

Roadblocks to Publishing

Obscenity and Blasphemy in Ulysses and The Satanic Verses

Liz DeBell

Submitted to the Department of English, Vanderbilt University,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the Major,

April 24, 201

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
I. Writing, Rewriting, and the Importance of Publication in <i>Ulysses</i>.....	4
Garrett Deasy and the Gentlemen of the Press.....	7
Wanted: Smart Lady Typist to Aid Gentleman in Literary Work.....	10
Stephen's Self-Publication.....	19
Infinite Revisions.....	22
Reading Different Modes of Publication.....	27
Resistance to Conventions.....	30
“Aeolus” and the Mechanical Institution of the Press.....	31
II. <i>The Satanic Verses</i> and Anxieties of Authorship.....	35
The First <i>Satanic Verses</i> Controversy, Before Publication.....	36
Mahound the Businessman.....	38
“Verses and Again Verses”.....	41
The Doubts of Two Salmans.....	47
Muhammad and the False Revelation.....	50
Blasphemy as an Obstacle to Publication.....	54
III. Defending Joyce and Rushdie.....	60
Literary Value as a Defense for Joyce and Rushdie's Transgressions.....	61
Conclusion.....	71
Bibliography.....	75

Introduction

The publishing industry is in such turmoil—thanks to digital publishing platforms which offer higher royalties and instant gratification to authors—that nearly every day a new story comes to light of a bookstore closing, or a digital publishing success, giving doomsayers foretelling the death of the industry and the downfall of publishing houses endless material. While their claims are, in part, correct—the industry cannot go back to the way it was before the introduction of e-readers and Amazon—a glance backward to self-publishing in the past suggests that the industry is constantly in flux, and changes, whether in the realm of obscenity, blasphemy, or technology, inevitably impact the industry. Of course, even using the words “self-publishing” brings to mind a very specific definition, yet this definition has changed over time. Once, it brought to mind images of vanity presses, but now most of the buzz surrounding self-publishing is in the digital world. These developments have given rise to a number of anxieties in the publishing community: how will publishing houses make themselves relevant in the digital publishing world? What is the future of the publishing industry? Does a text carry the same weight as “literature” when published online as when published in print? Do we value literature less when it’s sold at discount prices? While I don’t presume to have the answers to these questions, my hope is that examining cases of self-publishing in the past will shed light on the new developments in the industry.

Rather than looking at texts that are self-published in the strictest sense, I chose novels whose publication marked an important moment in literary and cultural history, and which were in some extended sense self-published. *Ulysses* was an obvious choice, given that the story of

Joyce's relationship with Sylvia Beach in Paris of the 1920s is often discussed, and historically rich. I decided on *The Satanic Verses* much later, though I knew next to nothing about it before I began this project. Much of the discussion I could find about the Rushdie affair came from the early or mid-1990s, though now the persecution of the novel reads as a precursor to the continued culture clashes between Islamic fundamentalism and Western culture.

Turning specifically to *Ulysses*' publication in 1922 and *The Satanic Verses*' publication in 1988, we can see that the forces outside authors' control that drive them to self-publish are every bit as important as the actual instance of publication. In Joyce's case, obscenity laws clashed with his stream-of-consciousness technique. His publication was much discussed in Western culture, and it was generally understood that he was using words proscribed by the standards of politeness and literary propriety of his time. In Rushdie's case, he launched *The Satanic Verses* into a world that was much more globalized than was Joyce's, and he therefore encountered different reactions according to the different values of the cultures who read (or heard about) his novel. In Western culture, his blasphemy was understood in its literary context, but in Muslim fundamentalist culture, the author and his work are understood to be one and the same, and the designation of "literature" did not signal a division between the two. These different standards came into conflict and drove him to a form of self-publishing for the paperback edition. Today, by contrast, many aspiring writers circumvent the traditional publishing system not as a way to avoid censorship but in order to break into the industry and to earn royalties from their work. Whereas the motives for self-publishing have evolved over time, Joyce's desire to effectively self-publish *Ulysses* is, in effect, borne of the same desire to see his work in print and to finally earn a living from his writing.

With these issues in mind, in the following pages I will turn to *Ulysses*, examining three different written texts that appear: Martha's letter, Deasy's published letter, and Stephen's unpublished verse. Through the exploration of these three texts' similarities and differences, we can form a picture of the way publication is treated in *Ulysses*, and we can explore the implications that had in Joyce's own life. Joyce's refusal to remove the obscenity from *Ulysses* rendered traditional publishing impossible in his case. Turning next to *The Satanic Verses*, we see that blasphemy, not obscenity, forced Salman Rushdie to evade the traditional publishing system, even though his novel was initially much heralded in literary circles. In *The Satanic Verses*, words are often fraught with doubts about their origin, a portrayal that complicates Rushdie's depiction of the Prophet Mahound (his version of Muhammad). Then, in a brief final discussion, I will reflect on how these issues of obscenity, blasphemy, and self-publishing play out today in the digital realm.

SECTION I

Writing, Rewriting, and the Importance of Publication in *Ulysses*

Now let awhile my messmates me
 My ponderous Penelope
 And my Ulysses born anew
 In Dublin as an Irish jew.
 With them I'll sit, with them I'll drink
 Nor heed what press and pressmen think
 Nor leave their rockbound house of joy
 For Helen or for windy Troy.

James Joyce, letter to Ezra Pound July 24, 1917 (Ellman 416)

Seeking publishers for *Ulysses* amidst the oppressive censorship of the 1920s, James Joyce found that in United States and the United Kingdom they were reluctant to print the novel, unless he removed the offending, “obscene” portions. Joyce’s refusal to do so prompted Sylvia Beach, owner of the Parisian English-language bookstore Shakespeare and Company, to take on the novel’s publication. As part of their unusual agreement, Joyce was to have as many sets of proofs and revisions as he wanted at the expense of the publisher. Joyce turned to this arrangement rather than accepting that he must cede to pressure from censors and “heed what press and pressmen think.” Thus, institutional constraints, rather than financial concerns caused Joyce to resort to a version of self-publishing. In its broadest sense, self-publication in this thesis will be used to denote an instance of publication that circumvents the traditional publishing apparatus of editors, agents, and the greater industry mechanics but still makes its way into print. Obscenity laws, in Joyce’s experience, were the roadblocks to traditional publishing, yet because he was forced to self-publish with Beach’s help, he was able to pursue a fantasy of individual autonomy in writing and editing *Ulysses*.

Joyce took creative control over the book’s production, from selecting the specific shade of blue chosen for the cover to painstakingly correcting proofs and rewriting portions of the text.

However, the nature of publishing requires a team: typists, printers, editors, as well as the author (and the benefactors who supported him while he wrote). Because of his agreement with Beach, Joyce was able to serve as editor, author, and publisher of his novel, yet he relied on typists and the printer, Maurice Darantiere, for their services. In this sense, Joyce attempts to strike a balance between self-publishing and the autonomy that it entails while acceding to the inevitable compromises and oversights that occur in the greater publishing industry. As much as Joyce seeks a fantasy of individual authorship—of having complete control over every aspect his text—the reality of publishing as a collective enterprise mitigates his complete autonomy.

Rather than solely focusing on the prepublication history of *Ulysses*, in this chapter I will examine instances of publication within the text—specifically, Mr. Deasy’s letter published in *The Evening Telegraph* and Stephen’s “self-published” poem—which I will compare with the unpublished letter from Martha Clifford that appears in “Lotus-Eaters.” A close reading of these moments enables a movement outwards to the novel itself, as Stephen’s methods of revision and composition illuminate Joyce’s own. This implicit commentary on the natures of composition and publication points to new ways in which *Ulysses* challenges novelistic convention. From this perspective, in writing *Ulysses* Joyce seeks ways to redefine the boundary between self-publishing and the publishing industry. This resistance to conventions becomes especially relevant in the “Aeolus” episode, when Bloom travels to the press itself, thus establishing a meta-literary parallel to the novel’s concern with publication. Furthermore, the typography of “Aeolus” draws implicit parallels to the press as an institution: the headlines disorient the reader from previous expectations about the novel as a genre; they blur the lines between machine and man; and they obscure the distinction between individual and collective authorship.

Turning to the specific moments in the text, we see that early in “Proteus,” Stephen recalls a version of his younger self, hungering for fame and admiration for his yet-unwritten novels, hiding his “epiphanies” to be published after his death. Because he acknowledges—however self-loathingly—this part of his past, his decision to write down the poem he begins in “Proteus” constitutes an instance of self-publication. Although Stephen’s poem isn’t printed, because a small part of him intends to eventually share his works, and to pursue a career as a writer, it is evocative of truths about self-publishing. His words are committed to the page, where anyone can read them and see the results of his writing process, making the poem concrete, rather than a passing thought. Stephen has the necessary connections to literary circles needed to become a published writer—a status that prompts Deasy to ask Stephen to have his letter published—yet the verse remains in this self-published state, unread and uninitiated into the press or the publishing industry. Conversely Martha Clifford’s letter, which like Stephen’s is written in private and not to be shared with a general public, does not represent self-publication, because it is intended to remain private and personal, never to be shared beyond the letter’s writer and its recipient. The insecure, exploratory aspects of Martha’s letter, and the furtive way Bloom reads it, demonstrates another part of Joyce’s writing process: the inclusion of personal anecdote and experience in the creation of a fictional universe. The inclusion of these details is also important in a historical sense, because Martha Clifford’s letter is indicative of *Ulysses*’ obscenity—the aspect of the novel that drove Joyce to self-publish. Looking at the similarities and differences between these two instances of private writing, we can better understand the nature and the importance of self-publication to Stephen and Joyce.

In stark opposition to these instances of private, intimate writing, Deasy’s letter marks a very public publication. His formal, high-blown style and his determination to see it printed in

the newspaper evoke truths about the publishing industry, which Joyce playfully skewers. In this instance of the press, Deasy depends on Stephen's connections and the editor's attention to get his letter printed, demonstrating that the author must compromise some of his control over his work once it passes from his hands into the greater press. The tension between Stephen's self-published poem and Deasy's printed letter echoes in Joyce's agreement with Beach, which attempts to recreate an ideal of self-publishing through the complete artistic control and the potentially endless revisions she allowed him—though in practice the realities of publishing's collective nature forced a compromise between self-publishing and publishing as an industry. Examining the external forces—obscenity laws, lack of connections to literary circles, or insecurity about legacy as an artist—that lead Joyce, Deasy, and Stephen to their respective decisions on *how* to publish illuminates the importance of different methods of publication for writers and readers, and elucidates the relationship between the act of publication and the culture surrounding the act.

Garrett Deasy and the Gentlemen of the Press

The first instance of a written text in the novel, Mr. Deasy's letter argues that because foot-and-mouth disease is curable, and that an embargo on Irish cattle in order to prevent the spread of the disease is unnecessary. This letter represents the material accepted for publication: misinformed and rather uninteresting, though easily skimmed for its main points. Although Deasy is not as intellectual as Stephen, his blind ambition, easily achievable short-term goal, and willingness to use Stephen's connections enable him to get his letter in print. When the letter first appears in "Nestor," Stephen glosses over the details, grasping instead the general concepts.

Foot and mouth disease. Known as Koch's preparation. Serum and virus. Percentage of salted horses. Rinderpest. Emperor's horses at

Murzsteg, lower Austria. Veterinary surgeons. Mr Henry Blackwood Price. Courteous offer a fair trial. Dictates of common sense. Allimportant question. In every sense of the word take the bull by the horns. Thanking you for the hospitality of your columns. (33)¹

From the opening plea, “May I trespass on your valuable space,” to the final “Thanking you for the hospitality of your columns,” Mr. Garrett Deasy’s letter attempts, rather failingly, to achieve eloquence, to instill in his readers a greater understanding of the disease, and to convince them that it might be cured. In fact, Koch’s preparation, which Deasy apparently alludes to as a cure, was used for the prevention of anthrax, and had only minimal success as an immunization against food-and-mouth disease (Gifford and Seidman 38). Although his facts are, typically, not entirely accurate, Deasy’s assurance about his accuracy and his powers of rhetoric never falter. “I have put the matter into a nutshell,” he tells Stephen (32). Deasy’s pseudo-intellectual nature does not escape Stephen, who reminds Deasy earlier in the episode that in quoting the Shakespearean wisdom “*Put but money in thy purse*” (30) he is quoting Iago, the villain, not the hero, of the play *Othello*. Still, Deasy goes on unencumbered by self-doubt. He boldly tells Stephen, “I want that to be printed and read,” and he remains convinced that the letter will generate enough publicity to attain the “influence in the department” necessary to enact change (33). Harboring delusions of grandeur, Deasy asks that Stephen “have it published at once” (35). Stephen, though he sees through Deasy’s blustering pride, accepts his duty, and agrees to present

¹ This letter is based on one written by Henry Blackwood Price (whose name appears in Deasy’s letter in *Ulysses*), a friend of Joyce’s who asked him to find a contact address for William Field, M.P., a butcher who was president of the Irish Cattle Trader’s Society. Price had heard of a cure, discovered in Austria, for the hoof and mouth disease. According to Ellmann, “Joyce forwarded to Field a letter from Price, which Field had published in the *Evening Telegraph*” (326). For the full text of Price’s letter, see Ellmann.

it to two newspapers for publication. In this case, the publishing process, as represented in Mr. Deasy's experience, seems to cater to those who are brazen enough to exploit connections to those wielding the power of the press—whether or not they are a real authority on their subjects.

The venue of the letter's publication, the newspaper presented in "Aeolus," represents the institution of the press within which Deasy functions comfortably as he attempts to pass off his opinion as fact. Whereas a column or an objective news item would carry more weight as a reputable source of factual information, Deasy chooses to voice his argument in a letter to the editor, a medium which implies that its contents are based on opinions, not indisputable facts. Nonetheless, Deasy remarks, "There can be no two opinions on the matter"—a decidedly un-Joycean thought (32). Deasy does not doubt that the power of his letter will convert those who disagree with his argument to his own point of view. Essentially, he presents his opinion as fact, and he shares his opinion in such an authoritative way that it fits in with the atmosphere of "Aeolus," where seemingly mechanically produced headlines mock the institutional feel of the press and its corresponding lack of individual authorship. In her book *Joyce's Anatomy of Culture*, Cheryl Herr notes that "the headings signify, among other things, the attempt of the press to hold sway over discourse in Irish society. This effort to control becomes critical when we consider that what the press presents as fact is often a seemingly authoritative version of a personal opinion" (Herr 77).² Like Deasy's letter, which confounds his own opinion with indisputable fact, the press as an institution here passes off "seemingly authoritative" personal views as fact. This parallel demonstrates that Deasy's letter is indicative of truths about the press

² Political issues such as Irish home rule and British imperialism run throughout *Ulysses*, but are not the focus of this thesis. For more on these topics, see (among many books on politics in Joyce) Herr's *Joyce's Anatomy of Culture*, Leonard Orr's collection of essays *Joyce, Imperialism, & Postcolonialism* (2008), or *Reading Joyce Politically* by Trevor Williams (1997).

as a whole. In portraying the faulty logic in Deasy's letter, Joyce cast doubts on the intelligence of the institution's contributors.

This parallel between the letter and the venue in which it is printed points to a criticism of the press. In *Ulysses*, "a seemingly authoritative version of a personal opinion" is the very best we can hope for from the press, but, as seen in "Eumaeus" when Stephen and Bloom find Deasy's letter in the paper, the press also takes the forms of a "line of bitched type" and "the usual crop of nonsensical howlers of misprints" (648). Deasy's letter appears in the pink edition of the *Telegraph* next to the account of "Funeral of the late Mr Patrick Dignam," which Bloom attends in "Hades." Although the letter is not reprinted in "Eumaeus," Bloom's careful reading of the account of the funeral—which not only misspells his name as L. Boom, but also counts Stephen Dedalus, B.A. as among the mourners despite his "total absence"—conveys the press's fallibility as a source of factual information. Deasy comes across as rather ignorant in "Nestor," yet in "Aeolus" and "Eumaeus" he initially appears to have gained credibility because a newspaper agrees to print his point of view. The press has an important sway over public discourse, yet the standards to which the press itself is held are not stringent enough to merit this power. Rather, Joyce mocks the press's pseudo-self-importance through the headlines, only to undermine this later in the paper ridden with mistakes, and the newspapermen who prefer to spend their days at a bar than at the press.

