

Final version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00739.x>

Global Joyce

“that european end meets ind” (Joyce, *FW* 598 15-16)

“Then why don’t one of you do *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Wog*” ? (Anand, *Conversations in Bloomsbury* 13)

In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Stephen Dedalus marks his geography book with a comic and cosmic charting of identity and place,

Stephen Dedalus
 Class of Elements
 Clongowes Wood College
 Sallins
 County Kildare
 Ireland
 Europe
 The World
 The Universe. (Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* 12)

If we take Stephen Dedalus’s inscription as an attempt to encompass the local, global and universal it can serve as a figure for Joyce’s ambitious life-long project: to link Ireland to the world, and to connect the vernacular with the global. This signature is everywhere in Joyce’s work: in his choice of the hybridized Hungarian/Jewish/Irish Leopold Bloom as hero of *Ulysses*, where Bloom serves as spokesman for a cosmopolitan and internationalist identity which includes an imagined utopia in which everyone speaks “esperanto the universal brotherhood (490)”; and in his later invention of a kind of global

esperanto in *Finnegans Wake*, which incorporates a distinct polyglot idiolect that steals and bastardizes words from sixty or seventy different languages, including dead languages, pidgin dialects, and the invented international languages of Volapuk and Esperanto. "I always write about Dublin," Joyce claimed "because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities of the world" (Ellmann 505). This access to the global *through* the core of the local makes Joyce a particularly suggestive example for writers interested in a rooted cosmopolitanism or a cosmopolitan vernacular, particularly for those writing, as Joyce did, from the margins of Europe. Joyce's placement of Dublin at the centre of world literature has served as inspiration for writers who have put Istanbul, St. Lucia, New Delhi or Tokyo as their own centres, and from there have ventured out to the wider stage of world literature without losing a sense of place or origin, thus confounding the either/or logic of the local/global binary and hinting in the cryptic shorthand of *Finnegans Wake* that "ruric or cospolite, for much or moment in dispute" (309.10).

Scholars have in recent years turned to Joyce's body of work as a locus where, as Vincent Cheng writes, "the conflicting desires and demands of the local/national and of the cosmopolitan/international" (25) might be made legible.ⁱ This study extends beyond Joyce's work to his own peregrinations, since even as Joyce collapsed and contained the globe into his accounts of early twentieth-century Dublin, he seemed the very model of the cosmopolitan intellectual; Joyce's Leopold Bloom has served as model for the hybridized, cosmopolitan citizen, and Joyce's own travels have become part of the canon of writer-as-exile-of-choice. Derek Attridge calls him "the most international of writers"

(xii); inexorably tied to his land of birth but unwilling to settle there, he moved from city to city, frequently making a living as a teacher of languages. As Cheng points out, the final words of Ulysses are not Molly's "yes" but Joyce's own "defiantly cosmopolitan" (20) dateline, "Trieste-Zurich-Paris, 1914-1921". Though Joyce's international dateline is European, it extends beyond Europe; when Mulk Raj Anand closes his novel *Untouchable* with the inscription "Simla—SS Viceroy of India—Bloomsbury" (157) he is tracing Joyce's journey along with his own.

Joyce's global influence outside of Europe, then, begins with his choice to expand his narrative beyond the traditional national confines of language and place, but is more powerful because in doing so he does not abandon categories of the local; it continues with the myth of Joyce himself as the émigré artist whose watchwords are, like those of Dedalus, "silence, exile and cunning," (208) a maxim that inspired artists whose exile was less freely chosen than Joyce's own. Similarly, Stephen Dedalus's echo of Lucifer's *non serviam* to his friend Cranly—"I will not serve that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church" (208)—has strongly resonated as a declaration for aesthetic autonomy against the demands of tradition, nationalism and fundamentalism in places where those claims have remained more intransigent than in the post-modern, increasingly secularized and nationally porous West. His creative, prodigious willingness to push the boundaries of the English language has been taken up by postcolonial writers driven to reinvent the language of empire, and his decision to side with English as opposed to the constraints of a revived Gaelic means he is an important influence for writers with global ambitions, at odds with a literary

