THE PAPERS

OF THE

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

SOCIETY OF

AMERICA

OLD FACES AND NEW ACQUAINTANCES
David McKitterick

WHAT "ULYSSES" REQUIRES
Hans Walter Gabler

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

REVIEWS

CONTENTS

What *Ulysses* Requires

HANS WALTER GABLER

THE critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses* raises fundamental issues of textual study and editing.[1] To these, the criticism of John Kidd is altogether peripheral.[2] This assessment by a clearsighted observer of the Miami Joyce Conference in February 1989,[3] even before the publication of *PBSA*'s much-delayed December 1988 number, is fully borne out by the 173 pages of "An Inquiry into *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*." It piles detail upon detail in promise of an in-depth analysis and critique. Yet, failing ultimately to comprehend—that is, to encompass and to understand—the conception, rationale, and procedure

Hans Walter Gabler (Institut für Englische Philologie, Universität München, Schellingstrasse 3, D–80799 München) edited James Joyce's *Ulysses* in a three-volume Critical and Synoptic Edition in 1984. His critical editions of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* came out in 1993. He has published scholarly and critical work in literary and textual studies.

of the edition it criticizes, it falls distinctly short of securing even its own foundations. Amassing materials of an utter heterogeneity, it states half-truths, selects and suppresses evidence, posits arbitrary categories for text-critical reasoning or editorial emendation, and coins demands for rationale and procedure from private preconceptions. It waxes irate—stifling response—and mistakes wilfully (or genuinely misunderstands) the object of its ire for what it is not, and never claimed to be.

The substance of the objective criticism in "An Inquiry" is slim and as meager as the presentation of it is bulky. Some initial comment may be in order:

The *Ulysses* edition sports—as what edition from manuscript does not—a couple of misreadings: H. *Shrift *(for*: H. Thrift; *U*:10.1259) and Captain *Culler *(for*: Captain Buller; *U*:5.560) are of its own erroneous making. This is the sum to date of manuscript readings indisputably recognized as wrong in the edition.[3a]

In a small handful of other instances, deciphering the manuscript hand remains a matter of opinion—ours, John Kidd's, or anyone else's (most notoriously so, of course, at *U* 1426.6–7 / *U*:16.1452–4). It must be assumed that even the combined successive reading efforts of Jack Dalton, Clive Driver, Hans Walter Gabler with Danis Rose, John O'Hanlon, Charity Scott-Stokes, and the rest of the editing team, of John Kidd, and of every preceding and subsequent user of the *Ulysses* manuscript materials, in the original as in facsimile and photoreprint, have hitherto not succeeded in verifying every reading beyond all doubt, or in spotting every presence or absence of marks of punctuation, or of fragments of erased text.

In the matter of erasures, specifically, it is true that the edition fails to meet expectations which it itself raises. A number of existing erasures it does not report,[4] and on the other hand it gives a sprinkling of indica-

3a. The 1993 impression of the 1986 Bodley Head edition, now also a paperback taking the place of the British Penguin edition (see above, note 1), restores Thrift and Buller. In addition, it offers an afterword by Michael Groden that sets the edition's procedures and the debate over it in perspective, as well as a Note on the Text by Hans Walter Gabler. In this state, the edition is due from Random House in 1994.

4. This problem, however, is not one of *The Corrected Text*, but solely of the apparatus notation in the critical edition. Moreover, it is largely, albeit not exclusively, confined to one short chapter, namely episode 2, "Nestor." This is neither an accident, nor can the report of "An Inquiry" be extrapolated to indicate an editorial imprecision weighty and significant throughout the edition. For *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,* Joyce faircopied his drafts for typing. The routine was picked up for *Ulysses,* but was discon-

tions of spurious erasures. Without attempt at vindication of a short-coming, it may be pointed out that neither part-survivals from erasure nor the physicality as such of erasures in any way affect the edition's reading text, i.e., the so-called "Corrected Text" that is ostensibly John Kidds' object of inquiry.

Equally of no consequence to the edited text are the observations in "An Inquiry" on the critical and synoptic edition's lemmatized apparat-uses. Among the edition's many thousands of footnote and appendix apparatus entries, John Kidd has spotted a couple of dozen where the edition reports the document and text situation inadequately or incom-pletely, and just sometimes (most conspicuously so in relation to folio 55 of the fair copy of "Nausicaa") erroneously. Besides, he notes its—mar-ginally—incomplete record in the historical collation of existing variants from the editions collated, as well as the obverse phenomenon of ghost variants.

Of textual consequence, however—over and above Harry Thrift and Captain Buller—are the instances where "An Inquiry" is able to fault the edition on its own terms. They are few, and to be singled out for its significance is the case of the "usual [handsome] blackguard type they unquestionably had an [insatiable] indubitable hankering after" at U 1446.16–17 / U:16.1804–5. For more, and partly other, reasons than John Kidd adduces, this is a place where the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* must stand corrected (see below, section "Handsome Unques-tionably").

In a spirit of professional and constructive cooperation, an editor could hope for nothing better than a response to his endeavours like John Kidd's insistent delving into the maze of particulars of the critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. He or she would find the

tinued after the third chapter. For, whereas *A Portrait* was sufficiently settled—Chapter IV aside, the extant fair copy was begun in 1913, when the text had been maturing since 1907—the incipient *Ulysses* proved far too volatile for the copy to remain fair for long, or without cumbersome, as well as unsightly, erasures. The erasures in the initial chapters, while of course a scribal feature of the fair copies, often indicate acts of revision, even though they only seldom permit the recovery of the superseded readings. From the fourth chapter onwards and, with the exception of the tenth to the fourteenth, the text's post-fair-copying volatility found its outlet in the lost working drafts from which the chapter fair copies derive, and which after such further revision became the copy for the respective chapter typescripts. After the third chapter, therefore, the incidence of erasure diminishes drastically and, moreover, becomes almost purely a matter of cleaning up disturbances in the author's scribal effort of faircopying. (See further note 12.)

dearth of objective faulting that results quite reassuring. But "An In-quiry" is not designed towards a consensus over the object of its investi-gation. In view of its global prejudice and bias, the problem of answering it arises not from its incidental constructive objectivity, but from its vast and opinionated subjectivity. Reading even just a few pages into it, and attempting to comment on them, requires concentrating every effort on clearing the debris of misunderstandings, inadequate premises, and false assumptions.

Terms and Concepts

Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition does not "expunge 5,000 errors found in previous editions" ("An Inquiry," 411). In textual criticism, an objective definition of the concept and term "error" is ruled out *a priori* by the hermeneutic nature of the discipline. In recognition thereof, the edition's orientation is not towards error, but towards the written and the changing text. It re-establishes *Ulysses* from a central segment—pragmatically delimited—of the documents of composition and pre-publication transmission, to wit, the fair-copy manuscripts, the type-scripts, the *placards* (or, galleys-in-sheet), and the proofs. Thence, it arrives at a critical edition text, and offers a reading text, from both of which the first and every subsequent pre-1984 publication of *Ulysses* is recorded to depart in over 5,000 instances. The elimination of error is in-cidental, and is but a sub-category of the overall critical and editorial undertaking of preventing the pre-1984 printing tradition. In such pre-vention lies the edition's radical editorial stance.

It is an essential quality of editorial work to be designed as open to checks and controls. Hence, it is a basic feature of the *Ulysses* edition that the decisions towards establishing its edited (left-hand page) and read-ing (right-hand page) texts, including those decisions proposing to eliminate error, are offered up to critical questioning. Where, in estab-lishing the edited text, the edition departs from the text of the docu-ments, it records every departure in the list of emendations footnoted to the left-hand pages. Referenced to the reading text, it records—from its indicated selection of editions collated—every departure of the printed transmission of *Ulysses* in the appended historical collation. The entries in these lists are written in the standard shorthand notation, only slightly

modified, of lemmatized apparatuses. Expecting to be read (as such apparatus shorthand by common convention expects to be read) against the background of the edition's rationale and declared rules of procedure, the entries always reason the grounds for a departure from the text of the documents, or else for a refusal to depart. In a minority of instances, a discursive textual note adduces supplementary justification or defense of an editorial decision. It would be superfluous to rehearse this clear-cut implementation of conventional editorial procedure were it not that "An Inquiry" enters but erratically into its framework of communication. Failing to do so, "An Inquiry" in fact, as it stands, needs refocussing at almost every point where it takes issue with the critical edition's editorial results, in order to assess its relevance, not to mention its own justification, in terms of the edition itself.

To aggravate the problem, "An Inquiry" lacks precision and stringency in basic text-critical concepts and editorial terminology for such focussing. To speak as it does—and persists in doing—of "a version with 5,000 changes" (412) would, as to the term "changes," be meaningful only if the first edition of *Ulysses* of 1922 were the critical edition's point of editorial departure. It was, and is, not. As to the term "version," it is inapplicable entirely. The edition's reading text, specifically, is categorically not a version, but an essentially copy-text-edited critical text of *Ulysses*. Nor of course is the synoptic text a version. At the same time, it is true that the synoptic presentation of the states of development of the text of *Ulysses* telescopes versions, and may therefore be used to provide access to distinct versions of that text. These may, if desired, be abstracted at pragmatically chosen levels of the textual development, employing the apparatus in all its sections as the instrument by which to isolate them. For this purpose, as for any other manner of working with, and criticizing, the critical and synoptic edition, it needs to be clear and unambiguous about what its emendations are, and what "emendation" does not mean in terms of the edition.

Strictly, textual criticism designates as "emendation" the editorial alteration of the edition base text, which in the case of the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* is the continuous manuscript text assembled from the documents of composition and pre-publication transmission. "An Inquiry" at times recognizes the term's received definition, as when it refers to the "reliance on lifetime editions to corroborate . . . emen-

dations of manuscript" (412f.). Yet at other times it confusingly does not, as when, for example, only a single paragraph later, it speaks of what it has already misnomed the edition's "changes" as "emendations." What is in question here, however (413, l. 7), are not the edition's emendations (that is, of the edition base text) but its non-agreements with the first edition of 1922. Of course, far from lacking even "one paragraph . . . devoted to justifying" them, the thrust of the edition's entire rationale is towards its non-agreement with 1922. To the detriment of its desired force of persuasion, "An Inquiry" here within a few lines (as is so characteristic throughout of its rhetoric) shifts the ground of its argument.

Within just over two introductory pages, by terminological imprecisions and sleights-of-hand as to such fundamental text-critical and editorial concepts as "error," "change," "version," and "emendation" alone, it warps its line of reasoning and renders itself questionable from the outset.

What Is a Critical Edition?

In asking "What is a critical edition?" (412; 413ff.), "An Inquiry" continues to raise, and immediately to beg, further questions of concept and terminology. No one should be confused, and no past or future editor feel slighted or deterred, by the claim that the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* is the first full critical edition of any of Joyce's works. The history of editing Joyce has seen at most critically edited texts—or, more precisely, critically reviewed texts—in published print, not critical editions. These critically reviewed texts have had adhering to them essential qualities of "practical texts," about which Fredson Bowers observed they are characteristically prepared by marking up existing printed editions.[5] Collation shows that Robert Scholes's text of *Dubliners* (1967) was so marked up, and Jack Dalton submitted a marked-up copy of the 1961 *Ulysses* to Random House, which I have seen. John McNicholas's apparatus for *Exiles* (1979) could, for reasons beyond his control, take no other form but that of a set of mark-up instructions for the printed text of the play. Even Chester G. Anderson's *Portrait* (1964) text is at bottom

5. Fredson Bowers, "Practical Texts and Definitive Editions," *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), 412–39, esp. 416–17.

a mark-up, not a text established wholly afresh from the *Portrait* holograph; and in its published form, the acknowledged arbitration over readings by Richard Ellmann turned it indeed into a "marked-down" text. Only Anderson's dissertation edition of *Portrait* (1962), were it not for its mode of establishing the text, could be said to have the makings of a critical edition; and William York Tindall's edition of *Chamber Music* (1954) similarly comes close to meeting the required criteria.[6]

The "more ecumenical definitions" cited notwithstanding ("An Inquiry," 414–15), and in support of the distinction I am making, I hold that a critical edition is defined by the complex interdependence of a text established from the ground up and its interfacing apparatus. The apparatus in particular, writing the editor and his informed judgment into the edition, is not a separable adjunct, but an integral element in the system of a critical edition, which is doubly centered, on the text and on the apparatus. With this understanding, even the 1986 so-called "Corrected Text" of *Ulysses* is by itself a mere critically edited text which, on account of being divorced from the 1984 apparatus, cannot claim the status of a critical edition.

As for attempts to edit *Ulysses* critically by methods alternative to that devised for the critical and synoptic edition, what militates against an edition established, for instance, on the basis of the 1922 edition is the textual situation, with its rich survival of documents of composition and pre-publication transmission. These offer a wealth of demonstrably authorial variants standing against alternatives in the first edition whose intrinsic textual authenticity is broadly uncertain. It is an uncertainty paradoxically increased, not lessened, by Joyce's multiple workings-over of the text in typescripts and proofs. Close collation reveals so many corruptive departures from the text in manuscript which he demonstrably— and often enough repeatedly so—did not see, that there remains very

6. The first critical editions of *Portrait* and *Dubliners* have now appeared: James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993); and James Joyce, *Dubliners*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993). The reading texts of these editions without apparatus have simultaneously been published by the Vintage Books International division of Random House Inc., New York. Also in 1993, Chester G. Anderson has provided the text for James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. R. B. Kershner (Boston and New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1993). Collation shows that, in revising his text of 1964, Anderson has paid renewed attention to substantives, though not to accidentals, in relation to Joyce's fair copy. An editorial rationale, however, is lacking, as is a textual apparatus.

little room for a benefit of the doubt that would favour the first-edition readings as authorial, or authorially intended. This effectively rules out giving the first edition leeway by broadly assuming passive authorization when the text as typed or typeset appears changed but was not touched. Therefore I would still maintain that "mere correction"—or, emendation of the first edition strictly according to the rules of copy-text editing— "falls short of the critical demand on an edition of *Ulysses.*"[7] An edition based on 1922—be it a copy-text edition in Greg's, or a version edition for example in Hans Zeller's, sense[8]—would be, for its text, in danger of not reaching a state of definition beyond that of a "practical text." For a version edition, committed to leaving the document text untouched but for the removal of unambiguous textual faults, this is self-evident. For a copy-text edition, the pull of the copy-text would leave just too large a margin of indifference (in W. W. Greg's sense of the term[9]) for the eclecticism to take effect, which the method advocates—and anyhow, the method has not really developed a rationale for working backwards, that it, for emending a copy-text by authorial variants of revision which precede it. Version edition and copy-text edition would amount to much the same thing—yielding practical yet indifferent texts, and large apparatuses jumbling together bulks of authorial and transmissional variants which a fragmentation by lemmas renders thoroughly unwieldy.

7. Foreword, vii.

8. Hans Zeller's understanding of the distinction between Anglo-American copy-text editing and German version editing, while touched upon in "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–64, comes out most clearly in "Struktur und Genese in der Editorik. Zur germanistischen und anglistischen Editionsforschung," in *Edition und Wirkung*, ed. Wolfgang Haubrichs, *LiLi: Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975), Heft 19/20, 105–26. A discussion of this and related pieces on principles of textual criticism according to the German understanding of the discipline may be found in my "Unsought Encounters," in Philip Cohen (ed.), *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1991), 152–66. At the time of writing, a volume of German essays on editorial scholarship in English translation is in preparation. *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland, is due to appear from the University of Michigan Press in 1994. Zeller's "Structure and Genesis in Editing: On German and Anglo-American Textual Criticism" will be included.

