"God becomes man becomes fish becomes barnacle goose …"

Joycean re-productions of modernity in adaptations across media

DIMITRIOS S LATSIS

Elle se lit : Dostoyevsky, Flaubert,
elle se compose : Gershwin, Mozart,
elle se peint : Cézanne, Vermeer,
elle s’enregistre : Antonioni, Vigo,
ou elle se vit,
et elle est donc […] l’art de vivre .

Jean Luc Godard
(from Je vous salue, Sarajevo, 1993)

One of the ways in which scholars have tried to grapple with the idiosyncratic and plurivalent incarnations of modernity found in James Joyce’s work, is by contextualizing them within their era’s larger artistic currents. In this vein, there have been multiple comparative and analytical efforts to, on the one hand, dissect Joyce’s (un)conscious intersection with the pre-World War II cinematic production and aesthetic milieu and, on the other, to demonstrate an innate filmic structure interiorized in his texts, through techniques like “montage”, free indirect discourse and the like¹. While certainly valid and useful in substantiating Joyce’s consciousness of and interaction with not only contemporaneous artistic circles, but also his work’s (in)direct intertextual kinship with emerging media dispositifs (cinematograph, gramophone, etc)—in the

¹ These are certainly welcome additions to a Joyce scholarship that, during its first half century, despite its wealth of commentaries, had all but ignored any rapport that his work might have had with the media; cf. for instance the essays in John McCourt (ed.), Roll Away the Reel World : James Joyce and Cinema, Cork, Cork University Press, 2010 and in Niamh Thornton and Richard Hayes (eds.), Film and Film Culture, vol. n° 3 (Special issue: James Joyce and Cinema), Waterford, Waterford Institute of Technology, 2004. I am also thinking of the approaches towards “adaptation” taken up in Margot Norris, Ulysses, Cork, Cork University Press, Ireland into film series, 2004; Craig Wallace Barrow, Montage in James Joyce's Ulysses, Madrid, Studia Humanitatis, 1980 and James Burkdall, Joycean Frames: Film and the Fiction of James Joyce, London, Routledge, 2001. By contrast, an earlier analysis in Jonathan Price, A Discussion Guide for the Film Finnegans Wake, New York, Expanding Cinema, 1970, comes much closer to the “free intermedial discourse” that I attempt to propose here.
way that Friedrich Kittler relates their ascent\(^2\), such accounts can easily lapse into *ex post facto* judgments and a teleological free-for-all. Therefore, certain questions always seem to persist: Can Joyce’s work be accommodated within the larger matrix of an intermedial discursive modernity? Does it elicit, if not a comparison, a close examination with artistic products inspired by and relying on his own work for their semantic and stylistic processes\(^3\)? Finally and most urgently, can a book like *Finnegans Wake*, a paragon of personal and unique literary construction, be successfully *transposed* to other media and what is lost or gained in the process?

This is no mere question of adaptation, of texts serving as prescribing sources for the visualization or the transposition in sound of narratives. Rather, for the purposes of the argument, the concept of transference or transposition (always fruitful within a media studies discourse) will be employed; one that implies the evocation and creative reincarnation of one medium’s expressive strategies by another. By exploring the many lives of a “text” across different “supports” and closely following this process of transformation of both *sene* and *forma*, my account will ideally bear that for Joyce’s opus too, it is valid to say that experience can migrate from one medium to another. In the theatrical, cinematic, musical and aural versions of Joyce’s last work which will be probed below (with the focus remaining on the same extract throughout), it is my aim to establish continuities, engage different conceptions of “modernity”—as each text brings it forth in its time—and attempt to “faire glisser l’une vers l’autre […] deux scènes de brouillard incompatibles\(^4\)”, as Raymond Bellour would put it, from his interstitial and meta-theoretic point of view. My focus will be on the multiple avant-texts spawned by Joyce’s work,

---


with each considered in the context of its era. All the while, of course, partiality, medium specificity, the gap of “translation” in its general meaning, ephemeral-ness and their perils must not be sidetracked, especially in dealing with a topic as contentious as Joyce’s adaptability.