nationalism and eager to assimilate and syncretize hybrid influences. As an artist skeptical both of the ambitions of empire and of the excesses of political nationalism, Joyce has also served as an important model for writers who have desired to claim authority and inspiration from their vernacular traditions, but who have been insistent on their place in the global conversation of literature and resistant to purist demands to confine their art to local languages or to expunge it of foreign and/or western influences. Some of the names of these latter-day Joyceans are very familiar: Derek Walcott and Salman Rushdie, who work in a reclaimed English hybridized and revitalized through contact with local languages are the most well-known. But Joyce's imitation, adaptation and circulation is evident not only in the epic breadth of Walcott's *Omeros* and the polycultural play and linguistic audacity of Rushdie, but also in the early experiments of Arabic and Japanese writers with stream of consciousness, in Jorge Luis Borges's rejection of the form of the novel, and in the struggle of writers like Mulk Raj Anand with the legitimacy of their decision to write in English. At the same time, these writers have challenged Joyce's assertion to be "at the end of English" (Ellmann 546) in their playful and independent mobilization of influence, never "the last word in stoltellen" (*FW* 3:12 424.34) but variations on a living and metamorphic tradition.

Recent studies of Joyce's influence outside of Europe and North America have begun to chart a series of global flows that extend Joyce through new readings of the global multiplicity and omnivorousness of Joyce's own work, through study of the translations that brought Joyce to new readerships, and through attention to those writers who both

followed and challenged Joyce's example. This cosmopolitan re-reading of Joyce has also come back home to roost in some interesting and significant ways: Vincent Cheng returns his internationalist Joyce to the contemporary debate about cosmopolitanism, while Andrew Gibson brings the postcolonial Joyce back to the Irish context, remarking "The global Joyce might even be a reflection of the Irish one, not a release from him" (17). But as Patrick O'Neill's magisterial study of global translations of Joyce, *Polyglot Joyce*, points out, Joyce also traveled well beyond Ireland and Europe to a degree that "his work also constitutes a crucial benchmark in the international history of twentieth-century European and world literatures" (5). O'Neill reminds us, "worldwide, readers read not only an English-language James Joyce. They also read an Arabic Jims Juyis, a Hebrew G'iims G'ois, a Russian Dzheims Dzhois, a Japanese Jeimusu Joisu, and—most splendidly Joycean of all—a radically expatriate Chinese Qiao Ai Si" (220). His record of the history of Joyce translations forces us to imagine a Joyce who is encountered against his own literary chronology; in Spanish, the last page of *Ulysses* appeared long before the first, in Buenos Aires in a 1925 translation by Jorge Luis Borges. Joyce has also been incompletely and unevenly translated, and unless you read English, French, German, Japanese or Dutch *Finnegans Wake* is accessible in translated fragments if at all, since it is an ironic but indisputable fact that Joyce's most linguistically capacious book is by far his most difficult to translate.

There are many more studies of Joyce as cosmopolitan author, and of Joyce in translation, than there are of Joyce's global influence on writers outside of Europe and

North America, and those studies that do exist tend to cluster around a few well-known names. As Charles Pollard points out in his essay on Joyce and Walcott,

[C]riticism of Joyce and his modernism has tended to view this cosmopolitanism almost exclusively in terms of the international scope of his allusions rather than in terms of his international influence on subsequent writers. In other words, we know a lot more about Joyce's debt to Homeric myth in *Ulysses* or to the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* in *Finnegans Wake* than we know about his significance for contemporary writers from Africa, Asia or South America." (198)

Mark Wollaeger makes a similar point, writing, "systematic, close attention to the revoicing of Joyce around the world is barely under way" (189). Attention to Joyce as a postcolonial writer should serve to call attention to other international writers, rather than to overwrite them in the name of his influence; the effect should be centripetal and should expand and dislocate our ideas of influence rather than situate them in a stable centre.

In addition, the study of influence, as Karen R. Lawrence warns in her introduction to the excellent collection *Transcultural Joyce*, is problematic for several reasons, not only because "the international importation and exportation of cultural icons is a politically loaded project" (2) but also because there is not one Joyce but many, and the afterlife of a *Dubliners* or *A Portrait* is deeply different than mediations of *Ulysses* or the wake of the *Wake*, "Which 'Joyce' are we, in fact, hypostasizing as an authorial commodity," Lawrence asks, "the Joyce of 'scrupulous meanness' in *Dubliners*, the epic Joyce of *Ulysses*, the polyglot Joyce of *Finnegans Wake*?" (4). The essays in *Transcultural Joyce* do a good job of navigating this minefield, though their strategies differ considerably: Michael Woods' article on *Finnegans Wake*, paronomasia, and the Cuban writer and

