



FORUM

University of Edinburgh
Postgraduate Journal of Culture and the Arts
Issue 28 | Spring 2019

Title	Joyce's <i>Exiles</i> : A Reception History
Author	Alexander Benoît
Publication	FORUM: University of Edinburgh Postgraduate Journal of Culture & the Arts
Issue Number	28
Issue Date	Spring 2019
Publication Date	28/06/2019
Editors	Ray Shannon and Dominic Richard

FORUM claims non-exclusive rights to reproduce this article electronically (in full or in part) and to publish this work in any such media current or later developed. The author retains all rights, including the right to be identified as the author wherever and whenever this article is published, and the right to use all or part of the article and abstracts, with or without revision or modification in compilations or other publications. Any latter publication shall recognise FORUM as the original publisher.

Joyce's *Exiles*: A Reception History

Alexander Benoît
Boston College

Exiles — James Joyce's lone extant play — has been the subject of scholarly neglect for the past century, with scholars dooming it as an Ibsenian knockoff and “a wholly bad play” (Kenner, 9). I suggest that we look at *Exiles* in a wholly different context, instead reading it as a theatrical entity worthy of the stage and not reading it as a work of fiction with accompanying stage directions. Far from suggesting that *Exiles* is Joyce's magnum opus, I attempt to elevate the status of the play by suggesting that the 1970 revivalist staging of the play helped to catapult the theatrical career of Nobel laureate Harold Pinter. I further gesticulate toward possibilities and opportunities for the gestation of a more complete critical edition.

Published in 1918, James Joyce's only extant play *Exiles* has been received quite enigmatically by scholars. On the one hand, it has been received as a wholly “bad play” numerous times since its publication (Kenner 9). However, it has also been overshadowed by the titanic pillars of both *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, leaving it perpetually in the profile of literary comparison. In the one hundred years since its publication, it has rarely been afforded the opportunity to be read as a thing-in-itself, and even less as an individual work of drama. When it is read dramatically through a critical lens, most scholars and critics collectively conclude that it is simply a rehashing of the plays of Ibsen. It was not until Harold Pinter produced the play in 1970 that *Exiles* began to receive more positive feedback, though this arrived in the wake of the seriocomic question as to whether or not it was indeed Pinter that wrote Joyce's play.

Before the 1970s, there is a large gap of scholarship on *Exiles*. In contrast with Joyce's other works of prose and poetry, *Exiles* has received the least attention by scholars. In the *James Joyce Quarterly*, a quick archival search will tell you that the keyword “*Exiles*” shows up 546 times compared to the 3,001 for “*Ulysses*,” which does not count the articles written about the eighteen individual chapters of Joyce's magnum opus (another quick search brings up a further 992 articles on the “*Circe*” chapter alone). Part of the reason for this is obviously the amount of material that can be covered, though it is also in part due to neglect; it has been walled off from scholarship due to its perceived inferiority. What this snapshot does is tell us about the gaping hole in scholarship that is pining to be filled. This is the crux of the problem at hand: if *Exiles* was written as a drama, why has it not been studied as a piece meant for the stage and instead been doomed to be compared to *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*? Ezra

Pound put it aptly when he wrote “It is not so good a novel; nevertheless it is quite good enough to form a very solid basis for my arraignment of the contemporary theatre” (Pound, “Mr. James Joyce,” 123). Furthermore, why did it take until Pinter for Joyce’s play to be recognized as having potential for the stage and for scholarship to catch up? It is necessary to bluntly state that even though I am arguing for *Exiles* to be read and given scholarly attention, I am in no way arguing that it is deserving of praise. As such, this essay will attempt to analyze this issue as well as providing a history of both academic and popular reception from the initial production and publication of *Exiles* up through Fargnoli and Gillespie’s 2016 critical edition of Joyce’s lone extant play. However, due to the dearth of academic reception, this reception history will focus mainly on popular reception in the 20th century.

