

ULYSSES

A Critical and Synoptic Edition

James Joyce

CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE	Foreword	vii
	Symbols	x
	Episode 1 (Telemachus)	2
	Episode 2 (Nestor)	46
	Episode 3 (Proteus)	74
	Episode 4 (Calypso)	106
	Episode 5 (Lotus Eaters)	140
	Episode 6 (Hades)	176
	Episode 7 (Aeolus)	238
	Episode 8 (Lestrygonians)	316
	Episode 9 (Scylla and Charybdis)	392
Episode 10 (Wandering Rocks)	470	
Episode 11 (Sirens)	548	
VOLUME TWO	Symbols	vi
	Episode 12 (Cyclops)	630
	Episode 13 (Nausicaa)	744
	Episode 14 (Oxen of the Sun)	824
	Episode 15 (Circe)	924
VOLUME THREE	Symbols	vi
	Episode 16 (Eumaeus)	1340
	Episode 17 (Ithaca)	1454
	Episode 18 (Penelope)	1634
	Textual Notes	1729
	Historical Collation List	1755
	Bibliography	1855
	Afterword	1859
	Acknowledgements	1908
Tables	1913	

AFTERWORD

This Afterword first briefly surveys the composition of *Ulysses* from early conceptions to the publication of the first edition in 1922. Then, focussing in succession on a series of textual and transmissional situations paradigmatically selected and analysed in detail, it discusses Joyce's manner and habits of writing, the types and relationships of the surviving documents and the main patterns of the descent of the text from manuscript to print. From such a basis of understanding of the textual and editorial problems, it introduces the edition, outlines the editorial procedures for establishing the critical text and explains the design of the apparatus.

THE COMPOSITION

The story and myth of Odysseus held a fascination for James Joyce ever since he first encountered the Homeric tale at the age of 12 in Charles Lamb's retelling. He began to embrace it creatively when, in 1906 in Rome, he thought of adding another story to *Dubliners*, to be named "Ulysses". It "never went forrader than the title". Yet it has been plausibly suggested that the subject matter for the story never realised lies submerged in the novel's concluding events, the brawl in Nighttown and the rescue of Stephen by Bloom, who takes the injured and drunken young man back to his house in the early morning hours.¹ Again, from a perspective of structure and theme, it has been argued that the initial sequence of Bloom chapters in *Ulysses* possesses the shape and significance of an extended *Dubliners* tale.² Joyce himself never expressly established the novel's connection to *Dubliners*. Speaking of its conception to Georges Borach in Zurich in 1917, he claimed it was in the course of working out *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* that he sensed the inner need for a progression in his oeuvre from the myth of Daedalus to the myth of Odysseus.³

The comprehensive planning and initial drafting of *Ulysses* began soon after the completion of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Exiles* in 1914. The earlier novel issued materially into *Ulysses*. A surviving fragment of text in fair copy from the *Portrait* workshop indicates that a Tower scene was still being considered for *Portrait* in 1912 or 1913, just as such a scene had been planned to provide the conclusion to *Stephen Hero*. In its final metamorphosis in Joyce's oeuvre, that scene now opens *Ulysses*.⁴

¹ Ellmann, p. 161-162. ² Kenner, p. 61.

³ Joseph Prescott (ed.), "Conversations with James Joyce [by] Georges Borach." *College English* 15 (1954), 325-327.

⁴ see Litz, pp. 132-141, and Gabler (1976), pp. 38-39.

To assume that *Ulysses* evolved from an overflow of material from the *Portrait* workshop agrees well with Joyce's assertion to his brother Stanislaus on a postcard intriguingly dated 16 June 1915 that he had just completed a draft of the first chapter of the novel. Similarly, in 1916 Joyce informed Ezra Pound that the "Hamlet" chapter could be made available as a sample of the new work. Close as it is in theme, narrative motifs, grouping of characters and setting to the fifth chapter of *Portrait*, this episode, though eventually placed ninth in *Ulysses*, may confidently be said to originate like the Tower episode in the textual and compositional ambience of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

In the early stages of planning, of which Joyce's correspondence alone gives some indication, the total work was conceived to extend to 22 episodes, 17 episodes, and eventually to the 18 episodes that were in fact realised. Apparently no notes or drafts have survived from the first three years of Joyce's work on *Ulysses*. The only manuscript that possibly carries over from that period is the extant draft of the third ("Proteus") episode, which immediately precedes the chapter's fair copy as it was written out and completed in December and early January 1917–1918. It follows third in the fair copies of the novel's opening chapters, which, begun in October 1917 during Joyce's sojourn in Locarno, were executed in swift succession. Typescripts were made from them, and, beginning in March 1918, the novel in progress was serialised in the American literary magazine *The Little Review*.

In the course of 1918, the work was continued in Zurich through nine chapters in fair copy. This achievement was explicitly noted on the last page of the manuscript of episode 9 ("Scylla and Charybdis"): "End of First Part of 'Ulysses' | New Year's Eve | 1918." Thereafter, in January and February 1919, while Joyce was suffering from his first major eye attack, episode 10 ("Wandering Rocks") materialised directly from notes, according to Joyce's testimony: "pp. 32–48 were written by my friend Francis Budgen at my dictation from notes during my illness January–February 1919." Budgen wrote out approximately the final third of the chapter. From the general appearance of the other two thirds, it may be assumed that this autograph section, too, was composed directly from notes.

During the remainder of Joyce's stay in Zurich, the work proceeded to episodes 11 and 12 ("Sirens" and "Cyclops"). Episodes 13 and 14 ("Nausicaa" and "Oxen of the Sun") were completed in Trieste, where, returned from Zurich, Joyce endeavoured to find a new foothold between October 1919 and May 1920. The writing of these chapters was still somewhat forced by the need to provide copy for the serialisation in *The Little Review*, but with the publication of "Nausicaa", and after the first instalment of "Oxen of the Sun", the serialisation fell victim to censorship in the United States in early 1920. Relief from the pressure of having to serve *The Little Review* may have contributed significantly to the growth of episode 15 ("Circe") to its vast proportions.⁵ To write it and episode 16 ("Eumaeus"), Joyce took up residence in Paris, at Ezra Pound's instigation, in early June 1920 for what

⁵ Groden, p. 169.

he expected to be only a few months' respite from oppressive conditions in Trieste. However, the few months extended to 19 years. The composition of *Ulysses* was concluded in Paris in 1921, with episode 18 ("Penelope") completed in September and episode 17 ("Ithaca") on 29th October.