9. Walter Wilson Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–51): 19–36, esp. 32; also in *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 374–91, esp. 387–88.

Some Indictment

Imprecise and inconsequential in terms of text-critical concepts as well as standard conventions of editorial procedure, "An Inquiry"—still just in its introductory pages—turns cavalierly self-serving in what it conveys about Joyce's work on *Ulysses,* and decidedly facile in its statements about the edition. It may sound plausible that "[o]nce *Ulysses* was printed, it began to change under Joyce's hand" (412). But it is false. Changing the book and its text ended with the submission to the printer of the final batch of the final proofs at the end of January 1922. It appears to have been a quite deliberate act to end the writing then and there. The validity of that act is in no way impaired by the few and intermittent bouts at authorial correction in the course of the post-publication transmission. Correction—be it the author's or, as is more pervasive for *Ulysses,* that of author-appointed or self-appointed agents—is not revision. Not only is it of general importance in textual criticism and editing to observe the distinction between correction and revision. The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* in particular would appear compromised by the fact, were it true, of revisional changes to the text in print. Therefore the easy insinuation of "An Inquiry" that *Ulysses* "began to change under Joyce's hand" in print is far from innocuous in a discussion of the edition.

As for the edition itself, it simply cannot be indicted for wilful idiosyncrasy about "copy-text" and "continuous manuscript text," or for inventing "levels" of text, let alone for exclusively inventing an apparatus. It is such matters we must turn to in the double labour of focussing the edition and the critique.

Copy-Text and Continuous Manuscript Text

The pages of "An Inquiry" (417–19) setting out to prove that "Gabler has done poorly by Greg" (419) may be dismissed outright. What goes wrong in the argument is succinctly illustrated when the quote from the edition's Afterword on page 417, "By common consent, an editor chooses as the copy-text for a critical edition a document text of highest overall authority," reappears on page 419 with the telling inaccuracy of ". . . chooses . . . a document of highest overall authority."

There lies the rub. An editor, under the dispensation of copy-text editing, chooses not a document, but a document text as copy-text. Greg's proposition of divided authority holds. The editor opts pragmatically for the document text of highest overall authority, i.e., the document text of the highest aggregate of authoritative accidentals and substantives. A reason of convenience (Greg's "grounds of expediency") is that this yields the most manageable apparatus. More importantly, the copy-text opted for broadly pre-determines editorial decisions. Although it is the whole point of copy-text editing that readings from document texts other than the copy-text be admitted to the critical text, Greg's stipulation is also that readings be not adopted whose revisional quality in the non-copy-text document text(s) cannot be critically ascertained. In relation to their copy-text counterparts, he calls them indifferent variants and rules that, for indifferent variants, the copy-text be followed. Current editorial practice is therefore accurately described by saying that "according to the precepts of copy-text editing . . . editorial decisions gravitate towards the copy-text, upholding its readings where possible" (Afterword, 1,894). This is the pull of the copy-text.

Greg's "Rationale of Copy-Text" was pragmatic by intention. Yet the proposition of divided authority, and the editorial practice following from it of constituting a critical text eclectically from textual elements present in two or more documents—conflation, elsewhere anathema in editorial theory, is its advocated mode of procedure—held the theoretical implication of a logical distinction of text and document. Fredson Bowers, firmly within the precepts and practice of copy-text editing, explored the logic when he defined virtual texts, i.e., texts not materially present in existing documents, as editorial stepping-stones towards his critical texts of Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, or of a range of works of Stephen Crane's.[10] The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*, defining its text-critical and editorial position both within and without the mode

10. Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling*, ed. Martin Battestin and Fredson Bowers, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974); see esp. p. lxxi.

For "The Text of the Virginia Edition" of Stephen Crane, see pp. xi–xxix (esp. p. xvi) of Stephen Crane, *Bowery Tales*, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969).

Fredson Bowers's creative development of copy-text editing is the particular subject of "Multiple Authority: New Problems and Concepts of Copy-Text," *The Library*, 5th ser., 27 (1972): 81–115; reprinted in *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), 447–87.

of copy-text editing, has moved further in realizing the theoretical potential of the logical distinction between document and text. Its copy-text itself, the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses,* is the text of a virtual document. Far from invoking a "theory of a 'continuous manuscript text'" (419), the edition introduces the notion of the continuous manuscript text as a heuristic device to solve the task of critically editing *Ulysses.*

Ruling out the text of the first edition as a document text to serve as copy-text—for the reason, as explained, that it would yield but a practical, not a critical text—the editorial enterprise was faced with the situation that no other single document text was eligible as copy-text. Preceding the first edition, it is true, there exists a very nearly complete typescript of *Ulysses,* whose only major lacuna is the loss of chapters one to three, and five. Yet, typed by a series of more or less unskilled typists, the typescript text already suffers from much the same shortcomings as does the first edition text. Were the typescript text the earliest extant document text, one could, according to Greg's injunction to choose the text closest to the source of the transmission, still make a case for the typescript text as copy-text. But the antecedent to the typescript text survives in Joyce's manuscript text. Moreover, all the stages of revision and addition which transformed the typescript text into the first edition text also exist in Joyce's handwriting. Thus, in terms of Gregian method and pragmatics, everything pointed to opting for Joyce's manuscript text as the critical edition's copy-text. Yet no manuscript exists as one document that contains a text of the work as fully written and finally revised. Therefore, the edition posits a virtual manuscript, calling it the continuous manuscript, to contain a full and complete manuscript text. The continuous manuscript is an imagined entity. But the continuous manuscript text is real. It is recorded in a series of extant documents, either in autograph (as fair copy, intermittently extant draft, or handwritten addition to typescripts and proofs), or in direct scribal transcript (that is, in typescript or in typesetting) from autograph.[11]

11. "An Inquiry" (pp. 419f.) has performed a nice piece of detective research into the history of textual criticism in linking the designation "continuous manuscript text" to the notion of "continuous copy" of old in Shakespeare scholarship. The echo was intended— and was intended to highlight a conceptual advance. On the basis of a logical distinction between document and text, a continuous *text* was conceived of for *Ulysses.* By comparison, the proposition of continuous *copy* for Shakespearean plays tied in the text inseparably

From the record to the edition, the first step in any editorial under-taking is to transcribe the record. With the record spread over multiple documents, its transcription for *Ulysses* takes the form of an assembly of the continuous manuscript text. The virtual continuous manuscript is comparable to a real, multiply revised draft. The editorial task in tran-scribing such a draft lies above all in disentangling its layers of com-position and revision and tagging the textual levels. To assemble the continuous manuscript text for *Ulysses* is essentially the same procedure in reverse. The textual layering is apparent from the outset, spread out as it is over the documents which individually carry the elements for assembly. Given that the temporal order of the documents is self-evident or ascertainable by external criteria, the levels of the text and their se-quence are commonly not in doubt. The development of the text *of* the virtual continuous manuscript, just as *on* any real multilayered draft, is understood to proceed by composition and revision, where revision may be deletion, addition, replacement, or transposition. These are textual operations, to be tagged by appropriate coding to distinguish them. For a real document, what results is properly a manuscript, or document, edition, often additionally characterized by the indication of inscrip-tional features (e.g., false starts, erasures, *currente calamo* transforma-tions, inks, and writing implements), as well as of the topography of the document (e.g., interlineation, sub- or superscription, horizontal or ver-tical marginal positioning). The assembly of the continuous manuscript text for *Ulysses* cannot have the same primary document relationship and is therefore less a document than a text edition. In the tagging or coding of the textual operations, it corresponds in type to the document edition, with the important extension that it indexes the textual opera-ions. The indexing helps to trace the continuous manuscript text back to the documents of provenance of its elements. But it is important to note that the assembled continuous manuscript text is not, and cannot be, a diplomatic representation of the documents from which, by assembly,

---

with theatrical documents. It was imagined that promptbooks gathered accretions over years of use in the theatre. The proposition was eventually rejected on the grounds that an over-cluttered document could be of no conceivable use to the dramatic company. More-over, a strong resistance to the idea of Shakespearean revision played a part in the rejection. Perhaps today it might be worth investigating how much of the erstwhile ideas surround-ing the notion of continuous copy bear looking into afresh under the present return to an acceptance of the fact that Shakespeare revised his plays.

it derives. Nor as yet, or as such, is it a critical text. On both aspects, more needs to be said.

The continuous manuscript text could be diplomatic only with respect to its own document. But "its own document" is a virtual document, functional heuristically only to focus the textual development over multiple real documents. Textual development and real documents, moreover, are asymmetrically phased in that, in the main, revisions occur at increasing removes from the document point of first inscription and fall in the interstices, as it were, between the documents. For example: let a change be entered in autograph on the second proofs. Though materially added to the reproduction of the text in the typesetting of these proofs, it is logically an alteration to the text first inscribed, say, in the fair copy. In terms of Joyce's manuscript text before transmission, therefore, the change appears in a document at three removes from that which carries the basic unrevised text. Written out, moreover, over the second proofs, and incorporated in the typesetting of the third proofs, the change—again in terms of the manuscript text—accurately occurs between the second and the third proofs. Indicating levels in the continuum of the text's development, it is precisely this moment logically situated at a point between the real documents which the coding index employed in the synoptic presentation aims at and marks.

By reason of asserting a logical independence of the text from the real documents, then, the assembly of the continuous manuscript text, as it presents the textual development synoptically, yields predominantly a text edition. It records—synoptically—the composition and revision by the textual results, not as material and manual processes. Only in the record of authorial operations within single documents does it preserve a modicum of document representation by indicating, e.g. for the fair copy, such features as false starts, *currente calamo* changes, in-document revision, or erasures; or, for autograph segments of overlay to the typescripts and proofs, revisions of the revision. Again, however, it transcribes these with a main view to the textual results, and with only a subsidiary and selective attention to the diplomatic record.[12]

12. Separating text presentation from document representation is more easily posited as a principle than executed in practice. Privileging the text over the document record reaches an impasse, for example, with regard to manuscript erasures. Such erasures are material to the document, but at the same time they have a text quality. Under the former aspect, their exclusion from the record would be defensible on the edition's own premises. Under the latter aspect, erasures were incorporated in the text assembly for the edition's synopsis.

The assembled continuous manuscript text, coded and indexed for the compositional and revisional sequence of its elements, presents the textual development synoptically. The segment of the textual development delimited—for pragmatic and systematic reasons—for the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*, and hence chosen to provide its continuous manuscript text, extends from the fair copy to the final proofs for the first edition. The pre-fair-copy drafting has been excluded on pragmatic grounds. Drafts and draft fragments survive for only a minority of the book's episodes, and some of them, moreover, are not contiguous with the fair copies.[13] To edit them either individually or in synoptic contiguity with the respective fair copies is a separate undertaking, begun as a subsidiary to the main critical edition, and still in hand. The pre- and post-publication textual history has, for systematic reasons, no place in the presentation of the compositional and revisional development: The serialisations in *The Little Review* and *The Egoist* do not offer authoritative texts, even though the printings are mediately authorized as documents; and, as indicated above, no textual changes beyond the final proofs for the first edition are revisional.[14]

Assembling its continuous manuscript text as a text edition (albeit with an orientation towards the document edition in the synoptic visualisation of the textual record), the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* takes its stand outside the Anglo-American mode of copy-text editing. Formal copy-text-editing procedures are employed, in an auxiliary capacity, only to secure the text for lost segments of the Joycean manuscript. Thus, the fair copy and typescript, when collateral for individual episodes, bear witness to the text of their antecedent lost final working draft. Being collateral, they permit reconstructing its basic text plus one layer of revision, and thus yield two initial levels of the textual development in the continuous manuscript text.[15] Similarly, the authorial revisions on the lost typescripts of the three opening chapters may be recovered—and distinguished from typist's errors—from the (collateral) serialisations, and first book galleys (*placards*). Even such subsidiary copy-text-editing

13. See further note 33.

14. We do not overlook that we have accepted the change from "foot" to "hoof" at *U* 858.20 / *U*:14.561 as a revision performed in the edition of 1926 ("he was for the ocean sea or to hoof it on the roads with the romany folk"). This must be taken as the one exception to prove the rule.

15. See further below in the section "The Apparatus."

moves, however—as they may be termed with reference to the practice of Fredson Bowers in the Virginia Stephen Crane edition[16]—cannot obscure the fact that the assembly of the continuous manuscript text, even as it combines textual elements from multiple documents, bears no relation to the critical eclecticism of copy-text editing. The editorial approach is historicist in the sense of the German "historisch-kritische Edition,"[17] and critical only to the extent of verifying the historical givens of the documents and document relationships when transforming them into the text presentation of the synopsis. Moreover, the assembled continuous manuscript text records solely the authorial variation within the textual development it covers, and excludes consideration and record of transmissional variants, except in a minority of instances where such variants get worked into revisions. For the purposes of a comprehensive edition of *Ulysses*, the continuous manuscript text, as prepared by abstracting Joyce's manuscript text from the documents of composition and pre-publication transmission, provides but a raw text in need of critical editing. At this point, the continuous manuscript text enters into the functions of a copy-text; and it is only here that we move to the more familiar ground of copy-text editing.[18]

Copy-text Editing and Emendation

At bottom, the continuous manuscript text is in need of copy-text (critical) editing because the critical and synoptic edition has set itself the pragmatic goal of providing a critically established text parallel to the published text of the first edition of 1922. This is an arbitrary ambition,

16. See note 10.

17. The full orthodoxy for this edition type is set forth in Siegfried Scheibe, "Zu einigen Grundprinzipien einer historisch-kritischen Ausgabe," in Gunter Martens and Hans Zeller (eds.), *Texte und Varianten: Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation* (München: Beck, 1971), 1–44.

18. McGann and Hammond and "An Inquiry" in their wake (see the discussion, pages 419–22) are hampered by the *a priori* assumption that editing requires a copy-text. The assembly of the continuous manuscript text does not; what it requires is the evidence (the inscription) of text on documents. The critical editing of the edition text to be presented in the synopsis declares the continuous manuscript text its notional copy-text. The synoptic text does not—*pace* Hammond—serve as copy-text for the reading text. The reading text, rather, is merely a clear-text extrapolation of the edition text presented in the synopsis. Incidentally: what "exists . . . in Gabler's computer program" (Hammond) is irrelevant to the issue.

not a logical necessity. An editorial presentation of the raw continuous manuscript text would not be inconceivable. It would, in a more literal sense than the critical and synoptic edition, give *"Ulysses* as Joyce wrote it" (my own words, smacking of the newspaper headline); and perhaps it could be worked more closely than we have chosen to do into recording "what the documents actually say" ("An Inquiry," 412). But the critical and synoptic edition has taken a different path. The continuous manuscript text requires critical editing, at an elementary level, to smooth the seams between its assembled elements. For example, Joyce, inserting and adding over the typescripts and proofs, may at times neglect to provide the requisite modifications of punctuation or capitalisation. Or, he may genuinely make mistakes in writing out his text, and perhaps even persist in overlooking them if they were not picked up by a typist or compositor. Or, his orthography may on occasion overstep even the wide limits of *OED*-recorded historical and contemporary usage.

This begins—but only begins—to indicate a range of situations where the editor will assume the critical task of emending the continuous manuscript text, utilizing it as a copy-text. Both aspects need to be stressed: the emendation is of the copy-text, and the task, as well as the responsibility, is the editor's. This raises questions of what and how does the editor emend, whence do the proposed emendations derive, and how can and does the editor justify them? They are questions not merely of practical, but of theoretical, concern.