To speak of the quasi-cinematic qualities of James Joyce’s novels would not be entirely unwarranted, from a biographical and literary perspective. By now, Joyce’s multiple and diachronic connections with cinema have been recounted in extension: his founding of Dublin’s first movie theatre (the Volta), his toying with the concept of a Ulysses adaptation by Sergei Eisenstein (whom he personally met), his informed and critical spectatorship (a comment on Pare Lorentz’s The River (1937) is telling: “the most beautiful prose I have heard in ten years”), the cornucopia of conscious allusions to film in his works and the many arguments made for “Circe” as a strong case for cinema’s impact on his writing. Indeed, Joyce occasionally expressed himself in terms that further cement such a connection:

Nothing of my former mind seems to have remained except a heightened emotiveness which satisfies itself in the sixty-miles an hour pathos of some cinematograph or before some crude Italian gazette picture. James

Consequently, it would be groundless to argue for a literary solipsism in Joyce or that his creative travails took place in an artistic vacuum.

However, while many scholarly analyses would be content to simply point out such links and then ponder their reverberations to the author’s prose—as if the interaction did not go both

---


ways or other similar “dialogues” with third media could be ignored—and in order to make the case here for a true cross-pollination which could obviate Joyce’s increasing importance for our current multimedia times, a proper theoretical framework is in order; one that modern hermeneutics can point towards. To begin with, Roman Jakobson deemed creative art as untranslatable, unadaptable and thus introduced the model of intersemiotic or intermedial transposition to explain such passages between artistic fields:

Only creative transposition is possible […] intersemiotic transposition from one system of signs into another, eg from verbal art into music, dance, cinema or painting.

Consequently, in the process of transposing one creative language into another there is no “lifting and placing” of concepts or styles but rather a transmutation, a translation which carries a part of the original noema and places it within a new context. As a result, one should eschew the “X inspired Y or the inverse” schema for one more like this: “X intersects with Y in Z respects and uses A means to transpose the expressive language of Y into its own.”

Within Media Studies, a parallel to the transposition theory can be found in the notions of “transversalité” and “differential aesthetics.” Both point to crossing over, instead of turning something into something else and are employed in discourses whose main remit is to update aesthetic philosophy in accordance with artistic practice today that has ceased to view media (and consequently cinema too) as entrenched on their own. More particularly, they introduce “a conception of aesthetics that renders the various discourses around art forms permeable to each other, exploring the boundaries between media, between languages.” In his seminal study on the present state of the image (“l’entre-images”) Raymond Bellour postulates an analogous

---

7 Among passages from *Finnegans Wake* often discussed in this respect are “Roll Away the Reel World” (64.22) cf. Philip Sicker in McCourt (ed.), 2010, p. 78 and “verbicovisual presentiment.” Louis Armand in *ibid.*, p. 141.
8 Roman Jakobson, *Selected writings*, Gravenhage, Mouton, p. 266.
argument, when he finds that the specific dispositif in art is but the conduit, the instrument for the conjuring of experience and not its exclusive container. The iconoclastic filmmaker Raul Ruiz echoed a similar conception of the cinematic image when he wrote, in his Poétique du cinéma: “Toute image n’est qu’image d’image [...] elle est traduisible à tous les codes possible.”

One can imagine that Joyce would have been at home with such lines of reasoning, for his writing teems with intertextual references to other arts, which he occasionally samples within it (music scores and graphic art in Ulysses and Finnegans Wake, for example). More crucially, his conception of textuality is entirely compatible with a paradigm favoring “transmigration,” quick changes of habiti (clothes but also passage from one state of being or mind to another—as “Proteus” and “Circe” in Ulysses) and a mixture of cinematic and photographic analogies in conjuring up the dead. Stephen Kern’s remark that “Joyce was deeply impressed with cinematic montage” can be taken to also apply to Joyce’s interiority as a writer and the “cultural unconscious” of his works at large. If we are to illustrate these passages or voyages across media and the manners in which they are effected, there is perhaps no better segment on which to concentrate than that at the end of the Washerwomen episode in Finnegans Wake, itself marking another transition, from the “Book of the Parents” (Book I, at the end of which it features) to that of “the Sons” (Book II).