THE AUTOGRAPHS: NOTES AND DRAFTS

Joyce's manner of literary composition was characteristically based on compendious note-taking. Frank Budgen relates that Joyce would make jottings on whatever surface material happened to be at hand and collect them in the big orange-coloured envelopes that Budgen considered one of the glories of Switzerland.⁶ The standard receptacle for notes for his writing was the notebook. Three such notebooks, widely separated by date, have been preserved for *Ulysses*: the Dublin/Trieste *Alphabetical Notebook*, begun around Christmas 1909, from which the material is divided equally between *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*; the *Zurich Notebook* of 1918 (Buffalo VIII.A.5), remarkable for its garnerings from Victor Bérard's *Les Phéniciens et l'Odysée*, W. H. Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, the plays of Thomas Otway and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*; and the Late Notes for typescripts and galleys of 1921/1922 (Buffalo V.A.2).⁷ Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon have recently made the discovery, as yet unpublished, that another early *Ulysses* notebook has survived among the workbooks for *Finnegans Wake* in Madame France Raphael's transcription.

Specific for *Ulysses*, moreover, is the formidable array of *Notesheets* from episode 12 ("Cyclops") onwards on sheets of a double legal-size format (or four times the quarto leaf size of the episodes' fair copies).⁸ Organised externally by chapters, and internally often by motif clusters, the notesheets appear to be transcriptions of earlier lost note-takings, mainly, one may suppose, of the variegated materials from the orange-coloured envelopes.

Joyce's notes contributed to his composition at every stage from the earliest extant drafts to the last of the proofs for the first edition and even beyond: one of the *Finnegans Wake* workbooks (Buffalo VI.B.10) contains a few corrections and *one emendation to the text* of "Cyclops". To keep track of notes used, Joyce would cross them out in crayon, and the different colours of the deletions evident in the notebooks and notesheets indicate several rounds of harvesting the materials.

After Joyce's notes, by definition disjunct, the category of documents of which examples survive are continuous drafts. Yet in the appearance of all extant drafts there is always some suggestion of descent from preexisting text. We know too little of the modes of transition from notes to drafts to tell whether the notes from which episode 10 ("Wandering Rocks") was directly composed would have conformed to

⁶ Budgen, p. 177.

⁷ *Archive*, vols. 7 and 12; edited by Herring (1969 and 1977).

⁸ *Archive*, vol. 12; edited by Herring (1972).

those in the extant notebooks and notesheets or whether, as may seem more probable, they were in the nature of preliminary sketches. The one-time existence of sketches for episode 9 (“Scylla and Charybdis”) may be assumed, if the description of them given on the occasion on which they were last seen is to be trusted. The catalogue of the La Hune exhibition in Paris in 1949 characterizes them as ten large leaves inscribed in ink with fragments of conversation that reappear in heavily altered form in the library episode.⁹ Unfortunately, these ten sheets – apparently legal-size folios – were lost in transit when the exhibition was acquired in bulk for the Poetry Collection at the University of Buffalo.

Pre-faircopy drafts have been preserved for episodes 3 and 11 to 16. Most of them were exhibited with the “Scylla and Charybdis” sketches at the La Hune exhibition. Safely conveyed to Buffalo, they may be identified by their number in Peter Spielberg’s catalogue of the Buffalo Joyce Collection, except for the second half of the draft for episode 13 (“Nausicaa”) and a 5-page fragment of the conclusion of episode 14 (“Oxen of the Sun”) at Cornell.¹⁰ The drafts for episode 3 (“Proteus”) and episode 13 (“Nausicaa”) are complete drafts. All other extant chapter drafts are fragmentary.

For two separate chapters, the surviving draft fragments divide into two distinct draft levels. For episode 14 (“Oxen of the Sun”), the levels are represented by V.A.11–V.A.12 and V.A.13–V.A.18 plus the Cornell fragment respectively. For episode 12 (“Cyclops”), V.A.8 precedes V.A.6. These successive draft fragments, moreover, though they have an undeniable affinity to sections of the fair-copy text, are both remote from the narrative structure the chapter subsequently attained. Among all surviving textual evidence for the early composition of the novel’s episodes, the drafts and fair copy for “Cyclops” thereby present a unique relationship. The drafts should thus perhaps more properly be considered as sketches intermediary between notes and drafts.

With the exception of the sketches or drafts for “Cyclops”, the surviving drafts are always the linear ancestors of the chapter fair copies. In the case of “Proteus” and “Eumaeus” they are also their immediate ancestors. Commonly, however, one or more lost intermediary draft stages must be posited. The variant relationship between the extant manuscripts indicates the existence, and loss, of a final working draft between draft V.A.5 – a fragment extending to approximately the final two fifths of episode 11 (“Sirens”) – and the chapter fair copy. Similarly, the copybooks V.A.10 and Cornell 56 A and B which together form the complete early draft for episode 13 (“Nausicaa”) and the copybooks V.A.13–V.A.18 which constitute a fragmentary series of the second early draft for episode 14 (“Oxen of the Sun”) in each case precede lost final working drafts for these chapters. Draft V.A.19 for episode 15 (“Circe”) is to all appearances a first draft. It is relatively short and particularly dynamic, that is, also extraordinarily illegible and untidy. Internally divisible into segments, it comprises the textual nucleus of several distinct chapter

⁹ No. 254 in *James Joyce. Sa vie, son oeuvre, son rayonnement*. Paris: La Hune, 1949.