Fundamentally, I would suggest that, in the central editorial activity of emendation, the editor's responsibility takes precedence over authority. It is by no means the case that an editor can invoke and refer to authority—as commonly understood: another document, or the author's intention—in every situation or instance where texts in being critically edited require emendation. As traditionally defined, emendation is designed to oppose the influx of error and corruption in textual transmission. It is resorted to when a text is disturbed by a fault. Emendation repairs the text where its record of authority is deemed to be interrupted and broken. The notion of authority as thus residing in the record implies the assumption that records and documents somehow speak as author-substitutes in the way that, of old, legal and political documents spoke as the judge and the king, and Holy Scripture was the unmediated

word of God. By the emendation of a fault, the text is thought to be "healed" through a reflux of authority restoring it to full authenticity. But it is doubtful whether an emendation has, or can command, such authority and authenticating power. The underlying concept of authority must be questioned.

The problem may be reopened from the type of situation originally defining emendation with reference to preconceptions about authority. The editor of a medieval manuscript, say, judges that at certain points the text to be edited is faulty. The editor collates a number of other manuscripts and, as it is commonly understood, emends the base text by their authority. But on closer analysis this, I suggest, is not what the editor is doing. The collation yields readings that appear critically superior, and it is on the strength of such superiority that they qualify as emendations. If they have authority in that they represent the uncorrupted authorial text, it is an incidental felicity; for medieval manuscripts, this would be a long shot indeed. The paradigmatic editorial situation in the face of corruption may well be that of Lewis Theobald encountering "a Table of green fields" in the folio text of *Henry V*, II.3., and judging it to be nonsense. Having no rival source to refer to, he conjectured "a babled of green fields" and emended the text accordingly on his own strength as an editor. Yet the situation of conjecture, while highlighting the issue, is marginal. Multiple transmission as the source basis for emendations is more common. What needs to be brought into focus, then, is the nature and quality of authority in emendation. The authoritative quality of an emendation derives from its critical superiority. The authority of a text— be it the text to be edited, or the source text of an emendation—is an authority inherent in, and conferred by, the contextuality itself of that text; and it must be critically recognized as such, and as so conferred, by the editor.

This plays the emendation squarely into the editor's court. Grounded in critical faculties as supported by professional skills, the editor emends on his or her own responsibility. Divine, royal, legal, or even authorial authority may be felt to be super-authorities holding out the temptation to hide behind them. But the authority inherent in the contextuality of the text is for the editor critically to assess, and, in opposing transmissional corruption, to assert by emendation. On such premises, emenda-

tion is the editorial activity by which an editor writes his or her skills and faculties into an edition. Such an understanding needs perhaps to be stressed particularly in the face of current copy-text editing, which has adapted the formal procedures of emendation, originally designed to respond to textual corruption, to the purpose of coping with authorial variation, and has at the same time, significantly, not rethought the concept of authority. Thus, the critically eclectic text, the ideal of copy-text editing in the (Greg)–Bowers–Tanselle sense, is achieved through emending the copy-text by authorial revisions from non-copy-text documents. The emendations are declared to possess superseding authority conferred by authorial intention, and, by such authority, to merge with the authoritative copy-text in fulfillment of the author's final intentions. The super-authorities of the author and his intentions, conceived of as of old before present-day theoretical notions of textual autonomy were formed, tend to obscure the essentially editorial nature of the act of emendation, as well as the editor's structural position in an edition.

Against the background of such theoretical reflection, one may gain a clearer conception of what is involved, and what isn't, in copy-text-editing the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses* and, in the process, emending it. What is essential is again to restrict the method of copy-text editing to the handling of transmissional variants. Since the textual development of composition and revision is attended to in the assembly of the continuous manuscript text before copy-text editing, the copy-text-editing procedures themselves are devoted, and confined, to adjusting the text with respect to its variation within the pre-publication transmission. In the establishment of the edition text, and the reading text extrapolated from it, in the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*, the variance concerned, as it happens, is largely, although not exclusively, a variation of accidentals. The need has already been observed of smoothing the seams of the continuous manuscript text as assembled from multiple sources at different stages of the text's progression through the pre-publication documents. To the examples indicated, other types may be mentioned. There are, for instance, the accidentals of the typescript. Over long stretches of the text, the fair copy and the typescript are the collateral witnesses of the lost final working draft behind them. Being the linear antecedent of the typescript from which the book was set up, it is, in terms of the documents, the source of the text's descent, whereas the

extant autograph fair copy isn't. The lost, and only to-be-reconstructed, manuscript may therefore be responsible for some of the typescript's accidentals, although typists' changes are also a factor to be reckoned with in accounting for the differences in accidentals between fair-copy and typescript text. On the other hand, these differences may of course also be due to genuine authorial alterations in accidentals introduced in the process of fair-copying from the lost working draft. Contrary to the situation prevailing for substantives (for which it is possible to isolate the authorial revisions to the lost working draft from the typescript, and on the other side to identify, from the fair copy, some revisions made to the basic working draft text in the course of the faircopying), the accidentals provide little leverage, or none, to determine their status either bibliographically or critically. The procedure adopted has therefore been to emend the typescript and fair copy against each other without a strict formalist rule. The pull of the copy-text—with the typescript, on account of its derivation from the lost revised final working draft, standing in for that section of the continuous manuscript—has made itself felt in a certain permissiveness towards the accidentals of the typescript. Always recorded in the apparatus as documented in the typescript, these have, if accepted, often also been additionally labeled to suggest that perhaps they originated in the final working draft.

The impossibility, then, is evident in the range of the variants of transmission to arbitrate objectively between the rival claims to acceptance of the accidentals of the fair copy and the typescript. The reason is the loss of the document itself of the final working draft. A similar rivalry of variants arises at the further stages of the pre-publication transmission between the accidentals of the autograph inscription and those of their transmissional reproduction. Due to the survival of the manuscript segments, it is less extreme, yet it is still real because autograph inscription and transmissional reproduction continuously interact. In these circumstances, as was indicated, the copy-text editing of the continuous manuscript text proceeds by balanced critical choices. No formalist alternative of hard-and-fast rules is available. For a text that, in its materiality of word forms, capitalisations, spellings, and punctuation, progresses through a maze of autographs and autograph segments, typescripts, pre-publication serialisations, and typesettings, it would make little sense to decree that only Joyce's autograph, or solely the typescript, or the proofs

alone be followed. Yet if instead the editing be accepted as the pragmatic business it is, the critical factor it involves may still be assessed and its import evaluated.

The copy-text editing of the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses*, in sum, attempts to reconcile the manuscript text and the transmission under conditions of a hermeneutic pragmatism. In the overall textual situation of *Ulysses*, confining copy-text editing—close to the mode in which copy-text editing was first conceived as an editorial methodology—to the field of the transmission also means confining it largely to establishing the edition's critical text in its accidentals. (Greg's distinction, though questionable theoretically, cannot easily be denied its practical usefulness.) The edition's substantives, to the large extent that they are its authorial variants of composition and revision, are, in the edition's design, the matter for assembly of the continuous manuscript text. Yet substantives, too, become a category of variants of transmission when, as is the case with the fair copy, the author acted as his own scribe. By the very nature of transmission, errors in the transcription of drafts into fair copy are inevitable (whereas, owing to their compositional status, working drafts as a manuscript class virtually exclude the category of "error"). Consequently, the fair-copy substantives of the continuous manuscript text must be expected potentially to be in need of emendation. Clearcut slips of the pen aside, editorial acting on this expectation is, however, much limited on the one hand by the survival pattern of the manuscripts—there are not many drafts available against which to check the fair copy—and on the other hand by the implicit stabilizing of the manuscript/fair-copy text in the course of the text's further revisional development. Nevertheless, even allowing for these factors, the collation of the extant pre-fair-copy drafts yields substantive variants critically deemed to correct scribal errors of the fair copy. In principle, and in accordance with the edition's emendation procedures for the continuous manuscript text, these have been held eligible as emendations in constituting the critical text. Considering the interlocking of composition, revision, and transmission, however, the proviso was observed that the—local—context underwent no further change.[19] Where later authorial changes affected

19. The proviso has repeatedly required explication, most recently so by way of my letter to the editor in *James Joyce Quarterly* 28 (1990–91): 1,017–21. See also below in the section "Handsome Unquestionably."

the local context, a scribal variant, though critically identified as such, has been left standing.

The result of the emendation of the continuous manuscript text—in accidentals and, with restraint, in substantives—may be seen as a move towards a "more publishable" text than the stark manuscript text would have been. It was felt that to shape the critical text to some degree editorially into a "more publishable" text was defensible, especially if the tendency was balanced by the determination to uphold for the critical *Ulysses* on the whole the quality of an "old-spelling," or original-spelling and original-pointing, text. In particular, the permissiveness to non-manuscript accidentals of punctuation, word forms (particularly one-word compounds), and spelling, once having been introduced in weighing the fair-copy and the typescript testimony in accidentals against one another, was extended to variants in the proofs and also in the post-publication printing tradition.[20]

What must be absolutely clear about these procedures of copy-text editing is that they have not been undertaken under the premise of an obligation to fulfill authorial intention. Authorial intentions may be self-evident, or recognizable, or obscure, or indeterminable. To observe and respect them always plays a significant role in the business of critical editing. Yet they are but one factor in the complex set of determinants through which the critical editing process wends its way. For *Ulysses*, neither an uncompromising rendition of the continuous manuscript text, nor, at the other extreme, a presentation of the first-edition text edited for only a minimum of incontrovertible errors, could be expected to fulfill the author's intentions, let alone his final ones. If this is a novel perspective on basic text-critical positions and editorial attitudes by current conventions, it is an insight arising from strictly confining the activity of copy-text editing to the variant field of transmissional changes. It amounts to a reduction of the methodology's author-centred claims and redefines copy-text editing as an editor's tool for exercising his responsibility towards the text. In adjusting the text by way of copy-text-editing procedures, the editor, it must be understood, does not act in a field of definite (let alone definitive) "rights" and "wrongs," but emends in a hermeneutic context. With the eclipse of intention and authority as editorial lode-

20. This is how the accidentals readings e.g. from the edition of 1932, so troublesome to "An Inquiry," got into the critical text.

stars, the sharp opposition of error and non-error also wanes, and emendation assumes the nature of an informed and considered suggestion arising out of the potentialities of the text. Text and emendation then communicate by way of the apparatus which—no longer a mere material adjunct—marks the trail of the editor's decisions. Writing editorial engagement with the text into the edition, it provides, too, a platform for the reader's rival engagement with the text and the edition (and its editor).

The Apparatus

The preservation of extensive records of authorial writing and rewriting, as in the case of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, is characteristic of recent ages in literary history. In response to this historical circumstance, modern German editorial theory has recognized the difference in kind between authorial alterations to and transmissional departures from a text. In the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*, an apparatus of diacritics superimposed upon the presentation of the edition text records, even as it displays synoptically, the compositional and revisional development of the continuous manuscript text. Conceptually, this synoptic apparatus constitutes the application to the editing of *Ulysses* of an apparatus mode known as "integral apparatus," and is thus (*pace* "An Inquiry," 412) not a free invention. The integral apparatus—of whatever design—is the answer of modern editing to the challenge which the dynamics of compositional and revisional variance, such as authorial manuscripts preserve it, present to the scholarly edition. Displaying that variance in context, and sensitive to modern literary theory in its emphasis on contextuality and the process character of texts, the integral apparatus permits the study in context of the acts and processes of writing (insofar as their record survives) through which a text was constituted, and constituted itself, under the author's hands.

While it sets a new dimension for the scholarly edition in conception and design as well as in usability potential, the integral apparatus does not displace or supersede the traditional lemmatized apparatus. It merely helps to circumscribe anew for the lemmatized apparatus the applications and functions for which that apparatus mode was originally de-

signed. By a division of functions, on account of which the integral apparatus responds to authorial variation, the lemmatized apparatus serves on the one hand to report the editorial acts of establishing the critical text, and on the other hand to record the text's, or work's, variable documentation. As a list of emendations, it is therefore the place to evaluate the editor's engagement with the text; as historical collation, it is the place to survey the text's history in transmission.

The continuous manuscript text (as emphasized before), and therefore the integral apparatus for *Ulysses*, does not "record literary documents." It presents the development of the text. The diacritical symbols of the apparatus are pairs of raised half-brackets, pairs of raised carets and pairs of brackets (square and pointed). With these symbols, all types of textual operation—deletion, addition, replacement, and transposition—may be indicated both within and between documents. The raised half-brackets, furthermore, delimiting areas of change, always receive an index, and so does the opening one of a pair of square brackets if the pair is not contained within a pair of half-brackets. Via the index, every textual operation may be traced back to the document where it was performed or initiated; or if that document is lost, to the document where its result first appears. By the indices, the textual development is stratified into levels (i.e., those levels which properly constitute themselves, as was explained above, in the interstices between the documents). The levels are therefore neither "invented" (as "An Inquiry" suggests), nor are they hypothetical. As to the symbols themselves, the half-brackets and brackets go with the inter-document changes. A pair of half-brackets encloses pure additions and deletions plus additions, i.e., replacements. Deletions are enclosed in square brackets, which are indexed in the case of pure deletions; otherwise, the index in the preceding half-bracket rules. The carets and pointed brackets are employed, in analogy to the half-brackets and square brackets, to indicate the intradocument changes, i.e., the levels within an indexed level created by revision on a given document.

What defines the levels is the author's action on the text. It is evidenced in the documents of composition and transmission. Yet a level is not to be equated with a document. A document only carries the evidence for a textual level. The need to distinguish between document and level be-

comes immediately clear from final working drafts, such as the "Ithaca" and "Penelope" chapters in the Rosenbach Manuscript.[21] These are each one document, but carry several levels, i.e., show several stages of the author's action on the text. Similarly, many of the chapter fair copies in the Rosenbach Manuscript carry at least one (usually minor) revision level over the basic fair-copy inscription. By contrast, two documents may provide the evidence for one text level. An important instance is the basic text level of the final working draft. It is a meaningful level to define for those chapters where the typescript was not copied from the fair copy, and it may be defined by the textual identity of fair copy and typescript together. Thus, a text level may be identifiable even where the primary carrier document, in this case the final working draft, is lost. At the same stage of the compositional development, moreover, not one, but two, or even three text levels may be distinguished. While the fair-copy and typescript identity defines the basic text level of the final working draft, their difference helps to isolate a revision level in that (lost) draft. In addition, elements of this difference may point to a revision level situated in the fair copy. These distinctions derive from the fact that fair copy and typescript were both copied from the lost final working draft, plus the circumstance that the typescript was so copied later than the fair copy. Commonly, in this situation, the typescript is the document source for the revision level of the final working draft. The typescript differs from the fair copy because the final working draft was worked over after the faircopying. Unless, therefore, the typescript introduces errors of its own, the typescript differences represent the revisions in the final working draft, while the fair copy alone documents the text of the final working draft before revision. Yet occasionally, that basic text was revised in the act of faircopying. If this was the case, it is the fair copy which carries a change and the typescript which transmits the basic final working draft reading. The instances when this reversal of the commonly assumed situation occurs are sometimes evidenced by *currente calamo* changes in the fair copy; at other times, they are only critically determinable.

