

# Language and Literature

<http://lal.sagepub.com/>

---

## 'Creation from nothing': a foregrounding study of James Joyce's drafts for *Ulysses*

Paul Sopčák

*Language and Literature* 2007 16: 183

DOI: 10.1177/0963947007075984

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://lal.sagepub.com/content/16/2/183>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

Poetics and Linguistics Association

**Additional services and information for *Language and Literature* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://lal.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://lal.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://lal.sagepub.com/content/16/2/183.refs.html>

# ARTICLE

---

## 'Creation from nothing': a foregrounding study of James Joyce's drafts for *Ulysses*

Paul Sopčák, *University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada*

### Abstract

In May 2002, previously unknown early drafts of what was to become the third chapter of James Joyce's *Ulysses* surfaced. Joyce worked these drafts into the manuscript that is now known as the 'V.A.3-Buffalo' manuscript, in its turn the antecedent of the fair copy forming part of the so-called Rosenbach manuscript on which the published Gabler edition of *Ulysses* is based. In the study presented in this article, I chose three passages from the earliest drafts and found their corresponding passages in the V.A.3-Buffalo manuscript, and the published text (amounting to a total of nine text passages). In both manuscripts the first layer (before revisions) was chosen, to have the greatest possible difference between versions. After dividing the texts into roughly sentence-length segments, I conducted a foregrounding analysis on all segments of the nine texts and quantified the foregrounding devices. The objective of the presented study was to investigate whether results of past empirical studies of foregrounding, which have concentrated on poems or fairly straightforward narratives would hold true for such complex texts as James Joyce's *Ulysses*. To measure reader responses to the foregrounding of the texts, ratings on strikingness and affect, as well as reading times per segment were recorded. These responses proved to correlate significantly with the numerical foregrounding index per segment. Additionally, a salient framework is proposed for the study of manuscript materials.

Keywords: *empirical study of literature; Joyce studies; manuscript study; reader response; stylistics*

If I read a book and it makes my whole body so cold no fire can ever warm me, I know *that* is poetry. If I feel Physically as if the top of my head were taken off, I know *that* is poetry. These are the only ways I know it. Is there any other way? (Dickinson and Dickinson Bianchi, 1924)

A bloated carcass of a dog lay lolled on bladderwrack. (Joyce, 1984)

### I Introduction

Despite the valuable insights into foregrounding gained by van Peer (1986) and Miall and Kuiken (1994), there are still methodological and theoretical issues that remain unsolved. The quantification of foregrounding devices, for instance, necessary to make concrete predictions of reader reactions, does not adequately account for differences of degree. This especially holds true for semantic deviation



and parallelism, which resist 'objective' analyses beyond a surface level. It seems quite obvious that text thematics, intertextual relations, as well as other semantic features, have an effect on readers' evaluations of a given text passage. However, besides the fact that empirical studies of foregrounding are still young and its methods are constantly being refined, the insights gained so far are considerable. The study presented in this article investigates whether the knowledge gained from past empirical studies of foregrounding, which have worked mainly with poems (e.g. van Peer, 1986; Hakemulder, 2004) or fairly straightforward narratives (Miall and Kuiken, 1994), holds true for such complex and deviant narrative texts as James Joyce's *Ulysses*. The assumption is that readers will perceive those passages of the chosen text extracts that are to a higher degree foregrounded as more striking and evocative of affect, and that their reading times will increase in response to them.

Two further objectives of the study in question that will not be discussed in detail here but form important contextual information are, first, to argue that foregrounding theory offers a salient framework for the study of manuscript materials, since revisions at several different levels in the creation process become clearly identifiable in terms of linguistic alterations. Second, from the viewpoint of empirical studies of literature, I propose that the employment of manuscripts, or transcripts thereof, is a fruitful alternative to the controversial practice of text manipulation, since it enables the recording of readers' evaluations to different versions of the same texts, as they appear throughout the author's revision process, without disturbing the ecology of the literary work.

## 2 Materials and design

### 2.1 Texts

Remember your epiphanies written on green oval leaves, deeply deep, copies to be sent if you died to all the great libraries of the world, including Alexandria? Pico della Mirandola like. Ay, very like a whale (Joyce, *Ulysses* 3.141–44).