critic Guillermo Cabrera Infante, suggests that puns themselves stage a theory of the interconnectedness of cultures and languages; César Augusto Salado's article on Jorge Luis Borges and José Lezama Lima describes "the determining role Joyce has in the very constitution of Latin-American literature today, both in its Borgesian fantastic, metaphysical mode, and in the neo-baroque mode inaugurated by Lezama" (63); and Srinivas Aravamudan's focus on G.V. Desani and James Joyce's "transcultural dynamics," "creative affiliations" and "voluntary and cross-cultural connections" points to an alternate model of influence. Aravamudan argues that, "postcolonial narrative has arrived, not just as a temporal phase, but as a retroactive perspective that both dreams and debunks monocultural filiation into transnational affiliations" (125). Aside from the essays in Lawrence's collection, there have been a couple of articles on global reception in the recent *A Companion to James Joyce*, edited by Richard Brown, a book-length study of Walcott and Joyce, numerous articles on Joyce and Rushdie, a growing body of work on Joyce and Anand, and studies of influence from the early translations and effects of Joyce in Japan in the 1930's to the more recent appearance of *Ulysses* in Arabic in 1982, and the subsequent effect on Arabic writers.ⁱⁱ To map all of these flows would require an oceanographer rather than a literary critic, and even the more discrete focus of this article, on writers outside of Europe and North America who claim Joyce as a significant influence, is both a summary of work that has already been done and a call for more work in this area. In exploring some of the theoretical questions about influence raised by these texts, I am going to resist the impossible and Ithacan demand to be catalogic and comprehensive, in the hopes that others will fill in my gaps. This is a contribution to an ongoing and expanding conversation.

I would like to begin with a close analysis of one fascinating account of Joyce's early global influence in Mulk Raj Anand's *Conversations in Bloomsbury*, before moving on to briefly outline Joyce's influence on several other authors, paying particular attention to the multiple ways that this influence is mediated and understood, as well as to the gaps in this global conversation. In this study, auratic influence—the influence of the *idea* of an author's accomplishments, as well as of the author's own ideas—can be determinative, and later rewritings of Joyce's work can both claim and transform the very notion of the original. Nonetheless, we need to be careful about the danger of over-identification, a superficial labeling of the “Indian Joyce” (Desani, Rushdie), “the Caribbean Joyce” (Walcott), “the Brazilian Joyce” (Lispector, Luzama), “the Israeli Joyce” (Grossman) and so forth. The super-name of Joyce can overwrite the achievement of the writers who follow him, can obscure more significant and less celebrated and centralized influences, or can be lazy shorthand for “avant-garde,” “ambitious,” or simply, “long”. But the tendency to spot the Joycean can also be strategy—a way of bringing marginal figures towards the centre (and since many of the figures labeled as the “Joyce” of their context already enjoy considerable prestige in their own languages and countries, to the attention of the Anglophone academy). Certainly, Joyce explicitly acknowledges that the process of artistic production has never been pure; there is no shame in stolentelling. And in ignoring obvious and significant moments of encounter between Joyce and global authors, there is the opposite danger, of excluding writers outside Europe and North America from the kind of international conversations and rivalries that have always helped constitute literary creativity, re-parochializing them when they have alerted us in

various ways to the wide-ranging echoes of their voices. To the extent that literary influence is always a matter of silence, exile and cunning, the uses of the charting of influence will always be strategic and suppositional, labyrinthine and metamorphic, and capable of transforming not only our reading of a work but our understanding of its predecessors. In *Ulysses*, Buck Mulligan's willful misrecognition of Shakespeare as "the chap that writes like Synge" (254) is a dazzling joke at the expense of conventional, top-down narratives of influence; by this logic, Joyce is the fellow who writes like Keri Hulme, like Haruki Marakami, like Roberto Bolano, the chap whose work can be fragmented and reconstituted through the kaleidoscopic and retroactive lens of his later appropriations and re-imaginings.

In Mulk Raj Anand's memoir of his artistic coming of age in the 1920's, *Conversations in Bloomsbury*, Joyce is a seminal figure.ⁱⁱⁱ Joyce is one of the heroes of *Conversations*, both inspiration for Anand's emerging fictional ambition and a figure in which Anand recognizes himself. Anand begins his preface to *Conversations in Bloomsbury* by describing his arrival,

Exuberant naïve poet, hugging Iqbal's *Secrets of the Self* under one arm, with the sceptic Hume's *Treatise* facing me on the Reading Room desk, I discovered James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, with the hero's insistence on going away to 'encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race.' And I was inspired to begin a confessional novel of my own. (5-6)

The figure of arrival creates a triangle of influence; the Islamic revivalist poet Iqbal

intimately clutched under one arm, the “sceptic” Hume facing him (skeptically, one would presume) across the desk, and the revelation of Joyce’s work, which will seem to put Iqbal and Hume into joint. Anand’s account of this moment of inspiration mirrors Stephen Dedalus’s own discovery of himself as an artist at the end of *A Portrait*; Anand reads Stephen’s mantra as his own. This idealized, romantic and linear account of artistic influence acts as a kind of pinball machine where Stephen Dedalus’s fictional self-discovery triggers a fictionalized account of Anand’s own artistic autobiography.