Wanted: Smart Lady Typist to Aid Gentleman in Literary Work

In a sharp contrast to Deasy's letter, which circulates among the Stephen, Myles Crawford, and the men at the *Evening Telegraph*, Martha Clifford's letter to Bloom is part of an entirely private correspondence. Deasy's letter, which is published and therefore in theory subject to the press's standards and rules, fails to live up to the press's prestige as a factual

source; conversely, Martha self-edits her letter, which is private and therefore not subject to laws governing the press, though she still hints at sadomasochism. The letter operates in suggestion and euphemism rather than outright obscenity, in a vast departure from the complete lack of self-censorship needed to the aesthetic aim of *Ulysses*: the stream of consciousness technique. Joyce loosely based Bloom's correspondence with Martha on his own extramarital exploits, and this decision to draw on his own experiences and to include details despite knowing that they were obscene foregrounds the way in which sexuality and artistic creation were linked in Joyce's composition of *Ulysses*. He sought sexual encounters with a couple of women in order that he might use the experience as an inspiration for his writing, yet it was precisely because he included sexual details such as these that the book was declared obscene. In "Joyce and Feminism," Karen Lawrence notes that Joyce "believed that art is not simple self-expression or autobiography, but a complicated embedding, disguising, dispersing of the author and his desire in the text," and one such place where we see this is in the overlap between Bloom's correspondence and Joyce's own extramarital experimentation (240). Obscenity and art are far from mutually exclusive in this formulation; rather, Joyce treats the obscene elements as crucial to his literature. Because he creates a type of literature not yet welcomed into the world of traditional publishing, Joyce was driven to his version of self-publishing, which eluded obscenity law through publishing in France.

Just an hour after the appearance of the "bold hand" on the envelope of Blazes Boylan's letter for Molly Bloom introduces the theme of infidelity into the day's odyssey, Leopold collects his own correspondence at the post office, using a pseudonym to distance his real

identity from this correspondence.³ Waiting at the post office, Bloom thinks to himself, “No answer probably. Went too far last time,” but the postmistress brings him a letter from Martha. She writes, “I am awfully angry with you. I do wish I could punish you for that. I called you naughty boy because I do not like that other world. Please tell me what is the real meaning of that word. Are you not happy in your home you poor little naughty boy?” and threatens, “Remember if you do not [write] I will punish you. So now you know what I will do to you, you naughty boy, if you do not write” (78). Martha’s letter, with its repetition of the words “punish” and “naughty boy,” appears to be the work of a someone who is still reticent when faced with this type of sexually charged correspondence, and who has simply picked up key phrases from a different source; in this case, that source is likely Bloom’s own letter. While Martha’s letter is tame relative to modern standards, her tone gestures towards sadomasochism, which Bloom appears to have initiated.

Bloom goes to great lengths to conceal this correspondence, inappropriate for a married man even apart from its indication of his sexual fetishes. Unlike Stephen’s personal writing which is to be shared after his death, Bloom tears up the envelope addressed to Henry Flower Esq., hoping to disrupt any potential trail of evidence. Musing on the ease of destroying a written text, Bloom thinks, “You could tear up a cheque for a hundred pounds in the same way” (79), a thought that recalls the ease with which Stephen tears the end off of Deasy’s letter in “Proteus.” Unlike Deasy’s public letter, this letter’s readership is limited to the two parties

³ Lawrence notes that although Leopold’s pseudonym, Henry Flower Esq., initially appears to be just an obvious synonym for Bloom, the word “flower” also appears later in “Lotus-Eaters” while Bloom imagines himself looking at his own naked body in the bath, and sees “the limp father of thousands, a languid floating flower” (86). Thus, Lawrence establishes the connection between the name and Bloom’s sexuality on another, more subconscious level; “By a ‘commodus vicus of recirculation,’ we can trace the disguised signature back to the phallus of the author” (“Joyce and Feminism” 225).

involved: Bloom/Flower and Martha. Nonetheless, Martha's reticence in the letter shows that the letter is still self-edited, even though it remains private and is therefore not subject to legal restrictions about what is written, such as obscenity laws. Even as she's engaging in an "obscene" correspondence, Martha subscribes to some degree to the standards of propriety of 1904. Joyce, on the other hand, did not self-censor distasteful details in writing *Ulysses*. The inclusion of this letter, which raises issues about Bloom's sexuality, already links writing and obscenity—a relationship Joyce would come to know well in the years surrounding the 1922 publication.

While Bloom differs in many ways from Joyce, the inclusion of this correspondence with Martha recalls the ways in which Joyce sought life experiences he believed were crucial to his writing. Noting these similarities between Joyce's biography and his insertion of his desire into the text demonstrates that Joyce at times appropriated experiences for his artistic purposes that were equally as intimate as Bloom's letters to Martha, only to share them with the world in a display far more public than Deasy's published letter. During the eight years Joyce took to compose *Ulysses*, he had a couple of extra-marital relationships which began in exchanging letters, and therefore lend themselves to comparison with Bloom's correspondence.

On holiday in Locarno in 1917, Joyce met a female doctor named Gertrude Kaempffer whom he "sought to excite...by describing, in his fastidious handwriting, his first sexual experience," using words such as "piss" and "jiggled" which Dr. Kaempffer, like Martha, did not know or like (Ellmann 419). Compelled to destroy the evidence, Kaempffer, like Bloom, decided to tear up the letters. Joyce's letters to Kaempffer flirt with obscenity, just as Martha's letter to Bloom does, yet because Joyce's letter to Kaempffer remained private it was not subject to the censorship that *Ulysses* was. Because Joyce's letters to Kaempffer were entirely

unpublished, they were held to personal standards rather than legal ones. Whereas Martha conveys her discomfort in the obscene correspondence through her self-editing and her reticence, Kaempffer simply wrote Joyce off as an eccentric and tore up the letters. Joyce's interaction with Kaempffer prefigures his interest in obscene correspondence that appears in *Ulysses*, and his inclusion of dirty words draws parallels between Bloom and Joyce. Whereas Bloom receives a response even though he "went too far last time," Joyce found his letters to Kaempffer unreturned. When Joyce treated the same subjects in his novel that he did in his private letters, he was prosecuted; this eventual legal action highlights the different conceptions of obscenity in public and private. What can be ignored or downplayed in a private correspondence becomes subject to legal regulation when shared with an audience.

A more remarkable instance of Joyce's extramarital affairs occurred when Joyce encountered Marthe Fleischmann in Zurich in December 1918. Soon, he began his pursuit of her with a letter written in French (Ellmann 448). Fleischmann would later serve as inspiration for both Martha Clifford and Gerty MacDowell in *Ulysses*. Their meeting that marked the transition from a correspondence to a sexual relationship was to take place at Joyce's friend Frank Budgen's studio, and of this meeting Joyce told Budgen, "If I permitted myself any restraint in this matter it would be spiritual death to me" (as quoted in Ellmann 451). If taken at face value, Joyce's refusal to restrain himself appears borne of an understanding that the affair is crucial to his growth as an artist. However, a more cynical reading reveals that perhaps Joyce claimed that restraint would mean "spiritual death" because he knew that the guise of artistic exploration would win him Budgen's support. While we can never know whether Joyce's intentions were truly borne of a need for artistic experience or simply sexual desire, his claims to a spiritual need for infidelity recall Bloom's own ruse for beginning his correspondence with Martha: "Wanted

smart lady typist to aid gentleman in literary work” (160). Bloom uses literary work as a ruse to attract women to a dialogue that is more erotic than artistic, whereas Joyce actually uses such erotic encounters as material for his novel.

Like Bloom who poses as a literary gentleman in order to engage in a semi-illicit correspondence with Martha, Joyce himself used his alleged need for artistic experiences as a justification for his infidelity. While Joyce did not lead Budgen to believe that he and Marthe had consummated their affair, his interest in exploring extramarital sexual relations closely approximates Bloom’s own experiences on June 16, 1904.⁴ These moments in *Ulysses* that refigure Joyce’s own intimate relationships of the past dramatize the way that many forms of intimate correspondence can become public knowledge.⁵ However, because Joyce’s secrets were couched in a work of fiction, early readers of *Ulysses* would not have recognized their resonance with Joyce’s own experiences. Lawrence points out that “Stanislaus Joyce wrote that it could be contended of James’s style that he ‘confesses in a foreign language’” (*My Brother’s Keeper* 81, as quoted in “Joyce and Feminism” 240). Because Joyce distanced himself from his own experiences when he wrote them into fiction, “James came to realize that disclosure and disguise were inextricably linked, particularly in the arena of sexuality” (“Joyce and Feminism” 240). Just as Bloom pretends to be Henry Flower in order to exercise his sexual desires, Joyce disclosed his sexual past without really claiming it as his own. Although his experiences were disguised in *Ulysses*, Joyce nonetheless appropriates his own secret moments for a very public

⁴ Joyce famously set *Ulysses* on the date of the first walk he took with his wife, Nora Barnacle. He had an affinity for certain dates, such as June 16 and February 2, his birthday. Joyce decided that he wanted to have the first copy of *Ulysses* on his fortieth birthday in 1922, but he also set his liaison with Marthe Fleischmann for his birthday in 1919.

⁵This problem recurs in a different form in light of today’s technology, as online correspondence thought to be private is often hacked or reposted and made public.

publication. The line between public and private is tenuous, and material from one realm can easily be appropriated for the other.

Although Marthe Fleischmann's reincarnation as Martha Clifford in "Lotus-Eaters" only hints at obscenity, her influence on the Gerty MacDowell character in "Nausicaa" is more overtly sexual, and the episode's publication in *The Little Review* drew attention for its obscenity. When John Sumner of the New York Society for the Prevention of Vice read the edition of *The Little Review* in which the "Nausicaa" episode appears, he prompted the magazine's trial. Even in positive reviews of the novel, reviewers did not dance around the fact that much of Joyce's novel does not meet with the standards of "good taste." Of course, because the reviewers themselves conform to these standards, they do not enumerate the offenses, offering instead a general description. They assume the offensive words to be understood by the readers; paradoxically, obscenity is completely taboo, yet everyone knows about it somehow. The *faux pas* is to speak it explicitly, rather than trusting that it is understood. Ellmann notes the irony of the obscenity of the trial of *The Little Review* in his biography of Joyce. Attempting to avoid any offense to Margaret Anderson, the publisher of *The Little Review*, the judge "urged that [the obscene passages] not be read in the presence of Miss Anderson;" when her lawyer John Quinn pointed out that as the publisher, she surely had already read the passage, the judge "gallantly" responded, "I am sure she didn't know the significance of what she was publishing" (Ellmann 503). The judges anxiously avoid committing the same obscenity for which they are trying *The Little Review*, and reading the offending portion of "Nausicaa" in front of women is out of the question. He would not hesitate to convict her for publishing obscenity, even though he claimed she must be ignorant of the passage's underlying sexuality.

Anderson was not even allowed to speak in the trial of *The Little Review*—one which ended in her conviction. Rather, lawyers, judges, and “literary experts” gave the arguments. Anderson recalls a judge musing, “It sounds to me like the ravings of a disordered mind—I can’t see why any one would want to publish it,” though it does not occur to him to ask the publisher, who was present (“Ulysses’ In Court” 24). Instead, Anderson writes, “I suddenly feel as though I had been run over by a subway train. My distinguished co-publisher is pounding me violently in the ribs: ‘Don’t try to talk; don’t put yourself into their hands’” and instead of speaking out Anderson continues to “smile vacuously at the court” (“Ulysses’ In Court” 25). As a woman, Anderson was not allowed to defend herself, but she still had the right to be convicted. Given that *Ulysses* was controversial because of a scene of female sexuality, the fact that its first publishers were women—Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap at *The Little Review*, Harriet Weaver at *The Egoist*, and Sylvia Beach at Shakespeare and Company—demonstrates another way that the novel was ahead of its time. This complicated treatment of women indicates that a function of great literature is to force these social issues in order to force progress—a notion that Salman Rushdie will pick up in writing *The Satanic Verses*.

Comparing Joyce’s treatment of women to the judges’ brings to light major discrepancies between their relationships with women, and helps to explain why *Ulysses* scandalized so many people. Even though Joyce occasionally fixated on women like Marthe Fleischmann as sexual objects, his decision to work with female publishers betrays a progressive attitude towards women in the workplace.⁶ Nonetheless, Joyce is often criticized for his complicated treatment of women in his fiction and in his life. Introducing their collection of articles on *Women in Joyce*,

⁶ Joyce’s decision to work with women, like Sylvia Beach, essentially as equals or business partners is all the more striking when compared to the legal status of women: when Anderson and Heap began publishing *Ulysses* in *The Little Review* in 1918, they did not even have the right to vote—though they could (and would) still be tried for obscenity.

Elaine Unkeless and Suzette Henke argue that, “as sexual object or muse...Molly remains limited,” because “many of her characteristics are based on conventional, even stereotypical notions of female conduct” (Henke and Unkeless xviii). They see Joyce’s treatment of women as reductive, and as a perpetuation of stereotypes about women. Unkeless expands this theory in a later chapter, asserting that, “Delineating Molly mainly as a sexual being, Joyce confines her character to a conventional mold” (153). While it is certainly true that Molly is portrayed in a strongly sexual sense, and that even in her first appearance “Calypso” her intelligence is undercut, I would argue that Joyce’s treatment of her sexuality is anything but conventional, especially for his time. To treat female sexuality with such frankness was simply not done outside of pornographic literature.

Yet again, *Ulysses* resists an either/or categorization: it is neither a book that portrays women in complete fairness, nor is it a novel that completely reduces them to traditional roles. Karen Lawrence explores Joyce’s complex relationship with women through his records of his and Nora’s dreams, which betray an anxiety about women and his portrayal of women in *Ulysses*; Lawrence writes, “As Joyce’s own dreams and letters attest, to expose the workings of male paranoia, desire, guilt, and ambivalence in one’s fiction, is not necessarily to free one from the same feelings” (242). Thus, whereas Joyce treats issues that cause him paranoia and guilt, he has not necessarily found a solution for these problems. Still, because Joyce is understood to be so closely aligned with Stephen and Bloom, often readers are tempted to take the portrayal of women in the novel as the complete truth of Joyce’s own feelings towards women, and towards gender roles. The problem then becomes to understand where a fictional character—Bloom, Stephen, or Molly—begins and Joyce ends. Joyce’s case is a special one, specific to his technique and to his famous, public associations of himself and the fictional Stephen Dedalus

and Leopold Bloom, yet the prevailing thought among Western readers tends to be that the author's opinions and the contents of the text are not synonymous. In Rushdie's case, however, the Muslim fundamentalists who were outraged at *The Satanic Verses* could not see the distinction between the man, his opinions, and his fiction.

Stephen's Self-Publication

While Stephen's poem differs from Martha and Mr. Deasy's letter in that it is not yet shared with anyone, it continues Joyce's blend of personal experience with imaginative creation, and draws a parallel between Stephen's writing process and Joyce's own. Stephen's poem, composed on the beach in "Proteus," features the fantastic elements of a vampire and a bat. Whereas Deasy's letter is highly contextualized, clearly referring to a specific problem that he sees in contemporary society, Stephen's poem aims for literary artistry, the establishment of his oeuvre. Earlier in "Proteus," Stephen recalls his own delusions of grandeur. However, unlike Deasy, who hopes to have his work published immediately, Stephen remembers how he "bowed to [himself] in the mirror, stepping forward to applause earnestly" with chagrin; his best attempt at consolation lies in the thought, "No one saw: tell no-one" (40). He thinks of his "epiphanies on green oval leaves, deeply deep, copies to be sent if you died to all the great libraries of the world, including Alexandria" (40). Although Stephen looks back on those moments as childhood embarrassments, he still harbors visions of his own greatness or immortality; as when he asks himself "Am I walking into eternity along Sandymount strand?" (37). At this point, Stephen's writing is extremely private, though he hopes its genius will be recognized after his death. While at this time it may not be printed or finalized, Stephen's secret wish that his work will be entered into the "great libraries" shows that any act of writing or composition for him meant an entry into his future catalogue of work, and the commencement of something

historically significant.

