

## **Dial M for Marianne: The *Dial*'s Refusals of 'Work in Progress'**

*Ronan Crowley*  
*University of Passau*

Joyce was extremely anxious to introduce his heroine to readers in the United States. Aiming high, I sent her off to the *Dial*, hoping its editor, Marianne Moore, would find her attractive.

I was glad to get word that the *Dial* had accepted the work, but it turned out that this was a mistake. It had come in when Miss Moore was away, and she was reluctant to publish it. The *Dial* didn't back out altogether. I was told, however, that the text would have to be considerably cut down to meet the requirements of the magazine. Now Joyce might have considered the possibility of expanding a work of his, but never, of course, of whittling it down. On the other hand, I couldn't blame the *Dial* for its prudence in dealing with a piece so full of rivers that they might have been overflowed at 152 West Thirteenth Street.

I was sorry about 'A.L.P.'s' failure to make the *Dial*. Joyce, who was still in Belgium, was not surprised. 'Why did you not bet with me?' he wrote. 'I should have won something.' He added that he regretted the loss of a 'strategical position'. Joyce always looked upon his *Finnegans Wake* as a kind of battle.<sup>1</sup>

In this characteristically muddled account, Sylvia Beach provides the canonical version of 'Work in Progress's' rejection by the *Dial*. Implicit in her reference to rivers and the witty image of the flooded Greenwich Village office, explicit in the inclusion of its title is Beach's conviction that at issue was the 'Anna Livia Plurabelle' section (I.8) of the *Wake*. But as early as Richard Ellmann's *James Joyce*, first published in October 1959 to *Shakespeare and Company*'s September, this assertion was challenged.<sup>2</sup> For in 1926, the *Dial* accepted for publication not I.8 but an early version of Book III, the 'Four Watches of Shaun', before dramatically reversing its decision.

Indeed, this counter-narrative was already in circulation before the release of Beach's memoir. The first volume of *Letters*, edited by Stuart Gilbert and published in 1957, reproduces Joyce's July 1926 letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver in which he complains, 'Λabcd (no bids) has been offered to the *Dial*' (Letters I: 242). Such is the first-hand character of Beach's colourful testimony, however, and perhaps too the relative unfamiliarity of Book III over I.8 that the error dogged and continues to dog scholarship on the early reception of 'Work in Progress'.<sup>3</sup> Regrettable though the persistence of this mistake is, the confusion

overshadows an intriguing lacuna in the existing scholarship: for in point of fact, there were not one but two separate sections of ‘Work in Progress’ submitted to the *Dial* for consideration. In addition to the ‘Four Watches of Shaun’, Moore was offered and turned down, in February 1927, an early version of ‘The Triangle’ (II.2§8).

The omission of this twist in the curious publication history of ‘Work in Progress’ was first brought to light by Linda Leavell. In  *Holding On Upside Down: The Life and Work of Marianne Moore* (2013), she notes that ‘[t]he *Dial* received another short section of “Work in Progress” in February 1927’ before quoting from Moore and James Sibley Watson’s disagreement over the unnamed manuscript.<sup>4</sup> Taking wing from Leavell’s detective work, the present article offers a documentary recovery of the *Dial*’s deliberations over ‘Work in Progress’, a tale told twice, and one that played out in correspondence between Beach, Lewis Galantière, Joyce, Moore, Watson, and Weaver in late 1926 and early 1927. Hiding in plain sight in published volumes of letters and in the archives is the story of this second refusal.

Even excepting the evidence presented here, prior emphases on ‘Anna Livia Plurabelle’ are untenable. Not only did the *Dial* publish Padraic Colum’s enthusiastic analysis of I.8 in April 1928, ahead of the piece’s inclusion as the preface to the Crosby Gaige fragment in October – a decision hardly commensurate with an earlier rejection – but also Moore was not in the habit of accepting material previously published elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> For example, the office correspondence now in the *Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers at Yale preserves her rebuke of Joseph Campbell, the North of Ireland poet and Republican. Having accepted his poem ‘The Cock’ in 1925, Moore upbraided Campbell’s perceived indiscretion when she happened upon the poem’s prior appearance in Francis Stuart and Cecil Salkeld’s little magazine *To-Morrow*.<sup>6</sup> The publication of I.8 as ‘From Work in Progress’ in *Le Navire d’argent* some nine months before Beach first approached Moore could not have augured well for a *Dial* acceptance.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, in her initial letter of inquiry, Beach specifies ‘exclusive periodical rights in America and Europe’, which indicates that the instalment was not previously published.<sup>8</sup>

