

A NORTON CRITICAL EDITION

James Joyce
DUBLINERS



AUTHORITATIVE TEXT
CONTEXTS
CRITICISM

Edited by

MARGOT NORRIS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

Text Edited by

HANS WALTER GABLER
WITH WALTER HETTICHE



W. W. NORTON & COMPANY • *New York • London*

Contents

Preface	ix
Introduction, by Hans Walter Gabler	xv
Symbols and Sigla	xliii

The Text of <i>Dubliners</i>	i
The Sisters	3
An Encounter	11
Araby	20
Eveline	26
After the Race	32
Two Gallants	38
The Boarding House	49
A Little Cloud	57
Counterparts	70
Clay	82
A Painful Case	89
Ivy Day in the Committee Room	99
A Mother	116
Grace	128
The Dead	151

Contexts

A Curious History	197
<i>From</i> Gas from a Burner	200
Maunsel & Co. Advertisement for <i>Dubliners</i>	203
“The Sisters”:	
“Our Weekly Story: The Sisters,” <i>The Irish Homestead</i>	204
“An Encounter”	
Map	208
Photograph of the Pigeon House Fort	209
Advertisement for <i>Union Jack</i> and Typical Cover of <i>Pluck</i>	210
“Araby”:	
Map	211

Words to the Song from the Araby Bazaar	212
Back of the "Araby" Catalogue	213
Caroline Norton, "The Arab's Farewell to His Steed"	213
"Eveline":	
"Our Weekly Story: Eveline," <i>The Irish Homestead</i>	215
The Twelve Promises of Jesus to Saint Margaret Mary	
Alacoque for Those Devoted to His Sacred Heart	219
Words and Music to "The Lass that loves a Sailor"	219
"After the Race":	
"The Motor Derby: Interview with the French Champion,"	
<i>The Irish Times</i>	222
Photograph of the Gordon Bennett Race	225
"Two Gallants":	
Map	226
"The Boarding House":	
Words to "I'm an imp on mischief bent"	227
"A Little Cloud":	
Map	229
Advertisement for Corless's Restaurant	230
Lord Byron, "On the Death of a Young Lady"	230
"Counterparts":	
Map	232
Photograph of The Scotch House	233
"Clay":	
Map	234
Photograph of Trams at the Base of Nelson's Pillar	235
Words and Music to "I dreamt that I dwelt in Marble Halls"	235
"A Painful Case":	
Map	238
Photograph of Sydney Parade Station	239
"Ivy Day in the Committee Room":	
Portrait of Charles Stewart Parnell	240
"A Mother":	
Announcement of August 1904 Concert and Review from	
<i>Freeman's Journal</i>	241
"Grace":	
Leo XIII, " <i>Ars Photographica</i> " (1867) and "On	
Photography," trans H. T. Henry (1902)	242
Pope Leo XIII Being Photographed	242

Photograph of St. Francis Xavier Church	243
The Parable of the Unjust Steward	243
“The Dead”:	
Map	245
Floor Plans for 15 Usher’s Island	246
Words to “Arrayed for the Bridal”	247
Words to “The Lass of Aughrim”	247
Photograph of the Gresham Hotel	249
Criticism	
David G. Wright • Interactive Stories in <i>Dubliners</i>	253
Heyward Ehrlich • “Araby” in Context: The “Splendid Bazaar,” Irish Orientalism, and James Clarence Mangan	261
Margot Norris • The Perils of “Eveline”	283
James Fairhall • Big-Power Politics and Colonial Economics: The Gordon Bennett Cup Race and “After the Race”	299
Fritz Senn • “The Boarding House” Seen as a Tale of Misdirection	309
Morris Beja • Farrington the Scrivener: A Story of Dame Street	317
Roberta Jackson • The Open Closet in <i>Dubliners</i> : James Duffy’s Painful Case	327
Vincent J. Cheng • Empire and Patriarchy in “The Dead”	342
Selected Bibliography	367

Introduction

by Hans Walter Gabler

A History of Curiosities, 1904–1914†

In the first days of July 1904, probably on the 2nd or on the 4th, the Irish mystic, poet and painter, and close friend of W. B. Yeats, George Russell (otherwise “AE”) wrote to James Joyce inviting him to submit a short story to *The Irish Homestead*—the weekly, self-styled “Organ of Agricultural and Industrial Development in Ireland.” Russell asked for something “simple, rural?, livemaking?, pathos? . . . not to shock the readers” (*Letters*, II, 43).¹ The letter was timely. Despite his poverty, the twentytwo year old Joyce was in an expansive, confident mood. His burgeoning romance with Nora Barnacle was entering its fourth buoyant week, and he had begun to circulate among his friends and admirers the (incomplete) manuscript of his autobiographical novel *Stephen Hero*, on which he continued to work energetically.² Russell included with his letter the current issue of the *Homestead* and advised: “Look at the story in this paper.” That Joyce did so, and with important consequences for the development—then in embryo—of his *oeuvre*, has thus far slipped past the net of Joycean scholarship and biography.

That part of *The Irish Homestead* for which Russell solicited a contribution was a section entitled “Our Weekly Story.” In the summer of 1904, however, there was a troubling dearth of copy. The

† This section, as based on fresh and original research in Dublin, was prepared in collaboration with John O’Hanlon and Danis Rose. I am most grateful for their help and advice.—For “A Curious History,” as recounted by James Joyce himself, see pp. 197–200.

1. Though this letter is undated, from circumstantial evidence and from the chronology of subsequent events we can be reasonably certain that Russell must have written it on, or very shortly after, Saturday 2 July 1904.
2. His sister May lugged the bulky manuscript around to Constantine Curran (then living in Cumberland place, North Circular road, not too far from Joyce’s father’s house in Cabra) on June 23 (*Letters*, I, 55). After Curran had read and returned it, Joyce gave it to George Russell to read. According to Richard Ellmann (*James Joyce*, 163) and conventional wisdom, it was Russell’s reading of *Stephen Hero* which inspired him to write to Joyce asking for a story for the *Homestead*. But it is surely much more likely—given the tight chronology and given the fact that on an earlier occasion Russell had responded unfavourably to the poems of *Chamber Music*—that Joyce lent him the manuscript only after Russell had approached him. Furthermore, as we shall see, Russell had a more practical reason for writing.

issues of May 21, May 28, and June 4 contained no story at all, the section in the issues of June 11, 18, and 25 was taken up by a three-part novelette by Louise Kenny, and the issues of July 9 and 16 again had no story. It follows that the sole issue to which Russell could have been referring was that of July 2, in which issue there was indeed a story: a short piece written by Berkeley Campbell entitled "The Old Watchman." It is a first-person narrative in which the narrator, a twelve-year old boy, recounts the circumstances of the death of an old man he had befriended who had fallen on hard times. If this sounds familiar, then it should; for it would appear that Joyce not only read the story: he rewrote it. Had he called his own story "The Old Priest," which, but for its subtler complexities of meaning he might have done, then that would have advertised the fact. Even so, he put into "The Sisters" clues to the source of his artifice. In Campbell's story—which of course had the date of the issue (July 2) just above the title—the old watchman (who it transpires is the son of a former Dean of St Patrick's Cathedral) is sixty-five years of age; in the *Homestead* version of "The Sisters," the card fixed to the door of the house where the old priest died reads: "July 2nd, 189—The Rev. James Flynn (formerly of St. Ita's Church), aged 65 years. R.I.P."³

By the 15th of July, Joyce had finished writing "The Sisters" and, indeed, having already progressed beyond the idea of one story, had formulated an ambitious plan. In a letter to Constantine Curran he announced: "I am writing a series of epigrams—ten—for a paper. I have written one. I call the series *Dubliners* to betray the soul of that hemiplegia or paralysis which many consider a city."⁴ H. F. Norman, the editor of *The Irish Homestead*, accepted "The Sisters" for publication on July 23, making one change only: "I am changing the name

3. There are other, lesser echoes. Campbell's boy usually spoke to the old watchman (he had pleurisy) while he was huddled over his fire-basket. Joyce's boy conversed with the old priest while, wrapped up in his greatcoat, he sat by his fireside. The old watchman is not named; though his replacement is: James. Reverberations may be felt, too, even beyond "The Sisters." The watchman spent his exile in Australia, which is also where the school-friend of Eveline's father went (see especially the *Irish Homestead* version of "Eveline," lines 32–35). The watchman's earlier Dublin prodigality in drinking and gambling, albeit cliché, is not unlike Jimmy's in the finale of "After the Race." Lastly, the Electric Tramway Company's watchman at his fire-basket would seem an avatar of Gumley, the corporation's watchman at his brazier in "Eumaeus", the sixteenth episode of *Ulysses* (and this episode especially, one should recall, has its roots in the story "Ulysses" originally contemplated for *Dubliners*).
4. See *Letters*, I, 55, where "epigrams" is given as "epicleti." This misreading—"Grecker than the Greeks" (U 9.614)—has over the years led to deep yet, alas, misguided critical exegesis (see, for example, Ellmann, *op. cit.*, 163). Skeptical at what seemed to him an oblique way of using Greek, Wolfhard Steppe surmised that the word might simply be "epiclets" (i.e., 'little epics', an ordinary English diminutive). A reading of the original in University College, Dublin, has proved him right. The letter, incidentally, is rather ambiguously dated "The Rain, Friday." As there were showers on just about every Friday during that summer, the weather accounts are not terribly helpful. The cricket reports are more enlightening: uniquely, on the morning of Friday, July 15, there was "torrential rain" sufficient to put a stop to play.

of the Parish quoted in the obituary notice so as to make the details of the story more remote."⁵ He sent Joyce a sovereign in payment. By a curious, sad coincidence, the story appeared in the issue of 13 August 1904, the first anniversary of Joyce's mother's untimely death. In such humble circumstances, thus, did *Dubliners* and beyond it James Joyce's prose masterpieces see their beginning in print.