In its initial conception, Stephen's composition on the beach at Sandymount Strand is almost immediately intertwined with revisions, providing insights into Stephen's writing process, and recalling Joyce's own technique. "He comes, pale vampire, through storm his eyes, his bat sails bloodying the sea, mouth to her mouth's kiss," the poem begins (48). Continuing his composition, Stephen thinks, "Mouth to her kiss. No. Must be two of em. Glue 'em well. Mouth to her mouth's kiss" (48). Already, Stephen is revising the poem even as he is composing it. His attention to the placement of the words, and the effect they create portrays the artist's writing process. Like Joyce, whose "method was to write a series of phrases down, then, as the episode took form, to cross off each one in a different colored pencil to indicate where it might go," Stephen's process begins with the initial impulse to record an otherwise fleeting thought, then reshape it (Ellmann 416). Joyce's self-publication demonstrates the ways in which this mode of publishing and writing fosters artistic expression (which, in turn, according to Stephen's fantasies, fosters posthumous fame). However, although Joyce remained in control of the contents and appearance of the book, its publication depended on Darantiere, a printer in Dijon who produced the first edition, and the typists who transcribed Joyce's handwritten pages into type.⁷ Thus, Joyce's self-publishing inevitably was a collective enterprise at the same time that he sought complete control. This depiction of autonomy in self-publishing presents Joyce's fantasy of an individual author and publisher, free from the social anxieties about publishing. The eventual dissemination of the text highlights the tension between self-publishing and the

⁷ Beach recalls the typists' frustration with Joyce's method of writing and revision; after he "had been trying in vain for some time to get this episode typed. Nine typists had failed in the attempt. The eighth, Joyce told me, threatened in her despair to throw herself out of the window" (Beach 63-4).

publishing industry, as individual agency is again compromised once the text enters the public sphere. In a way, the printer and the typists served as authors of the book along with Joyce, suggesting that self-publishing in its purest form is an illusion, and that the reality of publishing requires writers and publishers to strike a balance between individual authorship and collectivity.

Stephen's epiphanies in "Proteus" portray thoughts equally as meandering as his path along the beach, as he consciously references Aristotle, Aquinas, and Swift, but when he composes his own poem, he fails to realize that he is not producing an original verse. Instead, he imagines that he is creating something all his own. Beplate notes that "Stephen's verse is, both literally and figuratively 'ripped off,'" because his poem is "a reworked version of an old Irish poem translated in Hyde's *Love Songs of Connacht*" (309). As quoted in Gifford and Seidman's *Ulysses Annotated*, the original stanza read: "And my love came behind me--/ He came from the South; / His breast to my bosom, / His mouth to my mouth" (62). In this moment, Stephen simultaneously exists in Joyce's version of Dublin 1904 and interacts with tradition and a cultural history outside of the pages of *Ulysses*. He participates in the same tradition that Hyde did when he translated the poem from its original language, though he adds his own twist to the poem in the incorporation of the vampire. Still, this failure to compose an original poem, echoing instead a poem from years gone by, recalls Stephen's statement to Mr Deasy in "Nestor": "History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (34). In this way, his poem is the deconstructionist "text" in dialogue with all previous works, entering into the same literary space as they, and revising the traditional text from *Love Songs of Connacht* in the same way that Joyce revised the story of the odyssey, and Salman Rushdie revised the satanic verses incident to offer a new way to understand a recycled story.

Even as Stephen exists firmly in the world of Dublin in 1904, he also interacts with past tradition and with literary history. Umberto Eco argues in *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos* that Joyce “conceived of a total work, a Work-as-Cosmos. The reference point is not the poet in his ivory tower but the human community and, ultimately, all history and culture,” and Stephen’s rewriting of Hyde’s poem reworking of an old poem underscores the resonances of the “human community” with Joyce’s “cosmos” in *Ulysses* (Eco 33). The tension between the desire to encapsulate the innumerable aspects of human life and the reality that the novel by definition has a beginning and end provides another opportunity to explore the nature of publishing; in this novel Joyce attempts to strain against the limits of his chosen medium. He is writing a novel that seeks to emulate life, but a continuous flow of days characterizes life—a notion which conflicts with the novel as a static object. In choosing to tell the story of a “typical” day in Dublin in 1904, Joyce wrestles with the ways in which publishing a novel can ultimately only capture a sliver of human experience, while attempting to find new ways that the novel can reveal truths about human life within the constraints of the medium.

Infinite Revisions

Attempting to convey the human side of *Ulysses*, Joyce wrote and revised the novel in a way that invites the reader to interact with the text. The Joycean interest in the process of writing, of potentially infinite revisions, and endless returns to a text (either as a reader or as a writer) is not stated explicitly in *Ulysses*, yet, as quoted in the introduction to Michael Groden’s *Ulysses in Progress*, Joyce asserts that he “put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant” (3). This claim speaks not just to the book’s labyrinthine construction but also to the way it compels us to revisit its passages. Clearly, this effect is the product of much labor on Joyce’s part. Frank Budgen recounts an

instance in which Joyce spent an entire day working on two sentences from “Sirens.” According to Budgen, Joyce told him, “I have the words already. What I am seeking is the perfect order of words in the sentence. There is an order in every way appropriate. I think I have it. The words through which I express the effect of it on my hungry hero are ‘Perfume of embraces all him assailed. Which hungered flesh obscurely, he mutely craved to adore.’ You can see for yourself in how many different ways they might be arranged” (Budgen 20).”⁸ In this anecdote, Joyce’s project was to craft a highly aesthetic text that also spoke to the humanity of its protagonist. He sought to ensure that the enigmas and puzzles after a while begin to seem, like life itself, at once completely random and part of a pattern. Stephen’s poem lacks such techniques of confusion, yet his attention to the precise words reminds us that we are reading a novel; thus, we are reading words that were carefully chosen to create an effect—no matter how completely random and obscure they may seem.

Joyce’s writing process centered around simultaneous revising, composing, and printing once Sylvia Beach, owner of the bookstore Shakespeare and Company and first-time publisher, took on the publication of *Ulysses*. In her memoir, *Shakespeare and Company*, Sylvia Beach remembers Joyce’s “insatiable” desire for the novel’s proofs: “Every proof was covered with additional text,” she writes; “Joyce told me that he had written a third of *Ulysses* on the proofs” (58). Ellmann corroborates this account: “With Joyce the reading of proof was a creative act; he insisted on five sets, and from notes he had made innumerable changes, almost always additions, in the text, complicating the interior monologue with more and more interconnecting details” (513). Michael Groden revisits this process of revision in *Ulysses in Progress*, remarking that

⁸ Groden has since proven that this anecdote is not entirely factual, though it is still useful in thinking about Joyce’s goals in writing *Ulysses*, and the almost mythical status that his writing process has acquired over time (*Ulysses in Progress*).

“for some pages there are as many as thirteen different stages of development, beginning with the manuscript from which the typescript was prepared and ending with the published text” (3). Thus, Joyce’s agreement with Beach enabled him to drastically alter the novel, and to have a degree of control over the finished product that is not typically possible in traditional publishing houses. He was able to act as editor, publisher, and author. The finished product was to be “as Joyce wished, in every respect,” according to Beach (60).⁹ A luxury for an author at that time, Beach’s generosity with Joyce enabled him, on the surface, to achieve an ideal of self-publishing, though the mediation of typists and printers meant that this ideal eventually was compromised.

When viewed through the lens of Joyce’s own composition process, Stephen’s concern with the individual phrase, “Mouth to her mouth’s kiss” becomes a reflection on the artistic process of the individual writer, and specifically a reflection of the process of revision so central to *Ulysses*. This refocuses the concern with publishing, from the general newspaper publishing industry that Deasy wants to utilize, to the very personal aspect of editing and publishing to a writer. In the midst of writing *Ulysses*, Joyce wrote to Ezra Pound in 1917 saying, “I wonder if you will like the book I am writing?” and in “Proteus,” Stephen asks himself “Who ever anywhere will read these written words?” when his poem is only “published” in his own hand (Letters 101, *Ulysses* 48). Like Deasy’s letter and *Ulysses* itself, Stephen’s hand-written poem exists to be read and shared, though at present the verse is still Stephen’s secret—a secret which is not obscene, like Bloom and Martha’s, but nonetheless kept private. Ultimately, it is the

⁹ However, she warns, “I wouldn’t advise ‘real’ publishers to follow my example, nor authors to follow Joyce’s. It would be the death of publishing. My case was different. It seemed natural to me that the efforts and the sacrifices on my part should be proportionate to the greatness of the work I was publishing” (Beach 60). If Beach and Darantiere were working on *Ulysses* publishing today, however, most of their problems dealing with typeface, setting the text, and inputting Joyce’s revisions would be obviated by digital word processing technology.

principal, not the poet, who hopes to profit from Stephen's connection with his "literary friends," as Deasy calls them (32). Stephen questions whether or not his own friends will ever read his poem, just as Joyce wonders if his friends will like the novel in which it appears. Joyce, like Deasy, was able to profit by his connections with influential people, as *Ulysses* was first published serially in the *The Little Review*, for which Ezra Pound was the foreign editor¹⁰ and *The Egoist*, which was published in England under Joyce's friend and longtime benefactor Harriet Shaw Weaver. This parallel demonstrates that in the novel as well as in life, the process of revision is extremely personal, whereas the process of publication is inherently public.

Following the initial process of revision, Stephen is struck with the artistic impulse to record his thought, and he reaches for the only piece of paper he has at hand: Deasy's letter. "Paper. The banknotes, blast them. Old Deasy's letter. Here. Thanking you for hospitality tear the blank end off," and recycles the end of Deasy's letter for his own purpose (48). In the midst of an artistic impulse, a prosaic question comes to mind: On what paper can I record my poem?¹¹ Each of the pages Stephen encounters in rifling through his pockets carries their own ties to the practicalities of his life. The banknotes remind Stephen that he got paid that morning, though he resents his dependence on the paper notes. "Symbols soiled by greed and misery," his wages are a reminder of his lack of financial means, and an unwelcome distraction from his artist's reverie (48). Though its pages already bear Mr. Deasy's message, Stephen chooses to write his verse on

¹⁰ Upon reading the opening words of the episode in which Stephen's poem appears, Margaret Anderson, founder of the *Little Review*, exclaimed "This is the most beautiful thing we'll ever have. We'll print it if it's the last effort of our lives" (as quoted in Ellmann 421). In fact, it was the "Nausicaa" episode that brought about the end of *Ulysses*' publication in the *Little Review*, after a trial following the July-August 1920 issue of the magazine.

¹¹ This moment again echoes Joyce's process; "Joyce carried dozens of small slips of paper in his wallet and loose in his pockets to make small notes. When he had filled up the front and back of these, he continued to write on them diagonally. At home he would decipher his notes with a magnifying glass, a hint of what he had written being usually enough" (Ellmann 442).

the same page. In doing so, he usurps Deasy's blank space, filling the white page below the letter with his own words, which are drastically at odds with the tone and the goal of Deasy's. In a sense, Stephen is revising Deasy's letter as he scribbles his poem on the bottom of the page, just as Joyce wrote corrections for the proofs of *Ulysses* in the margin. Stephen's action shows that, in his mind, his own purpose takes precedence over the letter's appearance. Furthermore, given that Stephen's poem is an implicit, if somewhat mocking, commentary on the nature of an artist's composition, this instance affirms that the individual writer's work trumps the industry's concerns, at least in Stephen and Joyce's eyes. This impulsive alteration of the page's character will not escape the men at the *Telegraph*, though Stephen either does not care about the consequences or is too caught up in the impulse to write to think about the ramifications of this decision for Deasy.

Stephen's interior monologue about recording the poem picks up the same psychological verisimilitude seen in his reading of Deasy's letter, and points to a marriage of banalities and creative impulses. In part, this psychological realism dramatizes the ways in which different methods of publication evoke different reactions in readers. Because we have access to Stephen's mind as he is reading the letter, the interactions between Stephen and the letter, the letter and the reader, and the reader and the novel are all linked, further highlighting the meta-literary quality of *Ulysses*. This connection also recalls that of the narrator and Stephen; Karen Lawrence writes, "in the 'Telemachiad,' the narrator 'borrows' the language and education of Stephen Dedalus, producing a kind of sympathy of minds, an 'intersubjectivity' between narrator and character" (*Odyssey of Style* 65). This "intersubjectivity" creates a space of communality between the reader, the narrator, and Stephen. Just as Stephen takes for his own the blank space at the bottom of Mr. Deasy's page, so we appropriate Stephen's thoughts about the contents of

the letter. We take his impressions for our own, since outside of Stephen's mind we have no access to the actual text of the letter. He understands it in fragmented thoughts rather than a coherent argument, and pays less attention to the exact words with each subsequent glance. Where he first saw "Thanking you for the hospitality of your columns" (33), he later reads "Thanking you for hospitality tear the blank end off" (48). Both instances of Stephen reading the letter illustrate the degree to which he is uninspired and unmoved by the letter as a whole. Rather than musing over the specific words and their effect as he does with his poem, he looks for basic concepts. In this way, Deasy's letter does not achieve its purpose: to be read. Rather, its arguments and its particularities are overlooked. The nature of the letter is understood; Stephen feels no need to carefully explore the information it contains. If Deasy's letter represents the material which typically makes its way into the press, then Stephen's lack of interest in the letter's content illuminates the lack of inspiration to be found in texts that conform to publishing standards—a criticism that could not be applied to Joyce.

Reading Different Modes of Publication

Myles Crawford, editor of the *Telegraph*, shares Stephen's ambivalence towards the letter's specifics. As he reads the letter in the *Telegraph* office in "Aeolus," the way in which he skims the letter while continuing a conversation reveals his lack of interest in its contents. "His eye running down the typescript. Emperor's horses. Habsburg" (132) is as far as the editor gets before he moves on to another conversation. Later, after having "crammed the sheets into a sidepocket" he assures Stephen, "That'll be allright, he said. I'll read the rest after. That'll be all right" (134). From Stephen's pocket to Myles Crawford's, the letter makes its way into the publishing world, without actually being read in detail. In this way the "natural selection" of the publishing process is implicitly called into question. Neither of the letter's readers bothered to

process the words into complete sentences, favoring a few key words from which they can glean the gist rather than dwelling on the particulars. The editor's screening process proves that, in *Ulysses* at least, in order to be published, one would do better to write a piece that is misinformed yet that conforms to standard format; odds are if that is the case, it won't be closely read anyway. However, as Jonathan Culler points out, "What sets off literary works from other narrative display texts is that they have undergone a process of selection: they have been published" (27). Because the newspapermen do not appear to wield their function as gatekeeper with any caution, the treatment of Deasy's letter challenges this esteem we hold for publication in our culture. Those behind the "process of selection" on which we rely to assign value to written works fail to recognize—fail even to read—that which they accept for publication. Like the mechanical nature of the press which produces the newspaper, the contents of the paper and the letter within pose no challenge to readers. Rather, they present easily digestible information, quickly understood without causing any mental strain from readers. Given that Joyce intentionally made his novel difficult to decipher, this contrast with the press and Deasy's letter offers a condemnation of their impersonal, uninteresting content. On a more general level, this rejection of the press provides an explanation of Joyce's decision to self-publish—he sees the institution as in opposition to his aesthetic aims.