More vitally, the recovery of a second refusal adds to our knowledge of the early fortunes of ‘Work on Progress’. At this point – February 1927 – Joyce had published only five sections of his new work and, as we can now compute, had suffered as many rejections.<sup>9</sup> Despite successes with Ford Madox Ford’s *transatlantic review*, Robert McAlmon’s *Contact Collection of Contemporary Writers*, T. S. Eliot’s *Criterion*, Adrienne Monnier’s *Le Navire*

*d'argent*, and Ernest Walsh and Ethel Moorhead's *This Quarter*, a number of these publications were fraught with delays and missed deadlines, difficulties with printers, and episodes of editorial cold feet. Moreover, 'none of these journals cared to repeat the experiment', as Katherine Mullin observes.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, by the spring of 1927, nothing new of 'Work in Progress' had appeared in over a year. And with no authorized publications emanating from the USA, the work was ripe for lawful piracy. Between September 1925 and 1926, all five sections were reproduced in the pages of Samuel Roth's *Two Worlds*.<sup>11</sup>

A climate of rejection, refusal, and reversal obtained in the years preceding *transition* serialisation. John Nash has argued that Joyce incorporated into his writing 'variations of previous, actual responses to his work', an emphasis on the 'writing of his reception' that Finn Fordham usefully repurposes as a 'writing of rejection' in his treatment of the 'Circe' genetic dossier.<sup>12</sup> Joyce's response to Wyndham Lewis and *The Enemy* represents an exemplary case of such writing of rejection – a writing which 'rejects those attempting to reject it'<sup>13</sup> – but the cumulative toll of closed doors and reversed acceptances cannot have worn well. One can only make so much lemonade from the lemons of rejection slips. Before delving into the correspondence related to the second chapter in the 'notorious case' of the *Dial*'s refusal of 'Work in Progress', it is therefore worth recapping the myriad setbacks attendant on the work's first run of appearances.<sup>14</sup>

Difficulties began early. As Ellmann relates, the *transatlantic review* began sending proof for II.4 to Joyce in February 1924, but these were so botched that publication was delayed until April of that year (JJII: 563; see also Letters III: 89-90). Ford 'fear[ed] prosecution and seizure on the charge of blasphemy', as Joyce informed John Quinn (Letters I: 210), and Sisley Huddleston, as the 'most representative official Englishman' available in Paris, was called upon to arbitrate.<sup>15</sup> Joyce told Weaver that Huddleston 'gave his opinion that ["Mamalujo"] would not lead to prosecution for blasphemy' (Letters I: 210).

Matters ran equally shakily with McAlmon's *Contact Collection* and Eliot's *Criterion*. Though the two fragments appeared in May and July 1925, respectively, Joyce had committed to both publications as early as late November of the previous year. A letter to McAlmon of 21 November reveals, in a run-on worthy of Molly Bloom, Joyce's finely calculated projections for this period of 'Work in Progress's' serialisation:

By what date (latest) do you want my copy and on what date (earliest) will the book be out because I promised to give [Eliot] a piece for the April number of his review and what I give you will depend on your date, that is, as being a piece earlier or later than his. (Letters I: 223)

However, Joyce was still waiting on first proofs of *Contact Collection*'s I.2 as late as 4 April 1925 (Letters I: 226) and, by the end of the month, was requesting 'a day or so more' to input further corrections and revisions (Letters III: 119). A model of consideration, by contrast, Eliot wrote to Lucia Joyce in late February saying that he now expected to include I.5 in the June number of the *Criterion* – ultimately, it would appear in July – and if Joyce would 'be so kind as to prepare it immediately he is able to work again', Eliot promised to 'allow him plenty of time to deal with the proof'.<sup>16</sup> The typescript was delivered by mid-April, to judge from Eliot's thank-you note to Beach, but not before Joyce's eyes and difficulties with his typist had caused numerous problems.<sup>17</sup> With the aid of 'Auguste Morel [...], some red ink and a magnifying glass', he determined to have the piece ready 'before the tooth and eye act starts' (Letters III: 115), but it was returned by the typist 'in a dreadful muddle': only with '3 magnifying glasses' and the aid of Giorgio was Joyce able to disassemble the document, and the redoubtable Morel reappeared to 'sew it up on his sewing machine' (Letters III: 119).

The publications of 'Anna Livia Plurabelle' and 'Shem the Penman' proved no less fraught. Indeed, bringing the two sections to press strained to breaking Joyce's timeline and preferred order of publication. On 13 June, he wrote to Weaver that he was 'working hard at Shem and then I will give Anna Livia to the *Calendar*' (Letters I: 228). By 8 July, he was 'getting into ever deeper Liffey water' and anticipated publication in September (Letters III: 121). In the midst of a season of 'worries and mix-ups', letters to the ailing Walsh register Joyce's determination that I.7 should appear in print before I.8, even if only on a technicality.<sup>18</sup> 'It does not matter if your review is delayed a few days after 30 September so long as it is dated September' (Letters III: 125). At this point, publication of I.8 in Edgell Rickword and Douglas Garman's *Calendar of Modern Letters* was projected for 1 October, but by 6 September, Joyce learned that 'the *Calendar* printers flatly refuse to compose Madame Anna Livia' (Letters III: 127: a fuller account of the affair is in Letters I: 233).