Despite the intervention of Ezra Pound, *Exiles* was continually rejected by English and American theatre. In spite of the rejection of the play by English language production companies, Pound urged Joyce “to try theaters abroad” (Ellmann 414). It was not until 7 August 1919 that the play was able to be staged for the first time, when the Munich Schauspielhaus put it on their performance bill; however, it was so poorly received that *Exiles* was off the Munich Schauspielhaus bill by 8 August of the same year (Weninger 13). Even though Joyce’s previous works were ridiculed upon their market debut, *Exiles* was different. It was a completely different genre than that of *Dubliners*, *Portrait*, and *Ulysses*, the last of which Joyce was writing and publishing at the same time as *Exiles*. One of the earliest criticisms of Joyce’s lone play was that it lacked the depth and sophistication of his other works. However, many of the earliest reviews were written without the context of seeing the play in person, though if Munich was any indicator, that may not have helped Joyce’s case. That being said, the critical issue with many of the early reviews is thus: it was reviewed as really anything except as a work of drama. In positioning *Exiles* against Joyce’s other works of fiction, *Exiles* was doomed from the beginning. A. Walton Litz, famed for his seminal work *The Art of James Joyce*, shares this view when he writes that *Exiles* functioned solely as a “cathartic release that was necessary before he could fully develop the design of *Ulysses*” (4).

The First Wave (1920s-40s)

I find it difficult to put any of my thoughts on *Exiles* into words. They are not used to words: they die. I feel that Joyce's play has died in words. I do not mean literally, — all Art is linguistic. But even Art must fail many times before it conquers those things whose nature it is to keep themselves a secret from us forever. (j h [Jane Heap], *Little Review*, 20)

'Bewilderment' is probably the best word to describe the scholarship dedicated towards *Exiles* immediately following its publication and initial stagings. Some of this confusion is surely due to the fact that *Exiles* was published in perhaps the most productive period of Joyce's life and during the height of his literary fame, as *Ulysses* was being serialized and prepped for final publication. It is worth considering why Joyce would consider writing a play during this time in his career. The hype surrounding him had never been greater, and he had suddenly been catapulted from a writer whose work was consistently rejected to one who welcomed the opportunity to dine with Proust, Diaghilev, Stravinsky, and Picasso.¹ But the confusion might have been the result of misunderstanding or of a letdown. In "A New Work by James Joyce" published in 1929, the anonymous author denotes the "slightly chaotic" nature of Joyce's play, though it was viewed as his "most individual piece of work [. . .] which remains in the memory" (111).

Due to the atrocious Munich debut, *Exiles* was not staged in English until February 1926 in London (MacNicholas, "Stage History," 12). At least some of the lack of critical and popular attention before this time can be attributed to this, though the play had been published in English in 1918. But the first "major" critical investigation of *Exiles* — and "major" is stretch — was not conducted until 1932 when Francis Fergusson published an essay in *Hound and Horn* entitled "'Exiles' and Ibsen's Work." Joyce's relationship with the Norwegian playwright is incredibly well documented, with much thanks to scholars like Fergusson. Joyce's fandom of Ibsen is clear in *Ulysses*; the structure of *Exiles* hoped to bear resemblance to Ibsen's classics of *The Wild Duck* and *A Doll's House* (Tysdahl 89). There is no intrinsic fault in comparing two authors, especially when there is a connection as powerful as the one between Joyce and Ibsen. But the extent to which this was rehashed not only makes it redundant in itself; it makes the play seem redundant.

¹ This event took place on 18 May 1922 at the Majestic Hotel on the Avenue Kléber in Paris.

And thus, such was the painful case of *Exiles*, doomed to be considered an Ibsenian knock-off for decades. When it was reviewed or written about without mentioning the Norwegian playwright, *Exiles* was punished with caustic reviews that criticized Joyce for experimenting in the dramatic arts. Harry Levin's 1949 preface to the play in *The Portable James Joyce* politely reprimands Joyce. Levin's preface notes that *Exiles* contributed to the development of Joyce's "scrupulous meanness," a term he used to describe *Dubliners*; however, Levin continues to harp on Joyce's rehashing of the Ibsenian tradition, thereby perpetuating the circular scholarship regarding the play. Even Hugh Kenner, one of the most distinguished Joyceans of the era, had surprisingly little to say regarding the play. He takes no formal stand for it, instead performing a cursory short reading that gives no sense of structure to the reception of *Exiles* in the early 1950s, although his close reading can serve as a means to justifying a reading of *Exiles* in itself without necessarily comparing it to other texts, whether they be Joyce's or others.