In this study, three passages from a recently discovered manuscript of James Joyce's were chosen (henceforth, following Hans Walter Gabler (2005), referred to as the Dublin Notebook) and their corresponding passages identified in the later 'V.A.3-Buffalo' manuscript,<sup>1</sup> as well as the published Gabler edition of *Ulysses*. The text passages investigated here are excerpts from the third chapter of James Joyce's *Ulysses* and drafts of the same as they appear in two different manuscripts. The first of these is part of a large collection of previously unknown Joyce manuscripts that were bought by the National Library of Ireland on 29 May 2002, for £8 million, and provided valuable material from which to learn more about the creation of *Ulysses* and Joyce's writing style in general.<sup>2</sup> Parts of this collection, which 'had been in the possession of Alexis Léon, son of Joyce's Paris friends Paul and Lucie Léon' (Grodén, 2003: 5), were made available for scholarly research.

One of these notebooks, of which Hans Walter Gabler produced an (unpublished) transcription that visualizes the layers of revisions and thus enables scholars to retrace the production process in its chronological unfolding, consists of 17 units of text forming the raw material of the 'Proteus' chapter that 'bear witness beautifully to Joyce's persistent "epiphanic" mode of writing' (Gabler, 2005: 23).<sup>3</sup> These texts do not document a '[c]reation from nothing', as the title suggests, but are the closest one can get to the creation of *Ulysses* using the available materials as evidence. Gabler suggests that they are fair copies of lost drafts that had been put to paper roughly between 1903 and 1917 and were 'recognisably written in preparation for the third episode, "Proteus"'. He further posits that 'the entire narrative body is already present in the shape of pre-fabricated building blocks'. Six of these 'epiphanies' were selected for the purpose of the present study. Since they reappear as three not six separate, coherent text passages in a later manuscript, they were presented as three passages to the participants (Gabler, 2005: 23).

The next subset of text passages consists precisely of the three excerpts corresponding to those from the Dublin Notebook as they appear in the V.A.3-Buffalo manuscript (Joyce, 1978: 238–57). The Dublin Notebook precedes this manuscript, although no continuity can be established between the two: 'Not only have the passages from the Dublin notebook been fitted into this manuscript, with only minor adjustments to their texts; but during intervening phases of work (of which no evidence survives), the chapter has also been given a continuous narrative line' (Gabler, 2005: 23). This so called V.A.3-Buffalo draft of the third episode gets a fair copy in 1917 and appears in literary magazines as well as in the novel's first edition published in Paris in 1922 (Gabler, 2005: 27).

Again, the direct text source for this study is not the manuscript itself, but an unpublished computer transcript of the V.A.3-Buffalo draft created by Hans Walter Gabler, in which each layer of revision in the production process is assigned a different text colour. To any scholar untrained in textual editing, or simply unfamiliar with Joyce's handwriting, this transcript is a true treasure.

Since both the Dublin Notebook and the V.A.3-Buffalo draft contain several layers of revisions, it was necessary to consistently follow the same layer in the selection of the text passages used for this study. In the interest of contrast, the first and most basic layer of each version was chosen. The third set of three texts consists of those passages in the Gabler edition of *Ulysses* that correspond to those chosen from the Dublin Notebook.

In short, three (originally six) epiphanies from the earliest available drafts of the 'Proteus' episode were selected plus their corresponding passages located in the V.A.3-Buffalo drafts, and the Gabler edition of *Ulysses*, amounting to nine text excerpts. Since each version manifests small, clearly definable, differences, the texts promised to be a fruitful basis for a foregrounding study, which would not need to resort to text manipulation. Table 1 gives an overview of the chosen text passages.