The 'predicament of *ALP*', in Melissa Banta's phrase, was resolved by Monnier, who came to the rescue with the pages of *Le Navire d'argent*.<sup>19</sup> The broad 'Autumn-Winter' interval flagged for *This Quarter* is something of a blind, however, for as late as 5 November, Joyce was still dealing with Walsh. 'Goodness knows,' he informed Weaver, 'what sort of text of mine he will offer to his readers if ever the second number comes out' (Letters III: 131). By 11 November, the Antheil musical supplement to the issue was in the hands of its composer, but the review was still not formally out (Letters I: 236).

For all these difficulties and frustrations, Joyce still managed to publish five sections of 'Work in Progress' by the close of 1925. No more of the book would appear – save the Roth piratical reprints – before *transition* serialisation commenced in April 1927. Over the course of that silent, frustrated interval, sections of the book would be rejected by Lewis for the *Enemy* (II.2§8) and, implicitly, by Ezra Pound for the *Exile* (Book III). Both of these texts were also to cross Moore's desk for *Dial* consideration.

Joyce's dealings with Lewis in 1926 are well documented, largely on account of his creative response to the latter's criticisms and appropriation of 'The Triangle'.<sup>20</sup> Lewis asked for a contribution to his new critical review, then prospectively titled the *Tyrocritic*, by the time of Joyce's 21 May 1926 letter to Weaver (Letters I: 241). By late September, Joyce was requesting a typescript of the section from Beach, 'in very legible type, double spaced, original and three copies', and before the month's end, he instructed her to dispatch the result to London.<sup>21</sup> When the *Enemy* appeared in the new year, it contained not 'The Triangle' but Lewis' latest attack on Joyce: 'Chapter XVI. An Analysis of the Mind of James Joyce' of 'The Revolutionary Simpleton'.<sup>22</sup> An eleven-leaf typescript of the section now forms part of the Wyndham Lewis Collection at Cornell University Library, but as we shall explore, Joyce almost immediately submitted a copy to Moore through the efforts of Galantière.<sup>23</sup>

Less certain are Joyce's expectations for the *Exile*. On 8 November 1926, he informed Weaver of Pound's plans for a new review and, implying an invitation to contribute, wrote that the poet had 'asked me to send him Λabcd to read' (Letters I: 247). Less than three weeks later, he reported 'I sent Λabcd to E.P. at his request and he has written turning it down altogether' (Letters III: 146). No explicit request for a contribution survives, however, and indeed, two days after Joyce's earlier letter to Weaver, Pound told E. E. Cummings that he did not want 'slabs of "work in progress" unless there is some vurryspeshul reason for it'.<sup>24</sup> Pound's initial response to Joyce was to quip, famously, that 'nothing short of divine vision or a new cure for the clapp can possibly be worth all the circumambient peripherization' (Letters III: 145), but he wrote at more cutting length in the new year:

First number of my new periodical designed to deal with various matters not adequately handled elsewhere has gone to press. I don't see that it can be much direct and immediate use to you. It comes out 3 times a year, so that serialization is out of the question.

I think, and always have thought, that the 'sample of woik in prog' stunt was bad. *The transat.* did it because there simply wasn't enough copy to fill the so large review.

If I had an encyclopedicly large monthly, the kewestion wd. be different.<sup>25</sup>

This, then, is the climate of overlapping catastrophe and hostility in which we must situate the *Dial*'s two refusals. In what follows, I offer a documentary reconstruction of the timeline of both submissions to the American journal. As the various campaigns of letters make clear, Moore responded favourably to Beach's initial query in a little over a week, but it was to be another seven weeks before word reached Paris of the formal acceptance. A period of assured confidence lasting a mere seven days followed, at which point a cablegram from the *Dial* conceded it was '[u]npermissible to publish Joyce verbatim'.<sup>26</sup> Moore's olive branch of publication with omissions, dated 17 September, crossed Beach's cablegram requesting the return of the typescript and three sets of Joyce's corrections.

Lewis Galantière, leaving Europe for the USA in early November, took with him a typescript of Book III in the hopes of securing an American publication. Midway through the month, Joyce told Pound that it had been accepted for inclusion in an unnamed annual, perhaps *The American Caravan*. In any event, the text went unpublished until serialised in *transition* between 1928 and 1929. The North American trail for Book III grew cold early in 1927, concluding with deposit of the typescript with Eric Pinker, Joyce's literary agent.