Whereas Deasy's letter is unread because it fails to grab the readers' attention, Stephen's piece is still in the personal revision process and kept private at this stage where he uses the intimacy of writing to explore his emotions. "Self-published" though it may be, Stephen's poem remains close to his mind, too fresh yet to be shared. In fact, the poem comes up in "Aeolus" because of its absence from Deasy's page: "Bit torn off," Stephen thinks, just before the editor

asks, “Who tore it? was he short taken” (132). Crawford’s joking remark¹² about the missing portion of the page leads Stephen to recall the poem. Placed into a poem’s standard format this time, with short lines forming a verse, the poem has taken shape compared to its first appearance.

On swift sail flaming

From storm and south

He comes, pale vampire,

Mouth to my mouth (132)

Stephen’s poem appears vastly revised from its beginning: “He comes, pale vampire, through storm his eyes, his bat sails bloodying the sea, mouth to her mouth’s kiss” (33). Whereas at its initial conception, the poem was written from a narrator’s perspective, the revised version is told firsthand, from the woman kissed by the vampire. This artistic decision causes Stephen to doubt himself. “Would anyone wish that mouth for her kiss? How do you know? Why did you write it then?” he asks himself (138). His insecurity about his authorial license demonstrates both his interest in the effects created by different techniques and his heartbreaking loneliness. Even as he is thinking about writing, Stephen is acutely aware of his lack of romantic companionship. After initially writing the verse on the beach he silently pleads, “Touch me. Soft eyes. Soft soft hand. I am lonely here. O touch me soon, now. What is that word known to all men? I am quiet here alone. Sad too” (49), and remembering his poem causes doubts to resurface about the authenticity of its sentiments. The composition of his poem then becomes extremely intimate, a vehicle for him to experiment with ideas that are uncomfortable for him. This function of writing recalls Martha Clifford and Bloom’s correspondence that transgresses their normal

¹² Crawford’s quip, which means, “Did he run out of toilet paper?” recalls Bloom’s bathroom scene in “Calypso,” when “he tore away half the prize story sharply and wiped himself with it” (70), perhaps suggesting the eventual fate of Stephen’s poem—or Deasy’s letter—and recalling the lack of value held for most printed material.

boundaries, and Joyce's tendency to disguise his past indiscretions in the text; in writing about these experiences, one begins to understand their impact.

Resistance to Conventions

In looking at the conflict between literary style and logical argument in the written texts in *Ulysses*, the relationship between rhyme and reason becomes an explicit analogy. The question of what is fit for print, as represented in Stephen's poem and Mr Deasy's letter, can be read as a conflict of style (rhyme) versus "rational" substance (reason). This spectrum of the writing's different forms appears as one of the headlines in the "Aeolus" episode.

RHYMES AND REASONS

Mouth, south. Is the mouth south someway? Or the south a mouth?

Must be some. South, pout, out, shout, drouth. Rhymes: two men dressed

the same, looking the same, two by two. (138)

Stephen concerns himself with the question of rhyme, a quality of his poem that signals its adherence to literary convention and technique. This fixation on the effects of specific words in the poem ironically recalls the reading of Deasy's letter, from which his readers extracted key words to get a sense of the argument rather than reading the complete sentences. In his article "Joyce, Bergson, and the Memory of Words," Justin Beplate argues that the two written texts are in an implicit dialogue with one another: "Deasy's letter functions throughout 'Aeolus' as a complex foil to Stephen's poetry. The absent rhymes of Deasy's reason-ridden argument are recalled as a literal footnote to his letter: the torn off 'mouth to my mouth' scribbles of Stephen's verse" (308). Even as Stephen focuses mostly on style, he still worries about the realism of the sentiment in the poem, leading Beplate to comment, "and yet this verse, ripped from the main body of the letter, plagues Stephen's memory precisely because it appears to lack

‘reasons’” (308). The interplay between rhyme and reason again indicates that the press favors reason, whereas the rhyme, the technique, and the content of the text are of secondary importance. At the newspaper in “Aeolus,” Stephen’s poem has no practical use, in this system where “words are processed and packaged in discrete blocks of information” (Beplate, 308). In this episode interested in publication, reason is privileged over rhyme. However, in the novel as a whole, reason and rhyme function side-by-side.

“Aeolus” and the Mechanical Institution of the Press

This tension between rhyme’s lack of practical utility and reason’s logical functioning is extremely relevant in “Aeolus,” in which the bold headings appearing throughout the episode present a commentary on the nature of the press and the process of publication in their automatic, inexplicable presence, and corresponding lack of individual authorship or accountability for their contents. Karen Lawrence argues that “In ‘Aeolus’ the book begins to advertise its own artifice, and in doing so, it calls attention to the processes of reading and writing” (*Odyssey of Style* 58). In addition to the processes of reading and writing that Lawrence brings up, I would add the process of publishing. The press in “Aeolus” as a whole asserts itself in the headings, which stem neither from Stephen or Bloom’s minds nor the narrator, as has been the technique in the first six episodes, but from an impersonal, apparently automatically generated source. In this way, they recall the machines that print the newspaper itself. Just as the machines automatically, relentlessly print copy after copy of the newspaper, the headlines in the novel appear to spring from the text beneath them. Still, the relationship between the two remains unclear. This relationship demonstrates one way that *Ulysses* challenges genre constraints, and underscores the way that as readers, we tend to have one specific concept of what “novel,” “poem,” “newspaper,” or “letter” means. To see all of these genres combined in one text confounds our

expectations, and prods us to reconsider the limits of each. Because the headlines appear against the backdrop of the printing press and the newspapers headquarters, they also “advertise the artifice,” to borrow Lawrence’s phrase, of the press as an institution. Their incoherence parodies the headlines in real newspapers, which supposedly convey the most vital facts of a story.

Through the headlines, Joyce comically takes a swing at the press and all its supposed glory.

The headings’ apparently mechanized presence also dramatize the ways in which man and machine are at odds in the press—in the physical act of printing as well as the transition from individual author to entry into the press. Bloom’s thoughts in “Aeolus” about this relationship between man and machine seem at first glance to be at odds with one another, but ultimately *Ulysses* rejects simple dichotomies of this type. He hears the “Thump, thump, thump” of the printing press, and indulges in a brief, morbid thought; “Now if he got paralysed there and no one knew how to stop them and they’d clank on and on the same, print it over and over and up and back” (119). In this vision, Bloom sees man as unable to control the machines, as their mechanics stamp the man over and over with the words of the press.¹³ Man becomes subservient to the unseeing machine that prints all over his body. The unthinking, unfeeling machine dominates the thinking, feeling man, a metaphor that resonates with the tension between Stephen’s feeling “rhymes” and Deasy’s mechanical “reasons” in “Aeolus.” Although this distinction appears to dominate the episode at first glance, later, Bloom hears the “Sllt,” of the machine, and thinks that it’s “Almost human the way it sllt to call attention. Doing its level best to speak” (121). This instance depicts a more sympathetic machine, whispering to catch one’s attention, not dully thudding along in its work. Still, the machine inserts itself into Bloom’s

¹³ Bloom’s fears come to fruition in “Eumaeus,” where, as previously noted, his name appears printed as “Boom” rather than Bloom. The account in print rewrites history, because it leaves Bloom out of the account of Dignam’s funeral. Still, Bloom is powerless to change this.

interior dialogue, reaffirming the machine's ability to imprint its mechanical agenda on top over Bloom's personal thoughts. However, because Bloom projects human characteristics on to the printing press in "Aeolus," the machine becomes more human, and the human becomes more mechanical. Cheryl Herr contends that "the dichotomizing operation by which the cultural paradigm at hand incorporates new data is both highlighted and subverted through Bloom's interchange of terms for the body and the machine" (86). The similarities begin to emerge, even as he points out the differences. While he highlights the differences between man and machine, self-publishing and the industry, Joyce simultaneously looks for ways to encompass both sides of the spectrum.

In Joyce's own experiences with printing *Ulysses*, the transition from his hand-written manuscript and his scribbled-in corrections on the proofs proved difficult, demonstrating that the relationship between the intimate writing and revision process and the actual publication at the printing press is inherently rather complicated—especially in this case, given Joyce's poor eyesight, reliance on hand-written corrections, and his wish for control over the final product. Despite his efforts to achieve a fantasy of complete autonomy through self-publishing, Joyce's reliance on typists and printers limited his agency. Joyce wrote to Harriet Shaw Weaver in 1921, "I am extremely irritated by all those printer's errors... Are these to be perpetuated in future editions? I hope not" (Letters 176). Unfortunately, Joyce's hope for an error-free edition did not come to fruition. Groden writes, "First the typists and then Darantiere's compositors made numerous errors. Joyce caught many of them, but four major factors—the printers' lack of English, Joyce's difficult handwriting and weak eyesight, and the pressures of time—made complete accuracy impossible. As a result, errors have persisted through all editions published

since 1922” (8).¹⁴ In this way, Joyce’s individual authorship was compromised as he moved from handwritten to printed text. The collaboration between the author, the typists and the printers, while necessary, dramatically changed the book. This tension between the hand-written text, which recalls Stephen’s poem, and the necessity of a printing press, which echoes Deasy’s letter, brings home this implicit commentary on the nature of publication.

Joyce’s experience in publishing *Ulysses* is at once a form of self-publishing and a concession to the necessity of traditional publishing, by virtue of his agreement with Beach and the pragmatic concerns of getting the novel written, published, and ready to be read. His friend and publisher Sylvia Beach left the editorial process up to him, refraining instead from telling him how to write or how to improve his book as an editor or a publisher usually does.

Additionally, he had access to all the proofs he needed, on which he wrote revisions by hand in the margins of the page—an image mirrored in Stephen’s scribbled poem on the bottom margin of Deasy’s letter. However, practical concerns like time (Joyce wanted the novel published by his fortieth birthday) and the limitations of the typists and printers inevitably forced Joyce to compromise his fantasy of uncompromised individual authorship. Throughout *Ulysses*, Joyce presents numerous ways of considering the novel as a genre, the process of composition, and the nature of publishing. Considering the multifaceted treatment of these issues, on both the textual and meta-literary levels, Joyce’s decision to publish an “obscene” text in an era of heavy censorship underscores his (attempted) refusal to compromise his agency and authorship, ultimately forcing the issues of obscenity’s place in literature and its value as an aesthetic tool.

¹⁴ Groden’s comment dates back to 1977, before Hans Walter Gabler’s controversial “corrected” edition appeared in 1984. For more on the controversy, see “The New ‘Ulysses’: The Hidden Controversy” in *The New York Review of Books*.

SECTION II

The Satanic Verses and Anxieties of Authorship

Baal asked: 'Why are you sure he will kill you?
 Salman the Persian answered: 'It's his Word against mine.'
The Satanic Verses (381)

Throughout *The Satanic Verses*, words often have obscure origins—we may suspect the identity of the author, but rarely does one have absolute certainty. Often, these ambiguous words are referred to as “satanic verses,” a phrase that reflects anxieties about authorship. In *The Satanic Verses*, one cannot know with absolute certainty who speaks the truth, who speaks to further his own cause, or who is using words as a weapon. The “satanic verses” exist on multiple levels in Rushdie’s novel: the satanic verses that Mahound claims the Archangel Gibreel revealed to him; the so-called “satanic verses” that Saladin Chamcha whispers to Gibreel the man, in order to drive him mad; and the meta-level of the novel itself, which draws on the tradition of the “satanic verses” recounted by some historians of Islam. Through these instances in the text, Rushdie introduces the theme of doubt; doubt as to the origin of Mahound’s revelations, doubts about Alleluia Cone’s fidelity, and Salman the Persian’s doubts about the veracity of the Koran all relate back to questions of authorship. Because Rushdie treats this subject of doubt, which is essentially taboo in Islamic fundamentalist culture, he was forced to “self-publish” the paperback edition of his novel. Although Rushdie works within the traditional publishing apparatus to produce this paperback edition, I will argue that he was in a sense self-publishing, because he uses anonymous publishers and attaches his name alone to the new edition. In this case, I will use the term “self-publishing” to denote Rushdie’s choice to take on full responsibility for the paperback edition, which circumvented the traditional publishing

techniques and freed any publishers from the threat of the fatwa. This move attributed complete agency to Rushdie, which concealed all the industry mechanics behind-the-scenes, but nonetheless constitutes an instance of self-publishing in Rushdie's claim to sole authorship.

The issues raised in *The Satanic Verses* and the Rushdie affair dramatize the way that Rushdie's novel entered into a global space—unlike Joyce who presumed his work to be geared towards a European or American audience. Because his book treats the immigrant's experience, and takes place both in London and his native Bombay, Rushdie courts audiences both in the West and East. Yet, he did not anticipate that the two sides of his audience would have vastly different reactions to his novel: it was embraced in the West as a work of high literary value, but reviled around the world by Islamic fundamentalists who felt his portrayal of Muhammad was blasphemous. When Rushdie introduced doubt into the story of the founding of Islam, he was behaving in way that is understood in most Western countries as an artist's right, a fundamental part of the right to freedom of speech, but his words were still read as an attempt to rewrite Islamic history in a negative light in Eastern countries as well as among fundamentalist Muslims across the globe, even though the novel was marked as fiction. These issues raise questions of the artist's place in society: How does this differ for a secular society, versus one governed by religion? How does one reconcile the two in a globalized world such as the one we live in today? While these questions are important to understanding the novel's impact, I will set these concerns aside for the time being, and turn to the novel's publication, the text itself, and its immediate repercussions.

The First *Satanic Verses* Controversy, Before Publication

Examining first the entry of *The Satanic Verses* into the publishing world, we see that Rushdie's case began to make waves in literary circles before it was even printed, though early

reactions related to its impact on the infrastructure of the industry, not the novel's blasphemy. Rushdie worked for years with Liz Calder, and was expected to publish his fourth novel, *The Satanic Verses*, with her as she launched her new imprint, Bloomsbury. However, Rushdie broke off his friendship and business relationship with Calder in favor of Andrew Wylie, an aggressive agent known as "the Jackal." Wylie was known for his aggressive negotiations with publishers, a dramatic shift from the previous role of agents who were more or less in complicity with the publishers. Wylie fought for his writers, and got them high-paying contracts as a result. In his biography of Rushdie, *Salman Rushdie: Sentenced to Death*, W.J. Weatherby notes the significance of this shift; "Aggressive agenting like Wylie's was only possible because publishing had changed its character and the way it did business over the last twenty years. Once an industry of small independent companies, publishing was now largely dominated by big corporations who had taken over many of the old companies" (Weatherby 109). Because the industry itself had changed, Rushdie and Wylie were able to change the way they did business within it. In a vast departure from the type of "agenting" we saw with Harriet Weaver and Ezra Pound on behalf of Joyce, which relied on personal connections to other powerful tastemakers in the literary world, Rushdie and Wylie took a more businesslike approach, and auctioned off the rights to *The Satanic Verses*. In the end, Peter Mayle, an editor at Viking-Penguin, won the right to publish Rushdie's book, in what was reported to be an \$850,000 contract—an enormous sum for a book that was not expected to appeal to popular taste.¹⁵

Because Rushdie decided to seek a high-profile book deal at the expense of his relationship with the publisher who'd been with him since the beginning of his career, he was

¹⁵ Several other publishers involved in the debate were reluctant to pay such a sum for *The Satanic Verses*, believing that they would not earn a profit. However, as Weatherby points out, the controversy stirred by Muslim protestors after the novel was published resulted in very high sales; "The more the book was attacked, the more it sold in British bookstores" (Weatherby 138).

able to work the capitalist system to his benefit in a way that contrasts sharply with Joyce's early experiences. Prior to *Ulysses*' publication, Joyce dreamed of making a living off his books, but was instead limited at best to small publishers like Beach who would take on the financial burden but could not pay any advance, or at worst to publishers who forced him to pay for the first 1,000 copies. Although, like Rushdie, he was considered a valuable "literary" writer, censorship law prevented his breed of fiction from finding its place in the commercial marketplace. Comparing Rushdie and Joyce's different experiences in finding an editor and publisher highlights the growth of the industry from small houses into big corporations. This change indicates that the common understanding of what constitutes the "traditional" publishing industry is constantly in flux—as it changed in the years between Joyce's publication of *Ulysses* in 1922 and Rushdie's publication of *The Satanic Verses* in 1988, and again between *The Satanic Verses* and the developments surrounding digital publication today. However, despite the initial excitement surrounding *The Satanic Verses*, Rushdie's blasphemy eventually excluded him from these high-profile interactions, forcing him to find another way to publish a paperback edition.