When Anand arrives in Bloomsbury, Joyce is the rage. His friend Nikhil Sen is trying to get his hands on a copy of *Ulysses*, which was banned in England; the fact that he and his friends have not read it yet does not stop them from speculating bombastically about its significance, and the novel circulates as a kind of intellectual samizdat among writers and intellectuals. The rumour of Joyce’s accomplishment has entered into conversations about the very future of the novel, even though it has been read by few of these conversational interlocutors; like the new science of psychoanalysis it has an effect on artistic practice based on gossip and second-hand accounts of its significance. As César Augusto Salgado writes in his account of Joyce’s influence in Latin America,

The polemics inspired by Joyce’s novels in Europe and the United States—the protest against the publication of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, the trials and censorship of *Ulysses* for obscenity, the controversy regarding *Finnegans Wake*’s unintelligibility—produced in the Latin-American ‘periphery’ an anxiety of anticipation that gave the critical confrontation with Joyce’s novels momentous implications. (63)

A similar effect is evident even from the metropolitan centre, where Anand and his circle

are part of the anxiety of anticipation. Though he has not read it yet, Sen calls *Ulysses* “a novel to end all novels” while Dobree responds, “No—a novel which may touch off more novels” (13). The analysis and influence of *Ulysses* begins in rumor and gossip, speculation, assumption, aura, and cliché.

Anand is similarly swept up in the celebrity buzz around Joyce, thinking “I must read *Ulysses* soon...I simply must get hold of the epic” (14). But unlike Sen, Anand is candid about his ignorance of *Ulysses*, though he marks this honesty as “gaucheness.”

“I have not read *Ulysses*,” I ventured gauchely. “I will if Nikhil lends me his copy...I think *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is marvelous. It approximates to the ideal of the poem of Mohammed Iqbal *Asrar-i-Khudi*—Secrets of the Self...James Joyce ruthlessly exposes himself and the Irish. In the very first word he shows what a child feels.

“Then why don’t one of you do *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Wog*,” Gwenda turned to Nikhil and me.

“I have already begun a confession about my childhood,” I said, “about my mother and playmates...” I blushed because I had decided in secret to emulate Joyce’s example. I had taken inspiration from his self-examination. (13)

Here, Anand reverses the priority of the centre and periphery, examining Joyce through the filter of Iqbal. Anand recognizes Joyce’s value through the prior standard Iqbal sets, where Iqbal is the ideal, and Joyce the approximation; this puts Anand’s own planned emulation of Joyce in a different light, as part of a loop of influence. But the second part

of this quotation is equally interesting: why does Anand blush? In part, it may be the casually offensive use of the word “wog,” and in part the premature revelation of the scope of Anand’s ambition, which ends up having something of the status of an open secret. Nikhil Sen exposes Anand’s Joycean ambitions again in the next chapter, “He is writing a novel *a la Joyce* and feels tentative about it—yet he thinks it will be a masterpiece” (18). Anand is concerned that his ambitions are aesthetically presumptuous, and though he finds support for his project the reactions he gets smack of ethnic tokenism—after Nancy Cunard reports to Catharine Carswell that she is “doing a big book called *Negro*” Carswell turns to Anand and says, “it only remains for someone to tell us about the Indians” (38).

Anand’s use of Joyce is not universalist or universalizing; by contrast, he claims Joyce as his own by recognizing that Joyce is himself grounded in a particular place and time. The stage-setting chapter “A Drink with Bonamy Dobrée” sets him up as Anand’s polite but condescending interlocutor, spokesman for official literary culture against Anand’s emerging and politicized understanding of aesthetics and empire. Dobrée seems taken aback at the suggestion of a political content in Joyce, overwriting the claim with an assertion of the book’s timelessness, “‘I did not know that Joyce had any political attitude,’ said Bonamy Dobrée rather flustered. ‘He wants to be Homer’” (12). When Dobrée praises the “universal consciousness” in Joyce Anand interjects, “That is why an Indian like me recognized myself in the hero of the portrait” (14). Dobrée departicularizes this recognition, responding, “Indeed, in a good novel everyone should recognize himself” (14). But that is precisely *not* what Anand means. Anand means he

recognizes himself as an Indian, in his historical and national particularity and to a degree that makes Dobrée uncomfortable.