¹⁰ This fragment was acquired after the compilation of Robert Scholes’s *Catalogue*.

sections. According to counts that vary in Joyce's letters, the episode progressed through six, eight or nine drafts in all. These several levels can, however, no longer be distinguished from the extant compositional documents, nor did the redrafting probably – as will be discussed in more detail below – comprise the entire episode each time in its later phases.

The drafts V.A.3 for episode 3 (“Proteus”) and V.A.21 for episode 16 (“Eumaeus”) are the immediate antecedents of the chapter fair copies and thus constitute extant final working drafts. V.A.3, a complete chapter draft, is contained in a copybook bought in Locarno. The general impression it gives is that Joyce began to copy from earlier drafts or sketches, but, in the act of copying, became increasingly involved in revising and expanding the text. The “Proteus” fair copy was written out upon Joyce's return to Zurich in January 1918. It differs in numerous instances from the final state of textual accretion in the draft. At the same time, it is astonishingly neat and clean – indeed, despite some deletions and erasures, a beautifully written copy. Nevertheless it seems safe to say that draft and fair copy are contiguous, which makes the fair copy the result of a very poised and concentrated effort of creative transcription.

V.A.21 for “Eumaeus”, a composite document that joins two fragments, is the direct ancestor of two separate extended chapter sections. The inferrable loss at draft level for this chapter is of manuscripts reaching back to the phase of composition between 1914 and 1917. Joyce repeatedly indicates in his letters that he had preserved such manuscripts as a basis for the final composition of the book's end. Presumably it was from them that he discussed the episode with Frank Budgen in Zurich in 1919. They would seem to have already established the chapter's characteristic style, since the idiom of “Eumaeus” is distinctly anticipated in a passage incorporated in the stylistic conglomerate towards the end of episode 14 (“Oxen of the Sun”; cf. 896.28–898.18), written to be published in *The Little Review* one whole year before “Eumaeus” was put into the shape in which it is known. The loss of all drafts preceding V.A.21 no doubt implies a thoroughgoing rewriting, expansion and to some extent even re-conception of the chapter in January–February 1921.

FROM DRAFT TO FAIR COPY: THE CASE OF “EUMAEUS”

The earliest extant continuous text of the chapters is commonly found in copybooks, inscribed in wide-margined columns on the rectos of the copybook leaves. At the end, the inscription may reverse through the blank versos. Usually, however, both the margins and the facing versos have been used to revise and expand the basic draft. In the transfer from one draft document to the next, the inscription pattern usually repeats itself. There appears to have been considerable fluctuation among chapters in the number of consecutive distinct drafts. At an advanced stage, loose leaves were used instead of bound copybooks. They were inscribed in wide-margined columns on their rectos only. This facilitated sectional revision where further required.

Joyce's routines of draft composition entailed repeated acts of copying chapter texts in whole or in part. In copying, he was both author and scribe. As author, he composed and revised unceasingly, but as scribe, he was simultaneously prone to inattention and oversight. Indeed, it may be assumed that the chance of inattention to the business of copying – as, later, to the chores of proofreading – rose in proportion to the degree of involvement in continued composition and revision.

Draft V.A.21 for “Eumaeus” (P-E) in a copybook is the immediate antecedent of the chapter fair copy on loose leaves in the so-called Rosenbach Manuscript (R) for two extended chapter sections. P-E, fol. 1, and R, fol. 13, commence identically (but for one comma) in mid-sentence of a paragraph conclusion: “message evidently(,) as he took particular notice” (1368.15). P-E, section A, extends to the middle of the copybook's fol. 19, ending “lovemaking in Irish. £200, though less, damages” (*cf.* 1416.5). P-E, section B, follows immediately, though there is an unmistakable hiatus in the text as well as a change in the handwriting and the width of the text column halfway down P-E, fol. 19. The apparent new paragraph, “Whereas no photo could . . .”, corresponds to line 1 on fol. 40 of R, which, however, though identically worded, is the conclusion of a paragraph from the preceding R page (*cf.* 1426.7).

Thus, in R Joyce joined together the continuous chapter text from this and another (or more than one other) draft source in alternation. No antecedent is extant for R, section I (fols. 1–12). R, section II (fols. 13–35, line 29), derives from P-E, section A (copybook rectos 1–19). No antecedent, again, exists for R, section III (fol. 35, line 29, to fol. 39, bottom). R, section IV (fols. 40–54), corresponds to P-E, section B (copybook rectos 19–23 and, in reverse order of the leaves, versos 23–19).

P-E is characterized as a copy of lost antecedent material not only by a fluent and fairly legible inscription in ink, but also by occasional obvious transcription errors. These may be identified with the help of R, which, though on the whole of course representing a revisional development, usually repairs defective sense and grammar in the P-E text it retains. At the same time, P-E is a working draft with a multitude of internal revisions and additions crammed between the lines, written in the margins or placed on facing or remoter preceding versos of the copybook leaves.

In fair-copying R, sections II and IV, from P-E, sections A and B, Joyce on the whole meticulously pieced together the continuous chapter text, incorporating the revisions and additions. Evidently careful not to lose material, he crossed out in P-E what he had copied. In the course of the fair-copying, he often changed the order and modified the phrasing of the textual elements in P-E; frequently he further expanded the text. Occasionally – as in the instance of the return of the sailorman from relieving himself outside the cabman's shelter (1396.25–28; *cf.* V.A.21, fol. 11) – it appears that he had trouble in deciphering his own handwriting and consequently recomposed a passage.