The stages, then, of the development documented by the fair copy alone, or the fair copy and the typescript, divide into the following levels: [0] (zero; this level index is not given) = the fair copy, or fair-

21. See below, note 28.

copy-plus-typescript text identity, constituting the level of origin for the synoptic presentation of the growth of the text. **A** = addenda to this basic textual state, provided, for example, as instructions to the typist. **B** = generally, the first revision beyond the fair-copy text, or the initial text identity of fair copy and typescript. (Where the primary carrier document is lost, as is the final working draft, the index is given as **(B)**.) **R** = the level of revision—when the typescript is collateral to the fair copy— occasionally occurring in the act of faircopying. The evidence may be physical, but it may also consist in the existence alone of the unique fair-copy reading, its revisional status assessed critically. In temporal terms, **R** is intermediate between **A** and **B**. In terms of the development of the text, level **R** is on a par with level **B** as a stage of first revision of the basic final working draft text. Revisions designated by the index **V** belong to the same stage of first revision, and are equally to be localized in the fair copy only. The use of two indices, **R** and **V**, for the identical level of the text development is an exigency of the establishment of the critical text. Revisions indexed **R** enter the edited text. Revisions indexed **V** have been deemed inadmissible to the edited text for critical reasons, in observance of the edition's rule of invariant context. They have their place in the synopsis only, where of course they must be read in reverse direction: the bracket (a wavy one is here used) encloses the result, not the textual point of departure, of the revision.

As a document source for the levels of the text, the typescript is of particular interest. For all chapters where it derives collaterally with the fair copy from the lost final working draft, its typed text proves from the fair copy/typescript collation to divide into levels [0] and **B**, as explained. The autograph overlay on all typescripts for chapters 1–14, furthermore, is a composite of revisions entered at the time of the typing (1918–19), and revisions added in 1921 in preparation of the text for the book printer, Darantiere of Dijon. Distinguishing the resulting levels, levels **C** and **D**, is again only possible by the evidence of more than one document. The state of the text in the *Little Review* serialisation identifies the level-C revisions in the typescript overlay. The state of the text in Darantiere's first proofs, or placards, confirms that the rest of the autograph entries in the typescript are level-D revisions. This, it may be added, is a generalizing description broadly covering the situation for chapters 1–14. In exact particulars, each chapter is characterized by trans-

missional circumstances and a succession of levels of the text peculiarly its own. This is especially true for chapters 15–18, which were never serialized, and for which the transition from draft completion to preparation of copy for Darantiere was practically continuous. The system of level designation was modified accordingly, and was throughout adapted to the text situation of each chapter individually.

The succession of levels of revision in the proofs, finally, now indexed by arabic numbers and not letters of the alphabet, no longer has the chapter units, but the bibliographical units of the printer's sheets or gatherings as its document basis of reference. Throughout, however, the phases of the author's action on the text remain the differentiating criteria for the level designations.

The levels of the text are the categories of designation and analysis for the edition's synopsis alone. In the emendation footnotes and the historical collation, by contrast, it is the documents themselves that are the basis of reference. Their characteristic sigla, therefore—e.g., aR; tB; (aW):tC; 22; 32, etc.—are not level designators. They indicate that individual readings were editorially accepted or rejected as "authorial in the Rosenbach Manuscript" –aR–; or "transmissional in the basic type-script" –tB–; or "possibly originating in the lost final working draft, but transmissionally evidenced in the printer's copy typescript" –(aW):tC–; or "introduced in the edition of 1932" –32–; and so on. In other words, the sigla in the footnotes and historical collation function as source indicators always do in such lemmatized apparatuses.

Single Rosenbach Leaves

"An Inquiry" justifiably draws attention to a grey area. The bibliographical findings were suggestive, but inconclusive—the editor should have said so, and held back from positive claims even where he saw high probabilities; "Nausicaa," folio 55, would have served to save him from looking foolish.

However: the hypothesis that individual leaves incorporated in R were also, at one time, leaves in W (the final working draft) is not invalidated by the editorial contradictions drawn from "Nausicaa," folio 55. Specifically, it serves once more to underscore the importance of the logical distinction between text and document:

- The typist did not type from the Rosenbach manuscript. At the same time, the typist must have had a physical document, a batch of manuscript leaves, before her/him. Call this the final working draft.
- The possibility or probability that, in Joyce's working practice over those bulky chapters 13, 14, 15, some individual leaves have done/do double service draws attention to the fact that "document" and "text" are not definable in terms of each other.
- Nevertheless, we must reckon with the two quite distinct texts, that documented in the assembly of manuscript leaves the typist had before her or him, being the final working draft text; and that now documented in the batch of leaves making up Rosenbach manuscript for a chapter.

Granted the double-service hypothesis for individual leaves, the final working draft would be incomplete, were it extant, having been pillaged to make up R. Yet its text is complete, represented as it is by its copy. The copy is written out physically, materially, in the typescript. At the same time, the typescript text is distinct from the final working draft text. Strip the typescript text of typist errors and changes, and we get a final working draft text. The stripping is aided by comparison with the Rosenbach manuscript. Strip the Rosenbach manuscript of its unique changes, and we get a final working draft text—close enough to the one obtained from the stripped typescript to be attributable to the identical document, yet different enough to distinguish a basic level of inscription and an overlaid level of revision of text in the (lost) document. Play the differences of the texts in the extant documents (R and TS) against each other, and we may distinguish:

R and TS   agree in representing the basic level of the working draft [o]
"   "   "   disagree because TS documents a revision in working draft ((B))
"   "   "   disagree because R documents its own revision (R or V).

The Last Lonely Candle

"An Inquiry" reveals contradictions in a set of apparatus notes pertaining to text contained in R, folio 55. This is right: folio 55 of R was not a leaf in the typist's copy, the textual note to *U* 814.16 notwithstanding. Except for the untenable claim, however, the note may be upheld: "The early draft alters its original 'lonely last' to 'last lonely' by deleting 'lonely' and re-inserting it between the lines in a way that Joyce misread it as

'long' in copying. 'Last', which is clear in the draft, is ambiguous in R and is misread" (or: may confidently be conjectured as misread) "by the typist." Confidently? The evident ambiguity of R, combined with a general awareness of just how common the a/o ambiguity is in Joyce's handwriting, inspires the confidence. And, as for "lonely" versus "long": That the original deleted word in the early draft is "lonely" is quite clear. What the interlinear insertion in the draft is, is less clear. Seen in isolation, it can be deciphered neither as "long" nor as "lonely." In combination with untouched "last," however, it is likelier to be meant as "lonely" than "long," so that nothing more than a transposition has been performed of "lonely last" to "last lonely." The next step is scribal: from critical assessment of the paleographic appearance of the draft, it is assumed that Joyce in copying misread the ambiguous "lonely" as "long" and hence perhaps construed "last" as "lost." Perhaps: for R is sufficiently ambiguous in "last/lost" not to be read unhesitatingly like the typescript: "lost long."

In this complexity of original draft reading and transposition, fair-copy ambiguity and typescript transmission, the editor has the option of adjudicating scribal plus typing error; or revisional intent. If he assumes revisional intent, he will establish the text according to the typescript, which entails resolving the fair-copy ambiguity as "lost long." Else, he will act upon the critical recognition of a scribal error, read the fair copy more easily as "last long" (i.e., narrow down the scribal error to "long" for "lonely"), impute a misreading of "lost" for "last" to the typist, and restore the only genuinely performed Joycean reading of the sequence, namely the original (transposed) "last lonely." What tips the scale is that the "lost long candle" is very much a faded coal compared to the "last lonely candle" of the fireworks. "A last lonely candle wandered up the sky from Mirus bazaar in search of funds for Mercer's hospital" is therefore proposed as the edition text, critically so established from the manuscript sources. The example demonstrates succinctly that a critical edition is precisely that: critical. It can never be definitive. Skilled in responsibly weighing all evidence, a reader and user of the edition may, within the scope and limits of the evidence, redetermine the text and thereby experience its essential indeterminacy.

The Bibliographical Dimension

The challenge of editing Shakespeare, as is well known, taught textual criticism to harness bibliography to its ends. The analytical and descriptive tools of antiquarians, book collectors, and librarians were adapted to serve the textual critic. Around mid-century, "bibliography" and "textual criticism" had become virtual synonyms. Hence the current legacy of a predominantly Renaissance-oriented methodology is not only eclectic copy-text editing. It is also "the bibliographical way." Analytical and textual bibliography belong as a matter of course to the text-critical procedures employed in preparing the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses.*[22] Yet they are not central to its methodology. As an edition, it may serve to reflect upon, and in part reconsider, the role of bibliography in textual criticism and editing.

The edition does not base the establishment of the critical text on a printed source. It re-establishes *Ulysses* from manuscript. The *Ulysses* first edition, not unlike a Shakespeare quarto, prints a text derived in transmission. Yet unlike the circumstances prevailing for Shakespeare's quartos, not only the derivative text, but the sources of its derivation are extant. Hence, analytical and textual bibliography are not required to ascertain or infer textual authenticity. Suggesting that, from its perspective, the special Shakespearean situation proves marginal, the textual situation of *Ulysses* points to the relative position that bibliography must be recognized to occupy among the procedures of method and argument of textual criticism in general.

To assess that relativity in the case of *Ulysses*, it is convenient to distinguish between the pre-publication and the post-publication phases of the transmission. For the pre-publication, i.e., pre-first-edition, phase of transmission, we have manuscripts, typescripts, and proofs with manuscript overlay, plus the serialisations in *The Little Review* and *The Egoist*, as the carrier documents of the text. Commonly, they survive complete, or near-complete. Only at times, when there are gaps in a series (such as missing sections of the typescript, or the proofs), are

22. So should enumerative bibliography belong. But in surveying the printing history of *Ulysses*, the edition shows itself uninformed about some limited-edition resettings prior to 1984. The oversight is regrettable. "An Inquiry" indicts it as "unforgivable" (514). Morally reprehensible or not, it is irrelevant to the editing.

analytical and/or textual bibliography called for to assess the text, and to supplement the evaluative critical collation. This may concern near-to-trivial details such as the technical fact of the typewriters' fixed right margins by which letters (e.g., "eight" for "eighty") or marks of punctuation disappeared. Or it may, for the missing typescripts of the novel's three opening chapters, amount to a full-scale collational plus bibliographical enquiry into the variants of the three (for Chapter 1), or else two (for Chapters 2 and 3), typescript-derived texts in *Little Review*, *Egoist* (Chapter 1 only), and first book proofs. Here, it is the analytical logic of textual bibliography which serves to establish conclusively that each immediate post-typescript state of the text derives from a different exemplar of the typescript, of which—demonstrably so for Chapter 1— two were worked over by Joyce and one remained uncorrected (though not entirely unrevised). Since collation also ascertains that the typescript in its three exemplars (i.e., top copy and two carbons) was typed from the extant fair copy, it follows for the establishment of the text that where all three derivations depart from the fair copy, the reason lies in the typing, and the change is transmissional, but where one agrees with the fair copy, the (always identical) departure in the other two reflects Joyce's post-typing working-over, and the change is revisional. As it happens, the logical inference from bibliographical analysis is additionally corroborated by external evidence. The characteristic consequences are readily apparent in the very first paragraphs of the opening chapter.[23]

23. In pre-publicity materials—dated 2 February 1992—for their announced edition of *Ulysses* edited by John Kidd, W. W. Norton & Company Ltd. of London include a section "*Ulysses*: A Publication History" which states: "From 1918 to 1920, [Joyce] revised two typed copies and sent them to the literary journals *The Egoist* (London) and *The Little Review* (New York). The third copy, which he eventually sent to the French printer of the 1922 edition, was a mixture of corrected and uncorrected states of his typescript." W. W. Norton may be unaware that this is known less from external testimony than from the bibliographic analysis carried out as part of the original research for the critical and synoptic edition and reported in the Afterword, pp. 1,869–74. The analysis pivots on the evaluation of variants. It makes neither text-critical nor editorial sense to accept the document hypothesis but to discount its textual basis and repudiate the editorial consequences. Yet this is what the Norton statement proceeds to do when it indicates that the new *Ulysses* edition will maintain the "standard" wording "by" (for "on," *U*:1.3), "up" (for "out," *U*:1.6), "country" (for "land," *U*:1.10), and "low" (for "slow," *U*:1.24) in the novel's first page.

Three of these readings fall squarely into the category of triply witnessed typescript departures from the manuscript: for "out," the typist typed "up" in anticipation of "up" twice in the following line; for "land," he substituted "country" (a native speaker memorising rather than always copying *literatim*); and for "slow," he typed "low," resisting the notion of a "slow whistle" and not appreciating that it echoes the phrase "Slow music,

Thus, for the opening episodes of *Ulysses* a bibliographical argument closes the gap in documentation caused by the loss of the typescript, and in a manner substitutes for that loss. This, typically, is the way textual criticism operates: to formulate an overall editorial hypothesis as a reference base for the pragmatic business of editorial decisions, it substitutes links of a logical construction for the lacunae in the actual documents. It may, as here, invoke bibliography to do so. Yet it has other means equally at its disposal, foremost, of course, the critical evaluation of collations. It is important to realize that bibliographical investigations do not always yield conclusive results, or if they do, that these results are not always textually, and hence editorially, relevant. It is a common enough experience that bibliographical findings remain tentative and indeterminate, or that, while illuminating the technical production of the document or book, they do not significantly support textual criticism or guide the editing.

In the practical textual criticism serving the editing of *Ulysses*, bibliographical investigations sometimes led to partial or no results. The efforts proved inconclusive in particular to analyse, for several of the individual episodes, the relationship between the physical make-up of the autograph and the textual transmission. Fold patterns in batches of leaves of the "Circe" autograph, for example, were strongly suspected to bear a relationship to the history of the text, i.e., to the phases of its drafting as well as to its successive typing in segments. That is, a particular matching fold would indicate just the batch of leaves that went to the typist at one specific, though to our knowledge no longer specifiable, time. But it appeared impossible to assemble enough evidence, internal or external, to

---

please." at U:1.22. These three readings—"up," "country," and "low"—were transmitted into all three typescript derivations. The fourth reading, by contrast, the preposition "by" of the manuscript, was to all appearances accurately typed, since it reappears unchanged in the first edition's first proofs (and hence, in the first edition). The alternative "on" is to be found independently in *Little Review* and *Egoist* only, which is to say: as the result of a revision entered in two of the typescript exemplars. Two distinct transmission patterns combine to support the document hypothesis. On its strength, it is by rejecting three corruptions and accepting one revision that one arrives at "on," "out," "land," and "slow," establishing them as the critically determined readings over the "standard" of 1922.

In 1985, countering John Kidd's "Errors of Execution in the 1984 *Ulysses*" (the exchange is now printed in *Studies in the Novel* 22 [1990]: 237–56), I pointed out that, while criticizing bibliographical procedures, he appeared less than assured in face of bibliographical reasoning and the force of a bibliographical argument. The instance then was the question of Joyce's corrections to the 1936 printing. Now it is the text in relation to the document situation for the opening chapters. I discern no change in appreciation.

verify the suspicion and consolidate it, say, into a sequence of dates. Nor—and this is the sticking point for the editorial enterprise—did what evidence there was seem to hold much promise of mattering in terms of establishing a critical text, or even just of differentiating further the synopsis of the textual development. In both these respects, however, the situation, under circumstances not altogether dissimilar to "Circe," was significantly exceptional for "Ithaca." Here, the segmental drafting and successive typing and retyping proved very well amenable to bibliographical analysis, which decisively helped to shape both synopsis and reading text. For "Nausicaa," the variant patterns from collation of fair copy and typescript, when related to the bibliographical units of the manuscript leaves, were frankly tantalizing. Again and again, they seemed to come close to appearing like proof of an hypothesis that the actual extant assembly of loose fair-copy leaves, which as a whole was clearly not the typist's copy, may have leaves intermixed that at the time of the typing were part of that copy. In the abstract, the hypothesis is not a wild guess. For "Circe," after all, its mirror image is demonstrable. Taken as a whole, the manuscript of "Circe" was the typist's copy, yet there are leaves intermixed in it that indubitably were not.[24] Nevertheless, for "Nausicaa" the evidence remains tentative at most, and where in a textual note I suggested that for one leaf it was strong enough, "An Inquiry" has rightly pointed out that the edition itself, from the assessment of other variants, contradicts the assertion (see above, "Single Rosenbach Leaves"). The hypothesis that, where Joyce habitually copied his intermediate and final drafts on loose leaves, some such leaves individually wandered downstream from one draft to the next, e.g., from final working draft to fair copy—or, to put it another way: that some amount of reshuffling of loose leaves took place when the fair copy was made ready for sale—remains less than proven for "Nausicaa." The textual evidence is moot, and bibliographical analysis, itself by no means always counterindicative, did not yield enough leverage for verification or falsification. Hence, bibliographical investigation was abandoned. This act of common sense, in terms of the pragmatics of textual criticism, should hold no surprise for the experienced textual critic and editor, who will also recognize that editorial attitude and action conform to it: with no demonstrable grounds for even a partial (e.g., leaf-by-leaf) alternative,

24. See Afterword, pp. 1,883–85.

"Nausicaa" is simply edited like all the other spisodes where fair copy and typescript (as the derivatives of the lost final working draft) are collateral witnesses to the early-version text.