This tale of the lives of the two principal characters (HCE and ALP) at a critical juncture in the (non)narrative continuum is summarized by Joseph Campbell this way:

[The principal tale is of ALP at her children’s ball, where she diverts attention from the scandal of the father by distributing to each a token of his own destiny. The mind is thus led forward from recollections of the parents to the rising generation of sons and daughters] As the stream widens and twilight descends, the washerwomen lose touch with each other; they wish to hear of the children, Shem and Shaun; night falls and they metamorphose gradually into an elmtree and a stone; the river babbles on.16

From one generation to the next, from twilight to darkness (and thus from vision to sound), from one recollection associatively to the next and from the human to the landscape element (for example, the metamorphoses at the end): Joycean shape-shifting and transmutation is at its most poignant here and is also embodied in Plurabelle’s multiple selfhood. It is thus striking to see this transmutation reflected in the many lives the passage has had in multiple medial reworkings through the years.

In considering these transmigrations it would be useful, instead of the piecemeal, overdetermined idea of modernity (i.e., that of the post-romantic experimentation with narrative and form so often evoked in connection with Joyce’s mode of expression) to put forth the revised model of “vernacular modernisms” in the way Miriam Hansen has suggested.17 In this case modernism is not simply a period, a style, a norm but more “a scaffold, a matrix, or web that allows for a wide range of aesthetic effects and experiences—that is, for cultural configurations that are more complex and dynamic.”18 A “vernacular Joyce” is one reconfigured by the various media to reflect the (post-)modernisms of the era in which each text is produced.

---


18 Ibid., p. 339.
But of course, by the time many of these “re-imaginings” were presented, his books were already (somewhat ironically given their original intentions) considered classics of the literary canon19.

In Mary Manning’s 1955 version of *Finnegans Wake* for the theater, a will to forgo any customary impression of an adaptation is evident from the beginning. Hers is a “free adaptation” and the title (*Passages from Finnegans Wake*) mirrors this process of sampling, reappropriating and pastiching so dear to Joyce himself. The multimedia dimension of the project20 is also emphasized by the playwright, who notes that “any production of [the play] should be paced so that the audience has time to hear [my emphasis] the phonetical spelling and rythmical arrangements of sentences21.” To Joyce’s *bricolage* of languages, citations and multilayered references (this “cantrap of fermented words22”), Manning seems to respond with a similarly cross-disciplinary assemblage, repurposed for the then contemporary artistic vernacular. After all, the source text was itself already an adaptation of something else: the *Tiberiast Duplex*, the *Book of Kells* and others if Joyce is to be believed, incorporating a play of its own23 musical notation24, a mock-biblical codex25 and so on. Accordingly, any illusions for fidelity to an ultimate archi-text seem to be thrown out of the window by Joyce’s constant, parodic and meta-textual shifting.

It is hardly surprising that among the extracts chosen for this theatrical treatment is the aforementioned ALP passage (here Scene Three), for its popularity and frequent role as a stand-in

---

19 Hansen’s text potently addresses this tension between the various conceptions of “classic” vs. “modern” within cinema, in a way that can equally be extended to other modes of creation.


for the entire novel are common knowledge. Nor is the reworking of this extract into a dialogue between the two women with interventions by a chorus particularly original. Yet, by focusing on Joyce’s most audiovisually evocative lines, with a multisensory use of stage-directions and by what she chooses to exclude or imply, Manning manages a non-reductive transference between the (prose’s) letter and the (theater’s) verb. Meta-textual elements find their “equivalents” as well: in Joyce there are references to Tennyson, Duns Scotus, Samuel Lover and Lewis Carroll where in Manning there are extra-scenical components: the off-stage bells ringing nearer and nearer, the fading lights emulating the coming of the night and the chorus (surrogate for the audience) that reflexively comments on the situation.