In late January, however, Galantière acknowledged receipt of a typescript of 'The Triangle'. This he could no longer place with *The American Caravan*, he wrote, as its first annual had apparently already gone to press. Early the following month, he wrote to Beach seeking the go-ahead for an approach to the *Dial*, feeling sure they would be glad to have Joyce's text. It seems that without waiting for explicit permission, he contacted Moore directly and, on 9 February, sent her the typescript of II.2§8. Now began a sped-up replay of the events of the previous summer and autumn. Moore sent the pages to Watson on Valentine's Day and, sometime between 26 February and 3 March, replied with a definitive no. Neither Beach nor Joyce's reaction to this second refusal survives, but a long letter to Watson of 10 March sets out Moore's objections to both Book III and II.2§8 and what she felt was a coercive approach on Joyce's part to the *Dial*.

To respect the veritable slew of copyrights involved, previously unpublished correspondence reproduced below are subjected to paraphrase. On the other hand, I have silently emended any errors caught in the published texts of letters after comparison with the available originals. References to these publications or, for unpublished material, to particular archival collections use the following set of abbreviations:

**Banta** James Joyce, *James Joyce's Letters to Sylvia Beach, 1921-1940*. Ed. Melissa Banta and Oscar Silverman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

**Costello** Marianne Moore, *The Selected Letters of Marianne Moore*. Ed. Bonnie Costello, Celeste Goodridge, and Cristanne Miller. New York: Knopf: Distributed by Random House, 1997.

**Dial/Scofield Thayer Papers**

*Dial/Scofield Thayer Papers* (YCAL MSS 34), Yale Collection of American Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

**Jahnke** Hans E. Jahnke Bequest at the Zurich James Joyce Foundation.

**James Joyce Collection**

The James Joyce Collection, Poetry Collection of the University Libraries, University at Buffalo, The State University of New York.

**Janssens** G. A. M. Janssens, *The American Literary Review: A Critical History, 1920-1950*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton, 1968.

**Walsh** Sylvia Beach, *The Letters of Sylvia Beach*. Ed. Keri Walsh. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

**Wasserstrom** William Wasserstrom, *The Time of the Dial*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

**1. Alyse Gregory to Joyce, 11 March 1924 (Dial/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Alyse Gregory, Managing Editor of the *Dial*, asks if there is anything among Joyce's papers that he would be willing to submit for publication. She hopes he might send them another poem, as 'A Memory of the Players in a Mirror at Midnight' (*Dial* for July 1920) is still remembered by his many admirers in the United States.]

**2. Beach to Marianne Moore, 12 July 1926 (Walsh: 110-1)**

Dear Miss Moore,

Mr Joyce is writing a new book, installments of which have appeared in some of the reviews. He has just finished another section of it and has left it with me to dispose of as I have charge of such matters for him. It consists of four consecutive parts and there are from 30000 to 34000 words in all, 115 pages of typescript, commercial size. A certain review has made Mr Joyce an offer for it but I do not think it is a suitable place for his work nor the price offered sufficient for a thing that has taken him so long to write and is the finest piece of writing he has done. I should be very glad to give it to you for The Dial if The Dial would care to have it. Your review occupies the highest place among reviews and is the most appropriate one to bring out Mr Joyce's work. What would be your offer for the exclusive ^periodical^ rights in America and Europe to publish this section?

[...]

P.S. There is nothing that the censor could object to in Mr Joyce's piece.

S. B.

[As Robert Spoo has argued, the 'certain review' was undoubtedly Roth's *Two Worlds*.]<sup>27</sup>

**3. Joyce to Weaver, 15 July (Letters I: 242)**

Λabcd (no bids) has been offered to the *Dial*.

**4. *Dial* cablegram to Beach, 20 July (Wasserstrom: 120-1)**

Two cents word but must see manuscript before deciding

**5. Beach to the *Dial*, 21 July (Walsh: 111)**

Dear Sirs,

I am sending you under separate cover by registered post Mr James Joyce's manuscript. In case you do not accept it will you please return it at once to me by registered post.

Yours faithfully,  
Sylvia Beach

P. S. If the manuscript is accepted will you kindly arrange for the payment to be made in dollars.

SB

**6. Joyce to Weaver, 25 July (Letters I: 243)**

The *Dial* telegraphed it would pay ½d a word for Λabcd but must see my text first. It has gone and I feel about as diffident as a young lady of 19 at her first coming-out.

**7. *Dial* memorandum, 30 July (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[A memorandum lists among manuscripts received 'the Joyce'.]

**8. Beach to Moore, 31 July (Walsh: 112)**

Dear Madam,

I am sending you herewith a list of corrections that are to be made on Mr Joyce's MS. in case it is accepted by the *Dial*.

**9. Joyce to Weaver, 18 August (Letters I: 244)**

There is no news yet from *The Dial*.