Such, then, without the tyranny of practice induced by absolute demands of an abstract methodology or theory, have been the pragmatics of bibliography in the textual criticism exercised for the pre-publication phase of the transmission to support the editing. Bibliography has provided one of several perspectives on the textual situations, though by no means always the decisive one. Bibliographical enquiries were pursued, and their findings scrutinized, for their relevance to the task of editing. But this very criterion strictly limited bibliographical investigation *per se*. At the risk even of errors of judgment as to invoking or not invoking bibliography, not every form of bibliographical analysis imaginable was carried out. This means among other things that, for aspects peripheral or not apparently relevant to the text, a comprehensive, and specifically bibliographical, study of *Ulysses*, from the manuscripts through the entire pre-publication phase and up to and including the first edition, still remains to be undertaken.

Relevance to the editorial task was also the guiding principle for the deployment of bibliography in investigating the post-publication phase of the transmission of *Ulysses*. Here especially, the edition's basic rationale became significant. Its central concern was to build up, from the authorial states of the text in the documents of composition and prepublication transmission, a critical text, as an ideal counterpart to the text actually published. On such a critical edition text, the states of the text in the publishing history, beginning with the first-edition text, have, or would have, a bearing only if Joyce revised *Ulysses* beyond the first edition's final proofs. Yet a textual survey from 1922 onwards shows that revision ended on the final proofs. The text was repeatedly attended to thereafter, it is true, but exclusively in the way of correction. Moreover, what intermittent and unsystematic correction there was, was only partially, and very unevenly, the author's.

The assessment that the post-publication variance was void of revision, initially gained from external documentation as well as from survey check collations, obviously needed verification. It also required policy decisions. Methodically, the policy decisions took precedence. Important among these were those concerning the recording and reporting of vari-

ants. With regard to the ins and outs of transmissional corruption (mis-readings, misprints, and related errors) and correction in the pre-publi-cation phase, it was a declared rule for the edition that misprints and their correction in typescripts and proofs which restored the original state of the text were not recorded or reported. Textual errors, on the other hand, which reached the first edition were listed in the Historical Collation. The extension of the rule, *mutatis mutandis*, into the post-publication phase of the transmission seemed logical within the edition's own system: Textual changes by means of correction in the second and subsequent printings of the first edition, and in the second and subsequent editions and their impressions, were not to be taken note of or presented in their entirety. This implies that the post-first-edition printing history was not an objective in its own right of the edition. The position is defensible partly because the ins and outs of corruption and correction within and between the editions are analogous to those in the successive proofs before publication, and partly—and more importantly—because, where the cor-rections, at whatever stage of the printing history, removed a first-edition textual error, they would, and could be seen to, restore the text to a state which the critical edition text had established anyhow by its own means of building up the text of *Ulysses* afresh from the authoritative docu-ments. Only the author's own corrections in the post-publication phase were not passed over in silence. They fall, in the main, into two groups: the corrections from Joyce's contribution to the several errata lists, for which these errata lists have been cited as a source (mostly an additional source) in the historical collation, and the corrections critically singled out from a collation yield between the 1936 private Bodley Head edition and its 1937 general-market reprint as the result of Joyce's proofreading.

Again, it was the editorial and hence textual concern which defined the extent and limits of bibliographical procedures. A test collation by Hinman Collator of multiple copies of the three states on different paper of the first edition's first impression was begun but only pursued to a point when it became evident that the expense of manpower, money, and time could not be justified for the purposes of the edition's tex-tual objectives. Anyone carrying it on for an analysis of the story of the printing of the first edition would, by contrast, still stand a fair chance of making interesting, strictly bibliographical discoveries about a book production that was unusual in many respects for the twentieth

century. Hinman collation was furthermore undertaken to double-check the survey assessment of the post-publication textual history within the series of printings of the first (Paris, 1922 to 1925), second (Paris, 1926 to 1930), third (Hamburg, 1932 to 1939), and sixth (London, 1936 and 1937) editions of *Ulysses*. Had—contrary to expectation, or pre-knowledge gained by external documentation or inter-edition collation—revision or substantial correction with author participation occurred at any point within these series, the fact was bound to have been discovered from comparison of single exemplars of each first and last impression.[25] In one case, and in one case only, the result was positive. Joyce's corrective proofreading of the 1936 Bodley Head edition for its 1937 reprint could be substantiated, and proven to be his only proper proofing of *Ulysses* after finishing his revisions and corrections of the first edition's final proofs in January 1922.

The James Joyce–Paul Léon papers in the National Library of Ireland in Dublin, made available to the public on 5 April 1992,[26] confirm essential results of the collational and bibliographical investigations for the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*. Revealingly, Paul Léon mentions to J. B. Pinker, Joyce's agent in London, that Joyce has not read either the Odyssey Press nor the Random House edition of *Ulysses* (29 December 1934). Learning that Stuart Gilbert had corrected the Odyssey Press edition, Allen Lane suggested that this should be the edition for the Bodley Head to print from (9 January 1935). His further suggestion that they be provided with a marked-up copy was not taken up. Instead, the course chosen as the typesetting progressed was that batches of queries were sent to Léon, who referred them all to Joyce himself, either directly in Paris, or by forwarding them to him on his vacation trip to Hamburg and Copenhagen in August and early September 1936. As lists on separate enclosures to the correspondence, they were naturally returned (and

25. The Newberry Melville edition may be cited as an example for similarly judiciously selective collation. See, for instance, Herman Melville, *Typee*, eds. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and the Newberry Library, 1968), 305, 3.c., and note 6.

26. *The James Joyce–Paul Léon Papers in the National Library of Ireland*. A Catalogue Compiled by Catherine Fahy (Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 1992). As they relate to *Ulysses*, they were kindly investigated by Dr. John O'Hanlon.

have therefore not survived). Only the first batch of queries was part of the body of the letter-text itself and has thus been preserved. It reveals the

typical printer's concern with minutiae of spelling and punctuation. This fully bears out the critical edition's analytical assessment that the 1936 edition, in line with its predecessors, shows no traces of authorial proof-reading.

Equally, and more significantly, the results of the Hinman collation of the 1936 limited and 1937 unlimited Bodley Head edition are confirmed and vindicated by the Joyce–Léon papers. The 1937 edition does incorporate authorial proof corrections.[27] One amendment nonetheless must be made to our previous assumptions: Joyce did not proofread *Ulysses* in Copenhagen in 1936. There, he still answered merely the final printer's queries sent him in preparation of the 1936 limited edition published on 1 October 1936. ("There are incorporated in the limited edition about a hundred corrections chiefly of punctuation." Paul Léon to Messrs. Monro Saw, 22 February 1937.) But when that edition was out, he did read and correct sections of the text. Pages 368–73 are specified as yielding eight or nine changes, as are pages 600–10 with one change only (27 October 1936 and 22 February 1937). What other sections Joyce read, the Joyce–Léon papers do not inform us. Importantly, however, pages 368–73 comprise the opening of "Oxen of the Sun." This was precisely where the Hinman collation revealed one cluster of changes going back to the pre-first-edition state of the text that could only have been Joyce's. That a proof-reader—a Mr. Fiefield—went through the 1936 published text against a copy of the Odyssey Press edition is equally documented in the Joyce–Léon papers, which thereby on both counts—author's and proofreader's corrections—promote the critical edition's analytical inferences to the status of assertable fact. At the same time, the disparagement, first voiced in 1985, of the bibliographical investigations on which the critical edition founded its text and apparatus in relation to the 1936 and 1937 Bodley Head editions is shown to have been justly refuted.[27a] It is true that from the cumulative reference in the Joyce–Léon papers to the proofing of the 1936 published text it becomes clear that the major share of the changes made to the plates was marked by the proofreader. Yet the essential, if minor, share of authorial corrections cannot be denied. In terms of the

27. Walter Hettche and Claus Melchior, "A Famous Fighter and Mairy's Drawers: Joyce's Corrections for the 1936 John Lane Edition of *Ulysses*," *James Joyce Quarterly* 21 (1983–84): 165–69.

27a. See above, note 23.

critical edition's basic conception, of course, the whole matter, while shown to have been appropriately investigated and analyzed, is and remains a distinctly subsidiary issue. There is no question of revision, and the late authorial corrections do not in any way affect the authenticity of the edition's established text. What demands the textual concern of the edition could make on bibliography were therefore fulfilled in the scope of the Hinman collations expended on the post-publication transmission of *Ulysses*.

Originals and Copies

The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* has its share of editorial inaccuracies—as who would expect otherwise. That these are—and have been—easily detected is a function of its design, presupposing as it does the existence of the facsimile of the Rosenbach Manuscript and the photo-reproductions in the James Joyce Archive as visual reference copy to the original drafts, fair copies, typescripts, and proofs which survive.[28] Corresponding to the guidance that visual copy may provide for readers and critics has been the use of such copy in the routine work of establishing the edition. Inaccuracies in the edition have been blamed on the use of facsimiles and photo-reprints in the place of originals.[29] This is mistaken. The blame, if justified at all, could be aimed at only a fraction of the edition's residue of error. The reliance on copy—an exigency to be acknowledged for the day-to-day practice of scholarly editing, and controlled within a system of checks and balances, common sense, and calculated risks—is not the cause for the edition's inaccuracies. These are not systematic, or endemic to any methodological faultline of the edition, but are no more and no less than instances of human failure that have slipped by the editorial controls.

28. James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*. With a critical introduction by Harry Levin and a bibliographical preface by Clive Driver, 3 vols. (London: Faber and Faber, in association with the Philip & A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation, Philadelphia, 1975); *The James Joyce Archive*, ed. Michael Groden et al., 63 vols. (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1977–79).

29. Without convincingly indicating that he has explored firsthand the complexity of the practice of originals versus copies for the *Ulysses* edition, G. Thomas Tanselle has been prominent in taking John Kidd's wholesale indictment at face value in "Reproductions and Scholarship," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 25–54, esp. 32.

As designed, these controls provided for all originals to have been seen and analysed in their inscriptional and material properties before visual copy was resorted to for the editorial routines. Repeated returns to the originals, in their diverse locations, followed, with lists of queries unresolvable from the copies. What appeared unproblematic in the routine editorial work but was nevertheless erroneously recorded was hence liable to slip through the nets of control (as did a spurious Captain *Culler), since a complete eye collation of the editorial transcript against the originals was not undertaken. This constituted a calculated risk incurred for reasons of economy. The potential improvement of an already highly precise editorial record was deemed to be out of proportion to the additional investment of man-hours and grant money it would have required. The pragmatic decision did not leave the edition unscathed. Yet to have eliminated a few additional blunders—to have rightly named Captain Buller, which would have been most fortunate—would have been no guarantee against a residue of oversights still remaining. The striving for absolute perfection in a perfectionist discipline such as scholarly editing runs the fundamental—and mindless—risk of infinite recess, to be halted with intelligence and out of a sense of responsibility which ultimately considers not the text, or editorial anxiety, alone.

The reaction to the use of copies in the preparation of the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* has been both disingenuous and a trifle hysterical. It may therefore not be out of place to view the matter in a somewhat wider perspective. In considering the question of the copy from which an editor works, one might distinguish an ideological, an ethical, and a practical dimension. In scholarly commitment to the firsthand (meaning: first-eye, first-touch, first-smell) immediacy of the testimony and the testimonials of the past, nothing short of working both from and with original documents will serve the textual critic and editor. With its promise of the closest attainable proximity to authority and the author, this is an ideologically transcendent attitude. At the same time, it satisfies practical needs: for perceiving and assessing the materiality of manuscripts (their format and paper, inks, penstrokes, positionings of every mark, letter, word, or doodle), there is no substitute for the originals. The originals, too, are by definition free of errors, which every derivation from them inexorably acquires—including of course the scrupulous transcripts of editors. Not only the idea (and ideology) of textual purity,

therefore, but the ethics of professional conduct stipulate that the editor go back to the originals to check his or her work against them (over and over, perhaps even reading collations backwards). The professional code of conduct attempts to balance and regulate the realities—namely that the scholarly editor, in day-to-day labour, can and does *not* work with and from original documents.

To assess the relationship of originals and copies, the further distinctions of textual record, inscription, and materiality may be introduced. The textual record is characterized by the use of signs. The conventionalized graphics of letters, arabic numerals, and marks of punctuation form units (strings, or tokens) of unambiguous meaning. Given the conventions of the alphabet, and of grammar, syntax, and semantics, the textual record is doubly systematized, and hence doubly controlled. Its systematic orders are privileged as regular and predictable. The inscription, by contrast, which has the quality of an image, is aleatory. The positionings, spacings, shapes, and sizes of the marks on paper of a given manuscript—as such, and by themselves, and taken at a level unoriented towards meaning—are random and unpredictable. This is so not only because there will be more, and other, marks than the token signs of language on a document; one is likely to find it replete, too, with unpredictably scattered carets, underscorings, crossings-out, blots, doodles, and the like. It is so also because the graphic conventions regularly observed for the textual record may in actual, and random, individual occurrences be countervened, defied, or annihilated in the inscription. Spellings may be misleading, the distinction of captalization versus non-capitalization obscure, the forms of letters (e.g., "a" versus "o") undistinguishable, or the handwriting, in whole or in part, thoroughly illegible. On the semantic level, the very language may prove impenetrable.[30] Random in itself, the inscription thus also impinges on the textual record unpredictably; and, though it impinges, there is no rule to distinguish those of its characteristics which have a significance for the textual record from those which do not. Both the textual record and the inscription, finally, are based in the materiality of the given original: its size, paper, paper quality, foldings, quirings, creases and tears, its inks, crayon markings, or pencillings.

30. The passage in episode 16 of *Ulysses*—*U* 1426.6–7 / *U*:16.1452–4—is a crux for this reason. The inscription in the Rosenbach Manuscript will resist being read as textual record as long as we remain unsure what of the passage is to be taken as English, what as French, or whether the assumption of a mixture of languages is correct at all.

Considered beyond itself, the materiality merges pervasively with the inscription (crayon over ink, for instance, is a material property of the inscription). Via the inscription it also affects the textual record. Different colours or shades of the ink may indicate successive levels of revision; and a corner of a manuscript leaf torn off, or a page of manuscript missing, may mean an irrecoverable loss of text.