Manning makes the most of the two women’s gradual acoustical alienation, a particularly apt element for a stage rendition; the staging of the “gone ahome”-“Thom Malone” double mishearing is telling in this respect. Moreover by excising the less performative and heavily literary asides, Manning concentrates on the double visual flow of the river between the women and of the latters’ progressive metamorphosis to elmtree and stone, thus staying faithful to Joyce’s fluvial underlying structure. Shape-shifting is triply evoked here: in the act of creative transposition of Finnegans Wake, in ALP’s embodiment as the river and in the transformation of the waterwomen.

No less successful in this play of transmutations is Mary Ellen Bute’s homonymous 1966 film which was based, in its turn, on Manning’s play and was actually workshopped as a script in

28 Ibid., p. 213, line 19-20.
29 Ibid., p. 213, line 35.
30 Ibid., p. 214, line 16-17.
31 Ibid., p. 214, line 24-25.
32 Manning, 1957, p. 31.
33 Ibid., p. 32.
meetings of “The James Joyce Society.” With this, the most well received Joyce adaptation within scholarly circles\textsuperscript{35}, Bute merges her preoccupation with avant-garde non-narrative film with Joyce’s linguistic investigations to produce “a kinetic form of the spoken word\textsuperscript{36}.” In the film \textit{Passages from Finnegans Wake} we both hear and read the text in subtitle form (even in English-speaking viewing contexts), to better experience the multitude of acoustic, scriptural, visual and aural permutations of the word. In addition, extra-cinematic elements abound: animation, stop-motion photography and montage against the continuity are employed (Ted Nementh and Bute’s production company’s name was “Expanding Cinema”), in an attempt to, if not capture, then at least approach the ineffability of Joyce’s prose\textsuperscript{37}. The degree of intermedial cross-pollination in evidence here is best summarized in Vickie Olsen’s observation that “Bute’s film is a pre-cursor to the postmodern game-playing between author, text and reader/spectator, as is, of course, Joyce’s novel itself\textsuperscript{38}.” One is thus dealing with two avant-texts, each one within its time and cultural milieu, and not with another case of adaptation, for as Bute cautioned in an interview in \textit{Film Culture}, “the film is not a translation of the book but a reaction to it\textsuperscript{39}.”

The film makes ample use of “warping,” “frame within a frame” and other self-reflexive techniques in the articulation of its (non-)story, and Joyce’s discursive devices of synthesized word-play, allusions and syntactic freewheeling, are here brought up to date for our media age. “Joyce’s simulated cinematic structural techniques are adapted by Bute, who employed television,

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{35} This may well be the only film to feature blurbs from academics and scholars as part of its promotional materials, rather than the usual ones from film critics. Maria Jolas and Padraic Collum actively cooperated in the adaptation. These documents and the full script are available online digitized by the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University, \url{www.beinecke.library.yale.edu} (last visited on December 2, 2010).
\textsuperscript{37} The film had three “textual music consultants”!
\textsuperscript{38} Olsen, 1998, p. 101
\textsuperscript{39} Gretchen Weinberg, “An Interview with Mary Ellen Bute on the Filming of \textit{Finnegans Wake},” \textit{Film Culture}, n° 35, 1964-1965, p. 26
\end{flushleft}
photography, and conventions of the stage to manipulate time. The filmmaker had long specialized in “abstronics” (a Joycean portmanteau word for abstraction and electronics) trying to achieve a perfect balance between language and vision. While no claims for perfection can be made for her end product (an adaptation must in any case “deal with the fact that the writer’s ‘essential vision’ is almost inextricably bound to the form and matter of the original”) Bute’s moving-image counterpart to Joyce’s “Book of the Night” is nonetheless a pertinent example of respectful revision and not of slavish mimicry. That this is the case is eloquently evidenced by the brief allusion to the ALP portion made an hour into the film (see Appendix II for the script extract).