**10. Joyce to Beach, 24 August (Banta: 68)**

Dear Miss Beach: I am returning your enclosures to me. Do not do anything till you return to Paris and till the *Dial* replies.

**11. Moore to Beach, 26 August (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Moore asks Beach's indulgence for the delay over the manuscript but writes to let her know that the *Dial* is accepting the fragment. She intends to publish it in small portions and asks if the title is to be 'abcd'. She also requests 'some slight biographical data about Mr Joyce' (Wasserstrom: 121). She notes that certain words of the manuscript are indistinct and requests that these be emended in proof.]

[Despite the apparent good news, this letter of acceptance would not reach Beach until 10 September. In the meantime, Joyce's patience began to wear thin.]

**12. Beach to Joyce, n.d. [c. end of August] (Jahnke)**

[Beach acknowledges receipt of a second list of corrections and additions for Book III, which are to be copied and dispatched to the *Dial* should the latter accept the work.]

**13. Joyce to Beach, 29 August (Banta: 69)**

Dear Miss Beach: I hope this finds you safe back in Paris after a pleasant holiday. [...] And the *Dial*?

**14. *Dial* to Beach, 31 August (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Gratia Sharp writes to acknowledge receipt of the first list of corrections.]

**15. Joyce to Beach, 2 September (Banta: 69-70)**

Did you get the extra corrections for  $\Lambda$ abcd? If so, please add p. 111. l 22 for 'mayo' read 'mayom'.

**16. Beach to Joyce, 9 September (Jahnke)**

[There is still no news from the *Dial*, but Beach expects to get word on one of the next boats.]

**17. Beach to Joyce, 10 September (Jahnke)**

[A telegram from Beach informs Joyce of the *Dial* acceptance. Beach will send Moore's letter to Joyce and his second list of corrections to the editor.]

**18. Beach to Joyce, 10 September (Jahnke)**

[A letter from Beach, enclosing Moore's acceptance letter of 26 August, informs Joyce of the favourable *Dial* decision. Beach repeats that she is sending his corrections to the editor.]

**19. Beach to Moore, 10 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Beach acknowledges receipt of Moore's letter and sends on the second list of Joyce's corrections to be made in the typescript.]

**20. Joyce to Beach, 11 September (Banta: 70-71)**

Dear Miss Beach: Many thanks for the telegram and good news. I have been going over  $\Lambda$ abcd all day and send you these final corrections. Please copy and send on. Miss Moore may consult Who's Who or Biographical Notes to Gorman's book.

$\Lambda$ abcd is a titlesign or private mark for myself like the others, for reference. She may use some such title as Ford or Walsh or The Criterion used. If she likes I will read the proof. When does it start to come out?

**21. Beach to Moore, 13 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Beach sends the third list of corrections to Moore. She assures the editor this is the final list.]

**22. Moore to J. S. Watson, 15 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[While discussing payment for the Joyce piece with Lincoln MacVeagh, Moore has discovered a number of insuperable objections to publication. She asks will Watson be available to discuss the fragment.]

**23. Beach to Moore, 16 September (Walsh: 112)**

Dear Miss Moore,

Thank you for your letter. I hope you had a good holiday in Maine. I am very glad to hear that Mr Joyce's work is going to appear in the 'Dial'. It has no title yet and he says anything will do. The fragments that were published by the 'Criterion', 'Le Navire d'Argent' etc., were called "From Work in Progress", "Work in Progress", "Extract from Work in Progress" so you may give it some such name. For the biographical notes Mr Joyce asks if

you will kindly consult 'Who's Who' or Herbert Gorman's book. (James Joyce. His First Forty Years. Huebsch.)

Mr Joyce will correct the proofs himself. I sent three lists of corrections of the typescript at different times, and hope they did not give too much trouble.

**24. Beach to Joyce, 16 September (Jahnke)**

[Beach writes that there has been no further news from the *Dial* but supposes a cheque will arrive soon as a number of boats are due the following day. She confirms that she dispatched the third list of corrections on the *Berengaria* the previous Saturday and that she has written to Moore earlier that day with regard to the contents of his letter of 11 September. She asks if he objects to the *Dial* chopping up Book III so small for publication.]

**25. Watson to Moore, 16 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Watson cables that 'Scofield probably not vitally interested either way' and that while MacVeigh's advise is valuable, the objections he raises are perhaps not insuperable. Watson suggests publishing selections of Joyce's text, 'using asterisks for omissions of words or short phrases' (Wasserstrom: 121).]

**26. Moore to Watson, 17 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Moore cables Watson that she is contacting Beach to request permission to omit some words and pages of the text.]