Table 1 The text material

	Source		
	<i>Dublin Notebook</i> (unpublished)	<i>V.A.3 Buffalo draft</i> (Joyce, 1978)	<i>Gabler edition of</i> <i>Ulysses</i> (Joyce, 1984)
Passage 1			
Number of segments:	27	27	34
Location in source:	Passages 11; 14	12.05–12.12; 12.16–41	3.303–9; 3.312–30
Passage 2			
Number of segments:	16	26	29
Location in source:	Passages 9; 5	2.03–3.01; 3.08–20	3.29–44; 3.47–52
Passage 3			
Number of segments:	16	17	18
Location in source:	Passages 1; 2	10.32–11.11; 11.17–22	3.271–81; 3.286–89

## 2.2 Foregrounding analysis

In a first step, the chosen texts needed to be divided into smaller units of inspection so as to make solid predictions of which characteristics would evoke certain reader reactions. Miall and Kuiken (1994) chose three short stories for investigation and segmented them into meaningful units of similar length, following phrase and sentence divisions. They were thus able to pinpoint foregrounded elements per segment that were in turn used to predict readers' relative reading times, and ratings on affect and strikingness. In the study presented here, which replicates this segmentation procedure, the nine text passages were divided into 210 segments.

An extensive stylistic analysis on all three levels of linguistic organization was then performed on each segment in order to identify elements of foregrounding.<sup>4</sup> These analyses are based on the theoretical and methodological foundations laid out in van Peer's *Stylistics and Psychology* (1986) and Leech's *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (1969).

Van Peer employs four distinct categories for each level of linguistic organization in his foregrounding analyses: parallelism, statistical deviation, determinate deviation and internal deviation. On the level of phonology only parallelisms were recorded in the present study. The only other slight alteration to van Peer's approach in this respect is the integration of one additional category each for statistical and determinate deviations on the semantic level.

In his impressive book on deviation theory, *Norm und Abweichung* (Norm and Deviation, 1981), Harald Fricke introduces, among others, the devices of 'violations of the empirically real', 'violations of the empirically possible', and 'violations of the rules of logic' (pp. 47–62). The last of these three is recorded by van Peer as well and characterizes any paradox as defined by syllogism. The first is a trademark of literary language. Its deviation consists in the fact that it presents the unreal world as if it were real, a violation of the basic rules of communication. Whereas 'violations of the empirically real' describe

events that have no foundation in reality but could very well happen, 'violations of the empirically possible' refer to descriptions of what is empirically impossible in the world as we know it. Fantastic elements are a typical example, but metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche can belong to this category as well; compare also Shen (this issue).

In order to avoid the Pygmalion (Oedipus) effect<sup>5</sup> and to strive toward a high level of objectivity, the foregrounding analysis of the presented study follows Bortolussi and Dixon's distinction between 'reader constructions' and 'textual features' (2003: 28). In this way, results become verifiable and the study replicable.

Unfortunately, however, the attainable degree of objectivity varies for the different levels of linguistic organization. For the phonetic and grammatical level quite solid theoretical frameworks exist, with a large consensus among scholars regarding them. The level of semantics is more problematic, since its evaluation is inevitably more subjective. To my knowledge, the descriptive tools of current theories can only account for basic semantic devices such as lexical rule violations, figurative language, etc., but offer no framework for integrating the notion of degree. It seems obvious that some semantic features will evoke stronger responses from readers than others. How to objectively identify these, however, remains an open question. Consequently, all identified semantic devices were rated equally in the present study. This procedure obviously does not capture the reality of literary response and is thus a considerable weakness of the present approach.

Following the linguistic analysis of the 210 segments, the foregrounding features discovered were transposed into a numeric form, in order to make concrete predictions of how readers would respond to them. Needless to say, this procedure is pivotal for the outcome of the study. How much effect will a rhyme have on a reader compared with a metaphor? How much effect will an assonance or a selection restriction violation have? To date, the quantification procedures have not been extensively developed in foregrounding theory, and thus, unfortunately, are still to a certain degree a matter of speculation. However, this is not a fundamental flaw in the approach, so long as the quantification is not random, but systematic and transparent. Empirical foregrounding investigations are still young, leaving room for many methodological improvements. Van Peer's (1986), Miall and Kuiken's (1994) and Hakemulder's (2004) studies demonstrate that, even though some of the methods are still crude, each new study, besides other insights, contributes to the methodology as well.

In view of these uncertainties, and considering the fact that readers may be inclined to pay more attention to phonetic features in poetry than in other text types, it seems cautious not to weight one level more than another in the quantification procedure. Miall and Kuiken (1994) solved this problem ingeniously. The number of foregrounding features per segment encountered on the phonetic, grammatical and semantic levels was first converted to a frequency per syllable. These frequencies were then converted into standardized values

(z-scores),<sup>6</sup> thus enabling a comparison of the individual levels of linguistic organization where equal importance is given to each. By computing the mean of the z-scores from each level, the final overall foregrounding index per segment was obtained.

