . . . The coeds, boytom thwackers and timbuy teaser"—561.3-4) are as much indicative of all children ("all the chippy young cuppinjars clattering round us, cluttering for their creams"—621.15-16) as their parents are of all men and women. The three individuals when placed side by side for a series of ones become "the one one oneth of the propecies, *Amnis Limina Permanent*" (153.1-2), and are thus compounded into 111 children to whom Anna Livia distributes presents in chapter 8: elsewhere they are found as "one one and one ten and one hundred again" (101.34-35) and "a hundred and eleven others" (38.13) and even "Twenty of Chambers, Weighty Ten Beds and a Wan Ceteroom" (105.3-4).

As much as Earwicker is both a single promontory and a range of mountains, and Anna Livia is a river in its full state of fulfillment from source to sea, the three children expand to become all-inclusive. The inflationary process begins with the five characters with whom Earwicker is involved in Phoenix Park, the two girls and the three soldiers, apparently personifications of Issy, Shem, and Shaun. (It should not be overlooked, in order fully to appreciate the "inflation" here, that the five characters besetting H.C.E. are themselves the five members of the Earwicker family: thus Anna Livia and Issy are the Temptresses, and Earwicker is one of the soldiers along with Shem and Shaun.)

In the same sense that the two sons are eventually reconciled as one and had initially been offshoots of the single Father, they are also capable of subdividing from two into three. They begin as the two base points (as when Earwicker's "rocks . . . exaggerated them- selse . . . while they went doublin their mumper"—3.7-8), and are so represented in the triangle in construction in the "riddles" chapter ("the climactogram up which B and C may fondly be imagined ascending"—165.23-24) * where C equals Caseous (a

* It seems consistent with *Wake* logic to assume that one triangle in the book suggests another, and a comparison with the pair of triangles constructed within the suggestive confines of Anna Livia's buttocks (293) reveals much of interest to Freudian-oriented *Finnegans Wake* enthusiasts. The "masculine" construction in chapter 6 not only foreshadows, but progresses hand-in-glove
cheesy type of Cassius who as Shem is Caesar-Earwicker's prime nemesis) and B represents Burrus (a buttered version of Brutus who as Shaun contributes to the downfall of the father figure and probably resembles the burro who accompanies the Four Old Men). (By the time we reach the Lessons chapter, the triumvirate is complete and "Sire Jeallyous Seizer" is confronted by "the tryonfroit of Oxthievious, Lapidous and Malthouse Anthemy"—271.3, 5-6.) But who is Antonius then? asks Mrs. Glasheen's

with the feminine complex of chapter 10. The first triangle is actually "in erection" as it ascends toward the completed form which is the mother's sexual parts. Thus the incest motif which is concerned with Earwicker's licentious desires for his daughter Isobel is complemented by the Oedipal lusts of the sons for Anna Livia. Joyce's description of the evolving figure can then be read for its multitude of double meanings: "The hatboxes which composed Rhomba, lady Trabezond (Marge in her excelsis), also comprised the climactogram up which B and C may fondly be imagined ascending and are suggestive of their true crust by even the youngest of Margees if she will take plase to layers of eocene and pleistoseen formation and the gradual morphological changes in our body politic which Professor Ebahi-Ahuri of Philadespoinis (Ill)—whose bluebutterbust I have just given his coupe de grass to—neatly names a boîte à surprises. The boxes, if I may break the subject gently, are worth about fourpence pourbox but I am inventing a more patent process, foolproof and pyrperfect . . . after which they can be reduced to a fragment of their true crust by even the youngest of Margees if she will take place to be seated and smile if I please" (165.21-166.2). The subject here (besides quantum mechanics) is seduction, particularly defloration of virgins, as boxes suggest vaginas in vulgar slang and hatboxes the figleaflike concealment offered by clothing (a motif involving the concept of the "outer shield" hiding what is real and basic; gentlemen's spring modes, Wyndham Lewis would be chagrined to learn, means both sartorial fashions and methods of sexual attack). The vagina is a climactogram since it is the source of passion and sexual climax. The mother (lady Trabezond) is best represented in most ideal sexual form during the present age by her virginal daughter (Marge in her excelsis), whose hymen the lecherous brothers are ingeniously scheming to destroy (if I may break the subject gently) by a coup de grâce in the grass (coupe de grass), a method quite familiar to the Lynch of Ulysses. They are indeed loving brothers of the penis (Philadespoinis). The sexual connotations of still another geometric problem in the Wake ("Show that the median, hce che ech, intersecting at royde angles the parilegs of a given obtuse one biscuits both the arcs that are in curveachord behind"—283.32-284.4) are investigated by Diana and Paul Thompson, "A Geometry Problem in Finnegans Wake," Analyst, No. 20 (September, 1961), pp. 2-4.
chart. He is apparently a synthesis of the opposing pair in the Hegelian scheme of things, described by Joyce as