On the suggestion of Russell, Joyce adopted a pseudonym and signed the name 'Stephen Daedalus' to "The Sisters." He continued this practice with the next four or, possibly, five stories, reverting to his own name only in the summer of 1905, well into his exile. Stephen Daedalus, of course, was the name he had given to the principal character in *Stephen Hero* and the name which he had recently begun to use in signing letters to his friends (see, for example, *Letters*, I, 54–55). Apart from the first ("The Sisters") and the last ("The Dead") the *Dubliners* stories were not written in the order of their ultimate arrangement. The second, "Eveline," appeared in *The Irish Homestead* on September 10, and very likely was composed during the second half of July and/or the first weeks of August. At that time, Joyce had begun to think prospectively about his relationship with Nora, and these considerations certainly inspired, if obliquely, its theme. "After the Race" was drafted while Joyce raced about Dublin touching friends and enemies alike for the wherewithal to get away from Ireland. The story was completed on 3 October 1904⁶ and handed in to the *Homestead* office the following day, just four days prior to Joyce's departure with Nora from the North Wall docks.⁷

James Joyce always considered 8 October 1904 as the date of his "first" marriage to Nora Barnacle (the "second" being 4 July 1931). The Joyces, after brief stays in Zurich and Trieste, settled down in Pola in Austria. It was while at Zurich, however, in late October that he began his fourth story. He called it "Christmas Eve." A month later, from Pola, he reported to Stanislaus that he had written "about half" of it (*Letters*, II, 71). By this he presumably meant the fragmentary fair copy of four pages which has been preserved.⁸ Instead

5. Letter to James Joyce of 23 July 1904, now at Cornell.

6. Joyce wrote from St. Peter's terrace to Nora on this day: "I am in such high good humour this morning that I insist on writing to you . . . I got up early this morning to finish a story I was writing. When I had written a page I decided I would write a letter to you instead. Besides, I thought you disliked Monday and a letter from me might put you in better spirits" (*Letters*, II, 50). Ellmann has dated this letter "About 1 September 1904." This is certainly wrong. The possible contending Mondays are August 30, September 5, 12, 19 and 26, and October 3. On the first date Joyce was still at 60 Shelbourne road; on the second at his uncle's in Fairview; on the third at the Tower; on the fourth back at his uncle's; and on the fifth had a bad cold and was feeling desolate (*Letters*, II, 56). Which leaves October 3. Furthermore, he signed the letter "Jim," which he did only after his "famous interview about the letters" with Nora on September 9.

7. Jim, it turned out, was no Eveline; nor, in their tryst, was Nora.

8. All surviving manuscripts of *Dubliners* are reproduced in vol [4] of *The James Joyce Archive*:

of finishing this story he recast it as, or replaced it by, "Hallow Eve," which he sent to Dublin on 19 January 1905. "Hallow Eve," was not accepted by *The Irish Homestead*, nor is it extant today in any manuscript version. (By the end of September 1905 Joyce had retitled it "The Clay" and "slightly rewritten it" [*Letters*, II, 109]. Subsequently, this title was abbreviated to "Clay.") For the next several months, while he waited in vain for good news from Dublin and during which time he decided to dedicate the collection to Stanislaus—he subsequently changed his mind about this—Joyce did not proceed with *Dubliners* but, instead, focused his energies on *Stephen Hero*. In early May, he wrote to Stanislaus promising he would write another story if he knew the result of "Hallow Eve." Eventually he began to think seriously about finding another publisher. On 3 June he asked Stanislaus to get permission from the *Homestead* to republish the first two stories. In the next six weeks he wrote the fifth and sixth stories—"The Boarding House" and "Counterparts"—and sent them to Stanislaus in mid-July, quite possibly in the very manuscripts that still survive. The first of these, "The Boarding House," is dated 1 July 1905 in the extant manuscript and is the last physically to carry the signature "Stephen Daedalus"; yet the manuscripts of these two stories are, as documents, so clearly companion pieces that "Counterparts" too may have borne the name Daedalus on its lost final leaf. Thereafter, Joyce relinquished the pseudonymous pose and signed all subsequent *Dubliners* stories in his own name.

The summer of 1905 was for James Joyce as difficult as it was eventful. His faith in himself and in the life he had created with Nora began to falter. He suspended work on the autobiographical novel *Stephen Hero*, abandoning it in effect as a fragment of twenty-five (out of a projected sixtythree) chapters. About *Dubliners*, however, he remained sanguine, believing (incorrectly as it turned out) that he could find a publisher to bring it out sooner rather than later and that it would bring in some much needed money. The birth of his son Giorgio on 27 July spurred him on to greater efforts. The seventh story to be written was "A Painful Case." It exists both in a draft manuscript (originally entitled "A Painful Incident"), which at least in part documents the process of composition, and in a fair copy signed and dated "JAJ 15.8.05." The eighth story, "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," survives in two fair-copy manuscripts, of which the earlier is dated "29 August 1905," just two weeks later than the fair copy of "A Painful Case."⁹ "An Encounter" saw com-

James Joyce, *Dubliners. A Facsimile of Drafts and Manuscripts*, prefaced and arranged by Hans Walter Gabler. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1978.

9. For both of these stories, and for "The Sisters" and "After the Race," Joyce requested specific information in a letter to his brother of 24 September (*Letters*, II, 109–112). Stanislaus authenticated details already present in them and in which, in the case

pletion about mid-September 1905 (within three weeks of "Ivy Day") and was sent to Stanislaus on 18 September. "A Mother," the tenth to be written, followed within a fortnight. Both of these stories are extant in fair-copy manuscripts.

Although Joyce's original plan (adumbrated in his letter to Constantine Curran of 15 July 1904 quoted above) of a suite of *ten* little epics was now complete, he had in the meantime changed his plans. Writing to William Heinemann on 23 September 1905, Joyce offered him *Dubliners*: "a collection of twelve short stories." On the following day he enumerated the sequence to Stanislaus: three stories of childhood, "The Sisters," "An Encounter," and another one (the as yet unwritten "Araby"); three stories of adolescence, "The Boarding House," "After the Race," and "Eveline"; three stories of mature life, "The Clay," "Counterparts," and "A Painful Case"; and, completing the pattern, three stories of public life, "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," "A Mother," and the last story of the book (the as yet unwritten "Grace"). (This arrangement, as we shall see, was subsequently altered at least twice.) By mid-October 1905 the eleventh story, "Araby," was completed and the twelfth, "Grace," begun. At the same time, as is indicated by the range of questions in the letter to Stanislaus of 24 September, Joyce was busy revising the existing texts. The opening story of the collection benefitted tangibly from his brother's investigations, as is evident from the few but important variants between the version represented by the *Irish Homestead* printing and the first of the two extant manuscripts for "The Sisters." The changes prove that this manuscript postdates *The Irish Homestead* and suggest late October 1905 as its date. It is significant that a first reconsideration of the opening of the book thus apparently coincided with the composition of the then concluding story, "Grace."

In the meantime, and apparently at the instigation of Stanislaus, Joyce wrote to Arthur Symons, who replied saying that he thought that Constable's might be interested in both *Chamber Music* and *Dubliners*. Joyce sent them the former but held back the latter, offering it instead to Grant Richards on 15 October, adding, foolishly perhaps, that he believed that "people might be willing to pay for the special odour of corruption which, I hope, floats over my stories" (*Letters*, II, 123). Richards asked to see the manuscript three days later.¹ Both "Grace" and the revision of the earlier stories were com-

of "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," both manuscripts accord. The textual changes one finds entered in the second fair copy of "Ivy Day" (as opposed to those revealed by collation with the first fair copy) are not related to the period and occasion of its composition but to its later history. It was one of several stories over which, time after time, publication difficulties arose.

1. For Grant Richards's side of the correspondence, see Robert Scholes, "Grant Richards to James Joyce," *Studies in Bibliography* XVI (1963), 139-160.

pleted by the end of November and he sent the manuscript to Richards on 3 December. He did not then know it, but the nine-year ordeal of getting his book *Dubliners* printed and published had begun.

During the following two months, while he waited for word, Joyce added a new story, "Two Gallants." Richards finally responded on 17 February 1906, making Joyce an offer which was accepted. The book was to be published in May or June or in September in a slim crown octavo volume priced at 5/-. A contract followed on 23 February. The previous day Joyce had sent Richards "Two Gallants" with the instruction that it should be inserted between "After the Race" and "The Boarding House." (This suggests that, perhaps when he sent the stories to Richards, Joyce had interchanged the positions of "The Boarding House" and "Eveline" from their order as cited in his letter to Stanislaus of 24 September.) Returning the contract signed on 28 February, Joyce wrote: "I would like the printer to follow the manuscript accurately in punctuation and arrangement. Inverted commas, for instance, to enclose dialogue always seemed to me a great eyesore" (*Letters*, II, 131). He added that he had written part of a fourteenth story ("A Little Cloud"). This was still unfinished on 13 March when he wrote to say that it was to be inserted between "A Boarding House" and "Counterparts." It was finished on 22 April. Before it could be fair-copied and sent, however, the storm clouds began to gather. Richards passed the manuscript of *Dubliners* to his printer on 12 April and instructed him to prepare sample pages. By a stroke of the worst possible luck, it seems that when Joyce had sent him the thirteenth story, "Two Gallants," Richards had not inserted it into its proper place in the sequence, but had merely placed it on top of the pile. To provide the sample pages, then, the printer chose the beginning of "Two Gallants" and had at least two pages set up (these survive and are now at Harvard). When he read his compositor's handiwork he was horrified, scrawled "We cannot print this" on the second proof, and sent it back to Richards. On 23 April Richards informed Joyce of the printer's refusal and added that he had strong objections to two passages in "Counterparts." He returned the manuscripts of the two stories and, further, asked for another word to replace "bloody" in "Grace." Joyce replied three days later, refusing to compromise. A long and protracted correspondence ensued, in which Joyce made some concessions and Richards demanded more deletions (*Letters*, I, 60-63, and II, 132-143). Finally, the parties appeared to reach agreement. On 19 June Richards sent back the entire manuscript to Joyce in order that he might make the necessary alterations. On its resubmission on 9 July Joyce stated that he had "re-arranged and renumbered the stories in the middle of the book" and that he had included "A Little Cloud" in the position that he

had earlier indicated. This sequence was to remain stable. He also said that he had rewritten "The Sisters." It may be assumed that Richards received the opening story at this time in its second extant fair copy. In "Grace," by contrast, Joyce had removed only two instances of "bloody." These, however, exist undeleted in the extant fair copy, which also incorporates passages following from Joyce's research at the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele in Rome in November 1906 into the proceedings of the Vatican Council of 1870. Among the surviving manuscripts of the *Dubliners* stories, this fair copy of "Grace" is thus identified as postdating the original negotiations for publication with Grant Richards. Incidentally, it bypasses Richards's censorial strictures.