Mahound the Businessman

Just as Rushdie himself married the creative act with self-serving instincts in dealing with potential publishers, so within in the novel the prophet Mahound—Rushdie's version of Muhammad—appears as a "businessman" caught up in mundane politics. Gibreel Farishta, a Bollywood film star famous for playing deities, has visions of himself as the Archangel Gibreel in a schizophrenic dream state. He sees Mahound in Jahilia, Rushdie's version of Mecca, where "the businessman-turned-prophet, Mahound, is founding one of the world's great religions"

(97).¹⁶ Mahound has already had the first revelation: there is no God but God, and thus the polytheistic religion is not true. In Jahilia, however, the temples of the “three best-loved goddesses” – Uzza, Manat, and Al-Lat – draw in visitors and sustain the city (103). The powerful, moneyed rulers of Jahilia fear that “only the pilgrimage stands between the city and its ruin” (105) and Mahound’s monotheistic message threatens this order. Money and financial wellbeing lurk behind their claims to religion, yet because Mahound is a “businessman-turned-prophet,” their requests meet a receptive audience.

Hoping to attract more believers to his new religion, Mahound wishes that he could “make it easier for the people to believe” (109) and asks the Archangel Gibreel to endorse the three goddesses. First, Mahound tells his followers that he asked Gibreel, “Have you thought upon Lat and Uzza, and Manat, the first, the other?” then he recites Gibreel’s answer: “They [the goddesses] are the exalted birds, and their intercession is desired indeed” (117). With these words, he welcomes the three goddesses into the new religion and moves away from monotheism. After this revelation, Hind, a powerful and brilliant woman, takes Mahound in, and tells him, “Between Allah and the Three there can be no peace. I don’t want it. I want the fight. To the death; that is the kind of idea I am. What kind are you?” (124). With this challenge, Mahound begins to change his mind. Although a great deal more is hanging on Mahound’s words, his impulsive revision of the first revelation recalls Stephen’s immediate revision of his poem in *Ulysses*, and both sets of revisions dramatically alter the nature of the writing. Mahound declares that “he has been tricked, that the Devil came to him in the guise of the archangel, so

¹⁶ Rushdie’s choice to name his version of the Prophet, Mahound, and his city of Mecca, Jahilia, already demonstrates the novel’s blasphemy. As Daniel Pipes points out in *The Rushdie Affair*, “Mahound is an archaic European name for the Prophet Muhammad; Jahilia, Arabic for ‘ignorance’” (55). By choosing a European and a word meaning ignorance for revered subjects, Rushdie appears to provoke Muslim readers.

that the verses he memorized, the ones he recited in the poetry tent, were not the real thing but its diabolic opposite, not godly, but satanic” (126), and that the verses espousing the goddesses are “banished from the true recitation, *al qur-an*” (127). Thus, Mahound establishes the first verses as “satanic” when he claims that they originated with Shaitan, not Gibreel or God. A simple revision of the first revelation suffices to meet Hind’s challenge and return Islam to a monotheistic religion.

Although Mahound claims to have received direct revelations from Allah, Gibreel the Archangel feels the words come from Mahound himself, as the Prophet plants the words he needs to hear in the angel’s mind, only to draw them out again. Through this confusion over the words’ origin, Gibreel raises issues about the authorship of the revelations, insinuating that perhaps Mahound’s businessman’s instincts prompted the revelations rather than God’s intervention. After Mahound requests that Allah recognize Al-Lat, Uzza, and Manat as divine, “Gibreel begins to feel that strength that force, here it is *at my own jaw* working it, opening shutting; and the power, starting within Mahound, reaching up to *my vocal cords* and the voice comes” (author’s emphasis, 114). In this initial scene of struggle between the Archangel Gibreel and Mahound, the pandemonium blurs the line between the prophet’s words and those of the angel, making it impossible to determine where one’s voice ends and the other begins. Yet, Mahound is more powerful and more dominant, and Gibreel notes explicitly that the power starts “within Mahound.” Creation is a violent force in Mahound’s hands, and the origin of speech is ambiguous. Mahound’s will appears to be the driving force behind the revelations, not Gibreel’s voice. In the second revelation, Mahound’s power becomes even more explicit:

After they had wrestled for hours or even weeks Mahound was
pinned down beneath the angel, it’s what he wanted, it was his will

filling me up and giving me the strength to hold him down,
 because archangels can't lose such fights, it wouldn't be right, it's
 only devils who get beaten in such circs, so the moment I got on
 top he started weeping for joy and then he did his old trick, forcing
 my mouth open and making the voice, the Voice, pour out of me
 once again, made it pour all over him, like sick. (125)

Because “it was what he [Mahound] wanted,” Gibreel has no choice but to speak the words, to renounce the original verses. His strength as well as his voice comes from Mahound. The detail, “archangels can't lose such fights,” gives credence to the portrayal of Mahound as a businessman—he has carefully orchestrated the situation so that it will convince his listeners. The comparison to the supposedly sacred revelation to “sick” dramatizes the impurity of Mahound, and Gibreel's sense of violation. Mahound manipulates the archangel and his followers through the force of his will and the power of his words. Beyond introducing doubts about the authorship of the Koran, Mahound's actions establish him as a desperate and deceptive man.

“Verses and Again Verses”

Saladin Chamcha, another desperate and deceptive man, attempts to destroy Gibreel Farishta. Chamcha provides an example of how words can be used to as a tool of destruction in the secular realm, when they are used in conjunction with the introduction of doubt as to a loved one's fidelity. Whereas Gibreel in his madness sees Mahound and Jahilia, Saladin Chamcha in his rage becomes fixated on Gibreel, whom he envies to such an extent that he feels he must destroy him. Farishta, the film star, happens to survive a fall from “twenty-nine thousand and two feet,” with only Chamcha as company. The two men—both from Bombay, both working in

show business—were on the same flight from Bombay to London when it was high jacked by three men and one woman wanting “an independent homeland, religious freedom, release of political detainees, justice, random money, a safe-conduct to a country of their choice,” or, in the words of the narrator, “nothing new” (80). During their 111 days aboard the airplane, Chamcha and Farishta become friends, but after the fall the two will be bitter enemies, at least in Chamcha’s eyes.

Although the two are united in heritage and occupation before the fall, the fall brings them closer still, even as it heightens the contrast between them: Gibreel comes back sporting a halo, but Chamcha turns into a hoofed goat-devil creature. In keeping with these transformations, Gibreel imagines himself to be the Archangel Gabriel, and Saladin becomes deeply evil, and hell-bent on destroying his friend and rival. Rather than dealing with these feelings out in the open, he stewes in secret anger, until his hatred towards Gibreel comes pouring out. Because Farishta appears to have achieved all of Chamcha’s goals, he turns an admirer into an enemy. Farishta has massive success as an on-screen actor, but Chamcha’s looks bar him from working in front of the camera—he turns instead to voice over, and becomes the Man of a Thousand Voices, the skill that would enable him to whisper his “satanic verses” to Gibreel Farishta and ultimately drive him mad. Farishta embraces his Indian heritage, but Chamcha attempted to quash his Indian identity and adopt an entirely British mentality. Farishta is deeply involved with a beautiful white woman, Alleluia Cone, who is famous for climbing Mount Everest and to whom Chamcha finds himself sexually attracted, but Chamcha returns from his fall to find that his British wife has left him, in an apparent testament to his failure as a husband (he could not impregnate her) and as an Englishman. Although Farishta’s life is perfect on paper, in reality his worsening mental illness makes acting impossible, and Allie’s foot problems

keep her from climbing, indicating that the perfection Chamcha detests is part of his own obsessive hatred of Gibreel: the form his madness takes.

“What is unforgivable?” the book’s unnamed narrator asks more than once (440, 441). After the fatwa, Salman Rushdie found that his blasphemy was unforgivable to a large group of Islamic fundamentalists. However, in Saladin Chamcha’s case, Gibreel’s appearance of having everything that Chamcha desires constitutes the unforgivable. Jealousy and the evil growing within Chamcha prove a lethal combination; “If love is a yearning to be like (even to become) the beloved, then hatred, it must be said, can be engendered by the same ambition, when it cannot be fulfilled” (443). Love and hatred are two sides of the same coin in this formulation. Only a thin line separates the two emotions, and Chamcha exploits this line in using his words to destroy Gibreel, turning his love for Allie into the manic hatred that threatens to ruin him. For Chamcha as well as Farishta, madness decides which emotion reigns. Whereas Farishta’s madness stems from an easily identifiable source, his paranoid schizophrenic delusions that began after the fall, Chamcha’s madness is rooted in the evil nature that threatens to overtake his life.¹⁷

Saladin Chamcha obsesses over Gibreel Farishta’s demise, and it finally comes to pass through allegations of Alleluia Cone’s infidelity whispered over the phone into Gibreel’s jealous ears. The furtive secrecy surrounding Chamcha’s “satanic verses” whispered over the phone parallels Martha and Bloom’s correspondence, in that both are erotically charged, and both operate in hiding. Just as Chamcha’s jealousy of Gibreel drives him to destroy his rival, Gibreel’s paranoid protection of Allie Cone makes him vulnerable to Chamcha’s attacks. Gibreel

¹⁷ The Fall as a metaphor for human condition also is at play here, demonstrating that *The Satanic Verses* also appropriated Christian elements which did not incite the ire that the Muslim components did.

frequently imagines that Allie is unfaithful, and his delusions at times convince him that she is deceiving him. Recognizing this, Chamcha, who is often compared to Iago within the text, exploits Farishta's weakness through words whispered in thirty-nine different voices, which all come from the Man of a Thousand Voices. Although all of the voices frustrate and anger Allie and Gibreel,

One voice stood out from the rest, the high soulful voice of a poet, one of the first voices Gibreel heard and the one that got deepest under his skin; a voice that spoke exclusively in rhyme, reciting doggerel verses of an understated naïvety, even innocence, which contrasted so greatly with the masturbatory coarseness of most of the other callers that Gibreel soon came to think of it as the most insidiously menacing of all. (458-9)

By characterizing the most offensive caller as a "poet," Rushdie calls on the power of words to persuade or manipulate, as seen in Mahound's verses. Like the businessman posing as a prophet, this caller's dark agenda masked in phony innocence is what disturbs Farishta so deeply. The insinuations of Allie's infidelity, when cloaked in this fake naïveté, become harder to stomach than outright, aggressive allegations. The logical response to angry accusations is anger, but the whispered couplets of the poet voice leave Gibreel to decide how to react, and invite his madness to take the wheel. Plus, the caller seems not to have his own "masturbatory" aims in mind (unlike Bloom in his version of suggestive correspondence), but a saccharine message, more appropriate for a greeting card than for a late night phone call to another man's lover. The "satanic verses that make [Gibreel] mad" begin with "*I like coffee, I like tea, / I like things you do with me*" (460, 459). This verse is winkingly suggestive even as it presumes innocence.

Ultimately, the verse that breaks Gibreel is more directly sinister: “*Violets are blue, roses are red, / I’ve got her right here in my bed*” and ends with a vicious, “*Goodbye, sucker*” (461). What begins sounding like a schoolyard Valentine card ends up in a very dark place. This message unabashedly pushes Gibreel’s buttons, and finally it elicits the desired reaction. Through this exchange, Saladin demonstrates the power of the poet, even if the poet is writing simple verses such as these, to provoke anger and emotion in his listeners. This move to illustrate the power that words have to drive people to irrational action seems to anticipate the fury that Rushdie himself would encounter when his *Satanic Verses* hit bookshelves.

Although unlike Saladin’s verses, Mahound’s verses are never explicitly called “satanic” in *The Satanic Verses*, the relationship between the two is cemented in Gibreel’s mind. In part, Gibreel’s paranoid schizophrenia is to blame for this melding together of the two instances of satanic verses. In Gibreel’s mind, “it is becoming impossible to describe the world. Pilgrimage, prophet, adversary merge, fade into mists, emerge. As does she: Allie, Al-Lat. *She is the exalted bird. Greatly to be desired*” (474). Gibreel cannot see the difference between his dream world and reality. His dream world threatens to overtake his reality, when he confuses Allie and Al-Lat, thinking “*She is the exalted bird. Greatly to be desired*” (474). Unlike the first incarnation of this verse, which says *they* rather than *she*, Gibreel’s version pares down the trio of goddesses to the most powerful. In this way, Allie becomes the most powerful of goddesses, to be worshipped or destroyed rather than truly loved as a living being.

The similarity between the names Allie and Al-Lat which causes Gibreel to associate the two in the same place also recalls the name of the most powerful god of all. Of Al-Lat, the narrator says, “Even her name makes her Allah’s opposite and equal” (102). Because he links Allah and Al-Lat, then later Al-Lat and Allie, Gibreel’s disturbed mind attributes to Allie the

same awesome power as the god and goddess. Like them, Allie has the power to ruin him, though despite her best efforts she cannot save him from his illness. In the end, the caller's words destroy him, while her words fail to convince him of her innocence. Gibreel asks himself: "What does a poet write? Verses. What jingle-jangles in Gibreel's brain? Verses. What broke his heart? Verses and again verses" (474). Gibreel can never escape the verses that ring in his mind. The juxtaposition of the questions, "What does a poet write?" and "What broke his heart?" points to the poet as the culprit for Gibreel's heartbreak, not Allie. This apparent incongruity suggests that deep down, he knows the verses are lies, but he cannot escape their influence anyway. The final "Verses and again verses" is ambiguous, because it is unclear whether he is speaking about the different incarnations of verses that Chamcha whispers over the phone, or the verses Mahound forced upon him. Perhaps he refers to both, or to all instances when words trick for evil or self-serving purposes; later, Rushdie's enemies would attribute such evil intentions to him during their protests of the novel, and his verses would lead them to actions as destructive as Saladin and Gibreel's.

Chamcha's "satanic verses" establish the power of words as a destructive force. Whereas Mahound's false revelation comes from a desire to create a new religion, Chamcha's lies stem from a desire to break something apart: Gibreel's relationship with Allie. The two uses of "satanic verses" introduce multiple ways that authorship and agency can be manipulated or obscured. In his own life, as a result of his blasphemy, Rushdie was condemned for trying to use words to manipulate the story of Islam's founding, and this accusation of a new kind of "satanic verses" draws on the same issues as Mahound and Chamcha's: words' power as a constructive or destructive force, and the retribution deserved for exploiting one's agency or authorship for a self-serving motive.

The Doubts of Two Salmans

In life, Salman Rushdie was criticized for allegedly attempting to rewrite Islamic history, casting Muhammad in a negative light, but in *The Satanic Verses*, Salman the Persian, a fictional character, quite literally rewrites the Prophet's revelations, and in doing so he commits an allegedly unforgivable act of blasphemy. Salman the Persian followed Mahound from the very beginning, through persecution and through success, only to lose his faith later. First, "Salman the Persian got to wondering what manner of God this was that sounded so much like a businessman. This was when he had the idea that destroyed his faith, because he recalled that of course Mahound himself had been a businessman, and a damned successful one at that" (376). Salman's realization that the God and the Prophet share a business-like attitude leads to a second doubt: that the Prophet might have invented the God for his own purposes. Through these realizations, Salman postulates that Mahound never stopped being a businessman, and that the entire religion is based on one man's desire to get ahead. Attempting to confirm or disprove this theory, Salman decides to put Mahound's divinity to the test. He changes the words "*all-wise*" to "*all-hearing*" in his records of the Prophet's revelations. In apparent confirmation of his suspicions, Mahound did not notice the change. Like Deasy's letter, which is accepted for publication without actually being read in detail, Salman the Persian's insertion of his own words into the Prophet's revelations goes unremarked. Mahound parallels the careless editorial attentions of Myles Crawford, as both allow texts of dubious accuracy to reach print.