an elusive Antonius, a wop who would appear to hug a personal interest in refined chews of all shades at the same time as he wags an antomine art of being rude like the boor. This Antonius-Burrus-Caseous grouponriyard may be said to equate the *qualis* equivalent with the older socalled *talis* on *talis* one just as quantily as in the hyperchemical economantarchy the tantum ergons iruminate the quantum urge so that eggs is to whey as whay is to zeed like your golfchild's abo boop caddy [167.1-8].

*Atonius-Burrus-Caseous* and *abo boop caddy* ("Et tu, Brute" becomes "Et tu, Cassius") suggest the A.B.C. configuration often found in *Finnegans Wake* (from "Arty, Bert or possibly Charley Chance" [65.16] to "alphabeater cameltemper"—553.2-3), representing the entire alphabet in the same sense that Tom, Dick, and Harry (from "Tob, Dilke and Halley" [90.3-4] to "tomb, dyke and hollow"—597.6) are accepted in popular parlance to signify just about everybody. (As seen in the quotation above, the alphabet runs its course from A to eggs, whey, zeed or, as found elsewhere in the *Wake*, from "Ada, Bett, Celia" to "Xenia, Yva, Zulma" [147.11-14] and from "apple, bacchante, custard" to "xray, yesplease, zaza" [247.35-248.2] and beyond.) Issy may have her mirror image with which to double herself into two temptresses or split herself into opposing halves; Shem and Shaun are coalesced into a unified figure or add a third dimension to become the three soldiers who plague Earwicker. "It's as simple as A.B.C." (65.27-28), comments Joyce.

But what is as simple as A.B.C. can also be "as semper as oxhousehumper" (107.34), indicating that since it is as eternal as the progression of the alphabet (used here as a translation of the words that stand for the first three letters of the Hebrew alphabet), it is also as complex as life itself. Simplicity can be a deceptive danger where *Finnegans Wake* is concerned, and even the best analyses of parallel situations suggested in the *Wake* must by Joycean necessity run aground if too literally translated. No parallel
can be carried too far, and none is without its exceptions. Since opposites must by Bruno’s concepts eventually be reconciled, and since every rule presumably has its exceptions, Joyce delights in planting an inherent inconsistency in every logical development he constructs. As Professor Morse thoroughly states the case,\textsuperscript{23} Shem is Jacob to Shaun’s Esau (they are “Jakob van der Bethel” and “Essav of Messagepostumia”—607.8-9), which on the surface looks to be a reversal of the case of Shem-Cain-Ham and Shaun-Abel-Japhet. But Morse proves that, although the accursed in two instances, Shem is the blessed in the third, and we are now that much better equipped to appreciate the subtleties by which Joyce chose his parallels. The dichotomies of Good and Evil are not always clearly divisible, either between Archangel Michael (“Michael Engels”—533.29) and Lucifer (“Lousyfear”—439.7) or Ahura Mazda (“ormuzd”—163.2) and Ahriman (“arimaining lucisphere”—239.34), despite the single-mindedness of Judeo-Christian scriptures and the Zoroastrian Avesta. Joyce was aware that the “prince of darkness” and the Persian “god of light” had something in common, at least in the etymologies of their names, that a Lucifer match (“he strikes a lousaforitch”—69.12) could give off light in the same manner as does a Mazda bulb. There is a patent irony in the fact that the Cain who struck the murderous blow in Genesis is the Shem who is repeatedly struck by Shaun (247, 300-3) in the \textit{Wake}; that whereas it was Cain who “was very wroth and his countenance fell” (Gen. 4:5), it is Shaun who “was wreathed with his pother” (303.15) and “his countinghands rose” (304.1-2). Further to equate the justification of each of the brothers, another reference in the \textit{Wake} informs us that “each was wrought with his other” (252.14). Though the battle lines are usually clearly drawn by Joyce, they are sometimes purposefully confused.