In this scene, the two women are replaced by Shem who, to the sound of his mother’s voice calling him, starts to walk along the river bank while we listen to his rendition of relevant passages in the voice-over. The flow of words (dominated by the so-called “liquid consonants” /r/ and /l/) is matched by the creek’s current on screen and a wind instrument-dominated music on the soundtrack. Bute here is consistent with a practice of sampling (passages come from various points of *Finnegans Wake* Book I, chapter 8), as is her protagonist Shem who ‘interrupts’ the flow of the river only to pick up a leaf, brood over it for an instant (much like the reader does over Joyce’s text) and then release it back into the river and into the writer’s word-flow which also metonymically stands for Shem’s mother Livia. That flow, lexical by necessity in *Finnegans Wake*, is in this scene suggested by a montage of dissolves and the smooth panning of the camera which, instead of words, effect here a succession of images. Finally, the associational progression

40 Kit Smyth Basquin, “Mary Ellen Bute’s Passages from Finnegans Wake: Introduction to a Screening of the Film at Anthology Film Archives,” *Flashpoint*, n° 12, 2008; www.flashpointmag.com/ basquin.html (last visited on December 2, 2010).

41 Edward Murray, *The Cinematic Imagination; Writers and the Motion Pictures*, New York, Ungar, 1972, p. 140
in Joyce’s style is maintained by means of a lap dissolve of the leaf which is then made to match a
letter that Anna Livia is grasping while in bed and thus takes us forward to the next scene of this
asynchronous storyline. With this play of cinematic-literary correspondences and by
experimenting in her medium just as much as Joyce in his, the filmmaker is able to set her work
up so as not to be judged by its perceived fidelity to a text, but by an experiential conjuring of the
spirit of the novel in film-specific terms. Patrick McCarthy similarly finds that Bute succeeds in
doing “with film what Joyce does with the printed word: that is to convey the sense that on some
level, Passages from Finnegans Wake is about film itself.”

In considering reflexivity, (post-)modernism and cross-medial transfigurations, two
pertinent cases must be mentioned, both aural iterations of Finnegans Wake, namely John Cage’s
1979 Roaratorio (Joycean punning present from the title) and the author’s recitation of his own
text recorded in 1929. Cage’s interdisciplinarity is most evident in his aim to get to “a
prelapsarian music untainted by history” that approximates Walter Ong’s primary (pre-
scriptural) orality which he sees embodied or at least simulated in Finnegans Wake. Using
exactly the same language used by the present argument to counter the idea of a simple
adaptation, Robert O’Driscoll notes that “John Cage considered Roaratorio to represent a possible
way of transposing works of world literature into an acoustic dimension, into a language
accessible to all.” Listening to the work and to Cage’s own reading of re-arranged passages

(last visited on December 2, 2010), (originally delivered as a paper to MLA 1977).

p. 129.

45 Robert O’Driscoll, “Joyce, Dada, Cage, Etrog” in Sorel Etrog and Robert O’Driscoll (eds.), Dream Chamber: Joyce
from *Finnegans Wake*, exposes listeners to an all-inclusive cosmology built out of human voices, natural sounds, noises, singing and music. As the citation for the Szuka Prize which Cage won for *Roaratorio* states “[it] equates Joyce with Everyman, and it equates everyman with every meaning and every sound, and it equates every sound, every note, every word with the one word, allowing all this to co-exist in a kind of universal music.” This could be as apt a description of Joyce’s novel itself and so Cage can be said to have achieved with sound something equivalent to and not simply mimetic of Joyce’s literary accomplishments: a true polyphonic collage with all the fluidity, non-linearity, universality and stylistic virtuosity of its “source” text.