At the end of July 1906, Joyce moved with his family to Rome. During August he contemplated rewriting "After the Race" and he also asked Stanislaus to send him the manuscript of "A Painful Case" as he wanted to revise it.² On 31 August he said that he had "some loose sheets in my pocket about 5 pages" to add to "A Painful Case," but that he did not have the energy to continue working. The heat and the inhospitability of Rome oppressed him and he began to feel homesick for the British Isles, "rashers and eggs in the morning, the English variety of sunshine, a beefsteak with boiled potatoes and onions, a pier at night or a beach and cigarettes" (*Letters*, II, 157). By 25 September his nostalgia had grown stronger, "Sometimes thinking of Ireland it seems to me that I have been unnecessarily harsh. I have reproduced (in *Dubliners* at least) none of its ingenuous insularity and its hospitality" (*Letters*, II, 166). It has often been said that in these words of Joyce lies the germ of the last story of *Dubliners*, "The Dead."³ Yet the conception and execution of "The Dead" lay still almost a year ahead. More immediately, Joyce added four days later: "I have a new story for *Dubliners* in my head. It deals with Mr Hunter" (*Letters*, II, 168). This story which—at least in this context—never got any further than its title, but which was centered upon a spontaneous act of hospitality, was to be called "Ulysses."

Out of the blue, Grant Richards wrote on 24 September 1906 breaking his contract and rejecting *Dubliners*. Joyce reacted by making new concessions, but to no avail. The manuscript was returned on 26 October. A barrister advised Joyce not to waste his money seeking legal redress. Wisely in this instance, he concurred. Summoning up a little energy and turning to his manuscript, he made some corrections: he added the name of the laundry where Maria worked—the "Dublin by Lamplight Laundry"—to "The Clay,"

2. *Letters*, II, 148. This would seem to indicate that, in addition to the set sent to Richards, Joyce left a spare manuscript of *Dubliners* with Stanislaus in Trieste.

3. Though in this story surely the sentiment comes under heavy irony, and the general miasma of frustration and pathos that pervades *Dubliners*, far from being dispelled, is thickened.

revised "Grace,"⁴ and re-introduced "bloody" into "Ivy Day in the Committee Room." He also thought of another story, "The Last Supper," about the son of his old landlady, but though he asked Stanislaus to supply details about the incident behind the idea for this story, and also (for the projected "Ulysses") to send his reminiscences of Mr Hunter (a proto-model for Leopold Bloom), Joyce never wrote it. In early December he sent the partly revised manuscript of *Dubliners* to John Long, the publisher. For the next few months he did little else but read. He did, however, conceive of new "titles" for stories: "The Dead," "The Street," "Vengeance," and "At Bay" (*Letters*, II, 209)—to add to the already mentioned "Ulysses" and "The Last Supper." In mid-January 1907 Long replied discouragingly and followed this up with a final rejection on 21 February.

In the meantime Joyce had had a bellyfull of Rome. He felt it was time he made up his mind to become a writer. He handed in notice at the bank where he worked, packed his bags, and rearrived in Trieste (his palm out to Stanislaus) on or about 7 March. Nora was again pregnant. Joyce's first few months back in the city were spent striving to make ends meet until, in midsummer, a few days before the birth on 26 July of his daughter Lucia, he was struck down with rheumatic fever. He spent a few weeks in hospital and another couple of months recovering. During this period of ill-health he wrote the fifteenth, final story and capstone of *Dubliners*, "The Dead." It was finished on 20 September. Though only fragments of its beginning and end have survived from Joyce's 77-page holograph, the story's full text, (incompletely) corrected and amended by the author, is preserved in a scribal copy of 18 typewritten pages and an allograph of 38 pages in two hands, one of them Stanislaus Joyce's.⁵ The composition of "The Dead" marked the end of Joyce's creative engagement with *Dubliners*. He returned to his abandoned autobiographical novel, now entirely reconceived, reorganised and newly styled as *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

Even now the saga of *Dubliners* was not over. On 24 September 1907 Joyce offered the book (now for the first time comprising all fifteen stories) to Elkin Mathews, the publisher of *Chamber Music*. Mathews asked to see the manuscript on 23 October, but laid it aside until after the Christmas season, and finally rejected it on 6 February 1908. When he turned it down, Mathews suggested sending the manuscript to Maunsel and Co. of Dublin,⁶ but Joyce, preferring an English publisher, demurred and asked (on 9 February) for it to be

4. It is probable that it was at this time that he wrote out the extant fair copy of this story.
5. Only page 29, from the fifth word onwards, is in Stanislaus's hand. The 'family likeness' of the other hand suggests that it may be that of Joyce's sister Eileen.
6. In his letter (now at Cornell) Mathews wrote that he "mentioned it to Mr. Hone (Maunsel and Co., Dublin) the other day, and he said 'Oh, send the ms. on to us, as it might suit us.'"

returned to him. He next tried Hutchinson's (they refused to look at the manuscript), Alston Rivers (ditto), Sisleys (they wanted Joyce to pay), Greening and Co. (No!), Archibald Constable (No!), and Edward Arnold (No! yet again).

By the end of the year, Joyce began to come around to the idea of having the book published in Ireland and he conceived the idea of sending Stanislaus to Dublin to push the business on. On 13 February 1909 he wrote to Mathews and asked him to arrange for a communication with Hone (Joseph Maunsel Hone, the money behind Maunsel and Co., which George Roberts ran). This was done, and at the end of July Joyce himself (and not as originally planned Stanislaus) went to Dublin to meet Hone and Roberts. The negotiations went well and a contract was duly drawn up and signed on 19 August. *Dubliners* was to appear in March of the following year in dark grey binding with dark red lettering, at a price of 3/6 (*Letters*, II, 230–38). Satisfied, and missing Nora considerably, Joyce returned to Trieste in early September.

Two months had not passed before he was back again in Dublin with a plan to set up the first cinema in Ireland. (The enterprise was not, for reasons not here entered into, a financial success.) According to his own account (*Letters*, II, 292) it was while he was in Dublin in December that George Roberts first asked him to alter the narrative passage in "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" dealing with Edward VII. He agreed, much against his will, and "altered one or two phrases."⁷ He returned to Trieste at the beginning of January 1910.

On 23 March Roberts wrote promising the proofs in early April and publication in May. The proofs, however, did not turn up until June, during which month Joyce was "very busy" correcting them. On 10 June Roberts wrote again and complained that he was still not happy with "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" and asked that the entire passage referring to the late King be removed or entirely rewritten. Joyce corrected and returned both a set of galleys and a set of page proofs. Curiously, the proofs for "Ivy Day" contained the original version—and not the (presumed late 1909) autograph alternative—of the disputed passage. Publication, scheduled for July, was nevertheless postponed once again. In December Roberts set 20 January 1911 as the new publication date and he sent Joyce another set of the proofs of "Ivy Day in the Committee Room." He once again asked him to delete or radically to alter the passage concerning Edward VII. The evidence indicates that he sent Joyce a copy of the uncorrected early page proofs. Joyce proposed either (a) deletion of the passage with a prefatory note of explanation added, or (b) arbi-

7. It is possible that it was on this occasion that he wrote in the "alternative" passage on folio 16 of the extant (Cornell) manuscript.

tration as a solution of the matter (*Letters*, II, 289). Roberts, infuriatingly, did not reply. On 10 June, at the end of his tether, Joyce wrote again repeating his proposal and threatening—if he failed to receive a reply forthwith—legal action. He further swore that he would communicate the whole affair to the press by way of a circular letter.

For the second time the legal advice received was that it would not be worth while to sue. Redirecting himself, Joyce next determined—like Anna Livia in *Finnegans Wake*—to present the case to and to seek the opinion of the King (now George V, Edward VII's son), to whom on 1 August 1911 he accordingly sent the proofs of "Ivy Day" with the disputed passage clearly marked.⁸ Understandably declining to opine, the King commanded his private secretary to return the enclosures. Not entirely displeased with this partial success, Joyce immediately set about putting into effect the next phase of his campaign. First he carefully corrected and revised the moot passage⁹ and had a number of slips of it printed (in an attractive art-nouveau type-font, presumably locally in Trieste). He then wrote (on 17 August 1911) his famous 'Letter to the Editor' into which he pasted a copy of the reprinted fragment (*Letters*, II, 291–93). Copies of the letter were sent to interested parties such as Grant Richards and to nearly all of the newspapers in Ireland. It appeared in the Belfast *Northern Whig* on 26 August with the passage from "Ivy Day" omitted and—in full—in the Dublin-based *Sinn Féin* on 2 September. To a man, the major organs refused to publish it, and, in sum, it had no effect on Maunsel and Co.