These distinctions may seem to belabour the obvious, or else appear unduly abstract in view of the nature of manuscripts as images. But they should help better to assess the relationship that copies bear to originals for a textual critic and editor and, in consequence, to consider with circumspection the standard situation under which she and he work with copies. Its basic condition is one of distance, and of losses. Yet the degree of loss differs significantly between the orders of materiality, inscription, and textual record. At one end of the scale, a copy, by definition, preserves nothing of the materiality of an original. At the other end, the textual record—in so far, and as long, as it is held unambiguous under the double control of the alphabet and of language—ideally loses nothing in copying. The problematic area is that of the inscription. It is this which modern technology, in providing visual rather than transcriptional copy, has succeeded in bringing up for permanent close attention.

The longhand transcriptions of old were essentially transmissions of the textual record. Once carried away from the holding libraries of the originals to the textual scholar's study, they were visually divorced from the manuscripts they were the copies of. While naturally—that is, by virtue of the cultural conventions—analogous to these in the graphics of the writing, they retained none of the image quality of the originals. Neither the randomness of the inscription, as constituting that image quality, nor the materiality of the originals was ideographically convertible into the longhand transcriptions. If not for that reason neglected or ignored altogether, they could be recorded only by symbols or descriptive discourse.

Longhand transcriptions have been rendered largely dispensable, if not altogether obsolete, by modern photographic and photo-reprint reproduction. This retains the textual record not as a transliteration, but as an image of the original inscription. Moreover, in imaging before our eyes not only the text, but essentially all signs and marks on paper of a given manuscript in their shapes and pictorial relationships, if not in

their materiality, they shift significantly the demarcation line between what, and what not, of an original may be perceived from a copy. Correspondingly, they reduce, though they do not render redundant, descriptive and symbolic representation of what does not show up in that, or any, copy. The loss of the original's materiality in itself, and in its interdependence with the inscription, remains a serious impediment, and is under all circumstances ignored only at the editor's peril. Nevertheless, to be able to keep an image of the image of the original before the eye has some off-setting gains for the textual critic's and editor's work. Given a prior visual and tactile experience, and a paleographic and bibliographic knowledge, of the original, the visual copy acts as a superior reminder, as well as an incentive to further refinement, to the analytical findings of textual criticism. More importantly still, such copy supports the editorial tasks of transcription and verification of the text. It reduces in number the successive transcriptions required where editions are prepared in the traditional way. In the era of computer-based editing and electronic typesetting, the repeated transcriptions may be reduced to one and, barring input corrections, one only. The associated advantage for the textual verification derives from the circumstance that, as observed, the copy better stands in for the textual record than for any other feature of the original. Wherever the text, under the double control of the conventions of writing and of language, is unambiguous, the copy is wholly adequate as a control document to verify it.

The modern visual copy renders a scholarly edition transparent in ways unparalleled before the advent of the technology of photo-reproduction. The opportunity to improve, as well as to check on, the accuracy of the editorial performance, however, is but an elementary order of such transparency. The potential for innovating the format of editions is of greater moment. The availability of visual copy makes practical sense of designing apparatuses both to convey the solutions of editorial problems in terms of the editor's critical understanding of the text, and to function as a system of reference to the writing processes in the originals. In heightening the transparency of the text itself, this holds out opportunities for a deepened engagement, through an edition, with the work and text edited.

The Use of the Computer

Scholars, and particularly editors, in their work today may commonly be assumed to be using computers. In the humanities, this generally means the hardware of personal (micro) computers, with the software of commercial word processing systems and some "desktop publishing" facilities, and perhaps some command of elementary programming skills. In such a surface environment, input and output data usually—to adapt terminology from sound recording—stand in an "analog" relationship ("What You See Is What You Get"), not a digital one. Scholarly editing, by contrast, makes demands on the in-depth data processing potential of computers for text storage and control, collation, form and language analysis, text and apparatus formatting, concording, indexing, and, ultimately, either electronic typesetting or dynamic (hypertext) screen display. The computer does not merely provide a substitute carrier medium, in imitation, as it were, of paper, ink, and print. Exploratively utilized, it generates innovative procedures and sequence structures for the pragmatics of editing. Yet although it may support and encourage responses to notions of textual dynamics and instability, the computer plays little part in theorizing textual criticism and editing. Nor—and this is perhaps most essential—does, can, or must it displace or replace the conceptual or procedural design and control functions of editors as rooted in their trained skills and critical judgment. This means for editors not to acquiesce in what computers have routinely been confectioned to perform, but to insist that they function according to the requirements of an editorial task in hand. To define that task, on the other hand, in full awareness of the computer's potential and limitations is, in the history of text-critical and editorial methodology, a new demand on scholarly editors. Correspondingly, it is a new demand on critics of computer-aided editions to address and evaluate the computer-related specificities of editorial procedures and results. This is a—yet another—problem area which "An Inquiry" barely faces, commonly doing little more, incidentally and in passing, then sneering in layman's fashion at some real or imagined consequences of the use of the computer in the realisation of the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*.

The gains from the computer to establish the *Ulysses* edition have been

significant, and should be evident. It served to store, verify, and secure the text. It input and collated all textual states and performed innumerable searches, collocated and formatted the synopsis, extrapolated the reading text, generated the footnote and appended apparatuses, and set the type electronically for publication of both the three-volume critical edition and the one-volume reading text. Beyond that, it also produced the *Handlist*, or wordform concordance, to the reading text.[31]

As the transcription base and storage medium for the text, as well as the typesetting agent for the edition, the computer secured a superior overall textual accuracy (the residue of error notwithstanding: using the computer caused it as little as did the standard consultation of visual copy; thanks to the computer, that residue is minimal). In terms of editorial procedures, it transformed conventional routines of collation by radically reducing the need for constant observation of text that does not change, bringing the variants alone to the focus of editorial decision-making. To be able to isolate variants as a separate, and heuristically separable, body of text proved of particular advantage in defining the strata of the synopsis. Here, the data processing strengths of the computer were utilized to perform a comprehensive collation of an early-text sub-edition against the first-edition text and then to match the resulting composite body of variation against a set of individual transcriptions of the document-specific revisions (e.g., the changes authorially written into the typescripts and each successive set of proofs respectively). This—besides helping to separate corruption from authentic text in the printed changes and accretions, which was not a computer-dependent activity—permitted introducing automatically the coding to signal the levels and stages of the textual development. The coding, as diacritical meta-text, was thereby generated error-free throughout in its innumerable individual notations. This manner of establishing the synopsis exemplifies how the computer was capable of suggesting innovative approaches to the editorial routines. In the case of the lemmatized footnote and appended apparatuses, furthermore, its organizing and formatting strengths were drawn upon. From a cumulation of computer collations, first, the footnotes were tagged into the edition text, and the historical collations into the reading

31. Wolfhard Steppe with Hans Walter Gabler, *A Handlist to James Joyce's* Ulysses: *A Complete Alphabetical Index to the Critical Reading Text* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1986).

text; then, the respective apparatuses were automatically extracted, and automatically supplied with their reference identifications of page.line or espisode.line numbers and lemmata.

For the consistency, transparency, and accuracy, then, of the editorial apparatus in its divers manifestations, as well as of the presentation in print of text and apparatus, the use of the computer provided a secure guarantee. Yet for recording the document source texts and establishing the edition text, it offered "merely" significant help. The distinction is important. It follows from the obvious facts that computers cannot verify their input, but can only assist in verifying it; and that they do not make decisions but, again, can at most be directed to pre-sort decision material. Computer-aided editing does not differ from traditional editing in principle. It does so, however, in its organisation. The resulting difference in routines is significant. The use of the computer in scholarly editing focusses an editor's critical and control functions in the verification of input and the decisions over output. Text verification and proofreading come to be concentrated in its early stages rather than occupying the editor through the entire course of a project and reaching a major peak at the end. The textual material of an edition, once transformed into electronic data and verified against the document sources, may be relied upon to stay secure in computer storage if subsequently, throughout the computer-aided editing processes, it remains "untouched by human hands" (that is, if collation, text-merging, the generating of apparatuses, etc., are automated, running in batch-mode, and not performed interactively at the computer screen, where each interactive operation holds a potential for fresh error). The verification itself, while the computer collation facilities may be enlisted to support it, depends exclusively on observant accuracy and corrective precision of the human eye and hand. It is moot whether or not, for the *Ulysses* edition, the "proofreading of what was put into [the] computer [was] insufficient" (*cf.* "An Inquiry," 413). A residue of error may under any circumstances be taken to indicate "insufficient proofreading," if one so chooses. The important point to realise is that original textual readings right or wrong do not result from "reliance on the computer."[32] For the subsequent stages of the editorial process, and the critical establishment of the edition text in particular, the

---

32. This is of course true, too, for the ghost entries or non-entries for witnesses collated in the historical collation. They are also logically errors of observation and only incidentally, if at all, due to the storing of the observations as electronic data.

case is essentially the same. Computer collation, it is true, will provide the record of textual variation from the textual data as input and verified. But the assessment of the variation, and the application to it of decisions in selecting or rejecting readings, is a critical activity dependent on editorial rationale and judgment, and is as such independent of the computer.

However, it should also be observed that, within the entire framework of a computer-aided organisation pattern for critical editing, the critically independent decision-making may not at all times be wholly, and as it were innocently, independent of the working environment created by the computer. The editor will be working from computer printouts, rather than constantly from original documents, or copies thereof, directly. The *Ulysses* edition provides at least one instance—shrewdly observed and highlighted in *The Scandal of Ulysses*, if not in "An Inquiry"—where such working at an environmental middle-distance has contributed to faulty editorial decisions.

Handsome Unquestionably

Two chapters which, as it happens, stand in symmetry to each other within the eighteen-chapter space of *Ulysses,* namely episodes three and sixteen, "Proteus" and "Eumaeus," happen both also to be among the minority of chapters for which pre-fair-copy drafts have survived. The question arises, how do the draft texts relate to the fair-copy texts and what effect, if any, do the draft texts have on the establishment of the edition's critical text? In genetic terms, the draft texts for these chapters immediately precede the fair-copy texts. A fully comprehensive synopsis of the development of the *Ulysses* text from the earliest surviving draft stages onwards would incorporate them. Owing to the systematic decision to define the fair copy/Rosenbach MS as the base line for the synopsis throughout, they do not enter the continuous manuscript text and are therefore not integral to the critical edition's copy-text.[33] Without the copy-text bonus, their text may be considered at a disadvantage in asserting itself. A global assessment of both the document and the text relation-

33. The respective textual situations which the "Proteus" and "Eumaeus" drafts exemplify contribute to specifying the reasons for the systematic definition of the synopsis base line. Not only are "Proteus" and "Eumaeus" among a minority of chapters with surviving drafts. Also, while the "Proteus" draft comprises the entire chapter, the "Eumaeus" draft exists only in fragments. Both the "Proteus" and the "Eumaeus" drafts are

ship between draft and fair copy must define the conditions, if any, of admitting their readings to the critical text.

A decisive question is whether the textual differences between fair copy and draft are due to revision or corruption. It is the distinction always to be made at the points of transition of a text from one document to the next, although it makes a significant difference whether the author or a scribe/typist/compositor produces the derived document. The methodological assumption is that the author revises, the scribe corrupts; authorial changes as revisions invalidate preceding authorial text, scribal changes do not. This clearcut opposition, however, is complicated by the consideration that the author's performance in copying is also that of a scribe. The purely formalist distinction must therefore be critically balanced. In the case of "Proteus," it is true, comparison of the draft and the fair copy indicates a superior overall compositional and aesthetic, as well as scribal, control of the textual development and transfer. It points, in other words, to the thoroughly revisional nature of the fair copy, against which, without danger of special pleading, hardly a variant potentially suspect could be plausibly upheld as an authorially scribal error or oversight in copying. Hence, to give an example, the copy-text—in this case, the reading of the fair copy—remains unemended at U:3.70: "I pull the wheezy bell of their shuttered cottage: and wait.", even though the antecedent draft reading: "I pull the wheezy bell of their shuttered cottage: and wait. Twice." might induce the suspicion that Joyce, in this individual instance, merely failed to copy "Twice.", i.e., did not revise (by deleting) as author, but committed an eyeskip (across "Twice." to the following "They") as scribe. The recensional assumption of an eyeskip is possible; yet it is neutralized by the critical assumption of an overall revisional control of the transfer of "Proteus" from draft to fair copy.

The critical, and text-critical, climate of opinion changes for "Eumaeus." This is not so much due to the circumstance that only fragments of the pre-fair-copy draft survive, as to the fact that these fragments demonstrate an intense, and probably protracted, process of composition, which has cluttered them in the extreme. In their final textual state, they

---

the linear as well as the immediate antecedents of their respective fair copies. By contrast, the "Nausicaa" holograph draft and the "Sirens," the "Oxen of the Sun," and the "Circe" autograph fragments precede the fair copies at one or several removes. The "Cyclops" drafts, at several removes, also point to a different textual development than that reached in the chapter fair copy.

are quite close to the fair copy—distinctly closer, in fact, than is the "Proteus" draft to the "Proteus" fair copy—but it is also clear that, revision in fair-copying apart, Joyce did not copy them as faithfully and with as much control as might be expected.

The critical question which this gives rise to is whether the evident shortcomings in "faithful copying" are in truth—or great likelihood—scribal failings, potentially to be emended; or whether they are no such thing, but are to be taken as compositional/revisional on the strength of the authorial writing act. Such absolute power of validation, or authorization, of the text is commonly granted an autograph manuscript; but it is usually also conceded that an author in copying makes mistakes, albeit these tend to be recognized only when they appear as impossible alternatives (defective grammar and syntax, misspellings, words of contextually erroneous meaning). Changes producing formally intact text tend less easily, if at all, to be considered attributable to an authorial scribal failing, even though it stands to reason, one would think, that an author when he copies cannot automatically be expected to escape the scribal hazards of lapses in concentration, or confused orientation in the draft copied. The heavily worked-over draft of "Eumaeus" on the one hand, however, and the recurrent trailings-off in the chapter fair copy on the other hand, suggest that Joyce's powers of concentration were over-taxed at the time of faircopying, and that he at times simply lost his bearings in face of the draft. The editorial recension, therefore, has in particular weighed carefully fair-copy omissions of individual draft words and phrases, has correlated their disappearance in copying to the circumstances and locations of their inscription as additions in the draft, and has thus attempted to distinguish critically revisional deletion from scribal oversight in copying.[34]

This is how, its omission assessed as a copying error, "handsome" has come to be restored in the phrase "the usual handsome blackguard type" at *U*:16.1804–5. Neither the reading as such, nor its restoration to the text of *Ulysses* from the pre-fair-copy draft, are, in the given textual situation, being specially pleaded for. The editorial rationale assumes a class of variants and declares rules of procedure for their treatment. The basis of assessment for each individual class item is critical. Admitting readings from pre-fair-copy drafts into the edited text of "Eumaeus," as of

34. Cf. the analysis given in the critical edition's Afterword, 1,864–67.

"Sirens," "Nausicaa," and "Oxen of the Sun," is in each case an emenda-
tion, that is, a change of the copy-text—the continuous manuscript text—
on the editor's responsibility.[35] Yet, in view of the constant progress of
the *Ulysses* text, the case of the critically recognized authorial scribal
omissions requires striking a balance between the basic editorial obliga-
tion to set right transmissional errors and the obligation towards the text
of final revision. The latter takes precedence in instances when, once a
transmissional error has occurred, the text is seen to have undergone
further revision. Taken in the logical absolute, this consideration would
rule out the assumption and admission of authorial scribal failings alto-
gether. But since, manifest in the inscription and/or critically recogniz-
able, they are a reality, editorial response cannot be logically abstract; it
must be pragmatically concrete. Hence, omissions assessed as scribal over-
sights in the act of fair-copying the "Eumaeus" drafts have been restored
to the edited text by way of emendation if the context remained invariant
in the course of the further development of the text under Joyce's hands.