Shem as Ham is also a logical construction. It is Shem who spies upon his father’s nakedness (566-67) and thus learns his father’s secret (the penis in erection which is the key to procreation).\textsuperscript{24} Once the secret is out, Shem has the knowledge necessary to sup-
plant the old man. Like the Ham of the nakedness incident (Gen. 9:20-27) he too is a mocker, but there is a fine coincidence that Shem should bear the name of one of the "good" brothers who did not mock. If Shem is Ham and Shaun is Japhet, who then is the Biblical Shem? This question (also asked by the Glasheen chart) again answers itself in the "inflationary" sense of the two sons becoming the three soldiers, all three of whom mock the old Earwicker.* All three (meaning both sons and their mysterious third personification) are guilty of "shame, humbug and profit" (582.10), a legacy inherited from their bourgeois father.

Nor is the "blessed" Jacob free of guilt. His role in Genesis is often suspect, and only a far more literal reader of the Bible than Joyce can fully accept God's arbitrary decision to honor Jacob's claim to Esau's birthright through deception and connivance. Craftiness is not necessarily to be equated with "goodness," nor is Esau's readiness to sell his birthright for a serving of "red potage" a particularly "evil" act, despite the obvious indication that he cared little for the sacredness of God's covenant with his father and grandfather. Joyce's Shem cares just as little, for that matter,

*An interesting parallel to Earwicker's Phoenix Park involvement can be found in a 1933 disclosure of a tablet bearing the text of a pre-Hebraic Canaanite spring festival which anticipates the Pentecost: "The sacred drama then begins on the reverse side of the tablet with a prologue invoking the 'Gracious Gods' and the sun [Cf. FW, 237 ff.], and the greeting of the worshippers assembled with their offerings (25-27). The action of the play, it is explained, opens with a scene on the seashore before the house of El where the aged supreme deity demonstrates his virility to two girls, identified with Anat and Asherah, who watched him carrying water into his house, and with accurate marksmanship shoot an arrow into the air and bring down a bird, which he then plucks and boils for his meal. As these events are recorded in the text, so impressed were they with his youthful strength and adroitness that they offered him their devoted service as either his brides or his daughters (30-36). It was as wives that he accepted them, and an erotic scene follows in which after passionate intercourse they conceive and bring forth the two gods, Dawn (Shr) and Sunset (Slm) (49-52a). This episode is repeated with the offspring called the 'Gracious Gods' (55-61a), the children and their mothers feeding voraciously for seven years on the fruitful earth (61b-76)" (E. O. James, Seasonal Feasts and Festivals [London: Thames and Hudson, 1961], p. 99).
and at times indicates that Esau’s characteristics are his as well. “Do you hold yourself then for some god in the manger, Shehohem, that you will neither serve nor let serve, pray nor let pray?” (188.18-19), demands Shaun in his Christlike personification, echoing the Christ of Matthew 23:13: “But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in.” The irony lies in the Shaun-Christ’s pose as “Justius” berating Shem-Mercius, the latter being a far better example of Christian mercy at this instant—and at many others in the Wake. It is also possible, of course, that the irony is twofold, and Joyce is commenting on the lack of “mercy” so often demonstrated by the irate, hot-tempered Christ depicted in the Gospels.