In essence, the first wave was categorized by shock and uncertainty regarding what to do with Joyce's play. Inevitably, this led to two outcomes: first, that *Exiles* was doomed to be neglected from the outset, and second, that when it was not neglected, it was misrepresented as a literary text. Admittedly, part of this misrepresentation — which plagued *Exiles* reception until the early 1970s — is the result of the lack of staged productions, for it is impossible to interpret a play in its theatrical context without the presence of the stage.

The Second Wave (1950s-60s)

The subsequent two decades saw a slight uptick in the amount of scholarship dedicated seriously to *Exiles*. However, not much changed in this second wave in comparison to the first wave, with the exception of the questioning of why *Exiles* had received such little critical attention up to the current point. Notable of these new injections was Robert Adams' studies into the *Exiles* manuscript, which up until that point was given next to no critical attention whatsoever. However, the old comparisons refused to go silently; even the trademarked Joyce-Ibsen comparison was rehashed in Bjørn Tysdahl's 1968 work *Joyce and Ibsen: A Study in Literary Influence*, a text which further contributed to the *Exiles*-as-necessary-catharsis dialogue. Of these new contributions to scholarship on *Exiles*, only A. Walton Litz's *The Art of James Joyce*

expresses that Joyce had finally “exorcised the spectre of Ibsen” in an apparent effort to “free his mind from his mind’s bondage” (4).

In spite of the appearance of a lack of progress in terms of scholarly recognition, the second wave featured two works that stand out from all the rest from the critical dialogue they create with regards to *Exiles*. The first of these was Richard Ellmann’s 1959 *James Joyce*, widely regarded as one of the finest literary biographies ever penned. Ellmann’s work shines next to no critical light onto the play, though he includes most of the correspondence between Joyce and others regarding *Exiles* that was available at the time of publication. Like others of his milieu, Ellmann was primarily concerned with the publication history of Joyce’s lone play and seemingly nothing more. He focuses mainly on amassing a compilation of letters that concern *Exiles* in an attempt to do two things. The first of these is to showcase Joyce’s larger social network and his connectivity in literary and artistic circles. Certainly, Ellmann accomplished this. The second, an implication of this, is to show how Joyce’s social network did not aid in the production of *Exiles* whatsoever. Effectively, Ellmann describes Joyce as being the quintessential ‘misunderstood genius’ whose work was not recognized in its time. However important and grand of a work *James Joyce* is, it does not deepen the scholarly conversation of *Exiles*, instead furthering the concept of the ‘cathartic mark’.

Besides Ellmann’s 1959 biography, the largest project undertaken in this period in regard to Joyce’s play was certainly Forrest Read’s 1967 editing of the Pound and Joyce letters. The influence of Pound on Joyce is incredibly well documented, especially on Joyce’s work regarding *Exiles*. It was Pound who first urged Joyce to publish and stage *Exiles*, though he abhorred theatre. In a letter to Joyce from September 1915 that was a direct response to receiving the MS of *Exiles* for the first time, Pound remarks that:

My whole habit of thinking of the stage is: that it is a gross, coarse form of art...When you are a recognized classic people will read it because you wrote it and be duly interested and duly instructed, but until then I’m hang’d if I see what’s to be done with it. (Read, 46-47)

Read’s edited collection of these letters serves as means to refocus the critical lens back to the initial reception of *Exiles*. The quoted passage from Pound’s September 1915

letter is the very first critical response to Joyce's play. That Read gives significant attention to Pound and Joyce's epistolary habits at this time is of great importance, gesticulating towards the possibility that *Exiles* might be received more favorably in years to come. That being said, Pound's words — and thus Read's volume — does bear the 'cathartic mark'. Because Pound characterizes the play as something that will only be of literary value or merit after Joyce's other works are received in due favor, he relegates the play to existing as a building block in Joyce's oeuvre.