Thoroughly depressed, and living in straitened circumstances, Joyce was at a complete loss as to what to do next. Around this time, also, he (temporarily) suspended work on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.¹ The seasons passed. In 1912 he decided to send Nora—who was anxious to see her family once more—with Lucia to Ireland. The new plan was for Nora to intercede at Maunsel's on her hus-

8. This set of proofs is now at the Beinecke Library at Yale. It is almost certainly the very set that Roberts had sent Joyce seven months earlier. The twin parallel lines in the margins of pages 193–194 marking the passage (see *Archive*, vol. [5], pp. 79–80) might be Roberts's, or they might be Joyce's. It is unlikely that when he sent it to the King the passage contained Joyce's autograph corrections and revisions (these would have confused His Majesty) or Joyce's smaller diagonal lines indicating the passage's beginning and end. These, as we shall argue, were added immediately *after* the King's return of the proofs to Joyce.

9. These improvements—which indicate an alteration of Mr Henchy's diction and a decision to remove some 'stage-Irish' spellings and punctuation—are of considerable textual importance in that, made just one year later when his memory was still relatively fresh, they probably correspond in nature to those corrections and revisions made on the lost corrected copy of the early page proofs returned to Maunsel's.

1. Indeed, it may have been at this time that he threw the *Portrait* manuscript in the fire; see the "Introduction" to the critical edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993, p. 4, and to the forthcoming Norton Critical Edition.

band's behalf. She arrived in Dublin on 8 July and saw Roberts soon after, but to no avail. On another impulse, Joyce decided that he would himself travel at once to Ireland, bringing Giorgio with him. En route, while passing through London he called on Joseph Maunsel Hone. He, however, could do nothing. In Dublin he met Roberts who came up with a new proposal: Joyce could delete disputed passages in "Ivy Day" and also in "An Encounter" or, alternatively, he could buy out the book from him, printed and bound, and have it distributed by Simpkin Marshall of London. Joyce said he would think about it, and left for Galway to join Nora. Further negotiations ensued, with Roberts now suggesting that Joyce buy the sheets from him and offer them to Grant Richards. Joyce arranged for a solicitor, John G. Lidwell, to advise him and returned to Dublin. After much haggling and toing-and-froing, threats and counter-threats of legal action, the matter seemed to be settled between them: Joyce would publish the book himself; of the total costs of printing the book, named at £57, he would pay Roberts £30; £15 were due within 15 days; on receipt, Roberts would let him have 104 copies of the sheets; and, on further receipt of a second £15 within a further 15 days, he would hand over the remainder of the total of 1000 sheets (*Letters*, II, 301–316). But this plan too came to grief in the end when the printer, John Falconer, refused to hand over even one set of the sheets. According to Joyce, Falconer said he was going to break up the type and burn the sheets. According to Roberts, the sheets were in fact guillotined (*Letters*, II, 319n.). The following day, 11 September 1912, having managed to obtain from Roberts "by a ruse" a complete set of proofs, James Joyce left Dublin in utter disgust, never again to return.

Such at any rate is the story that has come down to us. But is it true? There are several serious implausibilities in it. Take the question of the printer's hire: the £57 owed by Maunsel to Falconer for printing 1000 copies of *Dubliners*. This was by no means an inconsiderable sum in 1912. The printer's claim that he cared nothing for that money—or even just for the £30 that Joyce was to have been made to pay—is risible.² Hence, whether valued at £30 or £57, one wonders: was the merchandise available at all? Moreover, with 104 copies promised within two weeks, and a remaining 896 another two weeks ahead, the important question doesn't even begin to be answered of *when* and *why* 1000 copies, and copies of precisely *what* text, may be supposed to have been printed in the first place. While the events considered were those of the summer of 1912, *Dubliners* were set in galleys two years earlier. The surviving galley proofs of "A Mother" are dated 8 June 1910 and those for "The Dead" 19 June

2. Joyce's later paranoid suspicion that his enemies in Dublin had paid the £57 is equally incredible.

1910. Assuming an even progress of work, this times the galleys for "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," specifically, to the early days of June, which would allow just enough time for Joyce to have corrected and returned them to inspire Roberts's letter to him of 10 June expressing dissatisfaction with the state of the passage on Edward VII. We know also that Joyce was still engaged in correcting proof on 24 June—by which time he must have been working on the early page proofs—and that he completed the task (*Letters*, II, 287–88). Final page proofs—made from the corrected early page proofs—are extant for "The Dead." From the opening of the book, too, late page proofs—sheets A to K—exist up to and partly including "A Painful Case." This total of fifteen sheets of late page proofs extant was presumably pulled in June or July 1910. Six full sheets, however, are absent (i.e., sheets L–Q). So technically defined is this as a reservation of space that these sheets may in fact never have been printed. From June 1910 and yet more stubbornly from December 1910 George Roberts was not satisfied with the text as it stood. When, after his June letter, he wrote again in December, the final page proofs for "Ivy Day" (and with them, by inference, those of the remainder of "A Painful Case," and of all of "A Mother" and "Grace") seem not yet to have been prepared. Nothing happened in 1911 or in 1912 to make him change his mind about "Ivy Day" or to induce him to give the order for the printing of 1000 copies of the whole of *Dubliners*. Such an order would have been tantamount to a decision to go ahead with publication. The conclusion to be drawn from these inferences and these facts is that the one thousand copies of the sheets of *Dubliners* never existed.

The re-surfacing precisely of Joyce's spoil from the Dublin publishing disaster at the Stanislaus Joyce sale at Sotheby's in London in 2004 may confirm our distrust in the orthodox versions of the events of 1910–1912 and strengthen our alternative assumptions. In collational terms, the set begins with six gatherings—A to F—in late page proofs. Early page proofs follow for a stretch of 32 pages (or two gatherings: G and H). Though already carrying page numbers, they are easily distinguished as leaves of early page proofs because they are printed on one side of the paper only. The leaves are of uneven length; apparently, they were printed on galley-length paper, three pages to a galley, and then scissored apart. Gatherings I and K are again in late page proofs, while the stretch of 96 pages to become gatherings L to Q are once more in early page proofs. Finally, from gathering R, which begins with the half-title for "The Dead," the home stretch of the book is, as before, in late page proofs. It ends on signature X2r, with X2v blank. On page 289 by Maunsell's page numbering (that is: on the first page of gathering T), there is an entry in ink in the top margin: 'Proof Sept. 6/10.'

Altogether, the mix of late and early page proofs in the two sets of proofs that we now have differs in interesting ways. In the set earlier known, gatherings A to K are throughout in late page proofs. The newly found set, by contrast, alternates between late and early proofs through these quires. Yet on the other hand, both sets are identical in having early page proofs only for gatherings L to Q, as well as being in late page proofs from gathering R to the end, that is: for "The Dead." It is only the newly discovered set, moreover, that preserves the last of these late page-proof pages, and thus the end of the final story and of the book, in the three printed pages from gathering X.

The main discovery to be made from the set of Maunsel proofs that Joyce "obtained by a ruse," however, is that it bears marks of service as an in-house working copy at Maunsel's in Dublin. On the opening page of each gathering, be it in late or in early page proofs, there is a pencilled entry with a number over an oblique stroke, and under the stroke the initials 'J. H.', standing, most likely, for Joseph [Maunsel] Hone, "the money behind Maunsel and Co.," as we stressed above. It seems that Hone shared actively in the planning of the firm's work—and since he was the money behind it, he would also have seen to its economy. The numbering he enters numbers the gatherings; it runs from 1 to 17 through gatherings A to Q; and it begins afresh with the number '1' at gathering R (the beginning of "The Dead"). As the numbers in the first sequence rise, it is noticeable that they also get slightly, but increasingly, out of sync with the actual quire division. Why this should be so becomes clear on considering what it would mean, in economic terms, to print the book as before us in proof. Running into gathering X, it overshoots by three pages the length of twenty full gatherings (320 pages). The marking, therefore, looks like an attempt to re-impose the book sufficiently to bring it within this limit.

Yet why two number sequences beginning with '1'? Let us assume that the sequences were worked over in reverse order. This would mean that the calculations to contain the book within twenty gatherings concentrated first on "The Dead," and that the re-impositions through all gatherings from the beginning were found necessary only because the problem of overflow at the end could not be solved over the stretch of quires R to U alone. But in addition, it is also suggestive to assume that "The Dead" was in late page proofs before (some of) the rest of the book. We would conclude that the proof markings reflect the preparations for the book at a point before gatherings L to Q were put into late page proofs, and that it was precisely at this interval that the opportunity was seen and taken to prevent the text's overflow into a gathering X.