Nonetheless, Shem is Jacob and Shaun is Esau only when this arrangement serves Joyce’s greater purpose, and he in no way feels bound by consistency to insist that Shem always behave like Jacob and Shaun always like Esau. As the natural man, as the hairy man, as the glutton, Shaun is obviously Esau, while as the smooth urbanite and the outcast, Shem is Jacob. But Jacob’s successful wooing of the Maggies (Rachel intentionally and Leah inadvertently) is closer to Shaun’s successes with the young girls of the Wake, while Shaun’s unjustified claim to the letter as his own coincides with Jacob’s claim to Esau’s birthright. Nor is it always clear which twin is the older, a point about which Genesis is quite unequivocal. At the clearest instance Shem is indicated as the younger twin in a definite echo of the original; in the “bedroom” chapter we find: “Jerry Jehu. You will know him by name in the capers but you cannot see whose heel he sheepfolds in his wrought hand because I have not told it to you” (563.7-9), while Genesis 25:26 reads: “Afterward his brother came forth and his hand had taken hold of Esau’s heel; so his name was called Jacob.” (Note that Joyce separates the “sheep” from the “goats” when he identifies Shem with capers and Shaun with sheepfold, reiterating that Shem is satyrlike compared to Shaun’s pose as the Lamb, but the significance is much greater still when we realize that this gives Shem a claim as the
natural heir of H. C. Earwicker, who has often been identified as the "goat" [particularly the scapegoat]: "Hircus Civis Elbanensis! He had buckgoat paps on him" [215.27-28], although his hirsuteness is transmitted to Shaun.

There are indications in the book, however, which seem to point to Shem as the older: in the closing portion of the Shem chapter, the Penman as Mercius addresses himself as "firstborn and firstfruit of woe" (194.12), and, during Shaun's first chapter, the Post says: "Weh is me, yeh is ye! I, the mightif beam maicanny, which bit his mirth too early or met his birth too late! It should of been my other with his leikname for he's the head and I'm an ever-devoting fiend of his" (408.15-18). But neither of these two quotations definitely points to Shem as the older, and both can be interpreted to mean Shaun. What is unequivocal, however, is a reference to Shem as "this Esuan Menschavik" (185.34), which seems to label him as Esau as well as the "minor" (Russian, menshevik) brother.* And it is nonetheless most important that Jacob and Esau together bury their father as Shem and Shaun combine as Buckley to shoot the Russian General. Should external evidence be of any help in deciding the relative age of the mismatched twins, it may be noted that James Joyce was almost four years older than his brother, John Stanislaus (still the major model for Shaun), and that of the brother apostles, James and John, dubbed "sons of thunder"† by Jesus, James was the older, John the younger.

Also uncertain is the name Joyce has given to Earwicker's public house in Chapelizod. If we accept the judgment of the Skeleton Key, the pub is simply called the Bristol Tavern,25 without any further elucidation offered. And indeed there is ample reason to accept the name without further quibbling. Some seventeen allusions seem to corroborate the Bristol, although only three are in "pure" form as such: "the house the once queen of Bristol and Balrothery twice admired because her frumped door looked up Dacent Street" (405.26-28); "Step out to Hall out of that, Ereweak-

* To compound the confusion, Shem is also labeled "aboleshvick" (302.18).
† "Boanerges" (22.32).
er, with your Bloody Big Bristol" (421.12-13); "They were erected in a purvious century, as a hen fine coops and, if you know your Bristol and have trudged the trolley ways and elventurns of that old cobbold city, you will sortofficially scribble a mental Peny-Knox-Gore" (606.16-19). Yet none of these definitely identifies Earwicker’s tavern (the second one in fact seems rather to refer to his penis). The reference that leads Campbell and Robinson to refer to the "Bristol Tavern" occurs during Luke Tarpey’s comments on Matt Gregory:

she due to kid by sweetpea time, with her face to the wall, in view of the poorhouse, and taking his rust in the oxsight of Iren, under all the auspices, amid the rattle of hailstorms, kalospintheochromatokreening, with her ivyclad hood, and gripping an old pair of curling tongs, belonging to Mrs Duna O’Cannell, to blow his brains with, till the heights of Newhigherland heard the Bristolhut, with his can of tea and a purse of alfred cakes from Anne Lynch and two cuts of Shackleton’s brown loaf and dilisk, waiting for the end to come [392.25-33].

The Key translated the Bristolhut as the "Bristol Tavern," but without ever actually asserting that this is H.C.E.’s pub.