In the present study, Miall and Kuiken's (1994) standardizing of foregrounding scores was adopted. However, to obtain the raw number of foregrounding per segment, van Peer's (1986) method of quantification was employed. Each foregrounding feature was given one point, e.g. an assonance that reoccurs four times in one segment counts four points (as opposed to Miall and Kuiken's one point).

### 3 Measurements and Hypotheses

#### 3.1 Strikingness

In his study, van Peer (1986) analysed six poems and quantified the degree of foregrounding for each individual line. He then asked readers to rate how striking they found each line. The readers' ratings and van Peer's foregrounding rankings correlated significantly, confirming the hypothesis that higher foregrounded elements are perceived as more striking than those with a lesser degree of foregrounding. Miall and Kuiken (1994) applied this same procedure to three short stories,<sup>7</sup> and likewise obtained significant correlations between reader ratings on strikingness and their own foregrounding measurements (pp. 396–9).

The present study replicates Miall and Kuiken's (1994) strikingness evaluation, only slightly increasing the width of the Likert scale (1–7) to give readers finer grading possibilities when responding to the complexities and extremes of James Joyce's writing. The hypothesis is that readers will rate those segments of the text passages that have a higher degree of foregrounding as higher in strikingness.

#### 3.2 Affect

In the same study, Miall and Kuiken introduced a new element into foregrounding theory: 'affect'. In their view, the defamiliarizing elements of literary texts evoke feelings that 'guide "refamiliarizing" interpretative efforts' (1994: 392). They were able to show that the degree of foregrounding did indeed predict readers' ratings on feeling.

In the present study an attempt is made to substantiate these findings and verify whether they can be extended to other texts as well. As with strikingness, the hypothesis is that readers' ratings on feeling will correlate positively with the degree of foregrounding of a given segment.

#### 3.3 Reading time

The idea that passages of literary texts containing a high degree of foregrounding take longer to read than those that do not has already been suggested by Šklovsky

when he proposed the notion of *retardation* in literary reading (1965: 12). On each level of linguistic organization, deviations as well as parallelisms will slow down the reading process. This, intuitively, is quite obvious in the case of deviations. The assumption is that when, for example, the reader processing a deviant sentence structure recognizes the syntax as abnormal, she or he processes it against the background of the non-deviant version: the gap of an ellipsis is filled, a sentence that violates word order rules is reconstructed, etc.

Miall and Kuiken (1994: 394–6) successfully demonstrate the positive and statistically significant correlation between foregrounding and reading time. To support their hypothesis, at the onset of their study, they refer to the 'garden-path' sentence research of Frazier and Rayner (1987) who found that violations of normal syntax affect reading times and processing. Adopting Miall and Kuiken's (1994) model, the hypothesis for this study, then, is that reading times per segment will correlate positively with the foregrounding measurement of each segment respectively.

### 3.4 Literary training

Further, in line with van Peer (1986), Miall and Kuiken (1994), and Dixon et al. (1993), I hypothesize that differences in the participants' level of literary training will not significantly affect their responses to the Joyce passages. Although this is a bold hypothesis in regard to the complexity of the passages, I would argue that Joyce's *Ulysses* can be read in an entirely 'un-intellectual' manner, and highly appreciated nevertheless. I would suggest that possible differences in responses might stem from the fact that some people are 'message-driven' readers and do not appreciate the open, ambiguous style of *Ulysses*, while other readers enjoy filling the gaps the text leaves with the help of their imagination.