The principle governing the editing must be that R, from which in turn began the chapter's transmission into print, represents a wholly valid chapter text. Where R departs from P-E, so the rule should be, it overrides the text of P-E. But in practice,

the case is not always clearcut. Being itself a copy, R must be scrutinised for transcriptional errors. For sections II and IV, these may be identified with the help of P-E. But the critical task is to distinguish intended revisions from unintended copying mistakes or oversights. In the first instance, it is again cases of defective grammar and sense that arouse editorial suspicion. However, for this particular episode, the issue is of course complicated by the chapter style, which espouses inconsequential grammar and elliptical, if not defective, sense. Nevertheless, critical judgement may lead to the emendation of R by P-E. Such emendation restores text of Joyce, the author, that was impinged on by Joyce, the scribe. Significantly, it repeatedly anticipates authorial repair in proof or typists' corrections.

Even in the course of writing out the fair copy, Joyce sometimes caught himself in unintentionally departing from P-E. Touching up in numerous points of detail a sentence that read: "—Ay, ay, the sailor sighed again, more cheerfully this time with a kind of smile for a brief duration in the direction of the last questioner" to become in R: "—Ay, ay, sighed again the sailor, more cheerily this time with some sort of a half smile for a brief duration only of the questioner about the number" (1380.18–20), he missed the phrase 'in the direction' and hastened to reinsert it between the lines in the fair copy. The example illustrates concisely how attention to the mechanical act of copying can become deflected by the writer's concentration on the continuing creative development of the text. Interference of this kind — in the sense in which the term is used in optics or acoustics — may increase when the scribe hits upon some grammatical muddle in P-E, such as "The sailor grimaced, chewing, in a way that might be read one way or the other to be yes, ay or no." He cuts the knot by abbreviating the phrase to "in a way that might be yes, ay or no." Yet, though the sentence is now grammatically transparent, it has all but lost the original notion of the appeal in the sailor's grimace to an interpreting beholder. So, on authorial second thoughts, this is restored: "in a way that might be read as yes, ay or no" (1376.1–2).

Study of Joyce's habits of writing and rewriting points to the fact that, while he was constantly concerned with developing his text by expanding and stylistically improving it, he endeavoured to retain details of the narrative and its phrasing once articulated. This consideration is critically important in the scrutiny of a group of *omissions from P-E that, not signalled in R by disturbances of grammar or sense*, could in no way be recaptured without the existence of P-E. In a relationship of draft and fair copy dominantly characterized by textual revision and modification, their place — if they are to have a place in R, too, that is, if it was Joyce the scribe who inadvertently omitted the words or phrases in question — is in invariant contexts. For critical editorial treatment the editor must thus invoke a formal category of definition to deal with this group of variants as a whole.

Among the words and phrases that have fallen out of invariant contexts in the transfer of the text from P-E to R are the following (emphasized in italics):

*1384.31–32 —Has been? [P-E: objected Mr Bloom] the more experienced of the two objected, sticking to his original point *with a smile of unbelief*. I'm not so sure about that.

- 1394.9–11 [P-E: uncork and have a good long] and uncork it or unscrew and take a good old swig out of it *on the strict q.t.* The irrepressible Bloom...
- 1404.12–14 It's [P-E: absurd] a patent absurdity to hate people because they live round the corner and speak another [P-E: language] vernacular, *in the next house* so to speak.
- *1412.25–26 So to change the subject he read about [P-E: funerals] Dignam R. I. P. which, he reflected, was anything but a [P-E: good] gay sendoff. *Or a change of address anyway.*
- 1414.27–29 Betting 5 to 4 on Zinfandel. 20 to 1 Throwaway (off). *Sceptre a shade heavier, 5 to 4 on Zinfandel, 20 to 1 Throwaway (off).* Throwaway and Zinfandel stood close order.
- 1426.10–11 and leave the [P-E: photo] likeness there *a minute or so* on the plea he. (restoration in proof: *for a very few minutes*).
- 1436.30–31 You can't drink that stuff. *Do you like cocoa?* Wait. I'll just pay this [R: this lot].
- 1446.15–17 He looked... at the sideface of Stephen, image of his mother, which was not quite the same as the usual *handsome* blackguard type they had an [P-E: incurable] insatiable hankering after...

To test the differentiating quality of the criterion of invariance, a few counterexamples should be considered. In the change from P-E "there was always the offchance of a Dannyman *informer* turning queen's evidence *to divulge the names of his accomplices* like Denis Carey" to R (fol. 28.34): "there always being the offchance of a Dannyman turning Queen's evidence or King's now like Denis Carey" (1400.32–33), the dropping of a word and a phrase appears interrelated, one mutually constituting an altered context for the other, which renders the omissions systematic and therefore presumably intentional. Thereby, the modification of the added "or King's now", which by itself would not determine the case, strengthens the decision against possible readmission of word or phrase. Still more clearly, in the sentence towards the end "Even more he liked an old German song of Johannes Jeep in which you saw the clear sea and heard the *wooning* voices of the sirens, sweet, false and cruel", the tightening and precision achieved in the R (fol. 51.28) revision to "...of Johannes Jeep about the clear sea and the voices of sirens, sweet murderers of men" (1446.24–26) forbid a recapturing of 'wooning' voices.

In an act of critical editing, moreover, that endeavours to constitute R as the firm authorial basis of the text as ultimately published, the criterion of invariance applied to the question of how to treat the P-E readings omitted from R must of course be extended to the revisional development of the text beyond R. It may well have been partly by mistake, for instance, that Joyce did not copy invariantly from P-E "Ex quibus, Stephen mumbled, their eyes conversing, *all alone to himself*, Christus or Bloom his name is". But looking over what he had written (R, fol. 29.33): "Ex quibus, Stephen mumbled, their two or four eyes conversing, Christus or Bloom his name is", he did not reinsert the omitted phrase from P-E, which was before him

close at hand, but instead revised to: “Ex quibus, Stephen mumbled *in a noncommittal accent*” (1404.1), shifting, though slightly, the communicative quality of Stephen’s mumble. The revision alters the context, cancelling out any continued validity of the omitted phrase. Similarly, the comment on the watchers’ reaction to the sailor’s demonstration of Antonio tattooed on his chest, “the curious effect excited [P-E, 1st level: general] the general and unaffected admiration of all”, appears intentionally revised to R (fol. 18.16): “excited the unaffected admiration of everybody”; lest we still feel tempted to restore the over-redundancy of ‘general and’, ‘unaffected’ is in proof once more changed to ‘unreserved’ (1380.8). But it seems remarkable that these are the only two clear instances in which the contexts of R omissions of P-E words or phrases undergo fair-copy or post-faircopy alterations. If otherwise our critical distinction of variance and invariance of context holds, there is nothing in the texture of the writing to prevent the filling from P-E of the lacunae in invariant contexts that the P-E : R comparison reveals. The issue becomes reduced entirely to a question of judgement on the reason for the lacunae: do they represent authorial commissions or indeed scribal omissions? No grounds exist, of course, for adjudicating the cases individually. A subsidiary rule – which may conform or run counter to the general one of R precedence over P-E – must be formulated from recurring features and then applied equally to all readings of the group as defined.