Cage had in fact recomposed the text for his own purposes as *Writing for the Second Time Through Finnegans Wake*, a series of five poems which consist of quotations from the novel, lexically reorganized so as to form lines centered around a mesostic on the central axis reading “JAMES JOYCE,” over and over again (Appendix III). These passages, which preceded *Roaratorio*, came to form its verbal component and Cage has characterized them as a process of “writing through” instead of reading through Joyce’s work, using different literary methods. The resulting five poems are meant to be read aloud in the manner of oral, meditative poetry whose sense is contained in the sound: a kind of “sound sense” as James Joyce once described *Finnegans Wake* confirming this desire for a return to orality. The tenets of analogy, sampling and

---

46 Ibid.
creative reappropriation permeate Roaratorio throughout its 2293 acoustic elements creating “a world made up of sounds, texts and music in which the listener can have experiences at will.”

As I have tried to demonstrate, the different modernities of these creative transpositions can help bring to the fore of critical attention some (post)modern features of Joyce’s own fiction and its capacity for establishing networks of reference across media. If it is true that, as the literary critic Kevin Dettmar’s states, “Modernist texts […] always contain the germ of their own Postmodernity,” then adaptations of Modernist texts may set in motion a dialogical encounter among texts resulting in a new artistic and critical synthesis. Joyce himself teasingly gestured toward such a direction through his oral delivery of the ALP passage in a recording made in 1929. Here is a writer using a recording technology to render words from a novel aspiring to the condition of music in a state beyond wakefulness. Lest one’s hermeneutic aspirations get way out of hand, however, Joyce is ready to caution Joyceans: “Latin me that, my trinity scholar.” The way this specific aside is vocalized by the author, in an overtly pithy, provocative and ironic tone, should serve as a warning to “scholards” of all times including those trying to mine his work for intermedial ties to culture at large.

But, for all his pretenses otherwise, Joyce indeed embraces a modernity that goes beyond a literary isolationism. Two testaments to the writer’s multimodal orientation, one from a filmmaker, the other from a fellow modernist novelist, should suffice here as a conclusion. Sergei Eisenstein used Joyce in his theoretical writing as a literary counterpart of what he was trying to accomplish with cinema, asserting that “The most heroic attempt to achieve [a conscious and

---

49 Quoted in O’Driscoll, 1982, p. 75


sensed reflection of the world and reality] in literature was made by James Joyce in *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*\(^{52}\).” The German novelist Alfred Döblin for his part, announced in 1928 in his essay “Ulysses by Joyce” that “the cinema has penetrated the field of literature\(^{53}\).” As these arguments reveal, a transmedial approach to Joyce might help to better position his oeuvre as always in-progress, permeable to artistic debates of its time and constantly negotiating its signification anew in a dialogue with other modes of expression. A crucial commonality of cinema and Joyce’s language is, after all, these “endless transformations, suggested in the art of quick-changers or, as *Finnegans Wake* has it ‘quackchancers\(^{54}\)’ per John McCourt’s inspired comparison\(^{55}\);

; or, as Joyce himself might have put it, they are acts equally “guilty” of “stollentelling\(^{56}\).”

---

\(^{52}\) Sergei Eisenstein and Jay Leyda, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*, San Diego, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, p. 184.


\(^{54}\) Joyce, 1999, p. 342, line 31.

\(^{55}\) McCourt 2010, p. 9-10.

\(^{56}\) Joyce, 1999, p. 424, line 35.
Appendix I

Excerpt from Passages from Finnegans Wake, play by Mary Manning (1957, p. 31-33)

FIRST WOMAN
Well, am I to blame for that if I have? You're a bit on the sharp side. I'm on the wide. (The Angelus rings faintly in the distance. The voices of the women become more lyrical.) Well, you know or don't you kennet or haven't I told you every telling has a tailing and that's the he and the she of it.

SECOND WOMAN
Look, look, the dusk is growing.

FIRST WOMAN
My branches lofty are taking root (she slowly raises her arms) and my cold cher's gone ashley. Fieluhr? Filou! What age is at?