The mark of the second wave finds its genesis in the very origins of the first wave. Up until this point in *Exiles* scholarship, this was the dominant mode of thinking about the play. Earl John Clark's systematic synopsis of the scholarship dedicated to *Exiles* up to 1968 demonstrates this: of the fifteen hundred available bibliographical entries on Joyce as of 1968, only twenty-three were focused on the play, and over half were reviews of three pages or less, with many of these reviews debating "the rather insignificant question of whether the play is an 'Ibsenite' drama or not. No more than six are significant contributions to Joyce scholarship" (Clark 69). Clark's essay focuses in on a central element of my argument: if James Joyce is renowned as one of the most innovative and verbally dazzling writers of the twentieth century, we should be reading his entire body of work, including *Exiles*. In effect, Clark insinuates that scholars have collectively un-authored *Exiles* from Joyce's body of work, forever marking it as the black sheep that few dare to touch. Clark's essay concludes with a statement that summarizes the scope of the issue thus far: "In general critics of Joyce regrettably have not examined *Exiles* as a reflection of Joyce himself and have tended to ignore or subordinate it as a commentary on Joyce's biography" (77). Clark seems to further imply that only a complete reworking of our cultural understanding of *Exiles* would serve to resurrect it from the grave it has been forced into.

The Coming of Pinter

The moment when Lazarus was raised was certainly the arrival of Harold Pinter, who coincidentally held the same surname as Joyce's agent for the publication of *Exiles*. Without a doubt, Harold Pinter's staging of *Exiles* in 1970 was the fulcrum by which reception of the play shifted. The original production was staged at the now-vacant Mermaid Theater in London. While not yet a Nobel Laureate, Pinter was certainly a stable figure in the British dramatic scene.

As Ronald Knowles wonderfully notes in “Joyce and Pinter: *Exiles* and *Betrayal*,” Pinter had a longstanding relationship with the works of Joyce, and there were a startling number of similarities in their lives. Joyce wrote an essay on Ibsen that he published as a student at University College Dublin; likewise, Pinter wrote an essay entitled “James Joyce” in his school’s publication, the *Hackney Downs School Magazine*. Eventually he grew to be so fond of Joyce that he placed his copy of *Ulysses* alongside his family’s copy of the works of Shakespeare in their East London home (Knowles 184-185). His father was so incensed with its obscenity that he ordered him to remove it, stating that “he wouldn’t have a book like that in the room where my mother served dinner” (Pinter 18). As such, Knowles becomes one of the first scholars to assert that *Exiles* influenced someone other than Joyce himself.

Through his love of Joyce’s prose, Pinter stumbled upon the lonely text of *Exiles*. At the time of his production of *Exiles*, Pinter was relatively well-known within dramatic social circles, but he was far from the household name he became after winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2005. It is possible, as Michael Billington suggests in *The Life and Work of Harold Pinter* and Ronald Knowles purports in “Joyce and Pinter,” that Joyce’s play resonated deeply with Pinter on a personal level. According to Billington, Pinter was suffering from a particularly damaging bout of writer’s block at the time he came across *Exiles*, and Billington presents the case that Joyce’s play became “a landmark production for Pinter in many ways . . . [it] planted the seeds which were to germinate many years later in [Pinter’s play] *Betrayal*” (Billington, 1996, 211). But what exactly was so wonderfully revolutionary about Pinter’s staging of *Exiles*? Critics seem to disagree about exactly what Pinter did to change the play. Irving Wardle notes that the Ibsenian elements were removed while Michael Billington (2006) comments that Pinter perhaps mystically self-annihilated in order to conjoin his own life experience with that of the protagonist Richard Rowan, though they all seem to agree that it was the removal of some distinctly Joycean element that made it so. *Exiles* was far from one of the first plays Pinter had directed, though the play helped to define what became known as the “Pinteresque,” so much so that Joyce’s play came to be seen as a landmark production for Pinter in many ways (Billington 1996). Of the elements that the Swedish Academy notes as comprising the Pinteresque, many are well suited to describe Pinter’s production of *Exiles*, such as the enclosed space, the unpredictable dialogue, and the minimalistic plot. The looming question

over Pinter's success is thus: while *Exiles*' temporal success certainly helped elevate Pinter, did it necessarily elevate the perception of Joyce's writing of the play?

