

Press. Morris's own attempts at cataloguing were happily amateur and chaotic. He chose his most important books and wrote out, with no attempt to describe format or collation, eight leaves in calligraphic script, which described a few early manuscripts, several calligraphic manuscripts, and fifteen of the early incunabula.

The account of the dispersal of the Morris library is as fascinating as the attempts to catalogue it. The roll-call of intending buyers who visited Kelmscott House included E. Gordon Duff (for the newly established John Rylands Library), H. Yates Thomson, Lord Balcarras, Fairfax Murray, Bernard Quaritch, Chatto, and Pickering, but the eventual buyer was Richard Bennett, an eccentric Lancashire manufacturer who kept 31 manuscripts and 239 printed books and disposed of the rest for £11,000 in 1898. Two years later he issued a catalogue of his books, forty per cent of which were Morris items, and in 1900 Pierpont Morgan acquired this collection for an unknown sum (reputed to be £140,000).

Morris was no scholar-collector, he was not interested in research, format, provenance, completeness, or rarity, though he knew of these things. There was no egotism in his collection. He had an almost impersonal attitude to book acquisition. Above all, he regarded books as functional.

A similar sort of professional functionalism coloured his work as a typographer, a skill which he did not become accomplished in until his fifties, and which was to culminate in the Kelmscott Press. John Dreyfus's essay is rich in its detailing of Morris's typographical achievement, and it, too, endorses the view of Morris as an indefatigable searcher after the appropriate materials with which to produce a book. A nice contrast between Morris's efforts to correct nineteenth-century taste and the sort of opposition he was up against is ironically revealed in the hand-printed Wayzgoose feast menu reproduced in the catalogue. The feast was a treat for the Press staff every year from 1892 to 1895, but the menu is a fine example of popular Victorian taste.

The plates in this volume are produced to a remarkably high standard. It is a shame, though, that there is no illustration of one of the three Albion Presses (specially reinforced because the Chaucer required such a heavy impression) which were featured in the exhibition. And, inexplicably, there is no bibliography to this book.

No one book could do anything like full justice to Morris's work and publications, a point which this book makes; but as the repository of the largest and most valuable single block of volumes from Morris's library, the Pierpont Morgan is singularly well placed to display the material out of which justice may be done. In collaboration with Oxford University Press they have produced an exceedingly handsome volume. Clearly, many different skills and accomplishments have gone into producing it. Books such as this, like the Kelmscott Chaucer, are testimony to Morris's idea of the Art of the Book as a co-operative venture. To publish them is, of itself, demonstration of one's homage.

*Lampeter*

ALLEN M. SAMUELS

JAMES JOYCE, *ULYSSES*; a facsimile of the manuscript; critical introduction by Harry Levin; bibliographical preface by Clive Driver. London, Faber & Faber Ltd., in association with the Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation, Philadelphia, 1975. 3 vols., 64 pp. and 1,136 plates. £60 the set.

THE Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation in Philadelphia has published

James Joyce's *Ulysses*, one of its twentieth-century literary manuscripts of major importance, through Octagon Books (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux) in the United States, and Faber & Faber Ltd. in Great Britain, in a handsome, boxed three-volume facsimile edition. Following an Introduction by Harry Levin, a Bibliographical Preface by Clive Driver, and two brief, unsigned sections, Bibliographical Description of the Manuscript and Dates Relevant to the Composition of Each Episode in volume 1, volumes 1 and 2 reproduce the 698 loose manuscript leaves of the novel's episodes 1-16, Telemachus to Eumaeus, and the two notebooks (less 58 of 59 blank leaves of the larger one) which substantially contain Ithaca and Penelope: 810 holograph pages in all. Twelve fair-copy pages—seven for Circe (the Messianic Scene), and five for the conclusion of Penelope—from the *Ulysses* materials in the Joyce collection at the Lockwood Memorial Library, SUNY at Buffalo, have been appended in an editorial attempt to represent *Ulysses* complete at manuscript stage. Volume 3 contains a reduced facsimile—four pages to a facsimile page—of the 1922 Paris first edition of *Ulysses*, painstakingly annotated to indicate its departures from the manuscript, and also the discrepancies between the manuscript and episodes 1-14 as pre-published between 1918 and 1920 in *The little review*.