Of the other "Bristol" references, those that do seem to imply Earwicker’s establishment more precisely include the mention in the Prankquean Tale of the piratess returning to van Hoother’s "keep of his inn" (21.14), now called "the bar of his bristolry" (21.34); the answer given by Yawn’s "ghost voice" to the question "And Drysalter, father of Izod, how was he now?": "—To the pink, man, like an allmanox in his shirt and stickup, brustall to the bear, the Megalomagellan of our winevatswaterway, squeezing the life out of the liffe" (512.2-6); and Earwicker’s own statement through the body of the prostrate Yawn:

The amusin part is, I will say, hotelmen, that since I, over the deep drowner Athacleath to seek again Irrlanding, shamed in mind, with three plunges of my ruddertail, yet not a bottlenim, vanced imperial standard by weaponright and platzed mine residenze, taking bourd and burgege under starrymisty and ran and operated my brixtol selection here at thollstall, for mean straits male with evorage fimmel [539.16-22].
Joyce-again’s *Wake*

(It is interesting to notice that in each of these three selections there exists a phallic reference to the erected penis—*bar, stickup,* and *strait male*—in support of the previous *Bloody Big Bristol,* hinting that the pub may well have gotten its name from being identified with the "erection" raised by the male hero. *)

The remaining allusions are vague at best: "indanified himself with boro tribute and was schenkt publicly to bristoll" (133.28-29); "the birstol boys artheynes" (353.34); Patrick Thistle agen S. Megan's versus Brystal Palace agus the Walsall!" (378.18-19); "he was so slow to borstel her schoon for her" (391.8-9); "about their bristelings" (442.10); "culprines of Erasmus Smith's burstall boys with their underhand leadpencils climbing to her crotch for the origin of spices" (504.26-28); "Blawlawnd-via-Bristow" (537.24-25); "best Brixton high yellow" (538.9); and "you were bragged up by Brostal" (624.32-33). The numerous instances in which these "Bristols" are connected with Borstal and Brixton, junior and senior houses of correction (and "brigs" in general), may well add a curious note to the name of the Chapelizod tavern. But the strongest reason for accepting Bristol as the name comes from the charter that King Henry II gave to the city of Bristol, presenting that British town with the city of Dublin in 1172. This historic event is celebrated in the *Wake* (where Earwicker serves as a personification of the British monarch). The Dublin charter is therefore parodied during Earwicker’s boastful recording of his "era of progress":

Wherfor I will and firmly command, as I willed and firmly com-
manded, upon my royal word and cause the great seal now to be affixed, that from the farthest of the farther of their fathers to their children’s children they do inhabit it and hold it for me un-
encumbered and my heirs, firmly and quietly, amply and honestly, and with all the liberties and free customs which the men of Tolbris, a city of Tolbris, have at Tolbris, in the county, of their city and through whole my land. Hereto my vouchers, knife and snuffbuchs. Fee for farm. Enwreak us wrecks [545.14-23].

(*) Various puns overlap in "the penic walls and the ind" (156.3), including punkah wallah, Punic Wars, penal walls, the pen and the penis, the inn, India, and indigo.
A second possibility more recently advanced is that the pub is called the Mullingar, since a public house of that name actually exists in Chapelizod. Several uses of the name in the *Wake* indicate that Mullingar is a more accurate choice than Bristol, and, although it is not as frequently mentioned, the references are far stronger. One or two may refer actually to the Westmeath County town of Mullingar, but even these seem to incorporate drinking allusions: "the Mullingan Inn" (64.9); "the Mullingar Inn" (138.19-20); "The boss's bess bass is the broud of Mullingar" (286.L); "that mulligarr scrub" (321.33); "the Mullingaria" (345.34); "the porlarbaar of the marringaar of the Lochlunn gon-lannludder of the feof of the foef of forfummed Ship-le-Zoyd" (370.27-29); "those Mullinguard minstrelsy" (371.34); "Mocked Majesty in the Malincurred Mansion" (380.4-5); and "Mallinger parish, to a mead that was not far" (475.22-23). The "coincidence" of *fee for farm* in the Bristol allusion (545.23) and *foef of forfummed* again suggests that possibly both names are intended for the tavern, the Mullingar existing on the literal level of the plot, while the Bristol again involves Earwicker historically as an invading Anglo-Norman, thus lending further weight to the duality of his existence as both native and foreigner, defender and invader. Professor Tindall, who seems to prefer "Mullingar" as the pub name, finds eight of the nine Mullingar allusions listed above, but misses—or dismisses—eleven of the Bristol references.²⁷