Just over fifty years before, the play had been disregarded as "all that noise for an Irish stew" (O'Brien 10). Upon his initial production of Joyce's play, Pinter's work was applauded, as Irving Wardle proclaims that "there is no greater excitement in the theater than the discovery of life in a play long given up as dead" (Wardle). Wardle's laudations were far from the only enthusiastic responses; Michael Billington, Katharine Worth, and Mel Gussow all penned highly praiseful pieces regarding Pinter's production. Gussow wrote of Joyce's play as "tantalizing [and] unjustly neglected" (60). Billington's 1971 review praised it, similarly, calling it "the best piece of theatrical salvage-work since the Royal Court rediscovered D.H. Lawrence" (Billington, 1917, 10). Yet even though the praise for Pinter's production was grand, few — if any — of the reviews and articles the date from the wake of the post-Pinter era commend Joyce's play in itself, and any that do couple and sandwich their praise between applause for Pinter.

There is little doubt as to whether or not Pinter's production of *Exiles* benefitted the play; if the colloquialism of any publicity being good publicity is true, it is certainly true of Joyce, whose notoriety surely increased the demand for texts like *Ulysses*. This is evident vis-à-vis the sheer amount of both popular and academic scholarship produced in Pinter's wake. The 1970s bore witness to the most pieces being written about *Exiles* since its initial staging. Furthermore, additional productions of *Exiles* were staged soon after Pinter's production. The most notable of these was Rob Thirkield's in 1977, which was highly acclaimed in *The New Yorker* and the *James Joyce Quarterly* by Edith Oliver and Myron Schwartzmann, respectively.

But questions such as these were a sort of double-edged sword, as the public — and soon thereafter, the academy — began to seriocomically consider whether or not it was Pinter, rather than Joyce, that wrote the play. That this comes in the wake of Foucault's famous "What is an Author?" lecture in February of 1969 is no coincidence. Katharine Worth gives the question of authorship serious academic consideration as early as 1973 in "Joyce via Pinter":

Exiles took so easily to Pinter's direction that as reviewers were quick to point out, it might almost have been written by him. It was common to hear people

wondering whether Pinter really *had* written it, in the sense, they would explain, of cutting or rearranging or, above all, of introducing un-Joycean silences so as to maneuver it into a more Pinteresque position. (Worth 46)

This consideration is not without its merits, for Pinter's production is not totally Joyce's. In making preparations for the 1970 production, Pinter cut out the scenes in which the maid, Brigid, was given significant attention. This was conducted with permission from the Joyce Estate and from the Society of Authors (Taylor-Batty 302). In a letter from Pinter's personal archive dated 17 September 1970, Samuel Beckett expressed cautious approval, writing: "Your changes in the text are very understandable. But I wonder if there is not a purely acting way out of the difficulty whereby they could be dispensed with."

Post-Pinter

The staging of Pinter's production of *Exiles* certainly did not place Joyce's play at the center of the scholarly focus of Joyce studies. There are still very few books and articles dedicated solely to *Exiles*, and even less that treat it as a work of drama rather than as another novel. Of the scholarly works produced during the post-Pinter years, the most notable was surely John MacNicholas' 1979 watershed opus *James Joyce's "Exiles": A Textual Companion*. It was the first comprehensive critical study to be carried out on Joyce's lone play, arriving sixty-one years after its publication and sixty years after its first staged production. MacNicholas' work took a primarily genetic approach, which was typical of Joyce studies at the time. Undoubtedly, one of MacNicholas' primary sources for his work was the facsimile, the notes, the galley proofs, and the manuscript of *Exiles*, which was published in 1978 as part of *The James Joyce Archive*.