Classed by its design, quality of paper and printing, and price as a bibliophile edition, the facsimile makes a simultaneous appeal to the Joycean critic and scholar. Yet where diverging demands of owners and users may be anticipated, the introductions as well as the standards of the manuscript reproductions themselves, hover somewhat uneasily along undefined borderlines of explicitness and accuracy. The enthusiastic owner may rest assured that he holds a facsimile of high quality, where 'every page . . . is reproduced in exact size and in a color of ink and paper closely matching the original'. The user gains initial help from the paper sizes (and the very few occurring watermarks, some of them indeed discernible in the facsimile) as specified in the Bibliographical Description to distinguish Zürich from Trieste papers, and these again from the miscellaneous papers used in Paris. Yet he will have to refine that information by exact leaf-by-leaf measurements, and thereupon go back to the original manuscript for physical paper quality comparison, if he seeks, say, to pursue the interlocking emergence of the final manuscript texts of Circe and Eumaeus. Again, if a scholarly analyst wishes, by the variations in ink and pen, to differentiate the phases of inscription within a given episode, or section of the manuscript, the close match of the facsimile, needless to say, is no safe substitute, generally, for the clear differences in colour of ink, and slope and pressure of hand and pen, distinguishable in the original. The colour of ink, in particular, comes out in shades of brown throughout the facsimile. Joyce largely used inks which now appear as brown or a faded greyish-brown. But there are distinct sections in black or in blue or blueish ink in the original manuscript which no longer stand out as such in the reproduction (while his colour-pen markings are rendered throughout in their true colours). Nor can pencil entries in the original in every instance be safely told from inked ones, and the sometimes informative shifts from pencil to inked pencil in the authorial numbering of the pages can be recognized in the facsimile only if before it has been observed in the original.

The bibliographical description, on the whole, gives ample information about normal patterns and departures from them, as when, for example, the versos of the manuscript leaves carry text (in which case they are also reproduced). Yet in at least one such instance the manuscript situation has not been detailed. Of pages 33 and 34 in Scylla and Charybdis, thus foliated by Joyce on paper differing in quality

and size from that of the remaining chapter, fol. 34 carries the number '33' on its verso, which one can discern only as show-through in the facsimile. It is true that the significance of the fact is not readily apparent, but it does not stand in isolation (cf. the change from '32' to '33' on fol. 33; thus: did Joyce number the leaves before he inscribed them? Do the two leaves belong to an earlier draft version? Are they later insertions? Or can no such inferences be drawn from the bibliographical facts?) Moreover, it belongs to those physical features of the manuscript which lose distinctiveness in the facsimile and should, therefore, on all accounts be underscored by editorial description.

This also applies to erasures, frequent particularly in the novel's early episodes. Indirectly, we get as good an account as may be wished of those which were undertaken to make room for new readings. Here, Mr. Driver and his assistants have supplied the earlier readings in annotations to the 1922 text in vol. 3, and full credit must go to them for making sense of even the slightest clues to the wordings of erased or otherwise obliterated phrases. Yet erasures not leading to textual substitutions, while immediately recognizable physically in the original, appear as mere blank spaces in the reproduction, with at most only a meaningless inkblot or two, and remain unrecorded. Finally, the bibliographical description's record of paper folds is incomplete, confined as it is to Cyclops and Circe, and omitting reference to Calypso, and especially to Eumaeus; yet it is true that anyone hoping to unravel part of the manuscript's history by matching paper folds must work with the original leaves.

Considerable excitement was caused shortly after the facsimile's publication by an apparent, or even real, misbinding in the Ithaca-Penelope notebook section. Ithaca I and Penelope were started by Joyce at the opposite ends of the 120(-1)-leaf blue notebook which forms part of the Rosenbach Foundation's *Ulysses* materials. If the notebook is opened at the Ithaca end, Penelope will be encountered upside-down, and in the reverse order of its pages. This feature has been faithfully reproduced by the facsimile, which for the sake of fidelity, and in deference to the reader's convenience once he has turned the heavy volume, goes to the length of denying its own bibliographic consistency by printing its lines of reference to the printed texts, too, upside-down, and at the tops of its pages, which have become the bottom margins of the upside-down pages of Penelope. Yet opening the blue notebook at the Ithaca end in itself would seem to entail a misjudgement. It appears to have gone unnoticed that it has an 'a' and a 'b' end, and begins at the 'a' end with Penelope. Since this concurs with some of the facts we know about the relative order of composition of Eumaeus, Ithaca, and Penelope, the more faithful order in the facsimile would presumably have been to have Penelope follow Eumaeus, and allow Ithaca I, at the end of the blue notebook, upside-down and in the reverse order of its pages, to face Ithaca II the right way up in the green one.