Such features are bibliographical and compositional. Neither are common to all, and some cases are unaffected by either. Nevertheless, it is a recurrent bibliographical feature (the instances are asterisked in the list above) that the omitted words or phrases were interlinear or marginal insertions in P-E, liable to have been missed in the copying, and it is a recurrent compositional feature that the textual lacunae were sensed or identified by Joyce at subsequent stages of the textual development. In one remarkable instance, this leads to the repair of what in retrospect is probably a defective reading in P-E. At first sight, the change from P-E: “To which absorbing echo answered when” to R (fol. 46.14): “To which echo answered why” seems to make enough sense (since there is less apparent sense in an ‘absorbing echo’) to be authorially intended. But the later revisional repletion of the lacuna with the phrase “absorbing piece of intelligence”, yielding “To which *absorbing piece of intelligence* echo answered why” (1438.18–19), may well at long distance restore an original wording only fragmentarily copied into P-E from a still earlier lost source. In two further instances, the attempt to fill in the lacunae results in readings of the published text that would seem to cancel out their original P-E alternatives (“with a gurgling noise” (1394.11) for “on the strict q.t.”, and “for a very few minutes” (1426.10) replacing “a minute or so”). But this does not obviate our overriding decision to consider the omissions from P-E in invariant contexts as scribal errors in R, to be amended in the edited text.

THE AUTOGRAPHS: FAIR COPIES

Fair copies alone – but for the additional draft V.A.3 of “Proteus” – survive for episodes 1–9. Similarly, fair copies were assembled for episodes 11–16, to which otherwise the drafts and draft fragments relate as described. The fair copies are all – but for a single extended lacuna of several manuscript leaves in episode 15 (“Circe”) – complete for their episodes at the conclusion of the draft development. In a manner adopted earlier to transcribe in a fair hand the texts of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Exiles*, each chapter fair copy is a compilation of quarto-sized loose leaves, obtained by quartering the double legal-size sheets which Joyce must have habitually bought, and inscribed on one side only. The manuscript of episode 10 (“Wandering Rocks”), though a draft in character, is the same type. Yet the concluding episodes 17 and 18 (“Ithaca” and “Penelope”) were never transcribed as fair copies on to loose leaves from the two copybooks in which they survive in holograph. The chapter texts in these copybooks are at their final draft stage of development, representing the state of composition achieved in the late summer and the autumn of 1921, while simultaneously the typesetting for the first edition and Joyce’s intense proofreading and extensive revision of the earlier chapters were rapidly progressing.

The copybooks form the two final sections in the one and only comprehensive holograph of *Ulysses*, today known as the Rosenbach Manuscript. As has been made clear, it is not a consecutively inscribed unified autograph of the work as a whole, nor is it a fair-copy manuscript throughout. It comprises the novel by individual episodes as written out over a period of four years. Fifteen episodes are in fair copy (1–9, 11–16), three further episodes (10, 17–18) are included as drafts. In a technical sense, the Rosenbach Manuscript is thus a collective manuscript of the episodes of *Ulysses*.

For each individual episode of *Ulysses*, the holograph notation in the Rosenbach Manuscript marks a decisive point of consolidation in the compositional development. The early drafts lead up towards it, and the later typescripts derive from it directly, or else from a state of the text it closely represents. That state was attained in a final working draft such as, for episodes 10 and 17–18, it is incorporated in the Rosenbach Manuscript; for all other chapters, it may be held to have been the immediate antecedent of the fair copy. For all but one of the novel’s episodes, the structural profile of the final working draft – as represented by the Rosenbach Manuscript notation or as coinciding with it for episodes 10, 17 and 18 – remains constant throughout, and despite, all subsequent revision and expansion. Episode 7 (“Aeolus”) provides the exception. Its segmentation by cross-heads was a structural alteration in proof.

THE TYPESCRIPTS

In addition to the chapter fair copies surviving in the Rosenbach Manuscript, typescripts were successively prepared for the episodes as they consolidated in final working draft. The copy, and thus the linear textual antecedent, for each chapter typescript was either the extant inscription of the Rosenbach Manuscript derived from, or coinciding with, the final working draft: this is true for episodes 1-4, (5?), 10, 12 and 15-18; or it was the lost final working draft itself from which, in these cases, the fair copy derives collaterally: this is apparently true for chapters 5?, 6-9, 11 and 13-14. The chapter typescripts were typed with at least two carbons each by several typists in succession. The pattern of three copies was initiated in Zurich by Claud W. Sykes, who arranged for the typing of the early chapters on Joyce's behalf.

Joyce always corrected the typescripts directly on their return from the typists. Yet he did not always without fail mark up all copies identically. For no intrinsically apparent reason, moreover, he tended to mix the sheet sequences as he went through them. After his correction, therefore, the chapter typescripts existed in three exemplars as mixed sets of top copy and carbon pages. Of these, usually one complete, or near-complete, set has been preserved, identifiable as the printer's copy for the first edition. Intermittently, too, individual pages, or page sequences, of a second, and sometimes a third, exemplar are extant. Only for episodes 1-3 and 5 are all typescript copies lost, except for a printer's-copy page each of episodes 2 ("Nestor") and 3 ("Proteus").