The major difference we see in *Exiles: A Textual Companion* is the emphasis on the text itself in isolation; MacNicholas conducts a hyper-formalist reading of the play. He does not take the 'cathartic mark' into direct consideration or make an attempt to position it against the rest of Joyce's canon. Much of this renewed sense of focus is not a direct result of Pinter's reclamation of the play, though, as the methodology of MacNicholas' focus can be seen in other contemporary works regarding *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*. The macro lens of genetic studies has stretched its tendrils of influence into Joyce Studies today, as well.

The problem with MacNicholas' text is that it lacks the authority to receive the moniker of an authoritative version or critical edition of the text. It should be duly noted that MacNicholas did not exactly set out to do this, as *Exiles: A Textual Companion* does not even include a version of the text in the first place. However, in creating a text of this kind, it must be asked: which version of the text is the authoritative one? Should one choose the original manuscript as the copy-text or consider using Pinter's emendated version, edited with consideration of Samuel Beckett and the Joyce Estate? The lack of an authoritative text at this point, or even the semblance of an authoritative text, is concerning. It is certain that MacNicholas understood this, as his work constituted the largest body of work on the play.

Even in the lack of the guise of authority, both popular and academic scholarship on *Exiles* progressed through the 1980s and 1990s, albeit slowly. Reviews of performances in the United States, the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Belgium were published in newspapers and scholarly journals.² At Joyce conferences and festivals, the play began to be performed. At the 1982 conference at SUNY Purchase, *Exiles* was performed five times (MacCauley). Popular interest trickled into academic interest at the end of the 1990s and beginning of the 2000s, where *Exiles* began to garner focus in studies on censorship and translation studies.³ But in spite of this guise of progress, *Exiles* was not gaining any sort of real, tangible traction among scholarly circles. If scholars were now giving attention to the play, it was only briefly and cursorily, though the "cathartic mark" theory appears to have gone out of style. Still, no one was taking Joyce seriously as a dramatist. Even Robert Weninger, whose important 2012 work *The German Joyce* revealed crucial details regarding the German reception of *Exiles* in Munich, names his chapter on Joyce's play "Enter James Joyce, a 'Poet of Silence and Truth'."

In briefly returning to the question of a definitive text, Fagnoli and Gillespie attempted to bridge this gap and give *Exiles* "the critical attention it deserves" (Slote). While the text certainly does make significant strides towards what could be a definitive critical edition of *Exiles*, it falls short. French critic Valérie Bénéjam points out that while "we cannot but heartily applaud an editorial project that encourages us to rethink our opinions about the play and its place in Joyce's oeuvre," we must be aware

² See O'Connor (1982), Landuyt (1995), and MacCauley (1982).

³ See Bulson (2001) for notes regarding *Exiles* in translation and Lazaro (2001) for notes regarding *Exiles*' history of censorship in Spain.

of the number of errors that are both factually and conceptually erroneous (136). Furthermore, Bénéjam makes a point to remind us that though this work is critically important in order to raise awareness of *Exiles*, it is not *their* work. In essence, this text comes to serve as a compilation, amassing the few critical essays written on *Exiles* by the centenary of the play's genesis. That being said, Fagnoli and Gillespie's text cannot be viewed as a complete blunder, for there is a very distinct sense that they wish to revive the theatrical nature of the play. In elevating the dramatic nature of *Exiles*, the editors believe that they "present a view of [Joycean] issues more concentrated and more directly represented than anywhere else in [Joyce's] writing" (Fagnoli & Gillespie 10). That the final essay in the volume is the transcript of an interview with Richard Nash — who himself staged two New York productions in 1995 and 1997 — shows that the editors fervently hope "to bring us back in the end to the truly theatrical nature of the text" (Bénéjam 140). However, this does not extinguish the need for an authoritative critical edition of *Exiles*; as G. Thomas Tanselle writes: "No edition ever eliminates the need for further editions of the same text or work, but only those texts perennially deemed of the highest significance are likely to be re-edited by successive generations" (63).