Joseph Hone, then, could be assumed to have marked the working-

copy set of proofs in advance of putting gatherings L to Q into late page proof. His pencilings would thus appear to be planning notes (as it were) for the completion of the publisher's and printer's job on the book. As to their timing, they could have been made at any time between September 1910 and September 1912, when Joyce absconded with the set. The explicit date on gathering T favours the likelihood that Hone's adjustments were devised in the autumn of 1910. Thereafter, they would have been held, pending the time when Roberts's, and eventually Falconer's, objections to the text of various passages along the stretch of gatherings L to Q would be met. Yet, as we have argued above, that time never came. It is true that we cannot tell with absolute certainty from these proofs as such whether, finally, the book actually did go into full production regardless of the unresolved conflicts over it between publisher, printer and author. Yet they do not, on the whole, make us readier to accept that such was the truth of the matter. On the contrary, the material evidence of this set of proofs that we take to be the Roberts/Hone in-house working copy for their contracted edition of *Dubliners* might in actual fact be the best underpinning presently available of our contention that *Dubliners*, between 1910 and 1912, and under the hands of Maunsel and Co. in Dublin, went just so far, and no further, towards completion. As for the narratives engendered by the case, they would appear as a conflagration of Irish facts. Roberts would have bluffed with his offer of 1,000 sheets, counting on Joyce's inability to raise the money. When the pecuniary deterrent did not work, Falconer's moral objections had to smoke-screen the non-existence of the goods haggled over. The shredding or sending up in flames of the non-existent sheets could be outshone finally only by the ardent fictionalisation of James Joyce's own "Gas from a Burner."³

While in London in transit to Trieste, Joyce tried without success to interest Ford Madox Hueffer's *English Review* in *Dubliners*. He also took it to Mills and Boon to whom Padraic Colum had given him an introduction. On 13 September he handed over to Mr Boon the set of sheets he had wangled out of Roberts (*Letters*, II, 320). Ingenuous to the last, he included as a preface a copy (presumably a press-cutting obtained in Dublin) of his letter to *Sinn Féin*. He considered that it would act as a "selling point" for the book; whereas

3. Hugh Kenner is inimitably illuminating on "Irish Facts" in the introductory essay, "Warning," to *A Colder Eye. The Modern Irish Writers*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983. Roberts's version was recounted to Richard Ellmann many years later. Falconer's version, which we know only secondhand from Joyce's letters, must have been an embellishment made in the heat of the moment. Had Joyce allowed himself to perceive what had been going on with a colder eye, he would, of course, have lost the title of the broadside which—energised with ire—he composed a few days later in the waiting-room of a railway station at Flushing in Holland.

to the publisher it acted merely as a frightener. Boon had his letter of rejection in the post in less than a week.

In the year that followed, *Dubliners* once again did the rounds. In December Joyce sent his set of Maunsel proofs to Martin Secker; in February 1913 he approached (for the second time) Elkin Mathews; in April John Long (ditto); and in July he tried Macmillan. There may well have been others. Finally, back at square one, on 23 November 1913 he wrote to Grant Richards and asked him to reconsider his 1906 rejection. Richards, who was a relatively decent chap for a publisher, had in the long interim experienced some twinges, if not pangs, of conscience over his earlier treatment of Joyce and, besides, Joyce did offer to cover part of the expenses of publication (*Letters*, II, 324). Richards wrote back at once asking to see the book again. Joyce, still intent on the inclusion of his preface, quickly brought it up to date, entitled it "A Curious History" (*Letters*, II, 324–25) and submitted it, together with the set of Maunsel proofs.⁴ With "A Curious History" and the printer's copy, a title-page was also included (*Letters*, II, 330).

While Joyce waited for news from Richards, a vortex of change entered his life in the person of Ezra Pound, brass band and band-wagon. At first drawn to and by the poetry, Pound soon became an important and influential advocate for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. But he did not lack in engagement for *Dubliners*. Joyce sent him "A Curious History" which Pound printed in his regular column in *The Egoist* on 15 January 1914. While the surviving correspondence is confusing and perhaps misleading on the subject,⁵ it appears that he also sent him some stories. Writing as he did on 19 January that he was forwarding "the" three stories (one of which was "An Encounter") to the New York magazine *Smart Set*,⁶ Pound must have had them in hand. Perhaps he was even temporarily in possession of the entire collection. That Joyce did assemble at some time after 1910, though more probably after 1912, a complete run of the *Dubliners* stories distinct (and textually different) from Richards's

4. Robert E. Scholes still argued in "Observations on the text of *Dubliners*" and "Further Observations on the text of *Dubliners*," *Studies in Bibliography* XV (1962), 191–205, and XVII (1964), 107–122, that this set was throughout a set of early page proofs. His conclusion could only be inferential, from internal collation evidence. Forty years ago, Scholes did not see Richards's printer's copy, nor was he even given to know it had survived. Yet, as discussed, it resurfaced in 2004. Footnote 9, p. xxx, surveys the traces it bears from the London printinghouse.

5. For Pound's letters to Joyce of the period, see Forrest Read, *Pound/Joyce* (New York: New Directions Paperback, 1970), pp. 24–25.

6. On 14 February he sent on the magazine's reply (delicately described by Pound as a prime "piece of bull shit"), which though lost was evidently a rejection. Forrest Read (*op. cit.* p. 24) assumes the other two were "The Boarding House" and "A Little Cloud" because, in May 1915, at the behest of B. W. Huebsch, *Smart Set* published these two stories. Read's argument is unsound, as the 1915 copy appears to have been provided by Huebsch.

printer's copy is certain, as, apart from two pages of "A Little Cloud," it has survived. It comprises: (a) the 1910/1912 final proofs (pages [i]–160) of "The Sisters" to "A Painful Case"; (b) manuscripts of "A Painful Case" and "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," (c) the galley proofs of "A Mother"; (d) a manuscript of "Grace"; (e) the (incomplete) final proofs (pages [257]–320) of "The Dead"; and (f) the final pages of the manuscript of "The Dead."⁷ It is thus possible that Joyce sent Pound the whole text in this exemplar.⁸

In the meantime, on 20 January 1914, Grant Richards replied requesting further information from Joyce. This was sent on 24 January (*Letters*, II, 328–29). Joyce wrote: "The book is in the form approved by me, i.e. with one or two slight changes already made."⁹ Richards finally agreed on 29 January to publish *Dubliners*, though shorn of the preface. He sent a signed agreement on 23 March.¹ Setting from printed copy, Richards's printer bypassed galley proof stage and in April sent page proofs to Joyce.² Joyce quickly corrected

7. At the end of (b) is written "Next Story of *Dubliners* A Mother in printed proofsheets"; at the end of (c) "Next Story of *Dubliners* Grace in MS"; at the end of (d) "Next Story of *Dubliners* The Dead part in book from page 160 to page 320 part in MS"; and at the beginning of (f) "End of Story *The Dead*": all in the same markedly sprawling authorial hand. The late page proofs themselves (what Joyce calls the "book," in which the unnumbered title-page of "The Dead" [257] follows page 160) are unmarked. In the *James Joyce Archive*, vol. [4], p. xxx, I essentially identified this mixed-copy assembly of the *Dubliners* text.
8. But if he gave him only a selection, it is not impossible that he sent a typescript, as Forrest Read (*op. cit.* p. 1) holds. *Dubliners* as a whole, it is true, was never typed. But this was a time when Joyce, to prepare copy for the *Egoist* serialisation of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, for the first time in his life employed a typist. In late March or early April (the letter is undated) Pound wrote again, saying that he had sent off "Araby" to the U.S., of which again, therefore, he must have had a copy.
9. Taking 'one or two' as a considerable understatement, one would infer from this remark that Joyce was sufficiently aware that the prize set of proofs obtained "by a ruse" from Maunsel in 1912 partly contained sheets in an advanced state of revision. The autopsy made possible before the Sotheby sale in 2004 showed not only that it was indeed a mixed copy (as discussed above). It also revealed that, to serve as Richards's printer's copy, the pages carry relatively frequent pencil annotations, especially in the early gatherings. These specify questions of general lay-out, fonts, and the like; and they insist on the house-styling of Joyce's dialogue dashes into inverted (or, as Joyce called them, "perverted") commas. Off and on—possibly at change-overs of the compositorial stints—there are also indications of the page breaks for the London typesetting. Throughout, the Dublin printed page numbers are altered in pencil. This is a printinghouse requirement due to the fact that the London typesetting is less expansive than the Dublin one, and that, with the blank pages of the Dublin setting skipped (and physically already eliminated) in the copy before them, the London compositors had to be reassured that they were not missing pages of text.
1. Richards added that his printer had mislaid pages 3–4 and 13–14 of "The Sisters." Three days later (on 26 March) Joyce sent off typed copies of the "Sisters" pages in question (*Letters*, II, 392–95). These have also re-surfaced with the proofs that have now come to light. They were clearly prepared, as was easy to do, from the additional fragmentary runs of the 1910 proofs still in Joyce's possession.
2. In April 1914, the printer's copy was returned to Joyce along with two sets of the Richards page proofs (one of which, unmarked, still survives). The title-page was sent back later (*Letters*, II, 334). The Maunsel proofs remained in Joyce's possession for many years. In May 1917 he described them to John Quinn as "the only copy extant, so far as I know, of the burned first edition" (*Letters*, II, 396). In 1927 he offered the set for sale to A.S.W. Rosenbach (*Letters*, I, 252, and III, 161). Rosenbach, and after him other dealers, declined. In the event, it was Stanislaus Joyce who preserved them and prized them suf-

and returned these, expecting to see a revise. It never came. Frustrated, he prepared a list of further corrections and sent them on to Richards on 14 May. The corrections were not made, nor has the list itself survived.

Dubliners, by James Joyce, in an edition of 1250 copies, was published by Grant Richards on 15 June 1914. In 1916, B. W. Huebsch of New York bought 504 sets of sheets from Richards and issued them as the first American edition.

The Document Relationships

Of each *Dubliners* story, there was first—after drafts that (save for that of “A Painful Case”) are all lost—an autograph fair copy. In fact, Joyce fair-copied the final draft text of most, if not all, stories more than once. The copies varied only slightly, as is witnessed by the two extant manuscripts of “Ivy Day in the Committee Room.” Where only one exemplar survives, such differences as there were, are, as a rule, irrecoverable. Exceptions are “The Boarding House,” where the variants in the single extant fair copy indicate that behind the printed text was another, somewhat revised manuscript; and “Eveline,” which went into the book publication of *Dubliners* in a version—and therefore, doubtless, from a fair copy—significantly different from the text published in *The Irish Homestead*. For “After the Race,” by contrast, also first published in *The Irish Homestead*, the book text, although presumably not printed from the manuscript behind the *Homestead* but from another exemplar, shows very little revision. The opposite is true for “The Sisters.” For this story, the *Homestead* and the book texts are radically different versions, each represented in one surviving fair copy. Of these, the first-version manuscript, as indicated, was prepared as the original copy of the story for the book as first submitted to Grant Richards in 1905, and thus postdates the *Irish Homestead* publication.