But even a compromise decision of allowing both possibilities within certain limits does not end speculation on the subject of the pub's name. Knowing as we do that Sheridan Le Fanu's *The House by the Churchyard* offered so much basic landscape and situation for Joyce's *Wake*, it is difficult not to wonder aloud why so fitting a name as the Phoenix, another real pub in Chapelizod mentioned by Le Fanu, did not determine Joyce's decision in naming Earwicker's place. Although the word "phoenix" plays a vital role in *Finnegans Wake*, both as the place name of the Dublin park and for the mythological symbolism of the bird of resurrection, there seem to be no definite instances in Joyce's book where it is employed as a name for the pub. The reason may be twofold: that
Joyce's recollection of details from Le Fanu was not exact (see his letter to Budgen, which as late as 1937 asks for information regarding names)—although he certainly might have remembered so cogent a point—but more important that he never depended upon slavish imitation of the materials he used, and would probably have been well content to do his own naming, the phoenix having already been well pressed into service. The double significance of the park's naming already adds two important ideas, the original Irish name of funishgue (clear water) and the English misreading into Phoenix. It is just by this sort of process of "misreading" (although not accidental any longer, but controlled by Joyce) that significances multiply in the Wake.*

And yet even the pub called The Mullingar or The Bristol (with The Phoenix understood) has surrogates galore in Finnegans Wake, since the pub is also all pubs. Like everything else in the book, the array of pubs includes two varieties: real Dublin pubs of Joyce's era, and those he "invents," and, since Dublin imagination is so potent, a list like "the House of Blazes, the Parrot in Hell, the Orange Tree, the Glibt, the Sun, the Holy Lamb" (63.23-24) is no less imaginative for being actual Dublin drinking houses than Joyce's compound of "the Duck and Doggies, the Gallopping Primrose, Brigid Brewster's, the Cock, the Postboy's Horn, the Little Old Man's and All Swell That Aimswell, the Cup and the Stirrup" (39.35-40.2), or "Byrne's and Flamming's and Furniss's and Bill Hayes's and Ellishly Haught's" (289.13-14). In other incarnations Earwicker's pub could be any of the following: "The Inns of Dungtarf" (16.22), "the Rum and Puncheon" (69.33), "L'Auberge du Père Adam" (124.34), "The Goat and Compasses" (275.16), "the snug saloon seanad of our Café Béranger" (372.11-12), "the Wheel of Fortune" (405.24), "the Cat and Coney or the Spotted Dog" (436.23), "the Beer and Belly and the Boot and Ball" (464.28), "the Tower of Balbus" *

* In evaluating the debt to Le Fanu, Aneiran Talfan Davies comments that "it is here that HCE keeps his pub, under the sign of the phoenix" ("A Note on Finnegans Wake," Welsh Review, VII [Summer, 1948], 142).
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(467.16), "the Anchor on the Mountain" (479.11), "Nile Lodge" (494.34), "the Heaven and Covenant" (510.25-26), "Toot and Come-Inn by the bridge called Tiltass" (512.34-35), "Eccles's hostel" (514.15), "the Bar Ptolomei" (529.34), "the Morgue and Cruises" (530.13), "his hostel of the Wodin Man" (535.5-6), "Oscarshal's winetavern" (536.21), "the Cat and Cage" (563.19), "the snug at the Cambridge Arms of Teddy Ales" (587.8-9), "Wynn's Hotel" (609.15-16)—or any one of scores of others.*