FROM MANUSCRIPT TO TYPESCRIPT: THE LINEAR PATTERN
RECOVERY OF LOST TYPESCRIPTS

The earliest extant versions of episodes 1 and 2 ("Telemachus" and "Nestor") are the fair copies of the Rosenbach Manuscript, written in Locarno in the autumn of 1917. Clearly intended to be copied into typescript, they are carefully and very legibly inscribed, albeit characterized by numerous penknife erasures. The typing from them was done in December 1917 by Claud Sykes in Zurich, while Joyce continued to send corrections and revisions by post. Some of these appear only in the text as it derives from the typescripts, themselves now lost. Others are seen to have been entered, not in Joyce's hand, into the margins of the fair copy, indicating how far the typing had progressed when they were received.

Although today all typescript exemplars of the initial chapters are lost, except for a single page each of "Nestor" and "Proteus", it is quite clear from collation that the chapter typescripts were the direct linear antecedents of the printed chapter versions. These may therefore give evidence of the lost typescripts. In respect of the nature and degree of error, correction and revision, the precise transmissional state, and thus authority, of the text in the typescripts (TS) may be established from a

critical estimate of the variation revealed between the chapter fair copies in the Rosenbach Manuscript (R) and the printings, respectively, in *The Little Review* (LR), *The Egoist* (Eg) and the first proofs (galleys-in-page, or *placards*: Pl) of the 1922 book publication.

The Egoist did not publish “Telemachus”, but galley proofs, which have a headnote in Harriet Weaver’s hand dated 1/3/18 (i.e., 1 March 1918), were set up for the chapter. “Nestor” and “Proteus”, though somewhat foreshortened and expurgated, eventually saw publication in *The Egoist* in January-February and March-April 1919. The entire “Telemachia” thus exists in an LR, an Eg and a Pl typesetting.

An initial question to be resolved is whether these typesettings are at any point interdependent. The expectation from the external evidence is that they derive independently from a copy each of the chapter typescripts. This transmissional relationship is confirmed throughout from internal evidence for the Pl typesetting of 1921. But variation patterns linking LR and Eg against R and Pl are open to interpretation either as proof of changes made in or to the typescript exemplars serving separately as copy for LR and Eg, or as an indication of the use of LR – and not of a parallel typescript exemplar – as copy for Eg. In the one case, LR-Eg common readings offer themselves for critical acceptance as instances of authorial correction and revision of the typed text. They reinforce each other, even though (since Pl does not share the readings) the changes were apparently entered in only two of the three typescript exemplars. In the other case, the LR-Eg concurrences would simply represent changes in LR – either originating there or deriving from its copy – that were passed on in transmission to Eg. Eg would have no independent standing either to confirm or to invalidate the variants of LR. What authority might be granted the LR-Eg common readings would in this case depend entirely on a critical estimate of the individual instance of variation in relation to an overall assessment of LR’s transmissional status.

It can be demonstrated that, in the case of “Telemachus”, a mixed pattern of common and divided error or revision signifies the independent derivation of LR and Eg from an exemplar each of the typescript. Considering that both the LR publication in America and the Eg proofs of “Telemachus” set up in England date from March 1918, one should hardly expect otherwise. In the case of both “Nestor” and “Proteus”, by contrast, LR and Eg are linked by significant common errors, which means that, in the early months of 1919, the *Egoist* compositors set up their text from the *Little Review* instalments as published in April and May of 1918.

TELEMACHUS

Initial proof of the assumption that, for “Telemachus”, LR and Eg derive independently from separate exemplars of the typescript may be gained from one instance of an authorial, but evidently erroneous, correction of a typescript error. At 4.7-8, R reads “Stephen Dedalus stepped up, followed him halfway and sat down

wearily on the edge of the gunrest.” As suggested by the agreement of LR, Eg and Pl, the typist omitted ‘wearily’ in the fair-copy position. The current book text (as first set up in Pl) and LR agree in reading “followed him wearily halfway”. This means that the word was restored, though seemingly without reference to R and thus probably by the author himself, who insisted upon the notion to be conveyed but did not precisely recall the position of the remembered word in the sentence. The absence of ‘wearily’ from either position in Eg still indicates the typist’s error. At the same time, it reveals that the authorial correction was made in only two of the three typescript exemplars. LR and Eg were set up from a corrected and an uncorrected exemplar respectively or, more specifically, from a corrected and an uncorrected page each, while, in this instance, the second corrected page of the typescript in triplicate provided the copy for Pl.

The sample analysis thus indicates that Joyce read, corrected and revised the “Telemachus” typescript; that he did so probably without referring to the fair-copy manuscript; that apparently he marked up only two copies per page of the typescript in triplicate; and that, when the three sets of typescript pages were reassembled after revision, marked and unmarked pages got variously mixed. Hence, one may formulate a hypothesis favouring as authorial typescript overlay all agreements of two printed texts against the third, which in its turn may either concur with the fair copy or differently depart from it.

Yet each individual instance must be critically weighed. Variants of punctuation or orthography are often not sufficiently significant to be plausibly attributable to the author’s correcting hand. The agreement of two printed texts, say, in the addition or deletion of commas cannot usually be taken to mean more than that two compositors – mostly the American one of *The Little Review* and the English one of *The Egoist* – chose to regularise Joyce’s idiosyncratic punctuation in an identical manner. Substantive variants, however, commonly carry greater intrinsic significance. It is sufficiently probable that, at 2.3, Joyce changed the preposition: “[by] on the mild morning air” (LR-Eg agreement); that, at 4.14, he revised “If I get the aunt” to “if I can get the aunt” (LR-Pl agreement); and that – presumably for reasons of style – he reduced the repetitions of the personal pronoun at 16.32: “Ghostly light on [her] the tortured face” (LR-Pl agreement). But with regard to the LR-Eg concurrence in ‘hauled’ against Pl (and R) ‘haled’ (20.17), critical doubt is stronger than conviction. The choice ‘haled’, though obsolete, is Joyce’s word; hence, Pl ‘haled’ must be considered to be a 1921 correction of a typescript error overlooked in 1917. The typescript without correction would have been represented by a triple LR-Eg-Pl agreement in ‘hauled’.