Joyce's original printer's copy for the *Dubliners* volume was a stable set of autograph fair copies which went to Grant Richards for the first time in November 1905, then a second time in June 1906, and finally to Maunsell and Co. of Dublin in 1909. The changes and substitutions in this set were few and specific. The first submission to Grant Richards in November 1905 consisted of the twelve stories originally planned, to which the thirteenth story—“Two Gallants”—followed in February 1906, while the negotiations over the publication were ongoing. The portfolio was returned in June 1906. In July, Joyce re-submitted it with the second fair-copy version of “The

efficiently not to include them in the cache of Joyceana that went to Cornell in the late 1950s. This is why Robert Scholes, who catalogued the Cornell collection, did not see them, nor knew of them (see p. xxix, n. 4).

Sisters" in place of the first, a replacement leaf or two in "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," and possibly in "Counterparts," and the fourteenth story, "A Little Cloud," inserted between "The Boarding House" and "Counterparts." Thirteen of the fourteen manuscripts seen, and in the end declined, by Richards (and preliminarily even handled by his printers, as in the case of "Two Gallants"), three years later became the copy for Maunsel in Dublin, with the addition now of "The Dead," written in 1907. For "Grace," as indicated, Maunsel received a fresh manuscript. The manuscript of the story as submitted to Richards has not survived.

The Richards/Maunsel set of manuscripts is not entirely lost. The extant fair copies of "The Sisters," "An Encounter," "A Painful Case," "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" (the Cornell copy), "A Mother," "Grace" (being the post-1906 version) and "The Dead" (with two large middle sections missing) belonged to it. The fair copies preserved of "The Boarding House" and "Counterparts," on the other hand,³ as well as the other surviving fair copy of "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" (the Yale copy), are manuscripts slightly pre-dating the assembly of the printer's copy in November 1905. While their pre-dating is suggested by minor as yet unrevised readings, collation nevertheless confirms them as sufficiently satisfactory substitutes for their lost counterparts in the Richards/Maunsel set.

The Maunsel edition, though never published, went through three stages of proof in 1910: galleys, early page proofs and late page proofs. Each stage is documented, though in the case of the galleys only by surviving fragments. Galleys exist for "Counterparts" (a fragment of one galley slip), "A Mother" (complete) and "The Dead" (with the end, to the length of probably one galley slip, missing). The alternation of early and late page proofs in the Maunsel in-house working copy, as well as the interlacing, in Joyce's own patch-up copy, of stories in autograph with runs from the 1910/1912 proofs from Dublin, have already been described above.

When Grant Richards rescinded his refusal of 1906 and offered to publish *Dubliners* in 1914, the Maunsel in-house mix of proofs, as said, became his printer's copy. Joyce received, corrected and returned page proofs in April 1914. These were the only proofs provided for the first edition. They survive in one unmarked set.⁴ As indicated, the list of some 200 corrections, dispatched to Richards

3. Their present location at Cornell, as part of the Stanislaus Joyce collection of Joyceana, would seem to identify them as vestiges of the set of *Dubliners* manuscripts held by Stanislaus (see p. xxi, n.2).

4. All Maunsel and Richards proofs that in the 1970s were known to have survived are reprinted in vols. [5] and [6] of *The James Joyce Archive: James Joyce, Dubliners. The 1910 Proofs and Dubliners. The 1914 Proofs*, prefaced and arranged by Michael Groden. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977.

when Joyce realised that he was not receiving revises, has not been preserved (nor were the corrections themselves made). After publication of the first edition, a further autograph list entitled "Dubliners / Misprints" was assembled and still exists (see *James Joyce Archive*, vol [4], pages 51–63). It is not clear whether this is the list prepared by Joyce in 1915 for a putative second Grant Richards edition, or a revised version made in 1917 for B. W. Huebsch. The typed version of the list, however, was almost certainly made in 1917 (*Letters*, II, 392–95). Beyond it, there is no evidence that Joyce attended to the text of *Dubliners* in his lifetime.

The Transmission of the Text through the Documents

Each *Dubliners* story reached its final stage of manuscript revision in the fair-copy exemplar incorporated in the Richards/Maunsel set of manuscripts. The galleys typeset from this set show conspicuous house-styling, especially in the punctuation. In a first round of proof-reading, Joyce appears to have concentrated above all on removing hundreds of commas. He continued the process in proof-reading the early page proofs. At this stage, he also turned his attention to a restyling of compounds. The late page proofs show an extensive elimination of hyphens, and compounds now appear as either one-word or two-word formations. Exactly the same proof-reading labour was in 1915/16 exercised on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. There, as can be demonstrated, Joyce's markings were often ambiguous, resulting in two-word divisions where he wished one word formations. The corresponding documentary evidence for *Dubliners* is missing, since we lack the early page proofs that Joyce marked up. Hence, it cannot be determined which of the individual two-word compounds in the *Dubliners* late page proofs were meant by him as one word. Along with the restitution of Joyce's light punctuation in the galleys and early page proofs, and his restyling of compounds in the early page proofs, one may note a certain amount of lowering of capitals in a manner typical later for *Portrait* and *Ulysses*; and, of course, at both proof stages much necessary correction of typos was carried out. Most importantly, both the galleys and the early page proofs received an even spread of revisions. Though not numerous, they are significant throughout. But the revisions actually made in the early page proofs are recoverable only in so far as the late page proofs survive. There, however, they do stand out as distinctly recognizable authorial changes. In truth, since Joyce's proof-reading on the Maunsel edition is traceable throughout only by its results, all proof corrections, restylings and revisions that we claim as authorial must ultimately prove themselves by their kind and quality, since

marked proofs have been preserved neither of the galley nor of the early page proof stage. Joyce's proof-reading on the Maunsel edition is traceable only by its results.

The circumstance that, though some proofs in the set of Maunsel pages that served as printer's copy for Grant Richards were late, others were early, means that the first-edition text to that extent lacks the final round of Maunsel corrections and revisions. Altogether, marking the 1914 proofs involved repeating much of the work done once before on the Maunsel proofs. Again, a considerable accretion of commas was removed; compounds, which had re-acquired hyphens in large numbers, were again restyled without them, though not as consistently and radically as in the two rounds of Maunsel proofing. In so far as memory served, moreover, some of the final Maunsel revisions were once more introduced. Yet in all, Joyce did not gain control over the first edition to the extent he wished. He requested in vain that dialogue be styled not with "perverted commas," but with the dialogue dash. Barred the opportunity, on which he had counted, of proofing revises, he drew up a list of some 200 further corrections—a list which has not survived—only to find when the book was out that they had been disregarded and that, furthermore, not all the changes he had marked in the proofs he read had in fact been carried out.

In sum, it is not the Grant Richards first edition text of 1914, but the text of the Maunsel late page proofs of 1910, incomplete though these are, which represents *Dubliners* as most closely and consistently under Joyce's control in print.

The Choice of Copy-text

In critical editing, one standard method of procedure is to select a copy-text from the texts represented in the extant documents. This method has been adopted in this edition, which is therefore a conventional 'copy-text edition.'⁵ According to rule, the editor establishes an edited text critically from the base of the 'copy-text' chosen (in descending order of preference, this would be the text of an autograph manuscript, of a scribal copy in manuscript or typescript, of a set of proofs, of a published edition—and if a published edition, preferably the first). In selecting the copy-text, the editor will be significantly guided both by what the author wrote, and by what shape the author and others gave the text in the course of production

5. In this, the present edition of *Dubliners*, as well as its companion edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, differs essentially from the edition of *Ulysses*, where the textual situation is greatly more complex. (The Critical and Synoptic Edition of *Ulysses*, prepared by Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, was published in 3 volumes by Garland Publishing, New York, in 1984/86; the reading text from that edition is available in paperback both in the US and the UK from Random House [Vintage and Bodley Head, respectively].)

and publication. It has thus been specifically to set out the options for the choice of copy-text, or copy-texts, that we have described above the nature and range of the surviving documents for *Dubliners*. In particular, we have emphasized how Joyce shared in the proof-reading of the aborted Maunsel edition even to the extent of exploiting it for his own purposes of revision. Yet we have also shown that he failed to gain influence over both the text and its presentation in the course of production of the first edition. What he was prevented from doing on the first-edition proofs was, in one respect, to restore a styling and a layout he favoured, which was a light rhetorical punctuation, and the setting-out of speech with dialogue dashes. In this, he insisted (though in vain) on effects and an appearance of his text as he had written it in his autograph manuscripts. In another respect, he attempted (though equally in vain) to do on the first-edition proofs what he had already once before performed on the Maunsel proofs: namely, to revise the text, that is, to re-write it in specific wordings and phrasings.

To decide, in consequence, on what course of action to take in the critical editing under copytext-editing auspices, it is important to consider that the first of these proofing gestures confirms the authority of the manuscripts. At the same time, the second does not invalidate them wholesale: authorial revision merely supersedes the manuscript text in specific readings. The situation as a whole is one to which copy-text editing procedures are comfortably suited. In their light, Joyce's autograph may be singled out as the obvious document to provide the base text for the critical editing. But no entire manuscript in Joyce's hand exists of *Dubliners*, nor does even every single story survive in autograph. Hence, the copy-text for each story must be chosen individually. Where this cannot be an autograph, the alternative is fortunately straightforward: it is in such cases the 1910 proofs that provide the readiest substitute. Printer's deviations and errors apart—which editorial vigilance should prove capable of isolating and eliminating—these proofs represent what one might term a 'virtual manuscript text' beyond the text of the autograph from which they were set up. In other words, the 1910 proofs give the (lost) fair-copy text at a (post-faircopy) stage of further authorial revision.