Yet again, Salman the Persian's actions bring into doubt the authenticity of Mahound's revelation, and introduce questions of authorship: Salman recalls, "So there I was, actually writing the Book, or rewriting, anyway, polluting the word of God with my own profane language" (380). Through his revisions of Mahound's dictation, Salman takes the verse that is

supposedly pure and contaminates it. However, given that Mahound himself does not notice the alterations, Salman begins to question the purity of the verses entirely. Because Salman pollutes the word of God, he too becomes an author of the Book, along with Mahound, and, debatably, the Archangel Gibreel. This anxiety about the authorship of the Koran causes Salman to lose his faith, and drives him into exile.

The once-faithful Salman the Persian did not have malicious intentions—he wanted the Prophet to prove him wrong, to prove that he indeed was a messenger of God—but because he dares to question Mahound’s authority as prophet and contaminate his message, Salman the Persian suffers the consequences. In his conversation with Baal, another poet and Mahound’s enemy, Salman the Persian admits that he did not doubt that Mahound would prove him wrong; “The truth is that what I expected when I made that first tiny change, *all-wise* instead of *all-hearing* – what I *wanted* – was to read it back to the Prophet, and he’d say, What’s the matter with you, Salman, are you going deaf? And I’d say, Oops, O God, bit of a slip, how could I, and correct myself. But it didn’t happen” (380). This confession demonstrates that Salman once was a believer, but because of the overwhelming evidence of Mahound’s falsity, he could no longer ignore the implications. He relies on reason over faith; once the introduction of doubt begins to chip away at his faith, Salman the Persian cannot overlook Mahound’s oversights anymore.

Thus, Salman takes up the theme of doubt that appears often in *The Satanic Verses*. He questions that which is supposed to be taken for granted, and his incredulity drives him to actions that transgress the rules Mahound has established. When he comes face to face with the Prophet again, Mahound says, “Your blasphemy, Salman, can’t be forgiven. Did you think I wouldn’t work it out? To set your words against the Words of God” (387). The change in capitalization between Salman’s “words” and the “Words of God” establishes the difference between Salman’s

profane language and the power of the Word with a capital W. In Mahound's eyes, to corrupt the profane with the sacred is unforgivable. However, Mahound's question, "Did you think *I* wouldn't work it out?" implies that Mahound's shrewd business instincts allowed him to see what Salman was doing, not that a divine force was at work (italics mine). The faculty for figuring it out is Mahound's *mind*, not his *spirituality*. According to the law, death is to be the price of blasphemy, though Mahound, "his mind elsewhere, concedes: yes, yes, let the wretched fellow live" (387). Given that Salman Rushdie, who would eventually be sentenced to death for his blasphemy, created this character Salman the Persian who also commits unforgivable acts of blasphemy, this moment in the story seems to beg the questions: Did he do it on purpose? How could he claim to not have foreseen the violent reaction to the book?

Like Salman the Persian, Salman Rushdie was raised in the Islamic tradition only to lose his faith later in life. Rushdie acknowledges his upbringing in the "Muslim tradition," but draws a describes his "family in the Indian subcontinent" as having "an absolute willingness to discuss anything, there were not these anathemas, these rules, about what you might not talk about. I know about Islam as well, and these people's Islam is not the only Islam" (as quoted in Weatherby, 13). Rushdie both claims to have roots in the same Islamic tradition that he offended, and distances himself from its extremists. His description of his family's brand of Islam allies itself more with Western traditions of freedom of speech than Islamic fundamentalist adherence to the written word in the Koran as an absolute truth. Because Rushdie's book addressed issues relevant to both Islamic theocracies and Western democracies, its reception varied greatly by geographical region, and according to the religious view of the reader. Despite his upbringing in the Islamic tradition, Rushdie claimed to be surprised that the reaction to the book was not more universally positive. On January 22, 1989, Rushdie wrote in the *Observer*,

“This is, for me, the saddest irony of all; that after working for five years to give voice and fictional flesh to the immigrant culture of which I am myself a member, I should see my book burned, largely unread, by the people it’s about, people who might find some pleasure and much recognition in its pages” (*The Rushdie File* 75). Whereas Salman the Persian knew that his words constituted a transgression against Mahound’s authority, Rushdie failed to anticipate the violent reaction his blasphemy would incite.

Muhammad and the False Revelation

Rushdie and his publishers defended these scenes, on the grounds that they appear in a dream sequence in a fictional novel. Nearly every scene containing blasphemy begins, “Gibreel dreamed...” and, as previously discussed, Gibreel’s mental state is extremely disconnected from reality. Nonetheless, the novel’s portrayal of Mahound undeniably echoes part of Muhammad’s life. Despite his claims to fiction, in a January 27, 1989 interview with Rushdie by Badung File, the author claims that “almost everything in those sections – the dream sequences – starts from an historical or quasi-historical basis, though one can’t really speak with absolute certainty about that period of Mohammed’s life” (*The Rushdie File* 28). Thus, his claims to a historical basis undermine his protests that the dream sequences are not to be taken as an attempt to rewrite a chapter of Islamic history; the Mahound/Muhammad character is at once fictional and historical. According to several sources on Islamic history, Muhammad, like Mahound, added a section to the Koran which changed the law from a monotheistic religion to one which allowed for the worship of the three goddesses local to Mecca, Lat, Manat and Uzza, whose temples attracted visitors and drew in income for his tribe. Soon thereafter, Gabriel appeared to Muhammad a second time, and told him that the vision was a false one from the devil; thus, the verses became known as satanic.

Although the event exists in some accounts of Islamic history, fundamentalist Muslims did not accept the idea that Muhammad could have made such a mistake, and were outraged at Rushdie's portrayal of the incident. Pipes stresses the importance of a literal reading of the Koran in this culture; "In Islam, the religion's irreducible core lies in the Qur'an (or Koran) as the exact Word of God. To doubt this is to deny the validity of Muhammad's mission and to imply that the entire Islamic faith is premised on a fraudulent base" (Pipes 56). Although Muhammad made no claims to a divine nature, Islamic fundamentalists tend to treat him as an infallible representative of God. Because Rushdie portrayed him as all-too-human, his novel was read as blasphemy. Not only did Rushdie portray Mahound/Muhammad as error-prone, but he also indicates that parts of the Koran are of dubious origin, an act which is extremely taboo; "A Muslim may not question the authenticity of the Qur'an. To do so is to raise doubts about the validity of the faith itself, and this is usually seen as an act of apostasy (Pipes 56). Rushdie raised doubts about the story behind the founding of Islam, and even though he made no claim that his story was a realistic representation, he was accused of apostasy, which led to the fatwa against him.

Al-Tabari (d. 923), a leader in Sunni thought in the 9th century who was known for having condensed many historical records into one account, recounts the incident of the satanic verses, also known as the "birds" or *gharaniq* incident, in *Muhammad in Mecca*. Tabari titles the event: "Satan Casts a False Revelation on the Messenger of God's Tongue." According to Pipes, because Muhammad's message was emphatically monotheistic, it "posed a direct challenge to the existing order in general and to the leaders of Quraysh [Muhammad's own tribe] in particular" (Pipes 57). For this reason, he "met with a very poor response among the well-to-do in Mecca" who earned their living from the tourism that the temples of the goddesses Lat,

Manat, and Uzza attracted (Pipes 57). Tabari asserts that Muhammad was upset because his tribe rejected his message, and that he

longed in his soul that something would come to him from God which would reconcile him with his tribe. With his love for his tribe and his eagerness for their welfare it would have delighted him if some of the difficulties which they made for him could have been smoothed out, and he debated with himself and fervently desired such an outcome. Then God revealed:

By the Star when it sets, your comrade does not err, nor is he deceived; nor does he speak out of (his own) desire...

and when he came to the words:

Have you thought upon al-Lat and al-‘Uzza and Manat, the third, the other?

Satan cast on his tongue, because of his inner debates and what he desired to bring to his people an answer that they wanted to hear:

These [i.e. al-Lat, Manat, and al-‘Uzza] are the high-flying cranes;¹⁸ verily their intercession is accepted with approval. (Tabari 108)

With this recitation, Muhammad accepted the three local goddesses into his new religion, and gave them divine approval. On the surface, this account does not differ greatly from Rushdie’s, though Muhammad’s motives for wishing to smooth things over with his tribe are clearly stated to be out of a concern for their “welfare,” not his instincts as a “businessman” like Rushdie’s

¹⁸ Originally “*gharaniq*,” translated elsewhere to mean “birds.” Because of this word, in Muslim history the verses are typically referred to as the “*gharaniq*” or the “birds” verses, not the satanic verses. The term “Satanic Verses” comes from Western historians.

Mahound. Soon after this revelation, Gabriel chastises Muhammad, and accuses him of having “recited to the people that which I did not bring to you from God” (Tabari 109). In the end, though, “God cancelled what Satan had thus cast” (Tabari 109). This portrayal of Muhammad’s fallibility, though it originates in a respected Islamic source, served as a point of controversy for centuries. The standard Muslim position on the *gharaniq* verses originates from Muhammad Husayan Haykal’s 1936 book *The Life of Muhammad*; his position was that because “orientalists had made much of the incident, Haykal argued that the Satanic verses were ‘fabricated,’ and called them ‘a fable and a lie’” (Pipes 61). Thus, the matter is settled in such a way that if one is to raise the issue, he is seen as a dissident, a mocker of Islam, and an ally of the “orientalists.” According to this mindset, Rushdie appears to side wholeheartedly with the Western skeptic’s view of the incident, fueling the fire of rage that burned against him.

The depictions of this incident in Tabari and in Rushdie resemble one another in many of the specifics, yet the chief difference between Mahound and Muhammad is the involvement of the Archangel Gibreel. Whereas Gabriel in the incident as recounted by al-Tabari is clearly not present in the false revelation, in Rushdie’s version Gibreel notices “just one tiny thing that’s a bit of a problem here, namely that *it was me both times, baba, me first and second also me*. From my mouth, both the statement and the repudiation, verses and converses, universes and reverses, the whole thing, and we all know how my mouth got worked” (Rushdie’s emphasis, 126). In this statement, Gibreel refuses the notion that Satan was the origin of the first revelation in favor of Lat, Manat, and Uzza. Rather, he blames both instances on Mahound himself, saying, “We all know how my mouth got worked.” The traditional view of the incident, in contrast, casts Satan as the unquestioned origin of the verses, and Gabriel as the purifier, the bringer of truth. By casting doubt on Mahound/Muhammad’s integrity, Rushdie touches on a very sensitive issue in

fundamentalist Islam. Not only is the Prophet fallible, prone to error, but he is also portrayed as a liar. This depiction appeared to be deliberately inflammatory and offensive to many Muslims, as well as many secular readers and readers from other religions.

Blasphemy as an Obstacle to Publication

The political ramifications of these moments in the text, which to appeared calculated to outrage believers of Islam, were greater than Rushdie could have imagined, stunning much of the Western world. Because this portrayal of Mohammed as an imperfect man was deeply offensive to some Muslim fundamentalists, certain among them called for a change to the blasphemy laws in England, so that they might prosecute Rushdie that way. Like Joyce's opponents, who first took legal action, Rushdie's initial protestors attempted to change the laws in order to seek retribution legally. However, blasphemy laws in England only extended to Christianity, and despite their efforts to change the law, legal action remained impossible. The Archbishop of Canterbury echoes their calls for a stronger blasphemy law, which would protect religions other than Christianity, as quoted in *Independent* from February 22, 1989, saying, "I understand their feelings and I firmly believe that offence to the religious beliefs of the followers of Islam or any other faith is quite as wrong as offence to the religious beliefs of Christians" (*The Rushdie File* 124). His statements reflect the ways in which Rushdie's words were not only shocking to Muslims, but also to believers of other religions. However, when a group of Muslims approached the Vatican to support their fight against Rushdie, the Vatican declined (*The Rushdie File* 107). Their inability to change the blasphemy laws that were so rooted in England's Christian past meant vast numbers of Muslim immigrants now living within British borders as citizens struggled to find alternative ways to make their voices heard. In Bradford, England, protestors burned copies of *The Satanic Verses* and an effigy of Rushdie. The book burners in

Bradford held up signs calling Rushdie a devil, and condemning Penguin for publishing the book.

On February 12, 1989, in Islamabad, Pakistan, six protestors died when the police opened fired on them as they tried to storm the United States Information Center. As reported in *Independent* from February 13, 1989, the day before Ayatollah Khomeini issued his fatwa, “More than 2,000 protestors screaming ‘American dogs’ and ‘God is great’ threw stones and bricks” as “several demonstrators climbed on top of the two-storey building and pulled down the US flag, which was burnt along with effigies representing Rushdie and the United States, as the mob cheered and chanted” (*The Rushdie File* 81). This scene in Islamabad demonstrates both the violent reaction against Rushdie and his novel, as well as the way the perceived insult was associated with the West, and America in particular. Unfortunately, the violence in Islamabad was only one instance of many: two bookstores in Berkeley, California, were firebombed, and ten people died during riots in Bombay (*The Rushdie File* 132). These violent reactions to Rushdie have lessened, though they have not abated entirely. Even as recently as the 2012 Jaipur Literature Festival in Rushdie’s native India, alleged death threats forced him to cancel his appearance.

The riots in 1989, which spanned three continents, underscore the globalization that occurred between Joyce’s publication of *Ulysses* and Rushdie’s publication of *The Satanic Verses*. Joyce had only Western standards of obscenity—which differed in each England, America, and France—to navigate, whereas Rushdie encountered a number of different ideologies—religious, secular, democratic, theocratic, Western, Eastern—in publishing *The Satanic Verses*. In part, Rushdie courted this cross-cultural audience, considering that the main characters in *The Satanic Verses* have roots in India and England, just as Rushdie himself does.

Because he offended an ideology, not a nation, the repercussions of his blasphemy appeared around the world.

Just two days after the deaths in Islamabad, the Ayatollah Khomeini pronounced a fatwa against Rushdie, sentencing him to death and granting the Muslim who killed him martyr status. Khomeini's condemnation of Rushdie was read on Tehran home service February 14, 1989. In his denunciation of *The Satanic Verses*, Khomeini calls it a "calculated move aimed at rooting out religion and religiousness, and above all, Islam and its clergy" (*The Rushdie File* 90). Khomeini views the book as a divine call to action, intended to wake up the Muslim community to the threat from "the world-devourers":

God wanted the blasphemous book of *the Satanic Verses* to be published now, so that the world of conceit, arrogance and barbarism would bare its true face in its long-held enmity to Islam; to bring us out of our simplicity and to prevent us from attributing everything to blunder, bad management, and lack of experience; to realize fully that this issue is not our mistake, but that it is the world devourers' effort to annihilate Islam, and Muslims; otherwise, the issue of Salman Rushdie would not be so important to them as to place the entire Zionism and arrogance behind it. (*The Rushdie File* 91)

In beginning his pronouncement by asserting what "God wanted," he immediately establishes Rushdie as a blasphemous enemy of God. With these words, Khomeini challenged Muslims to stop being passive and "attributing everything to blunder." Instead, he blames the "world devourers," who are unnamed, save Rushdie and Zionists. Amir Taheri in an article for the *Times* notes that Khomeini made it "incumbent on all true Muslims to eliminate [Rushdie]," charging

Rushdie with being “an agent of corruption on earth, one who had ‘declared war on Allah’ and, last but not least, a *murtad* – a born Muslim who has abandoned his faith and crossed over to the enemies of Islam” (*The Rushdie File* 92). Taheri alleges that Khomeini’s intention in issuing the fatwa was “not entirely religious,” given that “he has suffered a number of humiliating setbacks: the ceasefire with Iraq, the election of a woman prime minister in Pakistan and, with the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the failure of his protégés to secure a prominent role in the assembly organized by the Mujahidin in Rawalpindi” (*The Rushdie File* 94-5). However, Pipes disagrees with this reading, noting that *The Satanic Verses* had not come to Khomeini’s attention before the riots in Islamabad.