A facsimile edition thus calls for editorial decisions, and these demand a general cognisance of the history of the text and the relationship of the documents which transmit it. This naturally creates a dilemma, since an important reason for the reproduction must be to facilitate scholarly assessment of the manuscript, and determination of the relationship of witnesses, on the basis of the published facsimile. Mr. Driver as bibliographical editor can hardly be blamed for refraining from anticipating the labours of textual criticism, such as they would have been involved, say, in a thorough manuscript-typescript collation. Yet one cannot but take exception to the Bibliographical Preface in so far as it pronounces verdicts as if such labours had been undertaken. (The manuscript and *The little review* have

of course been compared throughout; but, as an authoritative as against an unauthoritative text, they are not truly comparable. Regrettably, the record of variants produced stands cluttered with listings of pure *Little review* house stylings, while the specific substantive variants remain unfocused, and largely unevaluated as to their origin and nature.) The Bibliographical Preface is admirable in so far as it succinctly outlines the order of composition of the episodes, the vicissitudes of publication, or the history of the Rosenbach manuscript, on the basis of known facts as well as of many new details from unpublished letters and inside records. But its claims for the uniqueness, unity, and overriding importance of the Rosenbach manuscript as 'the manuscript' of *Ulysses* stand overruled by the incisive reassessment of the Rosenbach holographs of the episodes of *Ulysses* and their place in the transmission of the text which, within a very few months after the facsimile publication, have been taking shape in the columns of the *TLS*, and in A. Walton Litz's review of the facsimile in *James Joyce quarterly*—a reassessment that, incidentally (rather than bearing out Mr. Driver's views), appears in accord with Harry Levin's general perspective, in his Introduction, of the dynamics of the textual evolution of *Ulysses*.

The Rosenbach manuscript, then, was not throughout the fountainhead for the further transmission of the text through typescripts and proofs into print; nor, indeed, can it be regarded as an integral and unified document. When Joyce began to compile it in late 1917—ending the compilation only in November 1921—he at first followed the work pattern previously established for *A portrait of the artist as a young man*, the textual development of which essentially ended in the holograph fair-copy manuscript. The typescript, naturally prepared from the fair copy, merely facilitated the transmission into print. Yet for *Ulysses*, circumstances led to an incomparably much earlier beginning of the fair-copying of the text. As subsequent episodes took shape, it became increasingly apparent that the text already 'finished' was by no means stable. Thus, it is initially only the three opening episodes, the Telemachiad as completed between October 1917 and January 1918, that were typed from their fair copies as preserved in the Rosenbach collection. Thereafter, as the novel enters the *Odyssey* proper with the first Bloom chapter, collations of the Rosenbach fair copies against the typescripts reveal a new work-in-progress pattern of writing and transmission. The typescript no longer derives from the fair copy, but fair copy and typescript together radiate from a common ancestor in close, but distinct temporal succession. The ancestor, presumably a working manuscript according to Joyce's consistent writing habits with sufficient marginal space for textual additions, was fair-copied at a stage of relative completion, but then further gone over and augmented before being handed to a typist. The procedure appears carefully calculated to avoid marginal additions and typists' pencil markings as they of necessity deface the pages of the Telemachiad episodes.

But for two exceptions, the pattern is consistent from Calypso (fourth episode) to Oxen of the Sun (fourteenth episode). The exceptions, Wandering Rocks and Cyclops, for which the Rosenbach fair copy once more served as direct copy for the typescript, are easily explained biographically. The completion of Cyclops coincided with Joyce's return from Zürich to Trieste in late 1919. A few months earlier, during his work on Wandering Rocks, he was overtaken by an acute eye attack. Pages 32 to 48 of Wandering Rocks were dictated to Frank Budgen from notes. Interestingly, the text in Joyce's own hand on pages 1–31 contains many additions in the margins, and deletions. If, for comparison, one considers how Joyce recopied the five final pages of Oxen of the Sun (as preserved at Cornell)