## 4 General procedures

One hundred and five English native speakers were recruited from participants at the PALA Conference 2004 in New York, the IGEL Summer Institute and IGEL Conference 2004 at the University of Alberta in Edmonton (Canada), Ripon College (Wisconsin, USA), the University of Memphis (Tennessee, USA), and Buddha View Divers Koh Thao (Thailand), besides other native speakers met in shopping malls, airports, etc.<sup>8</sup>

The entire data was collected using Microsoft® Word®-document questionnaires and computer screen readings,<sup>9</sup> which were designed identically. Each participant was presented with three text passages of one source only, i.e. as they appear in the Dublin Notebook, the V.A.3-Buffalo, or the Gabler edition. They read each passage as a continuous text first, and then clicked through the text, one segment at a time. For each segment a rating on either strikingness or feeling was requested, depending on the version of the experiment. Three tests



(one for each text source) collected ratings on strikingness, and three ratings on feeling. All ratings were collected on Likert scales. The computer programme PsyScope (Cohen et al., 1993) simultaneously recorded reading times per segment.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Strikingness

The first hypothesis stated that readers' ratings on strikingness for each segment would correspond to the degree of foregrounding on all linguistic levels combined. To test whether this assumption holds, a non-parametric Spearman rank correlation was run. Although the correlation is highly significant, it is not very strong ( $p = 0.005$ ;  $r = 0.180$ ). This means that for all nine texts employed, the prediction held true that readers judged those segments as more striking that contained a higher degree of foregrounding, and that it is very unlikely that this result is a product of mere chance. However, the level of foregrounding only partly predicts the ratings on strikingness.

In order to get a better picture of which text features affected these reader responses more than others, the same procedure was performed between strikingness ratings and the phonetic, the grammatical, and the semantic foregrounding measurement respectively. The foregrounding on the level of grammar did not play a significant role in readers' ratings on strikingness. The phonetic ( $r = 0.138$ ;  $p = 0.022$ ) and semantic ( $r = 0.200$ ;  $p = 0.022$ ) foregrounding, on the other hand, correlated significantly with how striking readers perceived a given segment.

### 5.2 Feeling

Following Miall and Kuiken (1994), it was assumed that readers would rate a segment's potential for evoking feeling according to its degree of foregrounding. In this study, the highly significant correlation between foregrounding and feeling ratings ( $r = 0.202$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ) supports the argument that the degree of foregrounding influences how evocative of feeling segments are judged by readers.

A separate look at how the foregrounding on each level of linguistic organization correlated with readers' experienced feeling, shows that the phonetic foregrounding had no effect whatsoever, whereas the grammatical ( $r = 0.160$ ;  $p = 0.010$ ), and especially the semantic foregrounding ( $r = 0.206$ ;  $p = 0.001$ ) seems to have influenced participants' feeling ratings in the way predicted by foregrounding theory.

Thus, looking at the responses to all nine text passages taken together, it can be observed that the semantic foregrounding influences ratings of feeling and strikingness. In addition, the phonetic foregrounding correlates with strikingness, as does the grammatical foregrounding with feeling.

### 5.3 Reading time

The third hypothesis concerned the effect of foregrounding on reading time. The degree of foregrounding of each segment was expected to correlate positively with reading times per syllable. The results in this study support this claim. Participants read segments with a higher degree of foregrounding slower than those with a lesser degree ( $r = 0.138$ ;  $p = -0.023$ ).

The next step will examine in turn the relevance to reading times of each of the levels of linguistic organization. The correlations between foregrounding and reading times were expected to be positive. However, the phonetic foregrounding correlates negatively, and with high significance and effect, with reading times ( $r = -0.401$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). In other words, the more a segment was foregrounded on the phonetic level the faster participants read it and vice versa. The interaction of the grammatical foregrounding and reading times was, as expected, a highly significant positive correlation ( $r = 0.403$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and the semantic foregrounding did not seem to affect participants' reading times in a predictable way.

### 5.4 Literary training

Fact is, however, that not everyone loves Wolfram von Eschenbach, Jean Paul, or James Joyce, because it demands too much literary training.<sup>10</sup>  
(Harald Fricke, 1981; my translation)

Many would agree that the level of literary training influences appreciation and processing of literature. The assumption is that it takes certain skills to fully recognize and appreciate the artistry of more demanding works of literature. The results of recent empirical research, however, suggest that 'naïve and unsophisticated readers are intuitively sensitive to at least some of the nuances of complex literary styles' (Dixon et al., 1993: 21). In their studies, Miall and Kuiken (1994: 404), and van Peer (1986: 165–173) found that the level of literary training did not have an effect on readers' responses to the texts presented to them.<sup>11</sup> As mentioned earlier, these studies worked with less deviant texts than James Joyce's *Ulysses*, which by many is seen as 'too literary or intellectual' to appreciate without a strong educational background in the humanities.