The intensely violent reaction to *The Satanic Verses* rendered traditional publishing a dangerous option for Rushdie, though in the early 1990s it did not keep him from hoping that he might see a paperback edition of *The Satanic Verses*. In 1991, Rushdie discussed his disappointment at the delay in bringing out a paperback edition: “The suspension of the paperback began at once to look like a surrender...It has now been more than three years since *The Satanic Verses* was published; that’s a long, long ‘space for reconciliation.’ Long enough” (“One Thousand Days in a Balloon” 23). Whereas initially Rushdie and his publishers hoped to publish the paperback edition one year after the hardcover version came out—the industry standard—the continued threat of the fatwa made it impossible to risk the lives of all the employees of the publishing house, Viking-Penguin, who could all too easily be made victims of circumstance. Nonetheless, Rushdie remained convinced that “*The Satanic Verses* must be freely available and easily affordable, if only because if it is not read and studied, then these years will have no meaning. Those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it” (*Rushdie Letters* 23). Determined not to be ignored or forgotten, Rushdie felt strongly that the

introduction of a paperback edition would make a clear statement that although he may be in hiding, he would not be cowed by the Ayatollah's threat. Rushdie's novel became a highly charged political symbol, and just as he felt compelled to produce a paperback edition, the fear was that his enemies would feel equally compelled to retaliate.

Eventually, Rushdie and his publishers found an acceptable solution: the Consortium edition, which would be completely anonymous, except for Rushdie's name. Initially, Rushdie and Wylie hoped to announce "a list of publishers who agreed to work toward that goal [of a paperback edition]" but because the fatwa "was aimed not only at Mr. Rushdie, but at the editors and publishers who brought out the book," support for this strategy faltered, as Esther Fein reports in a February 14, 1992 article for *the New York Times*. Because the fatwa treats authorship as a collective enterprise, the lives of numerous people were at stake in this publication. When the plan to have a formal Consortium announced failed, Rushdie and his publishers had to find a way to restructure the authorship so that they might minimize the threat from the fatwa. On March 14, 1992, Fein reports in the *New York Times* that "an anonymous group calling itself the Consortium is publishing a paperback edition of Salman Rushdie's novel 'The Satanic Verses,'" and in keeping with this anonymity, the group's spokesman "would not say who was financing the publication, who was part of the group or who would receive any profits the book earned." This arrangement excludes from responsibility all those engaged in the publication of the edition, except the author himself. They still work in tandem behind-the-scenes, yet on paper Rushdie appears to have achieved the fantasy of complete autonomy that Joyce sought when writing *Ulysses*. However, just as Joyce's situation was necessarily mediated by typists and printers, so too the circumstances surrounding this self-published edition concealed the collective nature of the endeavor.

Through the high-profile auction of the rights to the book, *The Satanic Verses* made quite an impression in publishing circles even in its earliest stages. Whereas initially the debate around its publication centered on the shift that this type of author-publisher relationship signaled in the publishing industry, soon the public eye turned to the outrage *The Satanic Verses* provoked in Muslims. For fear of inciting more violence, Rushdie had to find a way to work within the existing publishing system, without exposing the identities of any who helped him, to produce a paperback version. This paperback edition, like Rushdie himself, took on a symbolic role in this, because the act of publishing it was incredibly political. Blasphemy was the driving force behind Rushdie's decision to self-publish. Like Joyce, Rushdie went in a non-traditional way because social forces rendered it impossible for him to function within the system.

Throughout the text of *The Satanic Verses*, Rushdie questions the unquestionable, humanizes the Prophet, and explores the many manifestations of doubt in modern (and ancient) life. While doubt and loss of faith is an acceptable topic for discussion in secular culture, Rushdie published his novel into a globalized world, and his portrayal of the early days of Islam offended many Muslims who believed he wrote *The Satanic Verses* in an attempt to mock Islam. In his treatment of anxieties about authorship, Rushdie appears to anticipate his eventual fate, when his own writing would incite dire consequences. Just as Salman the Persian did, Rushdie "set his words against the word of God," but unlike Salman, who was spared by Mahound, Rushdie faced a death sentence.

SECTION III

Defending Joyce and Rushdie

Although *The Satanic Verses* differs from *Ulysses* in that it does not explore issues of self-publishing within the text, Rushdie's novel betrays a similar anxiety about individual authorship versus collective creation. Joyce treats these questions in relation to his own writing process, as he sought to achieve an ideal of complete autonomy through self-publishing, but Rushdie treats questions of dubious authorship in relation to the Koran. Joyce and Rushdie transgressed explicit or understood boundaries in place in the legal system, such as obscenity law, or in the cultural sphere, as in Rushdie's reprisal of the incident of the "satanic verses." Therefore, Joyce and Rushdie's obscenity and blasphemy, respectively, drove them, in effect, to self-publish. In 1922, when Joyce published *Ulysses*, the publishing industry was not yet the global enterprise that Rushdie would encounter, meaning that Joyce could clearly understand the obscenity laws of his specific audiences, even though the law varied from country to country among his predominantly Western readers. However, when Rushdie published *The Satanic Verses*, his words reached a global audience, and elicited a strikingly different response depending on the origin and the religious beliefs of the reader. Although Rushdie transgressed in different ways than Joyce, his situation raises many of the same issues as *Ulysses*: Is literary value a justification for "offensive" content? Does the secular acceptance of the right to freedom of speech promise freedom from intimidation or threat by those who believe religion is in everything? What is the author's role in a secular society? and how do we reconcile the

expectations for a secular writer in an age where he is publishing to a world audience that may not understand these values?

Literary Value as a Defense for Joyce and Rushdie's Transgressions

The Satanic Verses was published over 60 years after Joyce's *Ulysses*, but the two instances of publication are similar in that traditional publishing practice was out of the question for these books, one deemed blasphemous, the other obscene. Still, demand for the books was high, in part because of their controversial nature, and in part because the two writers were respected and distinguished. Rushdie was welcomed into elite literary circles, and his work fetched a high price from publishers. Joyce had vociferous advocates in some of the most influential critics of his time: Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, and Valery Larbaud. Although the two writers were condemned for different reasons, the defenses for Joyce and Rushdie were strikingly similar: in both cases, the novels' supporters argue that the literary merit of the novels renders offensive material acceptable, because the writer used the material in order to achieve an aesthetic goal. They rebuke the readers who take the controversial material out of context, and contend that one must understand the aim of the novel as a whole in order to see whether the material is obscene or blasphemous. The issue of the role of the writer in society and the question of *what is literature* underlie both disagreements. However, as Rushdie's case demonstrates, no simple answer exists for these questions in a globalized world, where different and opposing standards of taste, conduct, and of literary value exist side-by-side.

In Joyce's case, the book's literary value was often weighed against its obscenity, in reviews as well as in the Woolsey decision, which ended the ban against *Ulysses* in the United States. Dr. Joseph Collins, writing for the May 28, 1922 *New York Times*, calls *Ulysses* "the most important contribution that has been made to fictional literature in the twentieth century;"

then notes that “Mr Joyce has seen fit to use words and phrases that the entire world has covenanted and people in general, cultured and uncultured, civilized and savage, believer and heathen, have agreed shall not be used, and which are base, vulgar, vicious and depraved.” Collins thus asserts that “vulgar” and “important” are not mutually exclusive. While Collins does not extol the use of such vulgar material, he accepts that the “contribution to fictional literature” made in *Ulysses* outweighs the unsavory material. Further, even though the drama surrounding the publication of *Ulysses* took place mainly in England, the United States, and France, Collins assumes that everyone, everywhere, “cultured and uncultured, civilized and savage” will subscribe to the same definitions of “base, vulgar, vicious and depraved.” As Rushdie’s case showed, no one standard of taste can rule all these different demographics.

In his early review of *Ulysses* Arnold Bennett contends, “The book is not pornographic, and can produce on nobody the effects of a pornographic book. But it is more indecent, obscene, scatological, and licentious than the majority of professedly pornographical books.” Bennett asks whether “the staggering indecency” is “justified by results obtained,” concluding that “in the main it is not justified by results obtained; but I must plainly add, at the risk of opprobrium, that in the finest passages it is in my opinion justified” (570). Again, the aesthetic “results” determine whether or not the “indecent” material is justified. Observing this trend, Allison Pease argues in *Modernism, Mass Culture, and the Aesthetics of Obscenity* that “it is indeed the difficulty of *Ulysses* that rescues it from censorship and that...privileges it as a work of art” (91). Pease contends that Joyce’s ability to choose from the profanities of daily life and reuse them in a highly aesthetic way facilitated *Ulysses*’ canonization, which “was dependent on [his] ability to assert a high-cultural aesthetic, even while appropriating—even flaunting—the pornographic” (Pease 81). In this formulation, “difficulty” and a “high-cultural aesthetic” are what constitute

literary value in the culture surrounding *Ulysses*' publication. According to Pease, once Joyce laid claim to aesthetic mastery, he was free to "flaunt" the pornographic. Although early reviewers, and even Judge Woolsey, would resist her use of the word "pornographic," in general they subscribe to the idea that literary achievement is a justification for Joyce's obscenity.

Although certain facets of Joyce's novel recur in descriptions of its "literariness" – its difficulty, its genius, its stylistic experiments – this portrayal of "literary value" offers only a subjective understanding of what qualifies as "literature." Yet, the defenses of both Joyce and Rushdie's novels as important literary artifacts beg the question: How do we define literature? In her account of the *Little Review* trial, Margaret Anderson laments that the three judges "do not know the difference between James Joyce and obscene postal cards," which implies that although they treat the same material, James Joyce's work is "literature," and therefore it should be judged by different standards than postcards. If, as Foucault wrote, "writing unfolds like a game that inevitably moves beyond its own rules and finally leaves them behind," then Joyce's writing in *Ulysses* already surpassed the rules of the novel through its aesthetic experimentation (116). Thus, his transgression justifies Joyce's inclusion of obscenity, because he has left "the rules" behind. The work of an author then becomes to force progress in their art.

Echoing these sentiments, Rushdie himself defends his work, and literature in general, as an instigator of social progress. Rushdie believes that literature's role in society to continuously question, and in doing so, to expand our minds; "if religion is an answer, if political inquiry is an answer, then literature is an inquiry; great literature, by asking extraordinary questions, opens new doors in our minds" (*Is Nothing Sacred?* 10). This conception of literature supports Rushdie's presentation of a different possibility for the story of Islam's foundation in *The Satanic Verses*. Where he saw himself "opening new doors in our minds," however, many

Islamic fundamentalists saw blasphemy. Thus, Rushdie's conception of literature conflicts with the Islamic fundamentalist idea of how literature should function in society. This discrepancy demonstrates that "literature" has no universally accepted definition. Instead, its function is determined by the surrounding culture. Rushdie sees this subjectivity surrounding the definition of literature as its other crucial function; "The only privilege literature deserves—and this privilege it requires in order to exist—is the privilege of being the arena of discourse, the place where the struggle of languages can be acted out" (15). Implicit in the comment, "This privilege it requires in order to exist," is a call for free speech, and an exaltation of this freedom as necessary for progress in society. Rushdie was caught in a struggle of languages, which grew into a physical threat, and he therefore has much at stake in his call for freedom of speech. Rather than turning to violence, Rushdie advocates using literature as an "arena," and language as the "struggle."

Rushdie approaches this problem from a decidedly Western viewpoint, despite his upbringing in an Islamic Indian household. As noted before, Rushdie remembers his family as inquisitive and unafraid to question parts of Islam or anything else; thus demonstrating that the fundamentalist Muslim culture that was outraged at *The Satanic Verses* did not hold true for the Muslim community worldwide. Nonetheless, Pipes notes this division between the expectation for freedom of speech in the West and the power of words in fundamentalism Muslim theocracies: "It is sometimes that, just as high standards of living lead to a birth dearth, so freedom of speech lessens the power of writing and speech. In the Muslim world... where repression is common, books have a power rarely felt in the West" (Pipes 110). With this in mind, the secular culture's shock at the Muslim community's response to the book is inevitable—those in the West who are accustomed to free speech tend to take it for granted.

However, Rushdie's own failure to anticipate that his book would incite such a violent reaction allies him more closely with the Western tradition than his Eastern roots. Through this lens, his enemies' allegations that he was a traitor to his faith and his culture are more understandable, and their violence demonstrates the degree of importance they placed on these issues.

Whereas *Ulysses* was the book that finally catapulted Joyce into the canon of English literature, Rushdie had already established his literary reputation in 1981 with *Midnight's Children*. He won the Booker Prize that year, and in 1983, *Shame* was shortlisted for the prize. Again, in 1988, *The Satanic Verses* was shortlisted. This impressive track record with one of the most prestigious literary prizes in England demonstrates Rushdie's reputation as a serious, "literary" writer. Like Joyce, who wrote about Dublin from Zurich, Trieste, and Paris, Rushdie dealt with his complicated feelings towards the country of his birth, India, from his new home in England. Given that *The Satanic Verses* deals with immigrants, torn between their native country and their adopted home, it seems fitting, though still ironic, that this book, which won the Whitbread Prize for Best Novel in England, would be banned in India. This case further underscores the subjectivity of the literary value defense, and indicates that the culture into which a work is received plays a huge role in understanding what constitutes literature. Despite the praise in the Western world for the novel, many readers of Islamic heritage refused to accept the literary value defense. Pipes notes, "Assessing the accusations against the book requires that it be looked at in a literal, and very unliterary manner, for this is the way it is understood by those who protest it" (53). Whereas in the Western tradition, if a work is designated as "fiction," readers understand the author and his creation to be separate entities, those who rejected the book saw Rushdie's words and his opinions were indivisible. The author's role in creating literature is

closely allied in Western readers' minds, yet among the fundamentalist Muslims who pronounced a death sentence against Rushdie, the distinction completely collapses.

For both Joyce and Rushdie, the popular understanding of "literary" differed from the legal understanding. In the *Little Review* trial, Joyce's reputation as a writer and his novel's literary value were treated as irrelevant to the matter at hand: deciding whether or not certain sections were obscene. Anderson recalls that the judges denied the importance of these issues, saying, "they 'don't care who James Joyce is or whether he has written the finest books in the world'; their only function is to decide whether certain passages of 'Ulysses'...violate the statute" (Anderson 23). At least in these judges' eyes, the literary merit defense has no place in the courtroom. Of course, Anderson portrays the judges as Philistines, ignorant and less intelligent than she. This changed with the Woolsey decision, which ruled that literary merit could indeed be a legitimate defense for obscenity.

In the 1933 decision to end the ban on *Ulysses* in the United States, Federal Judge John M. Woolsey ruled that *Ulysses* was not obscene in the legal sense, that one must read the entire novel to understand the necessity of the "obscene" passages, and that literary merit is a legitimate defense in the United States against allegations of obscenity. Woolsey allows that "in many places the effect of 'Ulysses' on the reader undoubtedly is somewhat emetic," but concludes "nowhere does it tend to be an aphrodisiac" (as reprinted in *Ulysses*, xiv). This ruling established a precedent in the United States, aligning the popular and legal definitions of literature. However acceptable this notion was in the West, theocracies in the Islamic tradition did not pick up this progressive treatment of literature.

Just as the literary merit defense did not convince the early judges of Joyce, Rushdie's claims to literary renown did not exempt him from the wrath of Muslim fundamentalists either.