Anand goes on to elaborate on this recognition:

[W]hat went on in Stephen was also going on in me. I too wanted to face the actual realities of my experiences. I came from a coppersmith family, and the truth of his metaphor about the smithy went home. The impact of outer events seemed to me even more important as an Indian who was against illusionism. And Joyce's use of memory images. Also the sounds of words dictating sense, as my mother's mumbo-jumbo prayers...(14).

Anand's deliberate literalization of Stephen's metaphor of the forge concretizes and claims *A Portrait* in the terms of his own experience. This is not an abstracting or domineering faux-neutral universalism—this is influence as recognition. Anand feels called by Joyce's claims, but he is called in the terms of his own language and history. As he says later in the book, “hugger mugger—and kachar machar!...Joyce has given me the courage to use such words” (88). In Stephen, a servant of two masters, he recognizes his own situation; he writes, as Joyce does, in a colonial language but with the deliberate flavor of dialect and vernacular; like Joyce, he writes between the expectations of the dominant imperial voice and the emerging demands of an aspiring national one; he writes in English, and between cultures, but with a grounding sense that the country and landscape of his childhood will be his primary material. In this sense, the place Joyce occupies in Anand's account is very different than that of Kipling. In a moment of frustration Anand says to Dobrée and T.S. Eliot “I am going to rewrite Kipling's *Kim* from the opposite point of view” (52), the impulse that Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin term

“the empire writes back.”^{iv} By contrast, Anand finds Joyce a far more sympathetic and familiar figure, also on the peripheries of empire, also resistant to a traditional and religious culture and to demands for a new authenticity of language, subject matter or nation.

In this light, it is all the more surprising that Anand’s novels so little resemble *Ulysses*, at least on the surface. Anand explains this through a second origin story that serves to trump the first.

I settled down in the ashram and began to rewrite my novel, because Mahatma had said that I had used too many big English words. And I had told him I was under the influence of James Joyce in his novel, *Ulysses*, who writes from free association of words. Gadhiji had said: you forget all big writers. Write simply what you feel. Why don’t you write in your own language? (*Mulk Raj Anand: A Reader* xi)

Ghandi, whom Anand refers to by the traditional Hindi honorific and whose nickname, Bapu, identified him as father of India, eclipses Joyce as literary father in advice which aims both to simplify Anand’s book and to reject foreign influence, “why don’t you write in *your own* language.” But although Anand presents Ghandi’s influence as definitive, he does not turn to Punjabi or Hindustani, but instead to a social realist novel written in English which took the “Dalit” or untouchable as subject. This style and subject matter provoked comparison in an English audience to Dickens rather than Joyce, though we might more usefully put Anand’s shift to realism in the context of the shift in English writing in the 1930s away from avant-garde strategies and towards more direct political engagement and documentary realism. Still, Anand’s dateline at the end of *Untouchable* finishes in Bloomsbury, not in the ashram, and acknowledges, in the palimpsestic

reference to the end of *Ulysses*, Anand's own artistic beginnings. In Anand's account of Joyce's influence we find several important elements: an early auratic encounter with Joycean celebrity, a powerful model of literary influence as interpellation and recognition, and a later reaction and suppression which still leaves legible traces.

The Joycean strain in Indian writing is not generally associated with Anand's writing—realist, focused on the subaltern, more explicitly Dickensian than Joycean—but with the postmodern Indian novel most commonly linked with Salman Rushdie. Attention to Anand alongside Rushdie can illuminate the role of Joyce in the two major strains of Indian writing in English today, the realist and documentarian novel which frequently focuses on the lower classes, and the fabulist, playful epic associated with Rushdie. Rushdie has been explicit about his debt to Joyce, claiming as he received the James Joyce award at University College, Dublin, "James Joyce was probably more of an inspiration to me than any other writer ever has been." ("Author Rushdie wins Joyce award"). Readings of Rushdie and Joyce are numerous.^v But Rushdie's use of Joyce does not only lead back, it leads *through*. In Rushdie's introduction to *Mirrorwork*, he places G.V. Desani alongside R.K. Narayan as the most significant of the first generation of Indian novelists in English, writing,