Thus, all instances of triple LR-Eg-Pl agreement come under the particular suspicion of being typist’s errors that went undetected. But this group of substantive variants may be editorially rejected only if it can be rendered probable that authorial changes were never entered in all three of the typescript copies. A survey of the LR-Eg-Pl agreements in substantives in fact discloses only one change for which it would seem inevitable to hold the author responsible: at 24.19, the milkwoman’s

'shrunken breasts' (R) become her 'shrunken paps' (LR, Eg, Pl). If this revision was made on the typescript, it would follow that all LR-Eg-Pl concurrences against R showing no positive trace of error had to be accepted. It is fortunate, therefore, that a postcard of 27 November 1917, predating the typing, that contains Joyce's instruction to Sykes to make the change has survived. This one weighty revision may consequently be disregarded in the critical scrutiny of the remaining LR-Eg-Pl agreements against R.

Some of these LR-Eg-Pl concurrences are manifest errors. The omission of 'wearily' in its original fair-copy position, as discussed, is a case in point. Similarly, there are several instances of eyeskip. A particularly glaring one may be found in the milkwoman's rapid toting up of her bill (26.30). Inversions of the word order happen several times. It may be noted that Ezra Pound remarked on an accidental rhyme in response to what turns out to be just such an inversion: in "Buck Mulligan's gowned form moved briskly about the hearth to and fro, hiding and revealing its yellow glow", the sequence of the phrases reads correctly: "moved briskly to and fro about the hearth, hiding and revealing its yellow glow" (20.2-3). Other variants in the same formal category are well-meant, but mistaken, typist's corrections, e.g., "a long low whistle of call" at 2.24. The context of Mulligan's preceding request for "Slow music, please" (2.22) clearly conditions the repetition of the adjective and demands critical acceptance of the original reading, "a long slow whistle of call".

With Claud Sykes as Joyce's typist, it appears that the native speaker's own sense of the language encroached upon the text. In typing 'hauled' for 'haled', he substituted the current form for the obsolete one. Or, like Robert McAlmon after him in several instances in the final episode ("Penelope"), he changed 'round' to 'around' in the phrase in episode 3 ("Proteus"): "Airs romped round him" (76.28). It is the native speaker who, in the act of transmission, is most likely to dispense with spelling out and transliterating the words he is copying and to incline, instead, to memorising them. This may, on occasion, lead to an eking out of an idiomatic phrase: "If we could live on good food like that" (24.33) becomes "If we could only live on good food like that". Or it may result in the substitution of synonyms, or near synonyms, for original wording in the copy. The LR-Eg-Pl agreement in "country" for "land" at 2.10 or Mulligan's "birdlike cries" replacing the fair copy's "birdsweet cries" at 36.7 appear to be cases in point. The validity of 'birdsweet' may be confirmed by reference to the "voice, sweettoned and sustained" of the chapter's final paragraph.

Without exception, then, the agreement of two printed texts against the third (and/or the fair copy) reveals an authorial correction or revision of the typescript, while a triple LR-Eg-Pl agreement against R represents an uncorrected typing error. In not a single instance, apparently, did the author, in 1917, correct all three copies of the typescript. Corrections of the third typescript exemplar, when it was being prepared as printer's copy for the book in 1921, were intermittent and incidental and appear unconnected with the fairly systematic attention given each page of the other two exemplars four years earlier.

This conclusion helps to resolve critically the problem posed by the disappearance of the fair copy's system of punctuation by exclamation marks from the book text of "Telemachus". The fair-copy text of "Telemachus" has 55 exclamation marks. Significantly enough, a majority of them are associated with the character and speech of Buck Mulligan. Largely, though with some internal variation, the fair-copy system of exclamations survives in LR and Eg, but only eight exclamation marks reappear in Pl. Several compositors, who can hardly be assumed to have misrepresented Joyce's text with equal infidelity in respect to this category of accidentals, worked on the *placards*. The likelier source of the discrepancy would seem to be the typescript itself. If this is so, an answer must be sought to the question of whether Joyce determinedly (though incompletely) eliminated exclamation marks from the 1921 printer's copy or whether such marks simply were not in that copy.

A survey collation establishes that, while LR and Eg agree with R in 45 marks of exclamation, they substitute other punctuation in ten instances, mostly, though not invariably, in this case concurring with Pl. Most significantly, Pl, which agrees with R in only eight exclamation marks, shows a complete absence of any mark of punctuation in the corresponding positions in another eight instances. A hypothesis that therefore suggests itself is that the typewriter used did not have a separate key or character for the symbol and that the typist did not know how to form a substitute, say, by combining full stop and apostrophe.

If there were no marks of exclamation in the typescript of "Telemachus" as typed, they would have to have been written in by hand. Had the typist done this himself, one would expect him to have marked up all three copies. The fact that, by and large, only LR and Eg represent the fair copy's exclamations suggests that it was once again Joyce who marked up only two of the three typescript exemplars. This is supported by the observable delay of about one typescript page length until the presumed restoration of the fair-copy exclamations sets in in LR and Eg: it took the correcting and revising author a while to realise the typescript's defect, and in the later course, he overlooked some further locations of original exclamation marks. In at least one stretch of text, moreover, there is a sudden cluster of original exclamation marks reappearing in Pl and LR, as against full stops in Eg, which once more suggests an exchange of marked and unmarked pages in the typescript batches.