It may justifiably be argued that, while "handsome" was restored to the
text under the general pragmatic rule, it should perhaps not have been
restored under the proviso. The concatenation of clauses in the draft,
"the usual handsome blackguard type they had an incurable hankering
after," appears in the fair copy as "the usual blackguard type they had an
insatiable hankering after." What the example serves to focus is the fact
that, once an authorial change has been critically assessed as a scribal
error of omission, the observance of the proviso, the "rule of invariant
context," requires delimiting the relevant context. The example of the
"Proteus" episode discussed above contrasted with the instance at hand
shows the extent of pragmatic, and again critical, variability in such de-
limiting. The absence of "Twice." at *U*:3.70 was contextualized in terms
of the entire chapter, taking all indication of comprehensive authorial
control into account. In the "Eumaeus" instance, however—be it stated
without attempt either at pleading or apology—the phrase alone was
taken as contextually relevant; which is not to say that it might not have
been prudent to extend the view to the adjoining phrase in the con-

35. It may be remarked that, if the continuous manuscript text was extended to com-
prise the respective pre-fair-copy drafts, the readings in question would equally be ad-
mitted to the edited text by way of emendation. The formal procedure in that case would
necessitate the cancellation of the square brackets which, according to our apparatus con-
ventions, would enclose these readings on the first assumption that they were deleted in
the revisional copying.

catenated clauses. Be that as it may—whatever the adjoining phrase's contextual relevance for the "usual blackguard type" or "usual handsome blackguard type," it happens to present a wholly separate problem of transmission and editorial treatment.

In typing from the fair copy, the typist evidently misread the word "insatiable" and produced the phrase "they had an indubitable hankering after." (One may visually infer the misreading from the shape of the word "insatiable" in the fair copy.) At first sight, this calls for very simple editorial action: undoing the corruption and restoring the authorial reading. This was precisely what was done in establishing the critical text. Yet at the same time, albeit on a different level of operation, the critical text admitted as a matter of course the autograph addition to the typescript of the word "unquestionably" between "they" and "had," creating for the edited text the phrase "they unquestionably had an insatiable hankering after." It constitutes a genuine editorial error, which incidentally may well have been furthered in part by working over computer printouts, and thus at a middle distance from the original documents. More categorically, the error arose from a momentary failure to recognize an example of interaction of corruption ("indubitable") and revision ("unquestionably"). In truth, and plausibly perceivable from the typescript page, the addition implies the acceptance of the corruption, with the combination resulting in an added instance of the tautologies in which the "Eumaeus" text delights.[36] The phrase requires rewriting in the synopsis as "they ⌜B⌝unquestionably B⌝ had an [*B[insatiable] indubitable*B⌝ hankering after," and a consequent amendment of the reading text.

In the spirit of constructive criticism, John Kidd deserves credit for having put his finger on an editorial sore extending over 12 words of the 264,485-word text. It is regrettable that, in making so much, he has yet made so little of his "discovery." For only by placing this isolated, though double-barrelled, instance of a wavering or breakdown of rationale and rules of procedure in relation to the successes under those same rules is a just sense to be gained of the quality of the edition's overall response to *Ulysses.*

36. In *James Joyce Quarterly* 28 (1989–90): 1,018, I have pointed out the parallel of a mistyping from which revisional use was made, resulting in Bloom's "Wonder did she wrote it herself." at *U*:5.268–9.

The Tables of the Outlaw

Under the heading "Changes in Joyce's spelling," Table 8 of "An Inquiry" (524ff.) appears to be proposing an item-by-item questioning of the editorial decisions affecting spelling in the critical edition, suggesting that there is something untoward with each of them. What a jumble we are in fact given to deal with—as indigestible as it is undigested—the eleven examples at the bottom of page 524 suffice to demonstrate.

Two entries do not belong. Of these, "disvestiture/divestiture" cannot—if one wishes to uphold Joyce's "disvestiture"—be subsumed under spelling changes (see below). The other is obsolete in the present discussion. At *U*:17.762, the "Corrected Text," which purportedly is being inquired into, does read "irreducible." The 1984 edition sported an emendation according to 1926 "irreducible," it is true, but it was recalled in 1986.

Two entries seem to wish to propose non-existent words. That Joyce apparently—by joining "rn" in a way to make it look like "nn"—wrote "gunnard" at *U*:12.71, which was typed, and entered the printing tradition, does not alter the fact that there is no such fish. It is "gurnard," which *is* Joyce's spelling in draft, whence therefore it has been emended. Similarly, there are no "pumets" in a marketplace or elsewhere, but "punnets" (*U*:12.95). This is just one example of a type of slip of the pen common with "m"s and "n"s in any handwriting. Joyce simply missed the fourth downstroke of the two "n"s, so the typist read one "m." The error was put right in 1926, whence the continuous manuscript text has been emended. Obviously—however elementary the case—the edition deserves, if anything, to be commended for these emendations.

An explicit commendation, too, would be due for the emendational introduction of the correct Greek form "boustrophedonic" at *U*:17.1800. Joyce wrote "boustrephodontic," a free invention, apparently, from poor etymology, or dim memory. The 1932 edition (Gilbert?) got the "boustrophe-" part right, but still suggests a toothsome etymology for the word's second segment.

Less catastrophically, Joyce's spelling produces two nonceforms, "isoceles" and "nuptual," for "isosceles" (*U*:16.886) and "nuptial" (*U*:15.3035). "Isosceles" is Greek to us all, while, albeit in *Finnegans Wake* terms, one just might entertain the notion that "nupt*ial* partners" should,

recognizably by a spelling quirk, also be shown to have something mut*ual* about them. As it is, however, there is no indication that the manuscript forms are anything but spelling errors to be emended—which the critical edition has done.

Spelling errors in English, too, are Joyce's "prolungation" at U:17.936, contaminated by Italian, and "filtre" at U:17.165, a contamination by the French spelling (though introduced by Joyce, it is true, in alteration of his own earlier "filter"). A misguided correction, as we maintain? Or a revision, as "An Inquiry" would have it? The case for revision would yet need to be convincingly argued. Meanwhile, the point is moot whether the edition, by uncritically upholding these Joycean forms, should have contributed to extending the record of spelling variables in English dictionaries. Defensibly, it has critically emended both forms.

This leaves two items of nine where the suggestion of an editorial slip is arguable. The forms "fulfilled" (U:17.2314) and "persistence" (U: 17.1135), adopted by way of emendation, are the English standard. Yet they are superfluous changes by the edition's declared rule of accepting spelling variants attested by the *OED*. The critical text should more properly have provided Joyce's spellings "fullfilled" and "persistance."

Joyce's "disvestiture" at U:17.1479, finally, is both more interesting in terms of the *Ulysses* text, and most revealing about the insidious rhetoric of "An Inquiry." The specific facts are: Joyce wrote "disvestiture" (he also wrote "disvested" at U:17.2072); the 1926 edition changed (in marketplace parlance: corrected) to "divestiture." The critical edition emended its copy-text by the 1926 change. The related general fact is that there is no trace of "disvestiture" in the *OED* or *Webster's*. The discussion in "An Inquiry" at the bottom of page 479 is a smokescreen and speculates on the reader's lack of incentive to check the dictionaries firsthand. Since the word "disvestiture" is unlisted, no meaning "ritual undressing" could be attested for it. The parenthetical slur, too, about "divestiture" being "more relevant to South Africa than 7 Eccles Street, Dublin" bears no apparent relation to the specific dictionary definitions, which are either legal: "deprivation of a possession or right; dispossession; alienation," or literal: "putting off of clothing." (The third, economic, definition, to which, drawing attention to the contextual vicinity of Bloom's budget, "An Inquiry" appears to be colloquially attuned, enters the *OED* only in its 1989 edition as a post-mid-century meaning, with

which Joyce could hardly be imputed to have been familiar.) On the face of it, the literal definition fits the passage and, classifying Joyce's form (as "An Inquiry" does) as a spelling error, may be claimed as justification for the emendation by the 1926 correction. However, another line of critical reasoning is possible, to which "An Inquiry" alerts us, despite its facile argument. Joyce could be credited with coining a neologism on the pattern, say, of "investiture." This does supply the modicum of "ritual" connotation which one may sense as intended in Joyce's text. The participle "disvested" at 17.2072 appears to confirm the conscious coinage (and might be a warning not to emend). The *literatim* pun—accepted, it would be a foreshadowing of *Finnegans Wake* language—would redress the legal term to ritualise Bloom's undressing.

The eleven items of Table 8's first section are spurious in their implied argument and suggest that, in terms of the attitude of critique in "An Inquiry," its tables are ultimately of little use. At most, they spread before the reader—as unsuspecting of the tables' misleading nature as made suspicious of the "Corrected Text," and the critical and synoptic edition behind it, by the thrust of the adverse rhetoric of "An Inquiry"—private index card material from the Boston James Joyce Research Center. The question of how to deal with that material editorially is nowhere clearly put, or answered—neither in the article's extensive discourse preceding the tables, nor in the tables. Where Table 8 in its continuation remarks on spelling inconsistencies, for example, the term "inconsistency" would be meaningful, perhaps, for an edition differently conceived than the critical and synoptic edition. In its terms, however, what the table displays are spelling variables the critical edition upholds by its own rationale. Individual inclusions in the list, moreover, make one positively despair of its sense of orientation. To regularize "om(e)lette" for "omlet" at U:15.3909, for example, would in fact corrupt Stephen's pun on Hamlet (a Joycean delicacy making its premier appearance in the critical text). Or: the indication of "6 examples in all" of the spelling "disc" suppresses the mention of one of them as "Disc." in "Disc. Bacc." at U:14.1257. Or: "*jujube*" and "*jujuby*" are listed together as if they were not distinguishable as noun and adjective. Or: attention is drawn to two "therefor" among " 'therefore' throughout" in disregard of the fact that these are two words with distinct meanings in twentieth century English.

Or: what are properly the implications of the subhead "1984 creates [itself question-begging] inconsistency not in prior editions" (525) and the listing thereunder, say, of "hagadah/haggadah"? Generally, "An Inquiry" seems to object to strategies of normalisation and regularisation, and rightly so—except that in imputing such strategies to the critical edition, it sets up a fancied target in the first place. Then however, in instances like this, it appears to complain that the critical edition did not regularise. In truth, no question of "creating" two spellings is involved. The critical edition, at U:17.1878 (U 1598.11) preserves Joyce's spelling variant "haggadah" which had not made its way into former printings of *Ulysses*. The footnote keyed to U 1598.11 indicates what happened: On first proofs, Joyce introduced the spelling "haggadah"; he did so by inserting another "g" into the printed word "hagadah" which had been so far the accurate reproduction of his original Rosenbach inscription. The note also cites the *OED* in which both spellings (among several more) are attested; so Joyce's change does not constitute an idiosyncrasy alien to English usage. An entry in the "Historical Collation," keyed to the reading text's reference, tells the user of the edition that the printings of 1922, 1926, 1932, 1936, and 1961 uniformly stick to "hagadah," and that their deviation from the critically established text originates—logically—on second proofs. In other words: Joyce revised his original spelling on first proofs, but this revision was ignored by the typesetters and is therefore absent from the published text of *Ulysses* from second proofs onward. To understand the logic followed in declaring the second proofs the origin of the divergence between the received text and the critically established text, it is important to remember that "hagadah," as printed on first proofs, was then still in accordance with Joyce's autograph text, while the selfsame reading "hagadah" on second proofs, though seemingly unaltered, is no longer so, since it disregards Joyce's latest instruction.[37] That the typesetters failed to comply with the instruction is, however, no reason that the critical editor should reject it, too. On the other hand, this instruction does not impose an obligation to emend the two earlier occurrences of the word in order to enforce "haggadah" as a new standard for *Ulysses*. The uniformity observable in the first edition results from negligence, not from anybody's critical decision. The critical edition preserves both variants as they were laid down by Joyce. To say that thereby it "creates inconsis-

37. See Afterword, 1,904.

tency not in prior editions" is thus surely to be read as a jocular way of misconstruing the facts.[38]

In view of the heterogeneity and lack of focus of the tables in "An Inquiry," it would be tedious, and ultimately futile, further to rehearse them in detail. A summary survey will suffice. Tables 1–7, as well as 36 and 37, though their entries demand checking for accuracy both of the edition and of the assertions made in "An Inquiry," require little comment. In not a single instance do their listings have an effect on the critical text. For Table 1, see also footnote 5. Tables 2–4, 6, and 36 will yield a number of additional, or modified, records in the historical collation and/or the footnotes in the case of Table 36. Tables 5 and 7 are wholly pointless: requesting apparatus entries for categories of variants the edition systematically does not itemize, they are at the same time hopelessly fragmentary in the chance items they list. Table 37 exists only because the fact goes unrecognized that it is Joyce's autograph (since it yields the continuous manuscript text) which is the source for the variability in the number of dots to an ellipsis.

Table 23 similarly turns a blind eye to the textual situation it reflects. In the manuscript of "Eumaeus," ellipses occur, but they are rare. Following the edition's critical decision to approximate the fair-copy punctuation for "Eumaeus," post-fair-copy authorial ellipses adapting themselves to the typist's liberally elliptic styling have not been admitted to the critical text. The apparatus of course records them. That therefore we get "authorial ellipses . . . removed in 1984" and "authorial ellipses retained in 1984" is just as it should be. Table 23 is palpably tendentious in suppressing precisely that aspect of the evidence by which the edition's procedure is justified.

From shifting assumptions and a random play of private categorisation, Tables 20–22 and 24–35 heap up a mass of observations from which one is hard put to glean items of substance. Seldom do they indicate, let alone define, a point of perspective, so that it remains largely unclear what, other than that which the edition has done, should be editorially done or not done about their itemisations. How a useful critical list or table could be structured is (inadvertently?) demonstrated by Table 20. Of its twenty-eight items, twenty-five are beyond textual or editorial dispute, thus providing the foil and frame of reference for assessing—and,

38. Wolfhard Steppe proposes to expand elsewhere on this and other incorrigibles.

it should be needless to add, confirming the appropriateness of—the editorial action taken on three asterisked items. Unfortunately, however, such contextualizing is an isolated virtue for Table 20 among the tables, as indeed it is lacking for most areas of discussion and argument in "An Inquiry."

Given the edition's critical course of double observance, paying both the authorial writing and the "more publishable text" their due—which is a course, let it be emphasized, determined on resisting regularisations, normalisations, or the imposing of overall formal consistencies—all that can be said about, and for, the tables of "An Inquiry" is that they may be construed—against their apparent intention—as an aid to review the edition on its own terms. In a couple of handfuls of instances from its sixty-four pages of itemized listings, this could result in the adjustment of minutiae of spelling, capitalisation and punctuation. Yet by and large, the tables actually help to confirm that the edition has achieved what it set out to accomplish. The duly trained scholarly reader, moreover—retracing the paths by which "An Inquiry" has come by its observations (even though perhaps, in the present age of widespread lack of instruction in textual criticism and editing, having in this to rely on self-training)—will find, as s/he should, the record of the achievement articulated in the edition's discourse of text, synopsizing diacritics, footnotes, textual notes, historical collation, and afterword. In its specifics, this is a highly formalised and cross-referenced discourse, to whose demands "An Inquiry" does not willingly respond—it often, indeed, puts up a stubborn resistance to it. Since this is so, the question of whether the edition, by the mode of discourse it has professionally adopted, or by its own design, may sometimes, and perhaps unnecessarily, have put obstacles in the way of its users and readers, cannot very meaningfully be discussed from the standpoint of "An Inquiry." It obscures the view too much with idiosyncratic and private blocks.