Hatterr's dazzling, puzzling, leaping prose is the first effort to go beyond the Englishness of the English language. His central figure, 'fifty-fifty of the species,' the half-breed as unabashed anti-hero, leaps and capers behind many of the texts in this book. Hard to imagine I. Allan Sealey's *Trotter-Nama* without Desani. My own writing, too, learned a trick or two from him. (xviii)

And hard to imagine *All About H. Hatterr* without Joyce. Desani's half-breed hero is directly descended from Leopold Bloom, and his linguistic audacity is the ironic inheritor of Joyce's barn-burning claim to "be at the end of English." In the obituary published in *Outlook India* under the title "An Oriental Gent" (and translated into French as *G.V. Desani, le Joyce Indien*) Sheela Redding reports him announcing, "There are only two great novelists. One's Joyce, the other, your humble servant." But the benefit of reading Desani alongside Joyce is not simply to trace an avowed and bombastically claimed influence. In *Guru English* Srinivas Aravamudan reads *Hatterr* alongside *Ulysses*, arguing that,

Desani, Joyce and Rushdie [can] be read together in a manner that cuts the cord of one-way narrative of literary influence, originating from an *omphalos*, and instead replaces them with the crisscrossing of multiple threads. In this sense, the dialectic of postcolonial catachresis is one where the nation has to be simultaneously conjured and denied, created and disavowed. (141)

Other critics have similarly attempted to complicate the narratives of literary influence when looking at Joyce alongside postcolonial writers. In the case of Joyce and Walcott. Maria McGarrity writes, "establishing a link between Joyce and Walcott is not to suggest a simple similarity but instead a dynamic correlation based on the 'other'ness of each of their respective works when examined in tandem, an affiliation that may be akin to a parallax perspective" (83). The attempt to read influence as a parallax perspective reorients both authors as part of a shifting constellations, rather than mapping a series of satellites around a central star.

But it is also important to note that Joyce's global reach seems in part the consequence of the anticipation of the assumption of influence itself. When Derek Walcott published his epic poem *Omeros* he needed to sail past Joyce to get to Homer, and he knew it. In an interview he complains, "I know what's going to happen with this book. The parenthesis, the large parenthesis, will begin. Everybody will put in a bracket—now he is trying to do Ulysses" (Brown 182). In an interview with the BBC, the Turkish writer Orhan Pamuk noted "When I was writing my book I was thinking that probably critics would write "Pamuk did to Istanbul what James Joyce did to Dublin." But in his next breath, Pamuk confirms this suspicion, "As I was writing, imagining the book as a modern, ambitious book, of course I had in mind James Joyce - what James Joyce did to Dublin." The counterweight to this centralizing presumption of influence is the reclamation and reframing of Joyce by the author in the terms of his own concerns. Pamuk's recognition of Joyce, like Anand's, is of Joyce as a fellow provincial: "To sum it up what he did for me was this: he considered his city, as I consider Istanbul, to be on the margins of Europe, not at the centre" (Pamuk). In other words, Pamuk's recognition of Joyce, like Anand's, does not consist of the margin recognizing the centre, but implies a kind of fellowship of the margins. In an interview with Edward Hirsch, Walcott makes a similar argument more strongly,

The whole Irish influence was for me a very intimate one. When the Irish brothers came to teach at the college in St. Lucia, I had been reading a lot of Irish literature: I read Joyce, naturally I knew Yeats and so on. I've always felt some kind of intimacy with the Irish poets because one realized that they were also colonials with the same kind of problems that existed in the Caribbean. They were the niggers of Britain." (288)

Walcott's assertion of the intimacy of influence emphasizes recognition and commonality: even as Anand frames Joyce through the filter of Iqbal, Walcott presents the Irish writers as fellow colonials "with the same kind of problems that existed in the Caribbean" (288). And as Walcott, Rushdie and Pamuk have, like Joyce, been labeled as both exemplars and exceptions to their respective national traditions, they have been seen both as national spokesmen and as inauthentic or even traitorous in relation to their home countries. The path of *non serviam* is not easy to navigate.