SECOND WOMAN
It soon is late. O, my back, my back, my bach! I'd want to go to Aches-les-Pains. Pingpong! (The bell rings nearer now.) There's the Belle for Sexaloitez! And Concepta de Send-us-pray! Pang!

FIRST WOMAN
Pong! Wring out the clothes! Wring in the dew! Godavari, vert the showers!

SECOND WOMAN
And grant thaya grace! Aman.

FIRST WOMAN
Will we spread them here now?

SECOND WOMAN
Ay, we will. Flip! Spread on your bank and I'll spread mine on mine. It's churning chill . . .

FIRST WOMAN
Flep! It's what I'm doing. Spread! Der went is rising. I'll lay a few stones on the hostel sheets. A man and his bride embraced between them. Else I'd have sprinkled and folded them only.
SECOND WOMAN

Throw the cobwebs from your eyes, woman, and spread your washing proper! It's well I know your sort of slop. Flap! Ireland sober is Ireland stiff. Lord help you, Maria, full of grease, the load is with me!

FIRST WOMAN

(Dreamily. She is now the elm) Ah, but she was the queer old skeowsha anyhow, Anna Livia, trinketoes! And sure he was the quare old buntz too, Dear Dirty Dumpling, foostherfather of fingalls and dotthergills. Gammer and gaffer we're all their gangsters.

(Lights begin fading.)

SECOND WOMAN

The seim anew. Ordovicco or viricordo. Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle's to be.

CHORUS

Can't hear with the waters of. The chittering waters of. Flittering bats, fieldmice hawk talk.

FIRST WOMAN

(Calling across the river) Ho! Are you not gone ahhome?

SECOND WOMAN

(Dimly) What Thom Malone? (She is now the stone.)

CHORUS

(Urgently) Can't hear with bawk of bats, all thim liffeying waters of. Ho, talk save us!

SECOND WOMAN

(Looking up from her huddled position at the other, who, with arms upraised, is now forever the tree) My foos won't moos. I feel as old as yonder elm.

CHORUS

A tale told of Shaun or Shem? All Livia's daughtersons. Dark hawks hear us. Night! Night! My ho head halls. I feel as heavy as yonder stone. Tell me of John or Shaun? Who were Shem and Shaun the living sons or daughters of? Night now! Tell me, tell me, tell me, elm! Night night! Telmetale of stem or stone. Beside the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of. Night!

(Darkness. Nothing is heard but the bell ringing the Angelus, and then it too fades into the distance.)
APPENDIX II

Extract from *Passages from Finnegans Wake* (1966) script; p. 47-48
(corresponds to 1:07:50 to 1:09:20 in the film)

SHEM (O.V.)

Beside the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of Anna Livia Plurabelle, that our turfbrown mummy is a coming alpilla, beitilla, cllitilla, deltilla, running with her tiding, old the news of the great big world. With a beck with a spring, all her rillringlets shaking, rocks drops in her tackle, tram-tokens in her hair, all waived to a point and then all inuendation, little oldfashioned mummy, little wonderful mummy, ducking underbridges (A LEAF FLOATS BY, HE TAKES IT OUT OF THE WATER) bell-hopping the weirs, dodging by a bit of bog, and slipping sly by Sallynoggin, as happy as the day is wet, babbling, bubbling, chatering to herself, (CLOSE-UP OF SHEM AS HE PLACES LEAF BACK IN STREAM, CLOSE-UP OF LEAF AS IT FLOATS DOWNSTREAM) deloothering the fields on their elbows, leaning with the sloothering, slide of her, giddygaddy, granima, gossipaceous Anna Livia. (ALP & H.C.E. IN BED, ALP IS HOLDING TELEGRAM IN HAND, SHE IS ASLEEP: H.C.E. CAREFULLY REMOVES TELEGRAM AND READS IT)
and an extract from the mesostic of “Writing for the Second Time through Finnegans Wake”