In order to gain insight into whether the level of literary training affected reader responses, an analysis of variance (a one-way ANOVA) was run. This statistical procedure allows one to determine whether participants' ratings on feeling and strikingness differ significantly according to the number of University level Literature classes they have attended. The test showed that this was not the case: the level of literary training did not significantly affect ratings on strikingness for any of the nine texts. Thus, readers with higher levels of literary training did not rate the Joyce passages differently from those with less training. This is an interesting result, because it runs counter to the widespread assumption that

such an educational background is necessary to experience *Ulysses* as striking. Similarly, readers' ratings on feeling did not differ significantly in connection to literary training.

Thus, by way of conclusion, in this study no significant differences were observed in readers' responses to the variables of strikingness and feeling in relation to the level of literary training. These results confirm the insights gained by Miall and Kuiken (1994) and van Peer (1986), and extend these to more deviant narrative texts, such as James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

## 6 Discussion and conclusion

Similar to the way in which foregrounding devices in a literary text need to fulfill a function if they are to be perceived as meaningful, empirical investigations in literary studies must answer the question of their relevance if they are to contribute in any significant way to the field. The results must be fed back into the theory, in order to allow for the insights gained to be generalized beyond the present examination.

One of the qualities of an empirical approach to a foregrounding investigation is that it provides insights in two directions. For one, it employs the tools of stylistic analysis, which enable the linguistic features contributing to the literariness of a given text to be identified. Additionally, it allows for the validity of predictions concerning the effect of these features on real readers to be empirically tested. The contribution of this study is that it proposes a new approach to, and solutions for, two fields of literary studies that generally have little common ground.

Empirical studies of (literary) reading often involve text manipulation: a stylistic feature of a given text segment is identified and predictions made concerning its effect on readers. Then, two experiments are run collecting reader responses: one with the original text as stimulus, and the other with a text from which the identified foregrounding features have been removed, as in Hakemulder (2004). Although this method can be justified when the central focus of interest is on reader reactions only, it is questionable whether it yields any reliable insights into the literary quality of texts. Among many others, Mukařovský presents the notion of the integrity and 'indivisibility' of a work of art (1964a: 45, 1964b: 66), according to which the manipulation of one feature will disrupt the entire structure and balance of the work. The results presented in van Peer's *Stylistics and Psychology* support this view (1986: 160).

In the approach presented in this article, the problem of confounding variables introduced by text manipulation is avoided by turning to the author's manuscripts (typescripts), besides the edited text, for material. Passages of interest can be selected as they represent different stages in the production process, and the influence of identified features on readers tested, without resorting to

text manipulation. This aspect of the study, the empirical part of which is not elaborated in this article, is one of the key merits of the present investigation, I believe, and may prove fruitful for future foregrounding studies.

Moreover, the approach applied here is of great value for manuscript studies such as the *critique génétique*, which 'is the reconstruction and interpretation of literary writing processes on the basis of written materials documenting the creation of a literary work of art' (Grésillon, 1999: 294; my translation).<sup>12</sup> Empirical studies of foregrounding provide the theoretical and methodological basis for the productive analyses of text material that is extremely difficult to investigate interpretively. Grésillon points out the tautology of current manuscript studies, due to the teleology of their approaches: 'The text functions as the ultimate object, as the perfect and accomplished form toward which all handwritten drafts point, and at the same time, as yardstick by which any evidence of the genesis is measured' (Grésillon, 1999: 163; my translation).<sup>13</sup>

In Grésillon's view, this teleological principle bars any insights into the process of creation (1999: 171). The scholar must, she posits, phrase hypotheses on the basis of textual traces, which support the analysis and interpretation of writing processes, independent of the editable text (1999: 182).