Outside of Walcott's example, Joyce's influence is probably most extended in South Asian writing and Latin American writing, though his influence on the early Japanese avant-garde was early and significant.^{vi} His influence is also multiple: aesthetically avant-garde, political or apolitical, metropolitan or parochial. In his useful survey of James Joyce and the Spanish American Novel, Robin Fiddian summarizes Joyce's tremendous and extended influence on Latin-American writing. Fiddian mentions Jorge Luis Borges, Octavio Paz, Agustín Yáñez, Julio Cortazar and Jorge Lezama Lima and quotes Guillermo Cabrera Infante's astonishing statement, "Were it not for James Joyce's forked tongue, neither Nabokov, Gadda, Queneau, Cortazar, Donald Barthelme or I could now speak the same language with different accents; the Martello tower is our Babel" (86). Though Babel is the biblical site of the fall of language and is an originary story of loss and dispersal, here Infante makes Joyce's Babel the unifying standard of a productive commonality, a unity-in-difference that both acknowledges and transcends linguistic and national particularity. The Israeli writer David Grossman's Joycean holocaust novel *See Under: Love* is certainly one of these Babels. The various global adaptations and

incorporations of Joyce comprise an Odyssey of reading engaged both with the revisioning of the literary past and the future of literary studies.

Any attempt to be comprehensive invites revision—indeed, I hope respondents to this article will call my attention to significant examples of intertextuality and influence that I have scanted. But it does seem that Joyce’s global traces are less legible in Arabic and Chinese literature, where translations of his work are more recent. J. Brugman drily points out that Naghuib Mahfouz “is known to have referred to Proust and Joyce as the most important authors of the twentieth century, but it is questionable whether his appreciation has led to him being influenced by them” (296). In African literature, I would argue that the examples of Faulkner, Kafka and Marquez, and the influence of oral narrative and folktale, have been far more definitive than that of Joyce. Even J.M. Coetzee, whose protagonist in the novel *Elizabeth Costello* is famous for rewriting *Ulysses* from Molly Bloom’s point of view, himself writes after Beckett rather than after Joyce.

But I’d like to call attention to a different kind of omission, not of a country or a continent but of a gender. Why are female writers so much less prominent among those who claim Joyce as a significant influence? Is it possible that Joyce travels more easily across geographic boundaries than gender boundaries? The closest my examples come is Coetzee’s fictional Elizabeth Costello. While the Brazilian writer Clarice Lispector claimed Joyce’s influence, critics have generally not seen much depth in that claim; when the New Zealand writer Keri Hulme published *Bone People* in 1984 she explicitly

dismissed the general consensus that the work was a Joycean *tour de force*, saying she'd never read Joyce. Hulme may have been denying a real and suppressed influence, and Lispector's Joyceanism may be more extended than most critics acknowledge. But there is much less work on women writers after Joyce, an omission (or emission) Molly Bloom herself might have noticed.

ⁱ There has been a great deal of work on Joyce, cosmopolitanism and postcolonialism in the last two decades. Landmark works have included Enda Duffy's *The Subaltern Ulysses* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), Emer Nolan's *James Joyce and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1995), Robert Spoo's *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare* (New York: Oxford UP, 1994), Andrew Gibson's *James Joyce (Critical Lives)* (London: Reaktion, 2006), and Rebecca Walkowitz's *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism Beyond the Nation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

ⁱⁱ Some notable work on Joyce and international writers includes César Augusto Salgado's *From Modernism to NeoBaroque: Joyce and Lezama Lima* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses Inc., 2001) and Rachel Brenner's article 'The Grammar of the Portrait: The Construct of the Artist in David Grossman, *The Book of Internal Grammar* and James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*' from *Comparative Literature Studies* 31.3 (1994).

ⁱⁱⁱ Recent articles on Anand have examined the question of Joyce's influence, have used Anand to reclaim a political Joyce, and to re-examine cosmopolitanism in the context of early-twentieth century Bloomsbury and global modernism. See especially Jessica Berman's fascinating articles 'Comparative Colonialisms: Joyce, Anand, and the Question of Engagement' from *Modernism/Modernity* 13.3 (2006) and "Toward a Regional Cosmopolitanism: The Case of Mulk Raj Anand," in *MFS: Modern Fiction Studies* 55:1 (2009); Ben Conisbee Baer's 'Shit Writing: Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable*, the Image of Gandhi, and the Progressive Writers' Association' in *Modernism/Modernity* 16.3 (2009); and Sara Blair's 'Local Modernity, Global Modernism: Bloomsbury and the Places of the Literary,' in *ELH* 71.3 (2004).

^{iv} Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989). In *Conversations in Bloomsbury* Virginia Woolf compares Anand's writing to Kipling, reinforcing an identification Anand explicitly rejects.

^v See 'Silence, Migration, and Cunning: Joyce and Rushdie in Flight' by Friedhelm

Rathjen, *James Joyce Quarterly*, 39.3 (Spring 2002), Shailja Sharma's 'Salman Rushdie: The Ambivalence of Migrancy,' *Twentieth Century Literature* 47.4 (Winter 2001) and Michael Tratner's chapter 'What's Wrong with Hybridity: The Impotence of Postmodern Political Ideals in *Ulysses* and *Midnight's Children*' from *Joyce, Imperialism, and Postcolonialism* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008).