However, because he treated a problem centered in the Islamic faith, it was not as historically rooted in the West as questions surrounding Christianity. Therefore the legal framework did not exist for those who wished to prosecute him on the grounds of blasphemy. By the time Rushdie published *The Satanic Verses* in 1988, obscene books like *Ulysses* had already survived the censorship imposed by secular courts, and the legal understanding of literary value had more closely merged with the popular understanding. Because Margaret Thatcher protected Salman Rushdie after the fatwa—even though he publicly criticized her politics and depicted characters burning an effigy of “Maggie the Bitch” in *The Satanic Verses*—Rushdie’s experience indicates that, in England at least, literary value and the need to protect freedom of speech prevailed as defenses for controversial viewpoints and blasphemous art in the late 20th century. Among the large Muslim population living in England, the tendency to honor freedom of speech even in the face of insult did not suffice to calm their outrage. Whereas in the novel, Rushdie described Thatcher’s likeness being burned in an effigy, in reality Muslim protesters burned his effigy. In Joyce’s case, the government did not have to protect him from physical harm. After the Woolsey case the government’s protection of Joyce centered more on financial threats, when it extended his copyright on *Ulysses* into the United States, allowing him to begin earning royalties in that market and to prosecute anyone pirating his book.

Rather than existing solely in the literary spheres of contemporary culture, Rushdie’s novel enters the political realm, as onlookers began to debate the boundaries of freedom of speech and the role of the author in society. Rushdie suggests in “Is Nothing Sacred?” – a lecture written for February 6, 1990 and delivered by Harold Pinter – that literature has a transformative power, which must not be stunted by respect for sacred ideas. Whereas *Ulysses*

marks an aesthetic transformation, Rushdie focuses more on political transformations.¹⁹ In Rushdie's understanding of literature, one must question those ideologies that some take as indisputable fact, and in doing so open the door to progress and social change. "To respect the sacred is to be paralysed by it," Rushdie contends. "The idea of the sacred is quite simply one of the most conservative notions in any culture, because it seeks to turn other ideas—Uncertainty, Progress, Change—into crimes" (Rushdie 3). This argument in favor of transgression situates the artist at the center of "Change," and attributes social agency to his words. Rushdie sees the threat to him and the "attack upon a particular work of fiction" as "also an attack upon the very idea of the novel form" (Rushdie 2). His much-debated book thus becomes the test case for the genre of the novel. He insinuates that protecting his novel is in effect taking a stand in favor of literature.

In *the Observer*, the newspaper supports Rushdie's cause saying, "It is not the job of the artist to make life more comfortable for societies or governments. It is the job of democratic governments to protect the artist's right to free expression and the liberty of life" (*The Rushdie File* 121). This statement equates "the artist's right to free expression" and "the liberty of life." Furthermore, because the author of this statement argues that the protection of the artist is the government's job, he supports Rushdie's claims that the author's role is inherently political. Rushdie sees his duty to push boundaries, to incite change. The writer for the *Observer* seconds this view, and takes it one step further, charging that it is the government's duty to allow the writer to do his job. However true this may be for Western society, Rushdie's novel created trouble when it relied on this Western conception of absolute freedom of speech, which

¹⁹ Far from trying to enact the same kind of aesthetic transformation as Joyce, Rushdie embraces the Joycean aesthetic, and uses a similarly encyclopedic style at times. He pays homage to Joyce also in the text, through allusions to *Ulysses* such as "Inspector Stephen Kinch;" and Pamela Chamcha's statement: "I am the widow Chamcha whose spouse is beastly dead" (194).

conflicted with a theocratic notion of blasphemy's severity. Thus, the government's relation to literature is determined by the surrounding culture, and increasingly complicated in a global exchange of culture and ideas.

Some defenders of Rushdie go even farther, arguing that his case epitomizes the need for freedom of speech in society—both in the West and in the East—making him more a symbol than a man. Rushdie himself acknowledges that after being in hiding for over 1,000 days, he “ceased to be a human being. I’ve become an issue, a bother, an ‘affair’” (*One Thousand Days in a Balloon* 16). No longer able to be present in the public eye because of the fatwa, Rushdie seemed to exist solely in the public imagination, and this sense of him being an “issue” or a character more than a human being contributed to his transformation into a symbol. In his biography of Rushdie, Weatherby’s analysis of the situation makes explicit the way in which Rushdie and his novel became symbolic of the battle over freedom of speech: “Rushdie wasn’t at the heart of this macabre affair and hadn’t been since the Ayatollah spoke. *Rushdie was merely now a symbol* of what had to be defended and protected *without question or qualification* by any individual, any community and any country which purported to put freedom of speech on its list of essential human freedoms” (emphasis mine, 176). In this passage, Weatherby demonstrates that Rushdie the man is of less interest to him than Rushdie the symbol that must be blindly protected in the name of free speech. In “What is an Author?” Foucault argues that “writing is now linked to sacrifice and to the sacrifice of life itself; it is a voluntary obliteration of the self that does not require representation in books because it takes place in the everyday existence of the writer. Where a work had the duty of creating immortality, it now attains the right to kill, to become the murderer of its author” (117). In a very literal sense, *The Satanic Verses* threatened to kill Rushdie, because of the blasphemy contained inside and the repercussions of those words;

as a result of his work, Rushdie was forced to retreat into hiding—the response to his work obliterated the man and facilitated his transformation into a symbol. The boundless human right to freedom of speech and the fundamentalist Muslim understanding that religion is in everything seem hopelessly irreconcilable in this view.

Whereas the drama of Joyce's publication played out in the courtrooms, Rushdie's experience demonstrates the way in which the legal enforcement of obscenity or blasphemy law was on the way out by the end of the 20th century in the United States and England. In Iran and among the global population of Islamic fundamentalists blasphemy remains extremely taboo, and punishable by law in many places. In 1922 Joyce's novel could not be published, for fear of government retribution, yet in Rushdie's case, the government is being called on to protect the right to write controversial, sacrilegious, or obscene things. Instead of fear of legal action, social forces, like the influence of a religious leader or the fear engendered by his threats, decide what routes to publication are open to authors. Khomeini's edict, which technically was illegal on British soil, proved more powerful than appeals to British blasphemy law. Rushdie's case epitomized the inevitable clashes between Eastern and Western values in a globalized world. Both Joyce and Rushdie were chastised for incorporating controversial elements into their novels, yet both were defended as brilliant literary minds. Their cases demonstrate that literary value is often prized over good behavior in Western culture, though this value does not translate into cultures dominated by religion. Nonetheless, the power of publishing as a means to share their stories—however unpopular they may be—recurs throughout their histories, and testifies to the power of the press as an instigator of progress, even in the face of threats and government intervention.

Conclusion

How do these same issues of publishing, blasphemy, and obscenity play out in the world revolutionized by the Internet? Rushdie ran into problems with his blasphemy because he was publishing in a globalized society, and his situation almost anticipates—though no one could have foreseen it before—the extent to which the Internet brought the world closer together, and brought into dialogue innumerable ideologies online where information can be shared in an instant. In some ways, this flood of information dilutes the threat of blasphemy or obscenity, yet these issues remain controversial even in the digital environment.

Although *Ulysses* was ruled not obscene in 1933 in the United States, in 2010 Apple attempted to censor the iPad app *Ulysses “Seen,”* a comic version of the novel, for picturing nudity. According to Joel Rose’s NPR article on this censorship, the business manager of *Ulysses “Seen,”* Charles Rutkowski recalls that Apple asked two things of them: “One, please remove the image of the bare-chested goddess on page 37. And please rate it NC-17.” These calls to censor *Ulysses “Seen”* or to restrict its audience echo the calls of publishers in Joyce’s days, who offered to publish *Ulysses* only if he would remove the “obscene” portions. The cases are different, in that one concerns words and the other images, but because they treat the same subject matter, they facilitate comparison between Joyce’s initial publication and its reincarnation in digital format. The medium may have changed, but the issue of obscenity remains problematic.

Similarly, the ease of publishing one’s thoughts via Twitter, an act which is almost second nature to many of the site’s users, does not exempt the writer from facing the

consequences of blasphemous content—even in 140 characters or less. In February 2012, Hamza Kashgari, a Saudi Arabian writer, was arrested on charges of blasphemy—a crime which merits the death penalty in his native country. In a Tweet addressed to the Prophet Muhammad, Kashgari wrote, “I have loved things about you and I have hated things about you and there is a lot I don’t know about you. I will not pray for you” (as quoted by Liz Gooch in *the New York Times*). According to the *New York Times*, “More than 13,000 people have joined a Facebook page titled ‘The Saudi People Demand the Execution of Hamza Kashgari,’” though the number of members has only grown; on April 5, 2012, the group had nearly 28,000 members. These sheer numbers attest to the power of social media, and the impact that simply composing a Tweet can have. Nearly 15 years after Khomeini condemned Rushdie to death for blasphemy, his offense is reincarnated in the digital sphere. The after life of these issues parallels, though in a less violent way, the original Rushdie affair.

Ironically, Salman Rushdie still technically lives under the fatwa, but he lives a relatively unencumbered life in New York City. Unlike Kashgari whose Tweets resulted in his arrest, Rushdie shares his location freely on Twitter, and has earned the reputation of a socialite in New York. In her article “From Exile to Everywhere” for the *New York Times*, Laura M. Holson asks “Where *haven’t* New Yorkers seen Mr. Rushdie lately?” before detailing his recent social engagements. Rushdie’s life has vastly changed in the years since *The Satanic Verses* was published, yet the rest of the world has too through the advent of new digital technology. The change in Rushdie’s style of life, when compared with the arrest of Hamza Kashgari, demonstrates that blasphemy has not lessened in gravity in Muslim fundamentalist culture, but also that Rushdie himself is no longer the primary target of derision. Rushdie freely publishes his thoughts on Twitter, just as Kashgari did, and Rushdie’s words reach over 265,000 followers.

Whereas once he feared publishing a paperback edition of *The Satanic Verses* for fear of inciting another wave of violence, today Rushdie personally is unencumbered by his past blasphemy, though the issue is still taken seriously in the greater Muslim community.

However, the factors that drives most people to self-publish today is not a fear of retribution, but a removal of the traditional gatekeepers—anyone can be a best-selling author in the digital world, when a manuscript does not have to be vetted by editors and agents in order to be published. Or, if an author is already published, financial benefits from self-publishing constitute much of the appeal of digital self-publishing. Success stories give hope to aspiring writers who've been rejected from traditional publishers; Amanda Hocking, a prolific author of paranormal series geared towards young-adult readers, self-published on Amazon, earned millions of dollars in royalties, and was offered a publishing contract with St. Martin's press. The low barriers to self-publishing entice many as of yet unpublished writers to try their luck in the digital medium. Still, though success in ebooks is open to anyone with a novel to publish, most writers hope to use it as a stepping stone to a deal with a traditional publisher. Thus, no matter what the doomsayers predicting the end of print books say, the market for traditional publishers still offers skills currently unavailable in the digital sphere.

Conversely, many writers who already have established careers in traditional publishing choose to publish their back catalogue on Amazon, because they can earn higher royalties than with a publisher. From this trend, we can conclude that financial means are a huge attraction to self-publish—though of course profits drive the traditional publishing industry as well (as seen in Rushdie's decision to put *The Satanic Verses* before publishers in an auction). Overall, despite the massive changes in the level of publishing technology and the buzz surrounding digital publishing, from Joyce to Rushdie to self-publishing today, the need to circumvent the traditional

publishing system stems from a myriad of different reasons yet the results are the same: a self-published author risks taking on the backlash against the novel's contents—as in the case of obscenity or blasphemy—but also stands to gain the most from publishing. For Joyce, this meant finding a way to transition from his status as a banned author to a canonical writer; for Rushdie, this meant proving that he would not be intimidated by the Ayatollah's threats; for today's self-published writer, this means an opportunity to gain readers, to earn royalties, and to potentially find a print publisher. Whatever the goal, self-publishing remains a way to force progress in the industry and in the culture surrounding the publication.

Bibliography:

Section I

- Anderson, Margaret. "'Ulysses' in Court." *Little Review* 7.4 (1921): 22-25. *Modernist Journals Project*. Brown University. Web. 15 Apr. 2012. <http://dl.lib.brown.edu/mjp/render.php?view=mjp_object&id=1299777765531252>.
- Beach, Sylvia. *Shakespeare and Company*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959. Print.
- Beplate, Justin. "Joyce, Bergson, and the Memory of Words." *Modern Language Review* 100.2 (2005): 298-312. Web. 1 Dec. 2011. <www.jstor.org/stable/3727598>.
- Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ., 1967. Print.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: the Middle Ages of James Joyce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989. Print.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford UP, 1982. Print.
- Gifford, Don, Robert J. Seidman, and James Joyce. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2008. Print.
- Gilbert, Stuart. *Letters of James Joyce*. New York: Viking, 1957. Print.
- Groden, Michael. *Ulysses in Progress*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977. Print.
- Henke, Suzette A., and Elaine Unkeless. Introduction. *Women in Joyce*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982. Print.
- Herr, Cheryl. *Joyce's Anatomy of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1986. Print.
- Joyce, James. *Letters of James Joyce*. Ed. Stuart Gilbert. New York: Viking, 1957. Print.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*, New York: Garland Pub, 1984. Print.
- Joyce, Stanislaus. *My Brother's Keeper: James Joyce's Early Years*. New York: Viking, 1958. Print.
- Lawrence, Karen. *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1981. Print.
- Lawrence, Karen. "Joyce and Feminism," *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*.

"The New York Review of Books." *The New 'Ulysses'™: The Hidden Controversy*. 8 Dec. 1988. Web. 04 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/1988/dec/08/the-new-ulysses-the-hidden-controversy/>>.

Unkeless, Elaine. "The Conventional Molly Bloom." *Women in Joyce*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982. Print.

Section 2:

Tabari, Al. "Satan Casts a False Revelation on the Messenger of God's Tongue." *The History of Al-Tabari: Muhammad at Mecca*. Ed. W. Montgomery Watt and M. V. McDonald. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1988. 107-12. Print.

Appignanesi, Lisa, and Sara Maitland, eds. *The Rushdie File*. London: Fourth Estate, 1989. Print.

Pipes, Daniel. *The Rushdie Affair: The Novel, the Ayatollah, and the West*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2003. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Is Nothing Sacred?* New York: Granta, 1990. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. "One Thousand Days in a Balloon." Ed. Steve MacDonogh. *The Rushdie Letters: Freedom to Speak, Freedom to Write*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1993. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *The Satanic Verses*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2008. Print.

Weatherby, William J. *Salman Rushdie: Sentenced to Death*. New York: Carroll & Graf, 1990. Print.

Section 3

Arnold Bennett. "CONCERNING JAMES JOYCE'S 'ULYSSES'." *The Bookman; a Review of Books and Life (1895-1933)* 1 Aug. 1922: American Periodicals Series Online, ProQuest. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.

Collins, Joseph. "James Joyce's Amazing Chronicle". *New York Times (1857-1922)*, p. 40. 28 May 1922. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008). (Document ID: 109337460).

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Comp. Sherry Simon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1977. Print.

Pease, Allison. *Modernism, Mass Culture, and the Aesthetics of Obscenity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Conclusion

- Gooch, Liz, and J. David Goodman. "Malaysia Detains Saudi Over Twitter Posts On Prophet." *New York Times*. 10 Feb. 2012. Web. 5 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/11/world/asia/malaysia-detains-saudi-over-twitter-posts-on-prophet.html>>.
- Holson, Laura M. "From Exile to Everywhere." *New York Times*, 27 Mar. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/25/fashion/salman-rushdie-out-of-exile-is-a-fixture-on-the-social-scene.html?_r=1&ref=lauramholson>.
- Rose, Joel. "Apple Relents, And 'Ulysses Seen' Is Seen After All." *Www.npr.org*. 16 June 2010. Web. 5 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127887793>>.