because, in an unsightly manner, they were accumulating too many revisions, it seems thoroughly conceivable that the extant pages of *Wandering Rocks* constitute what under different circumstances would have been the episode's working manuscript, yet again to be fair-copied. If this is a viable hypothesis, it should alert one to a degree of fluidity between the draft stages, facilitated by the writing on loose leaves, as is indeed indicated in such instances as the beginning of *Lotus Eaters*, where pages 1-5b were typist's copy, though the remainder of the chapter very clearly was not; or, perhaps, p. 27 of *Scylla and Charybdis*, which looks conspicuously as if composed on the spot. If it was, it would mean that its text was copied from the 'fair copy' into the working manuscript, and thence typed—a hypothesis not inconsistent with the evidence of the textual variation between the witnesses. Thus, even though for half of the novel's eighteen episodes the fair copies of the Rosenbach manuscript stand apart from the text's direct linear descent through the transmissionally relevant documents, they nevertheless contribute, in strictly circumscribed areas accessible to bibliographic and palaeographic analysis, to a critically relevant recovery of stages of the composition. In this respect, the three initial leaves of *Sirens* must surely be a source of delight to any attentive reader, so clearly do they reveal the genesis of the chapter's double opening. Evidently the orchestral tuning-up by way of a segmented concatenation of the episode's linguistico-musical motifs was prefixed to the narrative opening proper as a 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ -page manuscript addition.

While, under the increasing pressures of immense textual complication, and of time, the typescript of *Eumaeus* was again prepared from the fair copy, and that of *Ithaca* and *Penelope* from the notebooks, or working manuscripts, as preserved—they were 'written very legibly, to save trouble with typists', as Giorgio Joyce expressly informed John Quinn on his father's behalf—*Circe* stands apart, as in so many other respects, and creates a transmissional situation to itself. When a first typist, typing the text directly from the pages in the Rosenbach manuscript, relinquished the job, for personal reasons, half-way through p. 45, Joyce, with Sylvia Beach's assistance, and in order to render the text legible to typists unaccustomed to deciphering his hand, resorted to first having two (or more) amanuenses in succession copy out the text once more in longhand. This was done largely, but apparently not invariably, from the subsequent leaves of the Rosenbach manuscript. For what remains of fols. 54 to 62, collation (as well as some bibliographical features of the transcript), suggests that other copy than the Rosenbach manuscript was used. (Incidentally, this may also help to explain the manuscript's one major lacuna, *Circe* fols. 57-61.) As, from the longhand transcript, a Mrs. Harrison in typing had reached the end of the brothel scene and had proceeded, in fact, into the long and intricate stage direction by which Bloom exits from Bella Cohen's, as far as 'Incog Haroun al Raschid, he flits behind the silent lechers and hastens on by the' (not in italics in either manuscript or typescript), her husband in indignation saw fit to destroy several pages of her copy. The incident is well known, having from the outset been highly dramatized by Joyce himself in his letters; and so is the sequel that Joyce requested approximately ten pages from John Quinn in New York to repair the damage. When they arrived in duplicate photostats, the elaborate procedure of longhand copying and subsequent typing was repeated. Yet close inspection of the related witnesses now reveals that Mr. Harrison destroyed mostly pages of the amanuensis copy which had already been typed. Between the end on Mrs. Harrison's last typed page and the resumption of the text in the original longhand transcript and accompanying typescript, there is

a gap of less than two typewritten pages. Consequently, Joyce quietly used only two pages of the second typescript prepared from the transcript of the photostats when assembling printer's copy for the episode.

It must give satisfaction to the Rosenbach Foundation and the publishers alike that, beyond engendering universal excitement and curiosity among enthusiasts, critics, and scholars, the published facsimile is proving a rich source for new insights and discoveries about the genesis, the composition, and the textual integrity of *Ulysses*. Grasping more fully than hitherto the complex interconnections of the workshop materials in their entirety, textual critics in particular, through assessment of the quality of the witnesses preserved, are gaining a clearer perspective also of the nature and relative authority of those no longer extant. Textual hypotheses on which to base a critical edition of the novel may now be confidently approached. The *Ulysses* materials from the Rosenbach collection will not enter as an integrally organized manuscript of the novel taken as a whole. Instead, and on account of the divergent genetic and transmissional status of the holograph in its several parts, it is the individual episodes which will be seen to constitute distinct manuscript units. The final integration of *Ulysses* was achieved only in the published text of 1922 itself. The Rosenbach facsimile helps to recognize, as it dramatically confirms, that from the novel's first inception to its ultimate publication in book form, Joyce wrote 'continuous copy'. The documents we possess—draft fragments, working manuscripts, fair copies, typescripts, proofs; even, in significant instances, the chapter versions as pre-published in *The little review*—are essentially transitional stages in a dynamic process of artistic creation. To answer these conditions, current editorial theory will require extension by a rationale of 'continuous copy-text'. All in all, then, it is by the textual foundations it renders accessible and their critical potential that the Rosenbach facsimile makes its contribution to a fostering of the literary heritage of our century, and makes it possible for us to feel again after more than fifty years, something of the initial impact of James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

Munich

HANS WALTER GABLER