In the present edition, Joyce's autograph manuscripts consequently hold the copy-text wholly for eight stories, and partly for a ninth ("The Dead"), while the Maunsel typesetting, in the state of the late page proofs, provides the copy-text for six stories. The eight stories edited from manuscript are: "The Sisters," "An Encounter," "The Boarding House," "Counterparts," "A Painful Case," "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," "A Mother," and "Grace." The 1910 late page proofs have provided the copy-text for "Araby," "Eveline," "After

the Race," "Two Gallants," "A Little Cloud," and "Clay." Only "The Dead," at the end of the collection, offers a situation of somewhat greater complexity. Its autograph survives only in part, and the text from its missing sections is represented merely in two distinct derivations. These are, on the one hand, a transcript partly typed and partly written out in two scribal hands (Eileen[?] and Stanislaus Joyce's), and on the other hand the 1910 galleys. While the typist and the family amanuenses appear, on the whole, to have made good sense of Joyce's punctuation, their general accuracy is highly variable and their copying is, all things considered, an amateur performance. On the other hand, the Maunsel compositors in Dublin did a professional job on setting type directly from the very same Joycean autograph that, in combination with the typist/amanuensis transcript, has survived in fragments. Having these fragments in Joyce's hand, we did not wish to dismiss them, so far as they go, as copy-text suppliers. Yet in weighing the further alternatives, we chose not the (later and amateur) transcript, but the (earlier and professional) 1910 galleys as copy-text document for the sections missing in the autograph. In the case of "The Dead," therefore, a splicing of copy-text documents exceptionally occurs even within the individual story. What can be said in favour of this procedure, however, though it is arbitrary, is that it brings the copy-text basis, in this instance too, closely in line with the selection of the 1910 typesetting to provide the copy-text for those stories whose autograph manuscripts are wholly lost.

The Editing

The copy-text is a text preserved in a document of transmission. It is not the text of the critical edition. A copy-text is never *in* an edition. It is, on the contrary, always *behind* the editing. The editor transforms the copy-text into an edited text through acts of critical editing. This editorial activity is recorded in an edition's apparatus. For the critical edition of James Joyce's *Dubliners*, the apparatus divides into two main sections. These are the notes at the foot of the text pages, and the historical collation. The historical collation, placed after the work's entire text, is to be found only in the 1993 (Garland) first printing of this edition. There it can be consulted and easily related to the present printing, since, regardless of the difference in volume pagination, the text, the lines, and the line-counts are identical in both printings. The purpose of the historical collation is to record in detail the differences between the edition's critically established text and the texts in the surviving documents. In practice, this makes much of the historical collation a listing of errors in transmission (defined as such through the editing). Such errors are misreadings

in and of the manuscripts, as well as misprints and other non-authentic readings in the proofs and published texts. The published texts singled out for reporting in the historical collation to this edition of *Dubliners* are two only, namely the 1914 first edition and the Viking edition of 1967, edited by Robert Scholes. This narrow selection of published editions for the historical collation record is justified by the fact that—the autograph list of “Dubliners/Misprints” of around 1917 apart—the author at no time had a hand in the numerous editions and re-issues of *Dubliners* after the first edition, and in his lifetime. Consequently, all editions and issues marketed around the world before 1967, even though they inevitably introduced their own non-authentic readings or outright errors, were ultimately derivations from the first edition of 1914. Editions after 1967, and specifically after 1992 when the copyright situation for *Dubliners* changed, have predominantly modeled their texts on that prepared by Robert Scholes. His Viking edition is best characterised as an amalgamation of selective features and readings from the manuscripts and the abortive 1910/1912 Maunsel edition to the first-edition text.

By contrast, the present edition establishes the text of *Dubliners* wholly afresh. On the surface, the two editions, Scholes's and the present one, while they do not concur in every word, are close in their readings. However, constructing its critical text newly from the early documents of the writing and transmission, this edition presents the stories in the punctuation and word forms of their first sources. This amounts to a re-patterning of *Dubliners* capable of giving a new feel for the language and the rhythms of the text, and of thus subtly altering one's appreciation of the narratives' shadings of meaning and sense. For this early Joycean work, moreover, the present edition for the first time also retrieves elements of authentic text that had been lost in the transmission since 1914. It is the second main section of the apparatus, namely the notes at the foot of the pages, that serves to record such retrievals, as well as comprehensively to detail the editing carried out to transform the copy-text into the edited text.

Considering the notes at the bottom of the text pages, what is most helpful for the user of the present edition to realize is the critical potential and interpretative usefulness they have. It is a minute authentication of the text, for instance, that Mrs Mooney, of “The Boarding House,” after walking out on her violent and menacing husband, “went to the priests” (“The Boarding House,” line 12)—and not ‘to the priest’, as according to all previous editions. Yet in terms of making interpretative sense of *Dubliners*, this one-letter restoration of what Joyce wrote in manuscript amounts to no less than a re-focussing of Mrs Mooney's character, as well as of the

society in which she lives. By the evidence of Joyce's plural form, she turns for support not just to her parish priest and confessor, but as it were to the whole priesthood corporately personifying the church that dominates her world. In this, as in numerous other instances, the footnote marks a 'STET' to affirm the copy-text against the printing tradition since 1914. By strict adherence to apparatus conventions, there need be no entry, since the edited text does not alter, or emend, the copy-text. The 'STET' record, however, registers an original detail of the text considered critically significant—as similarly in that other instance in the same story, where Mrs Mooney, amusingly to our ears, sends her daughter out to be “a typewriter in a cornfactor's office” (“The Boarding House,” lines 53–54). We catch a usage still possible before the language conveniently disambiguated the instrument and the agent of the new invention. (Polly Mooney the typist belongs to a new generation of office workers, while Farrington of “Counterparts” is still a clerk doing his allotted copying with pen and ink in longhand at the stand-up writing desk.)

The incidence of emendations and footnotes varies considerably between the stories. For some, as for “Araby,” “A Little Cloud,” or “Clay,” they are scarce, and for obvious reasons: the copy-text for these stories is the text of the 1910 late page proofs. No earlier records exist, so we lack evidence of variation at the stages of composition; nor does the transmission through the 1914 proofs, the first edition, and the Viking edition register much, if any, correction or revision. By contrast, we have the situation of “Eveline” or “After the Race.” The nature and extent of Joyce's revision of these stories between their appearance in *The Irish Homestead* and their inclusion among the printer's-copy manuscripts for Richards (1906) and Maunsel (1910/12) can be extrapolated from the foot-of-the-page notes and critically analysed. Similarly, the controversy between author and publishers over “Counterparts” can be followed to a considerable extent, and the notes reveal how much of the text Joyce did rework, even while he was not giving in to the censorship demands in principle. Again, for a story like “Ivy Day in the Committee Room,” the notes reveal over page after page that the author changed his attitude to phoneticising the dialogue and thereby representing in print the Dublin vernacular of his characters. Abandoning such a strategy, Joyce seems implicitly also to be distancing himself from the experiments in representing spoken language that were, around the time of his writing *Dubliners*, being initiated on the stage of the Abbey Theatre by the Irish Revivalists—experiments that Joyce had already anticipated privately half a decade earlier in his (hilariously free) translation of Gerhart Hauptmann's play *Before Sunrise* (*Vor Sonnenaufgang*).

Read not so much in terms of aiding critical analysis and inter-

pretation, but instead in terms of the critical editing, the apparatus at the bottom of the text pages furthermore takes the user through the editor's deliberations and decisions in the course of transforming the copy-text into the edited text. The case of "The Dead" with its split copy-text base proves particularly instructive to illustrate the range of the copy-text editor's problems, options, and solutions. The documents providing the copy-text, as said, are partly the surviving fragments from the autograph originally included in the Richards (1906) and Maunsel (1910/12) printer's copy, and partly the 1910 galley proofs set up from that autograph. As it happens, each of these copy-texts is also mirrored in a near-duplicate. The galley proofs, set from the once complete autograph, naturally duplicate the text for which the manuscript fragments provide the copy-text; and for the text residing as copy-text in these galleys themselves, a parallel derivation equally exists in shape of the amanuensis transcript, copied from the sections of the autograph now lost. The text closest to the source of Joyce's own writing is thus doubly attested throughout. In instances of variation within this double transmission, the text of the autograph fragments usually takes precedence where they provide the copy-text. Where the copy-text shifts to the 1910 galleys, the textual differences between the galleys and the amanuensis transcript must be critically weighed. For it may represent an error either on the part of the compositors setting up the galleys, or an inaccuracy of the typist or family scribe fabricating the amanuensis copy. Once this relationship has been editorially mapped out and the punctuation of the amanuensis copy, in particular, accepted to emend the galley-proof copy-text, the task begins of relating to the copy-text the variants in the 1910 late page proofs and in the first-edition text.

This may be illustrated by a few examples. For instance, the edited text allows Gabriel Conroy at lines 63–64 to reassure his aunts with the words "Go on up. I'll follow," according to the text in print, though against the copy-text, which lacks the two phrases. Similarly, it makes Gabriel anticipate his after-dinner speech as "an utter failure" (line 136), not as "a complete failure"; and it specifies that Gabriel's father was an employee of the "Port and Docks" (line 150), not of the "Post Office." These are examples of emendation in instances where the copy-text resides in the autograph. The collation pattern recorded in the apparatus shows that they answer to revisions performed in marking up the 1910 and the 1914 proofs respectively. For the changes at lines 63–64 and 136, the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs that derive from those 1910 late page proofs naturally agree against the manuscript and the—unmarked—1910 galleys. The revisions must have been entered in a parallel set of these galleys or, subsequently, in the early page proofs, else they could not have become incorporated in the late proofs and thence

transmitted to the 1914 proofs. At line 150, on the other hand, the revised first edition stands alone against four documents: the manuscript, the 1910 typesetting in both its surviving states (galleys and late proofs), and the extant unmarked 1914 proofs. It is in the parallel (and now lost) set of the 1914 proofs, therefore, that Joyce must have marked the change.