An examination of these surface problems indicates something basic in the dilemmas confronting the Wake scholar: that the years following publication have produced a wealth of exegetical material, but also a far greater wealth of unsolved questions and untapped resources. That the plot of Finnegans Wake is crucial to an understanding of the book has begun to obsess commentators, yet the few questions treated here should indicate that they are far from agreement on what happens, to whom it happens, and why it happens. The various substrata characters remain an enigma, although the five principals have been well described and individualized by now. Even the Four Old Men have received fairly thorough treatment, but such personages as Kate the Charwoman, the Cad, Lily Kinsella, Old Joe the Curate, Constable Lally Tomkins, and Constable Sackerson are far from clear. The last three, for example, may not be three distinct characters at all, but only two, for there is reason to believe, as Mrs. Glasheen does, that Sackerson is another name for the Man Servant, since as a policeman he comes to close the pub (370). But, since policeman equals policeman, this may well mean, as Campbell and Robinson seem to think it does, that Lally is Sackerson, and that possibly all three are one person.

Since Sackerson at the beginning of Jaun's chapter is a petrified pillar of sorts, indicating Earwicker interred in the landscape, we

* Mrs. Glasheen believes that the third riddle in chapter 6 holds the key to the pub name. If so, then the answer, "Thine obesity, O civilian, hits the felicitude of our orb!" (140.6-7), which parodies the Dublin motto, indicates that Dublin itself is H.C.E.’s tavern (The Dublin Inn, Dubl Inn, Double Inn?).
are now faced with the possibility that all the male characters in
the book are H.C.E.; this is true on the symbolic level of the
Wake, but if carried too far negates the underlying literal level on
which everything is constructed. It is sheer *reductio ad absurdum*
to maintain that Earwicker is Lally, since that policeman is iden-
tified with the Four Old Men who plague Earwicker (94-96), nor
is it too safe to assume that Earwicker is Sackerson (despite that
policeman's efforts to close the pub and rescue the publican from
his hostile customers), since he testifies about Earwicker's Phoenix
Park activities during the Yawn seance (511).

The only way out of such dilemmas is to realize that the shifting
perspectives of the dream create changes that are internally logical
only in relation to the new situations created. As we have seen in
investigating previous material, one possibility is never sufficient.
The question is not so much "who is who when everybody is some-
body else," but who is who in each particular situation. We have
seen, for example, that all three principal males have taken turns
being Jonathan Swift. The identity of the Cad, then, must be mul-
tiplied threesfold, if we accept the name as derived from Swift's
Cadenus. When we first meet the Cad, he has confronted Earwic-
ker in the park with a request for the time, inadvertently tricking
Earwicker into a confession-denial of his guilt (36). The Cad thus
presents himself as Earwicker's opposite, his enemy; and, if both
Earwicker and the Cad are incarnations of Swift, we are faced with
the very logical realization that Earwicker is his own enemy—as
indeed he is.

The Cad's wife ("knee Bareniece Maxwelton"—38.9) is the
original instrument broadcasting H.C.E.'s misdemeanor, but a
careful examination of her name indicates that she is already
known to us: *Maxwelton* suggests "Annie Laurie" (hence,
A.L.P.), while *niece* indicates Issy, the daughter-disguised-as-niece
in Earwicker's dream (21.14-15, 312.24, 314.22, 348.23, 349.28,
373.26, 532.24, 558.21, 608.8). Thus the two women of Ear-
wicker's household combine as his enemy's wife to defame him.

That the Cad is also Earwicker's sons then becomes obvious: in a
review of the events of the encounter and subsequent trial, we hear of "that same snob of the dunhill, fully several yearschaums riper, encountered by the General on that redletter morning or maynoon jovesday" (50.30-32). The dunhill and yearschaums references indicate the pipe the Cad was carrying ("he met a cad with a pipe" —35.10-11), while General Earwicker prefigures the shooting of the Russian General (H.C.E.) by Buckley. During the "shooting" chapter, it is Taff who is identified with the Cad ("Piff paff for puffpuff and my pife for his cigar"—341.16-17), which reminds us that Earwicker is identified by the cigar symbol (phallic, of course) since the instance in which he gave a cigar away ("he tips un a topping swank cheroot . . . suck that brown boyo, my son, and spend a whole half hour in Havana"—53.22-26). At another instance Shem is identified with the Cad since he is "Jakob van der Bethel, smolking behing his pipe" (607.8), while Shaun gets the nod when he describes himself with "my g.b.d. in my f.a.c.e., solfanelly in my shellyholders and lov'd latakia, the benuvolent, for my nosethrills" (450.10-11); since g.b.d. refers to "pipe notes," and solfanelly is not just musical but also sulphurous, we can add these to latakia to picture Shaun as the pipe-smoking Cad. Other origins of Joyce's Cad can be found in cadet, the youngest son; in Cadmus, the founder of Thebes; and the most important in the Caduceus of Hermes, whose interlocked serpents return the encounter in Phoenix Park to the Garden of Eden and strongly identify the Cad with Satan.