In some sense, Pound's prophecy came to fruition, at least to a degree: "When you are a recognized classic people will read it because you wrote it and be duly interested and duly instructed . . . but until then I'm hang'd if I see what's to be done with it" (*Letters III* 366). While *Exiles* began to be well received by the public with Pinter's production, only now, a century after its publication — in fact, 2018 marks its centenary — is *Exiles* beginning to receive noteworthy scholarly attention. While certainly far from perfect and complete, Fagnoli and Gillespie's 2016 critical edition shows that contemporary scholarship is beginning to read *Exiles* as it deserves to be read — a work in a genre separate from *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, a work that has earned the right to be free from comparison to these pillars of modernism.

To some extent, there is still some confusion about what to do with *Exiles* in a modern context. Some of this confusion must come from the study of modernism as a whole. Kirsten Shepherd-Barr points out that "The neglect of *Exiles* as a piece of theatre might suggest the marginalization of theatrical performance in the historiography of modernism" (170). Elin Diamond further notes that "modern drama has been excluded from the received canons of modernism" (4-5). If we are to do anything with this insight, it is to take a look at the types of scholars who have worked with Joyce's

play. Most are not trained thespians; in fact, besides popular reviews, there was no investigation of *Exiles* in its theatrical context until Shepherd-Barr. What both Shepherd-Barr and this essay suggest is that the only way to conduct a proper “reading” of *Exiles* is to “read” staged productions in order to gain a truer sense for the theatrical elements of the play.

Although I have argued for a reading of *Exiles* without the influence of the looming figure of Joyce as author, it is precisely because of Joyce as author that *Exiles* has not been lost to time and that it will continue to be remembered. That most critics thought of it as a “bad play” or that *Exiles* was perceived as lacking “the enchantment of *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* or the richness of *Ulysses*” certainly attests to this (Kenner 9 and Colum 7-8). However, value in *Exiles* cannot be solely relegated to an understanding of it as just another work that Joyce created. It furthermore cannot be shrugged off as merely a failed foray into another genre or only as a genuflection towards Ibsen, Strindberg, or Chekhov. Forthcoming studies of *Exiles* must make diligent efforts to surpass thinking of the play as the developmental or ur-area of Joyce’s larger works. As Kristen Shepherd-Barr writes, “*Exiles* needs to be considered on its own terms, as a play intended for the stage, rather than simply dismissed by Joyce scholars whose primary interest is in his fiction” (169). Instead, *Exiles* should be studied as a play that arrives in Joyce’s oeuvre at a crossroads in his career and in the modernist literary movement as a whole.

Works Cited

- Adams, Robert. "Light on Joyce's 'Exiles'? A New MS, a Curious Analogue, and Some Speculations." *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 17, 1964, pp. 83–105.
- Bénjéam, Valérie. "'Exiles': A Critical Edition Ed. by A. Nicholas Fagnoli and Michael Patrick Gillespie" (Review)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 53, no. 1-2, Fall 2015-Winter 2016, pp. 134–143.
- Billington, Michael. "'Exiles' at the Aldwych." *The New York Times*, 8 Oct. 1971, pp. 10.
- . "'Exiles': National, London - 4/5." *The Guardian*, 3 Aug. 2006.
- Bulson, Eric. "Getting Noticed: James Joyce's Italian Translations." *Joyce Studies Annual*, vol. 12, 2001, pp. 10–37.
- Colum, Padraic. "Introduction." *Exiles: A Play in Three Acts by James Joyce*, Grafton, 1989, pp. 7–8.
- Clark, Earl John. "James Joyce's 'Exiles.'" *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1968, pp. 69–78.
- Diamond, Elin. "Modernity's Drama," *Modern Drama*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2001, pp. 4–5.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Gussow, Mel. "Drama: Joyce's 'Exile' Back." *The New York Times*, 20 May 1977, pp. 60.
- Herring, Phillip F. "Review: *The James Joyce Archive*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1981, pp. 85–98.
- Kenner, Hugh. "Joyce's 'Exiles.'" *The Hudson Review*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1952, pp. 389–403.
- Kestner, Joseph. "James Joyce's 'Exiles': A Textual Companion by John MacNicholas (Review)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1980, pp. 319–20.
- Knowles, Ronald. "Joyce and Pinter: Exiles and Betrayal." *Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies*, vol. 9, 1998, pp. 183–91.
- Landuyt, Ingeborg. "James Joyce in the Low Countries by Peter Van Kraaij (Review)." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1995, pp. 472–74.
- Lazaro, Alberto. "James Joyce's Encounters with Spanish Censorship, 1939-1966." *Joyce Studies Annual*, vol. 12, 2001, pp. 38–54.