Names

The grid for the self-blocking strategy of "An Inquiry" is laid in the listing of "Thirteen Unacknowledged Classes of Emendation" (478). The terminological, and conceptual, confusion over "emendation"—rightly: emendation of the copy-text; wrongly: emendation of the first-

edition text—returns here with a vengeance. No indication is given of how these "classes" relate either to a comprehensive rationale of textual criticism, or to the methodological conception of the procedures of editing in the critical and synoptic edition. They bespeak a nodding acquaintance with textual scholarship—just enough to induce unease about what they conjure up ("changes in Joyce's correct . .. . spellings," "changes of . . . names," "illusory improvements"). Yet for lack of a systematic background, they are in truth wholly arbitrary even on their own terms. In terms of the edition, they are misconceived, or themselves illusory.

Prominent among the categories of objection to the edition have been those of "personal names" and "place names." As regards personal names, "An Inquiry" insinuates the premise—as Dr. Kidd has repeatedly done elsewhere—that characters in a novel should spell their names like the historical personages from whom these names were borrowed: a notion, were it so expressly put, no literary critic could (and no textual critic should) be imagined to subscribe to. The order of fiction is not the order of reality. Characters may be named in a novel as in reality, but their names are real, they exist, only within the autonomous linguistic system of the fictional text. Hence, regardless of whether a number of fictional names are borrowed, the text alone, and its author, set their spelling. No one would insist on "Daedalus" for *Portrait* and *Ulysses* because the mythologically historical father of Icarus (Ikarus?) is conventionally so spelled. Connolly Norman of *U*:1.128 we get as "Connolly" in Joyce's hand—so that is the spelling of the name for the man mentioned in *Ulysses*. The fact that he is "Conolly" in *Little Review, Egoist*, and the *placards* for the first edition (and hence, in the first edition)—each printing deriving from a different exemplar of the lost typescript—indicates that he was so spelled in the typescript, but not that Joyce, when all other evidence from the variation patterns between the fair copy and the three typescript derivations defines triple agreements as typist's changes, could be claimed to have revised all three typescript exemplars in this one instance. The logic of bibliographical reasoning simply forbids making a special plea for a "Conolly Norman." Indeed, the case demonstrates how the clamour for a principle of historic fidelity in the forms of personal names would effectively displace and invalidate standard principles of text-critical procedure in editing—and only for the sake, here, of the

removal of one "n" from an attested authorial spelling. That the relevant
text-critical and editorial question is not one of asserting actual or pos-
sible historicity over the text, but of scrutinizing a textual derivation
against an autograph inscription, is succinctly demonstrated in the in-
stance of Dove Campbell at U:15.2189–90 (for whose printed name
"Dave Campbell," it is true, no historical precedent is being claimed; cf.
"An Inquiry," 493). The critical realisation that, in Elijah's address, the
two gentlemen—Jake Crane and Abe Kirschner—are paired with a lady
each—Creole Sue and Dove Campbell—determines the text-critical in-
sight that "Dove" was misread as "Dave" in the transmission.

Names, then, assert themselves in spellings specific to the fictional text.
They are fictional as are the characters they identify. Such identification
is of course modelled on the world of experience as the entire fiction is.
Different spellings may—though they need not—indicate different iden-
tities. Hence, it seems justified to emend "Levinstone's" (Joyce in auto-
graph) at U:15.4043 to "Levenston's," the spelling established at U:
8.1139 (while at the same time leaving "Legget" in the same line un-
touched, since it has no precedence in the text). Nor, surely, is there a
good reason to weaken the identifying quality of a spelling identity by
following Joyce's wavering between "Bandman" and "Bandmann" for
Mrs. Bandmann Palmer. "Bandmann" is one of Joyce's options, and hap-
pens also to be the historically authentic form; it has become the edition's
spelling.[39] However, there is no good reason why Mickey Rooney and
Micky Hanlon should not be allowed the different spellings of their first
names ("An Inquiry"—Table 27—notwithstanding); or why "Raleigh"
and "Ralegh" should not coexist as equally current spellings—and inter-
changeably usable, incidentally, for the Elizabethan explorer and the
Victorian Shakespeare scholar who, as namesakes, are both written into
the world and text of *Ulysses*.[40]

Written into the text of *Ulysses*, too, is the British viceroy and his lieu-
tenant colonel, over whose name the inscription and transmission get so
entangled as to defy a resolution of the spelling from within the textual

39. In their world of experience, Joyceans wince when they find Richard Ellmann de-
prived of one "n" by—well, by those, say, who also put an apostrophe in *Finnegans
Wake*.

40. And why, outside the pale of proper names—where "An Inquiry," however, lists
the example—should not a francophone "Madame" and an anglophone "Madam" co-
exist for "Madam(e) Marion Tweedy" (*alias* Molly Bloom)?

evidence. He is named twice, at U:10.1177 and U:10.1222. At U:10.1177, he is "Haseltine" (Frank Budgen)—"Haseltime" (typist)—"Hessel-time" (Joyce on typescript)—"Hesseltine" (Joyce on first proofs). How Joyce may have come by the "ss" spelling is suggested at U:10.1222. There the series runs:—(no manuscript form in either Budgen's or Joyce's hand)—"Hesseltime" (typist)—"Hesseltine" (Joyce on fifth proofs). The second-segment spelling "-time" here as before in the type-script indicates that the lost manuscript insertion was in Budgen's hand (a look in the document makes evident why). This part of the corruption in both instances took Joyce longest to detect. Whether the first segment for the second occurrence was "Hasel-," "Hesel-," or "Hessel-" in manu-script cannot be known. All that can be asserted is that it was typed "Hes-sel-." A not improbable, even though undemonstrable, scenario for Joyce's typescript correction is that he first encountered "Haseltime" and changed it to "Heseltime"; then, finding "Hesseltime," went back to the first occurrence to make it agree. This does give us one "Hesseltime" constructed by Joyce before he later consecutively corrected the second segment of both occurrences. The spelling "Hesseltine" might hence, in formal adherence to the edition's rule of procedure, have so been upheld for the text of *Ulysses*. What was done instead was to cut this little Gord-ian knot of Budgen, typist, and Joyce spellings by emendationally opting for (historical) "Heseltine."

The distinction, then, should always be seen clearly between historical and fictional character names. Yet the stand in principle on the autonomy of the fictional text and its spellings in personal names is no absolute bar to resorting to an historical name form for an emendation—Mrs. Band-mann Palmer or lieutenant colonel Heseltine—if the situation warrants. None of all this of course gives spurious *Shrift and *Culler—out of whom, together with that head of a lunatic asylum, Connolly Norman, Dr. Kidd has gained such an unconscionable amount of polemical mile-age—any claim to existence either in history or the text. They are our mistakes, *Shrift from a misreading of Frank Budgen's handwriting in the manuscript of "Wandering Rocks," sections of which Joyce dictated to him; and *Culler from misinterpreting a (mis)clarification by Mr. Hirschwald (of the firm of Darantiere) of Joyce's handwriting in the proofs.

The case, however, is different for place names. In *Ulysses*, it is appar-

ent that the city of Dublin is invoked as the external referent for the topography of the city the narrative inhabits. Where its subdivisions of streets, squares, canals, and the like are identified by proper names, there-fore—and since, contrary to the situation for the names of persons, not a single square, lane, or street is fictionally invented—their spellings may legitimately be emended, and have been emended, to be correct accord-ing to a Dublin map. It goes without saying, however, that such emenda-tion extends only to the spellings (e.g., "Lansdowne" for "Lands-downe"), not the names themselves of streets, places, or canals. The viceregal cavalcade in "Wandering Rocks" at *U*:10.1273 is said to cross the Royal Canal bridge where, if one follows the route geographically, it is clear that the Grand Canal bridge is being crossed. This is not a tex-tual crux: neither is what the author wrote, nor is the textual transmission in doubt, or dispute. An annotated edition, though not a strict text edition like ours, will assist readers with a comment on the authentic factual error.[41]

Compounds

Compounds in Joyce, and their treatment in establishing a critical text, demand more than routine, or abstract, attention. It will not do to impute intentions and strategies, as "An Inquiry" does, and then to proceed to argue on such a self-speculative basis (cf. "An Inquiry," 480–86). The cue for assessing the issue of compounds in *Ulysses* comes from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. In the *Portrait* manuscript, Joyce broadly obeyed the conventions current in written and printed English of the day to hyphenate compounds (he stopped short, however, at "to-day," "to-morrow," and the like). The *Portrait* typists copied the manuscript usage, and the *Egoist* printers followed the typescript, as one would ex-pect. In face of the conventional hyphenation in print, Joyce appears to have experienced a thorough change of mind about how compounds should be written. Preparing part of the *Egoist* typesetting as printer's copy for the book publication, he crossed out all (or most) hyphens.

41. In its request for annotation, "An Inquiry" throughout tends to mistake the type of edition the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* is. The entries in Table 25 claiming historical name forms, for instance, are entirely material for commentary annotation (e.g., Gifford's *Ulysses Annotated*), not for textual notes to accompany the establishment of the critical text.

Neglecting to join the gaps, however, his instructions were ambiguous. The printers often produced two-word compounds, not the one-word formations Joyce envisaged. Harriet Weaver, who knew Joyce's wishes, was clearer in her instructions for the part of the *Portrait* first edition printer's copy she prepared from authorial lists of corrections. The (American) first edition of *Portrait* therefore has a preponderance of two-word compounds in the section marked up by Joyce, and of one-word compounds when Harriet Weaver did the marking-up. In the English first edition, i.e., the book's second edition, the difference was evened out, due to Harriet Weaver's renewed attention to the matter.

The refashioning of compounds was, for Joyce around 1916, not just a question of effecting a happier typography for *Portrait* in print. It went to the heart of his sense of language. He thoroughly adopted the restyling in his writing. Hyphenated compounds have virtually disappeared from the manuscript of *Ulysses*. One-word and two-word compounds reign, and in the autograph additions to typescripts and proofs, particularly, there is a further increase in the one-word formations. Clearly, both the conceptual unfamiliarity ("burntoffering," "learningknight") and the typographical strangeness ("doggone," "publichouse," the latter already to be found in *Portrait*) were calculated effects. In this light, some significance would seem to attach to the fact that the typescripts, whether deriving from lost working drafts or preserved fair copy, are, beyond the autographs, not infrequently the first suppliers of one-word compounds. The edition's overall rejection of passive authorisation notwithstanding, this is a circumstance not to be dismissed out of hand. The edition's dominant—though not invariable—procedural choice is to admit typescript one-word compounds to the critical text, thereby giving room to a characteristic of this text in its progress through the documents, even though authorial intention or specific authorisation may not be demonstrable. The editorial procedure may be said to draw general backing, at least, from Joyce's response to a written enquiry from the Darantiere foreman, Mr. Hirschwald (as preserved among the unpublished Darantiere-Sylvia Beach correspondence at Buffalo). To Hirschwald's question whether it was all right that he had been separating words in the typescript, the curt answer was no (though Hirschwald had of course, aside from dividing compounds, marked many erroneously missing spaces, which Joyce should not be imagined to have objected to).

Text-critical and critical considerations interpenetrate in determining, and should do so in assessing, editorial action on compounds in *Ulysses*. Typists' or compositors' failure to set a space may in many instances still be the simple cause for a seeming compound, classifying it as a corruption to be removed. Critically, factors like intra-textual reference ("hat trick" referring to "shoe trick") may prevent the adoption of a one-word compounding, as does, more pervasively, the consideration of stress and rhythm. The strange Greek of "metempsychosis," for instance, is recaptured much more audibly in the stress pattern of "met him pike hoses" than in that of "met him pikehoses." Where Joyce himself offers two forms of writing the identical expression ("post office," "postoffice"), it would seem admissible to adopt the one-word compound throughout, without turning such cautiously considered procedure in one case into a mechanical rule for all cases of two attested authorial forms. Leaving aside that one-word reflexive pronouns like "herself" are not commonly termed compounds (and so should not have been listed among them in "An Inquiry"), Bloom's musings that Molly always "liked to let her self out" (*U*:8.199) means that she relished undoing her stays (obsolete female undergarment), not that she preferred to open the door unassisted. It would be similarly fatal to fine points of meaning or style if the instances of separated "in to" were thrown in with all the text's occurrences of the regular pronoun "into." Editorial compound construction by analogy, lastly, must be thoroughly ruled out: no "coffeeplace" because of "coffeeroom"; no "operahats" because of "operaglass"; and no "bath chair"—let alone "Bath chair"—because of "*Sedan chair.*"

Thus, Table 14 of "An Inquiry"—really six superfluous pages—shows particularly clearly that the critical edition knew what it was doing ("Analogous compounds not made by Joyce or 1984"), and that the tables, as said, merely spread out private index card material without clear notions about the textual situations, the editorial options, or the critical place of the assembled listings. Tables 9–13, despite the seeming import of their headings and subheadings, similarly lack direction and focus, and similarly confirm the critical edition in its considered procedures, even though the occasional individual listing may invite reconsideration of the present editorial solution. If realized—and the instances will be isolated, and very few —such reconsideration will be a move towards minimizing emendations, so as to uphold as consistently as is at all

possible the continuous manuscript text, and the progress of the develop-
ing text through the documents, in their "inconsistencies."

Finis. We have done. Begin.

❧

The critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses* challenges re-
ceived paradigms and current methods in textual criticism and scholarly
editing. Taking its bearings from the debate about texts and textual
scholarship carried forward in the English-speaking world of learning,
as well as in Germany and France, over the past three decades, it enters
into that debate and adds to it fresh dimensions. The edition has been
pronounced a scandal: its challenge has been felt, and been timely. What
has been unfortunate is that "The Scandal of *Ulysses*" and "An Inquiry
into *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*"—the latter, as has become evident,
such a trivializing sequel to the unabashed, if unfounded, polemics of the
former—have mustered the wrong, or displaced, reasons for a right sense
that the edition is discomforting. Their attacks, alas, have not been
adequate in the quality of their critique—and yet they have preempted
attention, and have in a manner waylaid the developing analysis of the
edition's qualities: its overall editorial rationale and achievement, its con-
ceptual problematics, its theoretical implications, its scholarly and critical
potential.[42] Nevertheless, to give them their due, one should not overlook
that, in the publicity appeal of the controversy they have sparked, they
have raised remarkably a general awareness of the material indetermin-
acy of texts, the logical impossibility of definitive editions, the involve-
ment of readers as well as of editors in the process of texts, the centrality
of textual scholarship to the enterprise of criticism.

42. See for some responses of an altogether different calibre: Christine Froula, "The
Adventures of *Ulysses*," *The Yale Review* 74 (1985): 454–66; Jerome McGann, *"Ulysses*
as a Postmodern Text: The Gabler Edition," *Criticism* 27 (1985): 283–306; Patrick
McGee, "The Error of Theory," *Studies in the Novel* 22 (1990): 148–62; David Greetham,
"The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing," in Philip Cohen
(ed.), *Devils and Angels*, 78–102; Vicky Mahaffey, "Intentional Error: The Paradox of
Editing Joyce's *Ulysses*," in George Bornstein (ed.), *Representing Modernist Texts: Edit-
ing as Interpretation* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1991), 171–91.