Empirical studies of foregrounding comply with these standards. Not only are hypotheses formed on the basis of text features, the validity of these speculations are then put to the test by rigorous empirical investigation. The approach of the present study avoids the teleology characteristic of manuscript studies. Text passages from any point in the creation process can be contrasted with one another, and ultimately real readers evaluate their worth. The concept of literariness as a dynamic between text and reader allows for insights to be gained that may well run counter to the investigator's assumptions. It is still too early in the development of foregrounding theory to gain insights into the psyche of the author (but see Martindale, this issue). However, in contrast to pseudo-scientific, psychoanalytical approaches, which are indeed tautological and provide no falsifiable insights or fruitful theory of how literature functions (Kihlstrom, 2000: 471), a foregrounding study of manuscripts can offer valuable information on the text material and readers' processing thereof. Unfortunately, it is outside the scope of this article to demonstrate the fruitfulness in this regard by carrying the insights of readers' responses back into a close textual analysis. However, it seems obvious that the results provide a solid foundation from which to approach the explorative and interpretive investigation of manuscript material.

Nevertheless, the results gained in empirical studies require critical and modest interpretation. Ideally, these should be complemented with qualitative data, such as 'think-aloud protocols' or commentaries on passages found particularly evocative of feeling for instance.

Moreover, the influence of personality traits on responses to literary texts is an aspect that needs to be integrated more fully into reader response investigations, I would argue. The difficulty of measuring traits of personality may be seen

as discouraging, but, as the findings of Kuiken et al. (2004) for instance show, results are achievable on a small scale, and these will eventually lead to a better understanding of how textual elements, readers' world knowledge, and personality traits each contribute to produce the literary experience.

Several of the problematic issues of empirical investigations in foregrounding, such as the insufficient precision of the quantification procedure or failure to account for semantic features adequately have been addressed in this article. Despite these shortcomings, Miall and Kuiken's (1994) as well as van Peer's (1986) results were corroborated: foregrounding is a quality of literary works of art that readers respond to in a partly predictable way, independent of their level of literary training.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank David Miall and Willie van Peer for their advice and support regarding the research design. Further, I thank Hans Walter Gabler for introducing me to, and guiding me in the study of *Ulysses* and for generously making his transcripts of James Joyce's manuscripts available to me. For recruiting participants, I owe great thanks to: Marisa Bortolussi, Peter Dixon, and David Miall of the University of Alberta; Willie van Peer of Munich University; Max Louwerse of the University of Memphis, Tennessee; Lorna Sopčák of Ripon College, Wisconsin; and Alex Stäubli of Buddha View Divers, Thailand.

### Notes

- 1 For a photo offprint reproduction of the manuscript, see Joyce (1978: 238–57).
- 2 Before the transaction, Michael Groden was contacted by the National Library of Ireland to assess the authenticity and value of the manuscript collection. For a description of the events surrounding the appearance and purchase of the collection and its contents, see Groden (2002, 2003).
- 3 For a detailed discussion of Joyce's 'epiphanic' writing style, the development of his epiphanies, and the manner in which he employed them, see Gabler (2005).
- 4 To view the foregrounding analysis of all passages, including a transcription into the International Phonetic Alphabet and the quantification of features, please contact the author.
- 5 Popper describes the 'Oedipus effect' – in the social sciences often referred to as the 'Pygmalion effect' – as 'the influence of a theory or expectation or prediction upon the event which it describes' (1963: 39).
- 6 When all observations in research data are converted to  $z$ -scores, the changed scores will have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. This makes it possible to compare data from different studies, because they are now all expressed in the same units.
- 7 Miall and Kuiken (1994: 392–3) mention Hunt and Vipond conducting a similar study on the basis of Labov's 'discourse evaluations', in which they investigate the effect of textual features on readers.
- 8 Fifty-six of the participants were women and 49 were male. The age mean of participants was 30.08 years. 39 participants stated that their highest degree of education was a high school diploma, 43 a bachelor's degree, 12 a master's degree, and six a PhD. At the time of the study, 39 of the participants were or had been students of the natural sciences, 49 of the humanities, and 17 were not, and had never been students.