Levin, Harry, ed. "Editor's Preface to 'Exiles.'" *The Portable James Joyce*, The Viking Press, 1949, pp. 527-528.

MacCauley, Ian T. "Festival Honors James Joyce." *The New York Times*, Sunday, Late City Final Edition, New York, 14 February, 1982, Nexus Uni, <https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.bc.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3S8GS6Jo-0009-22YM-00000-00&context=1516831>.

MacNicholas, John. "James Joyce's 'Exiles' and the Incorporated Stage Society." *I-Carbs*, vol. IV, no. 1, 1978, pp. 10-16.

---. *James Joyce's "Exiles": A Textual Companion*, New York, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979.

---. "The Stage History of 'Exiles.'" *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1981, pp. 9-26.

Pinter, Harold. "And Thank You, Hackney Library." *The Times*, 18 Mar. 1995, p. 18. http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.bc.edu/ttda/info-mark.do?&source=gale&prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=mlln_m_bostcoll&tabID=To03&docPage=article&searchType=&docId=IF502126877&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0.

Pound, Ezra. "Mr. James Joyce and the Modern Stage." *The Drama: A Quarterly Review of Dramatic Literature*, no. 21, 1916, pp. 122-32.

O'Brien, Edna. "Review: Arts: The Ogre of Betrayal" *The Guardian*, London, 29 July 2006, pp. 10.

O'Connor, John. "TV: Joyce Play on Cable". *The New York Times*, Wednesday, Late City Final Edition, New York, 20 October 1982, Nexus Uni, <https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.bc.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:3S8GNR80-0009-213V-00000-00&context=1516831>.

Oliver, Edith. "Portrait of the Artist as a Young Husband." *The New Yorker*, May 30, 1977, pp. 85-87.

Read, Forrest, editor. *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*, Faber and Faber, 1967.

Schwartzman, Myron. "A Successful Exiles in New York." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1977, pp. 361-62.

Shepherd-Barr, Kirsten. "Reconsidering Joyce's Exiles in Its Theatrical Context." *Theatre Research International*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2003, pp. 169-80.

- Slote, Sam. Cover Endorsement. In Joyce, James. *Exiles: A Critical Edition*, Edited by A. Nicholas Fargnoli and Michael P. Gillespie, University Press of Florida, 2016.
- Stammen, Silvia. "Verrutschte Sphären." *Theater Heute*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2015, pp. 14–15.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. *A Rationale of Textual Criticism*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.
- Taylor-Batty, Mark. "Joyce's Bridge to Late Twentieth-Century British Theatre: Harold Pinter's Dialogue with 'Exiles.'" *A Companion to James Joyce*, 1st ed., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2011, pp. 300–17.
- Tysdahl, Bjørn J. "Exiles." *Joyce and Ibsen: A Study in Literary Influence*, Norwegian Universities Press, 1968, pp. 87–102.
- Walton Litz, A. *The Art of James Joyce*, Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Weninger, Robert. "James Joyce in German-Speaking Countries: The Early Reception, 1919-1945." *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe, Volume I: Germany, Northern, and East Central Europe*, edited by Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, vol. 1. London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004, pp. 14–17.
- Worth, Katharine. "Joyce via Pinter." *Revolutions in Modern English Drama*, G. Bell and Sons, 1973, pp. 46–54.
- "A New Work by James Joyce." *The Living Age (1897-1941)*, vol. 337, no. 4346, Sep 15, 1929, pp. 111.
- Letters of James Joyce*. Vol. 1-3, Viking Press, 1966.
- Little Review*. "Exiles: A Discussion of James Joyce's Plays." Vol. 5, 1919: pp. 20-50.

Author Biography

Alexander Benoît is a second-year Masters' student at Boston College where he researches Flann O'Brien, angling literature, and writing pedagogy.