At the line-break 406/407, the initial autograph fragment ends. The copy-text to be confirmed, or else to be emended, is now the galley-proof text. That it represents the lost autograph authentically is best attested when the galleys and the typescript-and-amanuensis transcript agree in a given reading. Conversely, it is against such agreement that those variants are to be made out as revisions which make their first appearance in later print: in the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs in conjunction, in the 1910 late page proofs alone, or in the first-edition text alone. This is the case when Miss Ivors' brooch no longer bears "an Irish device and motto," but only "an Irish device" (line 406); or when Miss Ivors uses the racier term "rag" (line 421) for "paper" to disparage the *Daily Express*. These revisions—both of them identifiable as revisions to the galleys or the early page proofs, since the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs agree against the extant unmarked galleys and the typescript—become the edition's readings. When however the galley copy-text and the typescript-and-amanuensis transcript disagree, there may be a doubt as to which represents the lost autograph. In the case of a name, "Clohissey's" at line 432, which is the typescript reading, the galleys have "O'Clohissey's." Without further textual evidence, this, being the copy-text reading, would become the edition reading. But in fact, the form attested in the typescript exists already in the 1910 late page proofs. This suggests that the typescript reading derives authentically from the autograph and supports the decision to emend the copy-text accordingly.

In yet another type of situation, one is faced with a contradictory revision. At lines 523, 525, and 528 it is clear from the galley and typescript agreement that the authentic unrevised term is "row" by which Gretta Conroy refers to the altercation between her husband and Miss Ivors; and Gabriel, defending himself, picks it up. In all three occurrences, the 1910 late page proofs change the term to "words" (and alter the agreement in the verb). It is then very puzzling that the 1914 proofs again read "row"; and just as strangely, after the 1914 proofing, the change reappears yet once more in the first edition, though only at the reading's third occurrence. Hence, compared to the 1910 late page proofs, the first edition offers a hybrid text. This may be intentional or not. Joyce's final intention could at best be surmised. But a surmise is not strong enough to support a critical text. An edited text must be constructed, rather, by a process

of critically assessing the historical givens of the work's text in transmission. In the present case, consequently, the two consecutive acts of revision have been weighed against one another. The outcome of that exercise of textual criticism has privileged for the edited text Joyce's attested treble revision as evidenced in the 1910 late page proofs, over the last, or 'final,' intervention in the 1914 proofs for the first edition.

The weakness in a stance of invoking the author's intention, or 'final intention,' as the ultimate arbiter in the critical task of establishing an edited text should become further apparent from a passage characterising Gabriel Conroy's mood during his final conversation with Gretta at night in the hotel room. It contains a sentence not heretofore present in any published text of *Dubliners*. The words, according to the double evidence of the galleys and the amanuensis copy, are: "The irony of his mood changed into sarcasm." That Joyce was aware of the sentence in the text before him at the time when he revised the early page proofs for the abortive 1910 edition is attested by the fact that he made one alteration to it. "The irony of his mood soured into sarcasm" is the wording in the 1910 late page proofs. In the 1914 proofs, however, the entire sentence is missing, and we do not know how and why it disappeared. One possibility is that Joyce asked for it to be deleted. But this is undemonstrable. It is also less than probable, since the 1914 proofs neither here nor elsewhere suggest that they differ because an instruction to change the text was given outside any markings entered on their printer's copy. That printer's copy, as we can now positively say since it has recently re-surfaced, bears no such markings. Nor would a deletion of the sentence easily concur with Joyce's known habits of writing and revision. There is no evidence anywhere in *Dubliners*—except perhaps in "Counterparts" and "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," which were however beset by outside censorship pressure—that, from writing the text, and even affirming it by revision, Joyce would turn round and opt for an outright deletion.

The sentence in either of its attested wordings—"The irony of his mood changed into sarcasm" or "The irony of his mood soured into sarcasm"—has, it is true, disappeared from the 1914 text. But to attribute its absence to authorial intention would again be feeble grounds on which to establish a critical text. Therefore, privileging once more the late 1910 state of the text over its 1914 state, the critical edition incorporates the sentence in its authorially revised form (at line 1478). That the critical edition does not follow the text of the first edition, even though this as a whole can claim James Joyce's final authorisation, may again be justified with reference to the history of the text, and quite specifically to the manifest history of the authorial writing culminating in the 1910 late page proofs.

The reader and user of the edition, on his and her part, however, should be aware of the conditionality and, in terms of the editorial rationale, the systematic contingency of the editorial decision. Editorial decisions are critical decisions, and the editorial choices they lead to must always be recognised as the considered options they are. A scholarly edition offers always a critical but never a definitive text; and in the field of discourse that such an edition opens, the instrument to involve the reader and user in critical exchanges with the text, as well as with the editor's choices and decisions that lead to the construction of the edited text, is the editorial apparatus.

The text of this edition, while offered as a reading text broadly within the standards and conventions of modern professional printing and publishing, endeavours yet to maintain the character of a scholarly edited text in preserving essential features of irregularity in the recoverable authorial writing. Word forms and word divisions, spellings, capitalization, and punctuation have been neither normalised nor modernised, nor have typographical matters such as abbreviations or ellipses been standardised. The emendations undertaken,⁶ or the refusals to emend, are recorded in the apparatus, with a few specific exceptions. The absence or presence of full stops after 'Mr' and 'Mrs' is not noted, nor are quotation marks (inverted commas) surrounding dialogue speech reported, except when joined with emended punctuation. Full stops lacking in the copy-text at the end of paragraphs have been supplied silently. At the end of dialogue speech they have been silently supplied only where the copy-text original is wholly unmarked, or marked by a dash only. Joyce's intermediate dialogue dashes have been explicitly emended. Taken together, this means that Joyce's manuscript habits of marking off the segments of dialogue speech by dashes have neither been followed nor fully recorded.⁷ The convention adopted in this edition's main text is that of dashes at the opening of dialogue only, placed flush left. It is the typographical solution answering to Joyce's own strong views on the marking of dialogue which, in print, and at his forceful instigation, was realised in the third edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1924) and has now become the com-

6. It should be made quite clear that 'emendations' are to be understood not in terms of changes in relation to the previous, unedited or edited, editions, but as emendations of the copy-text. Emendations of the copy-text, often drawing on the transmission, may in fact result precisely in agreement with the text in earlier print.
7. Joyce's manuscript writing, and within it the patterns and effect of his manuscript mode of setting out dialogue, may be studied in the photo-reproductions of the manuscripts in the *Dubliners* volume of the *James Joyce Archive*, or in the draft and fair-copy texts from autographs included in the section "Manuscript Traces" of the 1993 (Garland) printing of this edition.

mon feature of the critically edited texts of *Ulysses*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Dubliners*.

Hans Walter Gabler

Select Bibliography

- Stuart Gilbert (ed.), *Letters of James Joyce*. Volume I. New York: The Viking Press, 1957, 1966. (*Letters I*)
- Richard Ellmann (ed.), *Letters of James Joyce*. Volumes II and III. New York: The Viking Press, 1966. (*Letters II AND III*)
- Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982. (JJ)
- The James Joyce Archive*, 63 vols., General Editor Michael Groden. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977–79. Vol. [4]: *Dubliners. A Facsimile of Drafts and Manuscripts*, prefaced and arranged by Hans Walter Gabler; vols. [5] and [6]: *Dubliners. The 1910 Proofs and Dubliners. The 1914 Proofs*, prefaced and arranged by Michael Groden.
- Robert E. Scholes, "Some Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*: 'The Dead'," and "Further Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*," *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962), 191–205, and 17 (1964), 107–122.

Symbols and Sigla

The symbols employed in the transcription and apparatus sections of this edition describe characteristic features of the writing and indicate sequences of correction and revision within the relevant documents.

< >	authorial deletion in the course of writing
[]	editorial conjecture, e.g. in the case of manuscript defects
{} ¹ TEXT NEW ¹ }	text inserted/changed at first level of document revision
<{} ¹ TEXT OLD>	text cancelled at first level of document revision
{} ¹ <TEXT OLD> TEXT NEW ¹ }	text replaced at first level of document revision
	The symbols {} ⁿ delimit an area of change; a given number indicates the level, an additional letter identifies the agent ('A' = author; 's' = scribe)
← ¹ →	paragraph cancelled at first level of document revision
◇	erasure
□	illegible character(s) or word(s)
	line division in document

The document sigla employed in the apparatus sections are: MS, TS, AM1, AM2, 10G, 10P, 10, 14P, 14, 67. The documents they refer to are reviewed in the »Introduction« (esp. pp. xxxiv–xxxvii) and identified for each story individually in the opening footnote.

Following the lemma bracket in the emendations,

- e indicates a unique emendation in this edition;
- e: indicates a unique emendation partially supported by the document identified after the colon;
- a prefixed to a document sigla (e.g., a10P) indicates an authorial correction/revision in or to the document identified by the sigla.

This critical edition introduces for each story a through line numbering independent of the pagination. In the printing, end-of-line hyphenation occurs in two modes. The sign '=' marks a division for mere typographical reasons. Words so printed should always be cited as one undivided word. The regular hyphen indicates an authentic Joycean hyphen.