- 9 The computer screen readings were designed with the help of the software PsyScope (Cohen et al., 1993), specifically designed for psychology experiments.
- 10 'Zwar liebt de facto nicht jedermann Wolfram von Eschenbach, Jean Paul oder James Joyce, weil dafür zu viel literarische Vorbildung vonnöten ist ...' (Fricke, 1981: 206).
- 11 Van Peer (1986: 171–3) did find, however, that the level of literary training played a role in which layer of linguistic organization correlated higher with responses to foregrounding.
- 12 'Die critique génétique ist die Rekonstruktion und Interpretation literarischer Schreibprozesse anhand schriftlicher Zeugnisse der Entstehung eines literarischen Kunstwerks' (Grésillon, 1999: 294).
- 13 'Der Text fungiert als Endzweck, als vollkommene, vollendete Form, auf die alle handschriftlichen Vorstufen zustreben, und zugleich als Maßstab, an dem jeder Zeuge der Genese gemessen wird' (Grésillon, 1999: 163).

## References

- Bortolussi, M. and Dixon, P. (2003) *Psychonarratology: Foundations for the Empirical Study of Literary Response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, J. D., Mac Whinney, B., Flatt, M. and Provost, J. (1993) 'PsyScope: An Interactive Graphical System for Designing and Controlling Experiments in the Psychology Laboratory Using Macintosh Computers', *Behavior Methods, Research, Instruments, and Computers* 25(2): 257–71.
- Dickinson, E. and Dickinson Bianchi, M. (1924) *The Life and Letters of Emily Dickinson*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dixon, P., Bortolussi, M., Twilley, L.C. and Leung, A. (1993) 'Literary Processing and Interpretation: Towards Empirical Foundations', *Poetics* 22: 5–33.
- Frazier, L. and Rayner, K. (1987) 'Resolution of Syntactic Category Ambiguities: Eye Movements in Parsing Lexically Ambiguous Sentences', *Journal of Memory and Language* 26: 505–26.
- Fricke, H. (1981) *Norm und Abweichung: Eine Philosophie der Literatur* (Norm and Deviation: A Philosophy of Literature). Munich: Beck.
- Gabler, H. W. (2005) *The Rocky Roads to Ulysses*, *Joyce Studies* 2004, 15. Dublin: National Library of Ireland.
- Grésillon, A. (1999) *Literarische Handschriften: Eine Einführung in die 'Critique Génétique'*, *Arbeiten zur Editionswissenschaft* Vol. 4. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Groden, M. (2002) 'The National Library of Ireland's New Joyce Manuscripts: A Narrative and Document Summaries', *Journal of Modern Literature* 26(1): 1–16.
- Groden, M. (2003) 'The National Library of Ireland's New Joyce Manuscripts: An Outline and Archive Comparisons', *Joyce Studies Annual* 14: 5–17.
- Hakemulder, J. (2004) 'Foregrounding and Its Effect on Readers' Perception', *Discourse Processes* 38: 193–218.
- Joyce, J. (1978) Offprint reproduction of the manuscript to *Ulysses*, The James Joyce Archive (V.A.3-Buffalo). New York: Garland.
- Joyce, J. (1984) *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, eds H.W. Gabler, W. Steppe, and C. Melchior. New York: Vintage.
- Kihlstrom, J. F. (2000) 'Is Freud Still Alive? No, Not Really', in R. L. Atkinson and R. C. Atkinson (eds) *Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology* (13th edition), p. 481. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Kuiken, D., Phillips, L., Gregus, M., Miall, D. S., Verbitsky, M. and Tonkonogy, A. (2004) 'Locating Self-Modifying Feelings Within Literary Reading', *Discourse Processes* 38(2): 267–86.
- Leech, Geoffrey, N. (1969) *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longman.
- Miall, D. S. and Kuiken, D. (1994) 'Foregrounding, Defamiliarization, and Affect: Response to Literary Stories', *Poetics* 22: 389–407.

- Mukařovský, J. (1964a) 'Standard Language and Poetic Language', in P. L. Garvin (ed.) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, pp. 17–30. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Mukařovský, J. (1964b) 'The Esthetics of Language', in P. L. Garvin (ed.) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, pp. 33–69. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Popper, K. R. (1963) *Conjectures and Refutations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Šklovsky, V. (1965) 'Art as Technique', in L. T. Lemon and M. J. Reis (eds) *Russian Formalist Criticism: 4 Essays*, pp. 3–24. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- van Peer, W. (1986) *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*. London: Croom Helm.

## Address

Paul Sopčák, Office of Interdisciplinary Studies, 1–59 Humanities Centre, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2G5, Canada. [email: psopcak@ualberta.ca]