All roads in Finnegans Wake lead back to home, and all characters return to the interrelated five (and even the basic two). Since Earwicker is both Swift, the old man in love with young Vanessa, and Bartholomew Van Homrigh ("Barthalamou, where their dutchuncler mynhosts and serves them dram well right for a boors' interior (homereek van hohmryk)"—314.22-24), Vanessa's father, he finds himself in the ticklish position of pursuing his own daughter. But dutchuncler—and "ungkerls" (314.31) in the next paragraph—indicates the way out of the dilemma for the dreaming Earwicker, as daughter becomes safely transformed into niece. The
complicated tale of Earwicker's long nightmare defies any sort of synoptic treatment, since a synopsis is a single retelling of the events, while no single event actually exists unaltered for very long. Time and space and the vagaries of the psychology of dreams work their wonders on the material of the *Wake*, leaving a dozen questions newly unearthed for every answer miraculously found.

There remains, then, only the cold, logical realization that *Finnegans Wake* as an enigma may well go unsolved. Time, which was expected to bring all evidence eventually to the surface in an ordered pattern, so far has had the opposite effect. We are moving further and further away from the period of the book's genesis, and certain doors have now shut, to remain shut permanently. Joyce's death less than two years after publication must be acknowledged as the greatest blow to any expectation of a full explication. The author's own willingness during his lifetime to provide "the keys to" had been instrumental in bringing *Ulysses* so clearly into focus in so short a time. His method of distributing the hints necessary for individual interpretations leading toward a totality of explication is well known, as is his suspicion of artists who are unwilling to aid in achieving an understanding of their work (of Brancusi he said: "But I wish he or Antheil, say, could or would be as explicit as I try to be when people ask me: And what's this here, Guvnor?"32). Joyce's willingness to assist at the probing operation is indicated by the "marshalling" of the twelve "examiners" in 1929 while the work was still in progress, and his plan for "a book of only 4 *long* essays by 4 contributors . . . the subjects to be the treatment of night . . . the mechanics and chemistry, the humour, and I have not yet fixed on the fourth subject."33

Much happened during the 1930's to prevent Joyce from mapping out the exegetical attack on the bastion he has built; it is obvious that he did not expect to die without providing many further hints and suggestions for understanding *Finnegans Wake*. That "ideal reader suffering from an ideal insomnia" (120.13-14), if he ideally exists, finds himself tunneling in the dark without the headlamp usually provided for such work. It does not seem too
soon to predict that *Finnegans Wake* will never be fully read by any reader (no matter how ideal he may otherwise be). Fragments will be chipped away, brought into the glare of the sun, polished to a high gloss and admired. Conversely, generalities and broad statements will be made about the *Wake*, and in many cases fairly well documented. But the replacement of piece after piece into a reconstructed mosaic fully indicating the lines of the book’s ideas and material will probably never take place.

What Joyce said of Ezra Pound and his interpretation of *Ulysses* will be said of many critics for years to come: there will be “brilliant discoveries and howling blunders.” But it is naïve to expect, in the foreseeable future, that the mountain will come to Mohammed. Joyce, who apparently delighted in creating his own facsimile of previous “bibles,” may have provided for many centuries of new “Talmudic” scholarship. The number of words already printed explaining the *Wake* far exceeds the number of words in the *Wake* itself. The role of the contemporary commentator of *Finnegans Wake* is not to pontificate on “what it is all about exactly,” but humbly to attempt to show, while pausing along the route of his reading, “what’s this here, Guvnor?”