**27. *Dial* cablegram to Beach, 17 September (Janssens: 79)**

Unpermissible to publish Joyce verbatim

**28. Moore to Beach, 17 September (Wasserstrom: 121)**

We find that it would not be possible to publish the Joyce manuscript verbatim. We should be obliged if we are to publish it, to omit pages and parts of pages, reducing it by one third – perhaps a half. We are very much distressed that this discovery was not made before I had written to you. Do you feel that you must withdraw the manuscript?

[Moore also explicitly raises the possibility of publication with omissions.]

**29. Joyce to Beach, 19 September (Banta: 72)**

Dear Miss Beach: All safely received. So that closes temporarily my financial stabilisation scheme. Will you please cable them: Joyce requests return typescript with corrections?

**30. Beach cablegram to the *Dial*, 19 September (Wasserstrom: 121)**

Joyce requests return typescript with corrections

**31. Moore to Watson, 22 September (Wasserstrom: 121-122)**

Miss Beach cabled September 19th ‘Joyce requests return typescript with corrections.’ In going over the chapters, understanding the content as I did not when I first read the manuscript in Maine, I do not see how we could use more than the first section – 12 pages – and another section – pages 24-29. You think we might count on Scofield’s co-operating more, I fear, than I think we really could. I remember his indignation against the censors of *Ulysses*, but just before he went away he happened to speak to me emphatically of his disbelief in the present Joyce. I suppose you know without my saying it that I am acutely desirous of our having for *The Dial*, what it is your wish to publish and it is sickeningly ironic to me to refuse the work of one in whose technique I have such delight. I am also distressed to involve us in the disgrace of modifying an affirmative letter. Of course I should, if you could countenance our offering to publish but two sections, concentrate in myself in so far as I could, the whole blame and responsibility.

[To judge from the typescript of Book III reproduced in the *James Joyce Archive*, Moore’s ‘first section’ of twelve opening pages corresponds to an early version of III.1 (see *JJA* 57.252-261); her ‘another section – pages 24-29’ matches the ‘Sis dearest’ section of III.2.]

**32. Joyce to Beach, 23 September (Banta: 73)**

As regards *Λabcd* when it comes back you may dispose of it to anyone who will print it gratis for if *The Dial* will not even pay that modest sum no other review will.

**33. Joyce to Weaver, 24 September (Letters I: 245)**

Dear Miss Weaver: *Λabcd* was accepted by the *Dial* for 600 dollars and a week later they cabled, declining to print it as it stood whereupon I recalled it. (I enclose it in four pictures from the G.P.O. vestibule here.) [...] I suppose no other review will take *Λabcd* but I will give it to anyone who will print it. [...] I am sorry the *Dial* has rejected the pieces as I wanted them to appear slowly and regularly in a prominent place.

**34. Joyce to Beach, 26 September (Banta: 74-75)**

Dear Miss Beach: I return the *Dial*’s letter. Will you please confirm your cable to them and ask for return of typescript: Why did you not bet with me? I should have won something.

[...]

I am sorry to have lost the strategic position in the *Dial*’s pages and the not excessive booty of 600\$. I suppose it is the fault of my ‘bourgeoisisme’ again.

**35. Joyce to Weaver, 26 September (Letters III: 142)**

The *Dial* proposed to delete one third of Aabcd!

**36. Moore to Beach, 28 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Moore has been reading the typescript but now estimates the *Dial* could only publish its first twelve pages (i.e. III.1). Since all parties involved would prefer the text to appear intact, she realises a request for such a small portion must seem presumptuous. She promises to return the typescript should Beach decide against publication. Because the typescript arrived during vacation time, it shuttled from place to place, and Moore now regrets any impression of inattention. The initial letter of acceptance was not held back 'as I had asked that it should be until a final conference' (Wasserstrom: 122). A handwritten postscript notes the arrival of Beach's 16 September letter. Moore is confident that Beach shares her disappointment. 'Our Joyce', she supposes, will be more philosophical in the matter as he writes what he wishes.]

**37. Beach to Moore, 28 September (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Beach again requests the return of Joyce's typescript and corrections.]

**38. Beach to Joyce, 29 September (Jahnke)**

[Beach informs Joyce that she wrote to Moore confirming her cable of 19 September.]

**39. Joyce to Weaver, 8 November (Letters I: 246)**

I gave Aabcd to Mr Galantière to sell in the U.S.A.

**40. Joyce to Pound, n. d. [postmark 14 November] (Letters III: 144)**

Miss Beach has sent you the typescript [of Book III] I had made for you. As you know the *Dial* accepted it for \$650 and then cabled a refusal. It has now been accepted for publication in an annual which a number of American writers bring out in February for \$200. It is the whole of part 3 of the book.

[To judge from the following letter from Galantière to Beach, the unnamed annual may be *The American Caravan: A Yearbook of American Literature*, edited by Van Wyck Brooks, Alfred Kreymborg, Lewis Mumford, and Paul Rosenfeld. Galantière specifies 'The Triangle' as the text up for consideration, however. The first *American Caravan* annual did not appear until September 1927.]