^{vi} Joyce was translated in Japan very early, and among his translators were creative writers who took his work as inspiration for their own. See Donald Keene's *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999) and Eishiro Ito's "'The United States of Asia": James Joyce and Japan' published in *A Companion to James Joyce* (Ed. Richard Brown. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1996.)

I would like to thank Fiona Duncan, who helped prepare this article for publication.

Works Cited

Anand, Mulk Raj. *Conversations in Bloomsbury*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1981.

---. *Untouchable*. London: Penguin, 1990.

Anand, Mulk Raj. *Mulk Raj Anand: A Reader: Selections from his Fictional and Non-Fictional Writings*. Ed. Atma Ram. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2005.

Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Guru English: South Asian Religion in a Cosmopolitan Language*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

---. 'Postcolonial Affiliations: Ulysses and All About H. Hatterr.' *Transcultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 97-128.

Attridge, Derek. *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

'Author Rushdie wins Joyce award.' *BBC News*. 10 Oct. 2008
< <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/7662792.stm>>. 23 Jan. 2010.

Brown, Richard, ed. *A Companion To James Joyce*. Maiden: Blackwell Pub., 2008. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture.

Brown, Robert and Cheryl Johnson. 'Thinking Poetry: An Interview with Derek Walcott.' *Conversations with Derek Walcott*. Ed. William Baer. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1996. 175-188.

Brugman, J. *An Introduction to the History of Modern Arabic Literature in Egypt*. Leiden:

E.J. Brill, 1984.

Cheng, Vincent. 'Terrible Queer Creatures: Joyce, Cosmopolitanism and the Inauthentic Irishman.' *James Joyce and the Fabrication of an Irish Identity*. Ed. Michael Patrick Gillespie. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2001. 11-38.

Coetzee, J.M. *Elizabeth Costello*. New York: Viking, 2003.

Desani, G.V. *All About H. Hatterr*. New Paltz: McPherson, 1986.

Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.

Fiddian, Robin. 'James Joyce and the Spanish American Novel: A Preliminary Study.' *The Crane Bag* 6.2 (1982): 84-88.

Gibson, Andrew. *James Joyce*. London: Reaktion, 2006.

Grossman, David. *See Under: Love*. Trans. Betsy Rosenberg. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1989.

Hirsch, Edward. 'An Interview with Derek Walcott.' *Contemporary Literature* 20.3 (1979). 279-92.

Hulme, Keri. *The Bone People*. London: Penguin, 1986.

Ito, Eishiro. 'United States of Asia': James Joyce and Japan.' *A Companion To James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Maiden: Blackwell Pub., 2008. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture.

Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

---. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Penguin, 1967.

---. *Ulysses*. London: Penguin, 1992.

Lawrence, Karen. 'Introduction: Metempsychotic Joyce.' *Transcultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 1-10.

McGarrity, Maria. *Washed by the Gulf Stream: the historic and geographic relation of Irish and Caribbean literature*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 2008.

O'Neill, Patrick. *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Pamuk, Orhan. 'Sense of the City: Istanbul.' *BBC News*. 7 Aug. 2003
<<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3131585.stm>>. 23 Jan. 2010.

Pollard, Charles W. 'Traveling with Joyce: Derek Walcott's Discrepant Cosmopolitan Modernism.' *Twentieth Century Literature* 47.2 (2001). 197-216.

Reedy, Sheela. 'An Oriental Gent.' *Outlook India*. 18 Dec. 2000.
<<http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?210550>>. 23 Jan. 2010.

Reedy, Sheela. 'G. V. Desani, le Joyce indien.' *LExpress*. 1 Apr. 2001.
<http://www.lexpress.fr/culture/livre/g-v-desani-le-joyce-indien_804392.html>. 23 Jan. 2010.

Salgado, César Augusto. 'Barroco Joyce: Jorge Luis Borges's and Jose Lezama Lima's Antagonistic Readings.' *Transcultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 63-96.

Walcott, Derek. *Omeros*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux, 1992.

Wollaeger, Mark. "Joyce and Postcolonial Theory: Analytic and Tropical Modes." *A Companion To James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Maiden: Blackwell Pub., 2008. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture.

Wood, Michael. 'Cabrera Infante: Unruly Pupil.' *Transcultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 49-62.