**41. Galantière to Beach, n. d. [early February 1927] (James Joyce Collection)**

[Enclosing a letter dated 26 January that he wrote but misplaced, Galantière asks if he can approach the *Dial* with 'The Triangle'. He feels confident they will accept the piece.]

[The earlier letter reports that he has turned over the typescript of Book III to Eric Pinker, Joyce's literary agent, and that 'The Triangle' has arrived. He cannot place the latter with *The American Caravan*, however, as its first annual has already gone to press. He determines to try elsewhere but will wire for approval first.]

[A second enclosure, dated 26 January, is from Pinker and acknowledges receipt of the typescript of Book III.]

**42. Galantière to Moore, 9 February (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Further to a conversation of the previous day, Galantière encloses the typescript of 'The Triangle' for consideration. Its subject he describes as the third proposition of Euclid. The actors of the piece are Shem and Shaun, whom he maps onto Michael and Satan, light and darkness, or any other antimony one might imagine.]

**43. Moore to Watson, 14 February (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Along with stories by Conrad Aiken and A. E. Coppard, Moore sends Watson the few pages of Joyce material supplied by Galantière. They seem to Moore to be beyond consideration. Galantière has also been asking about the fate of what he terms 'the longer manuscript'. Moore has told him she would be happy if the new fragment were found acceptable.]

**44. Beach to Galantière, 21 February (James Joyce Collection)**

[Beach cablegrams to suggest that Galantière approach the *Dial* with 'The Triangle'. Though signed 'Sylvia', the cable was evidently authored by Joyce. An undated autograph note in his hand survives in the James Joyce Collection that bears the same message as the cablegram.]

**45. Moore to Galantière, 26 February (*Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers)**

[Moore apologises that she is not yet ready to give a formal answer on the Joyce typescript.]

**46. Moore to Watson, 3 March (Costello: 229-230)**

I am sorry I didn't ask you for your final impression of our obligation with regard to the Joyce manuscript. I still feel that the manuscript is bad material intrinsically, but I feel also very strongly that your wish in the matter ought to be pre-eminent. If I am obliging you to show me that a perspicacious person would have felt these questions to have been already answered, I will have been most sorry to have brought the matter up again.

#### 47. Moore to Watson, 10 March (Costello: 230)

Dear Doctor Watson:

In the letter with which you returned Mr. Cummings' play and other manuscripts, you make it plain I think, by your emphasis on 'protest', that the decision with regard to the Joyce manuscript is open, so I have read it again and recognize in it, literary ability that I had missed; but surely it lacks what originality and distinction parts of the longer manuscript had; and in so far as readers will be able to catch the author's meaning, we should be discredited I think. We have elected to exclude obscenity when it was dull, and even the advance guard couldn't think that we consider this piece brilliant. You permitted me to oppose Scofield when he fell below what we felt to be his own standard; so for us to like this would be exceedingly grievous to him, the more that he resists Joyce's present method. When Mr. Joyce has written what would make a magazine illustrious and yet chooses to coerce us, showing even for an author, exaggerated unconcern in the matter of reciprocal consideration, – we refraining from self interested requests – our position is, I feel, the more judicial, our liberty being emphasized by the fact that he is no longer in financial straits. Private publication could take what risks courage would recommend, but remembering that I felt detached from *The Dial* by certain juxtapositions of material when I was a subscriber to it, and sometimes a contributor, I am aware of the way the content of the magazine might affect some of our contributors and readers. An irrelevant consideration that irritates me, is that James Joyce possibly & Lewis Galantière surely, I think, will feel that we are being hoodwinked for despite Mr. G.'s insistence that it isn't, this book looks to me like an exception. To argue against taking the article seems contradictory to my assertion that your wish was to decide the matter. My reason for writing is that you may know specifically what has influenced me. I am honest in offering to put the article into *The Dial* if your wish to do so remains unchanged.

---

Thanks to Linda Leavell for assistance with the Marianne Moore correspondence that is now part of the *Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers at the Beinecke and to Nicholas Morris for assistance with the Beach correspondence now part of the Hans E. Jahnke Bequest at the Zurich James Joyce Foundation. This essay was completed during my term as Alexander von Humboldt Postdoctoral Research Fellow.

1. Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959, 170.
2. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, 593. See also JJII: 581.
3. See, for an early example, William Wasserstrom, 'Marianne Moore, *The Dial*, and Kenneth Burke', *Western Humanities Review* 17.3 (1963): 249-62 (especially 254) and, for a more recent example, Victoria Bazin, 'Hysterical Virgins and Little Magazines: Marianne Moore's Editorship of *The Dial*', *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* 4.1 (2013): 55-75. Bazin notes that 'as the word count indicates, other parts of Joyce's *Work in Progress* were added', and she specifies the 'Four Watches of Shaun' (59).
4. Linda Leavell,  *Holding on Upside Down: The Life and Work of Marianne Moore*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013, 238.
5. Pádraic Colum, 'River Episode from James Joyce's Uncompleted Work', *Dial* lxxxiv (April 1928): 318-322. Repub. 'Preface' to James Joyce, *Anna Livia Plurabelle*. New York: Crosby Gaige, 1928, vii-xix.
6. Marianne Moore to Joseph Campbell, 19 May and 1 July 1925, *Dial*/Scofield Thayer Papers (YCAL MSS 34, Series I, Box 1, Folder 33), Yale Collection of American Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. See also Joseph Campbell, 'As I Was Among the Captives. III. The Cock', *To-Morrow* 1.1 (August 1924): 2; Campbell, 'The Cock', *Dial* lxxix (August 1925): 144.

- 
7. Joyce, 'From Work in Progress', *Le Navire d'argent* 1 (October 1925): 59-74. Moore's prohibition on accepting previously published material did not run to the near-simultaneous publication of new work on both sides of the Atlantic to ensure copyright protection in multiple regimes and jurisdictions. Typically, in such cases of 'transatlantic echo', the *Dial* publication followed UK, Irish or continental issue within sixty days.
  8. Sylvia Beach to Marianne Moore, 12 July 1926, *The Letters of Sylvia Beach*. Ed. Keri Walsh. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010, 110. Above the phrase 'exclusive rights', Beach has penned the qualification 'periodical'.
  9. See 'Appendix 2: Publication History of *Work in Progress/Finnegans Wake*', *How Joyce wrote 'Finnegans Wake': A Chapter-by-chapter Genetic Guide*. Ed. Luca Crispi and Sam Slotte. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007, 490-94 (here 490).
  10. Katherine Mullin, 'Joyce through the Little Magazines', *A Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Brown. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008, 374-89 (here 384).
  11. 'Appendix 2: Publication History of *Work in Progress/Finnegans Wake*', 490.
  12. John Nash, *James Joyce and the Act of Reception: Reading, Ireland, Modernism*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 3, 31. Finn Fordham, "'Circe" and the Genesis of Multiple Personality', *James Joyce Quarterly* 45.3-4 (Spring-Summer 2008): 507-520 (here 511).
  13. Fordham, "'Circe" and the Genesis of Multiple Personality', 511.
  14. Bazin, 'Hysterical Virgins and Little Magazines', 59.
  15. Ford Madox Ford, 'Chroniques: Paris, March', *transatlantic review* 1.4 (April 1924): 196-201 (here 201).
  16. T. S. Eliot to Lucia Joyce, 26 February 1925, Eliot, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*. Vol. 2. 1923-1925. Ed. Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011, 595.
  17. Eliot to Beach, 15 April 1925, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, 630-631.
  18. Melissa Banta, 'Introduction: II 1924-1926', *James Joyce's Letters to Sylvia Beach, 1921-1940*. Ed. Banta and Oscar Silverman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987, 29-33 (here 32).
  19. Banta, 'Introduction: II 1924-1926', 32.
  20. See Dirk Van Hulle, 'The Art of Not Being Rude: The Encyclopedic Recycling of Wyndham Lewis's Early Joyce Criticism' at [www.antwerpjamesjoycecenter.com/lewis.htm](http://www.antwerpjamesjoycecenter.com/lewis.htm).
  21. Joyce to Beach, 22 September 1926, *James Joyce's Letters to Sylvia Beach, 1921-1940*, 72, 74.
  22. Wyndham Lewis, 'The Revolutionary Simpleton', *Enemy: A Review of Art and Literature* 1.1 (January 1927 [appeared February]): 25-192. Of this, 'Chapter XVI. An Analysis of the Mind of James Joyce' runs pp. 95-130. This material reappeared as Lewis, *Time and Western Man*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1927.
  23. Mary F. Daniels, comp., *Wyndham Lewis: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscript Material in the Department of Rare Books, Cornell University*. Ithaca: Cornell University Library, 1972, 147.
  24. Pound to E. E. Cummings, 10 November 1926, *Pound/Cummings: The Correspondence of Ezra Pound and E. E. Cummings*. Ed. Barry Ahearn. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996, 15.
  25. Pound to Joyce, 2 January 1927, *Pound/Joyce; The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*. Ed. Forrest Read. New York: New Directions, 1967, 228.
  26. G. A. M. Janssens, *The American Literary Review: A Critical History, 1920-1950*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton, 1968, 79.
  27. Robert Spoo, *Without Copyrights: Piracy, Publishing, and the Public Domain*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, 172.