It is true that the text went into book print without the original marks of exclamation. The editorial decision to restore them to the critical text is guided by the assumption that, in 1921, Joyce was no longer alive to the typescript's technical defect. Such procedure receives significant, albeit marginal, support from the fact that Joyce himself in the course of the proofreading increased the *placard's* eight exclamation marks by restoring another eight in original fair-copy positions, four of which were placed in the *placard's* punctuation lacunae. The authenticity of the fair copy's expressive punctuation is further validated by the conspicuous recurrence of exclamations when Buck Mulligan reappears in the text, as for example in episode 9 ("Scylla and Charybdis").

NESTOR AND PROTEUS

The modified stemmatic relation of LR, Eg and Pl to R for “Nestor” and “Proteus” is easily ascertainable. Bibliographical evidence establishes consistently that, for both episodes, the English printing in *The Egoist* derives from the American one of *The Little Review*: typographical nonsense produced in LR is repeated in Eg, end-of-line hyphenation of words becomes middle-of-line hyphenation in Eg, and non-English (and non-Joycean) forms such as the American ‘toward’ reappear in the English *Egoist*. In consequence of the altered stemmatic relation, the critical evaluation of departures of the three printed versions together, or in groups of two, from the chapter texts in fair copy takes on new aspects. It may still have been true that Joyce corrected and revised only two copies of the chapter typescripts in triplicate, but the fact is less easily demonstrable, if at all, from the patterns of variants in the printed texts. Agreement of LR and Eg, which for “Telemachus” points to an authorial marking-up of two copies of the typescript, here simply means that a LR reading, whether originating in the single typescript exemplar serving as LR’s copy or in LR itself, went unchanged into Eg. Hence, no stemmatic corroboration is available for the critical selection of a few likely authorial revisions from the group of LR-Eg concurrences that, taken together, predominantly represent corruptions in print of the text. If, furthermore, the second of two marked-up typescript pages was incorporated in the copy for Pl as might be expected on occasion, it will have resulted either in a unique Pl reading (if the other marked page belonged to the transmissionally unused typescript) indistinguishable from a correction/revision of 1921, or in a triple LR-Eg-Pl agreement indistinguishable by the variant pattern produced from an undetected typescript error. Editorially, the high potential of transmissional corruption in both LR-Eg and LR-Eg-Pl concurrences leads to the rejection of the variants from LR, Eg and Pl in all but a few critically compelling instances. The acceptance of a transmissional variant often receives support from external evidence, such as Joyce’s notes to Claud Sykes or his confirmation of the departures from R by changes made in the advanced proofs or even by some post-publication corrections requested for the book text.

CALYPSO

“Calypso”, fourth episode in the order of drafting and fair-copying, as well as typing, is the first chapter of which a substantial typescript fragment has survived. On eight consecutive pages from the chapter beginning, it corresponds to pages 1–10 of the fair copy. Pages 3–7, hand-numbered at the top by Joyce, are ribbon copies, while pages 1, 2 and 8, where the pagination is typed on pages 2 and 8, are carbons. This eight-page fragment – Buffalo V.B.3.a – was not used in the transmission, but the duplicates of pages 1 and 2 of the typescript, which additionally survive –

Buffalo V.B.3.b: here, page 1 has the roman numeral I typed in, which, however, does not show in the carbon of the V.B.3.a sequence – evidently belonged to the printer's copy of 1921. The textual revisions first printed in the *placards* are entered in autograph, and there is one obvious printinghouse clarification of Joyce's handwriting on page I.

Contrary to the unambiguous situation prevailing for the chapters of the "Telemachia", the direct and contiguous derivation of the typescript from the fair copy of "Calypso" is not self-evident. The observable patterns of variation between the fair copy on the one hand and the typescript and/or *Little Review* and *placard* texts on the other are in need of interpretation. ("Calypso" was not serialised in *The Egoist*.) Variants unique to the *placards* (and thus the book text), if they are not obvious errors and corruptions, belong to the 1921 round of revisions. But departures from the fair-copy text in which LR and PI agree, and whose authority is indicated by their quality, require a stemmatic explanation. While it is obvious that the revisions and additions in question must have entered the transmission outside the fair copy, several hypotheses of their origin are logically possible. With the printer's copy for the *Little Review* wholly absent and that for the *placards* equally so except for its first two pages, the notion may be entertained that the LR and PI agreement represents an identical marking-up of the respective typescript exemplars. But this hypothesis is invalidated by the surviving typescript fragment, which shows the departures from the fair copy all integrated in the typing. They therefore antedate the typescript.

For the stretch of the extant typescript fragment, the authorial pre-typescript revisions are confined to pages 4–7. Pages I, 2 and 8, by contrast, concur wholly, but for typing errors, with the fair copy. Pages 2 and 8 are clearly the work of one typist, while pages 3–7 are that of another (and page I perhaps that of a third). Taken together, the distribution of the variants and the bibliographical pattern in the extant stretch of typescript suggest that pages 3–7 are retyped pages intercalated between pages 2 and 8 – and if the imputed first typing of pages 3–7 was anything like the poor quality of page I, one can imagine why, with the addition of authorial revisions, retyping would have recommended itself.

The retyped pages were authorially corrected for typing errors, as is evident from the LR text as well as from the surviving typescript. The copy that Joyce retained for himself was not corrected, as shown by the same errors persisting in the setting of the *placards*. Whether retyping extended to any pages beyond page 8 cannot clearly be determined. One peculiarity confined to pages 3–7 of the extant typescript may be noted. The typewriter's right-hand margin was fixed relatively far into the page and not released to be over-written for full-measure lines. If not corrected by hand, this left some words lacking letters and/or marks of punctuation. This feature regularly recurs in the typescripts of the later chapters. It may have been the cause also for a few defective readings in the *placard* text deriving from the lost typescript section of "Calypso", but it is impossible to tell whether this implies a retyping of pages or merely the employment of the typist/typewriter of pages 3–7 for some, or

all, of the missing final pages. The chapter's significant post-faircopy (and pre-typescript) revisions are in fact largely clustered on pages 4-7 of the typescript. Though a small handful of similar revisions do occur in the latter half, they do not enforce the assumption of double typing for that lost typescript section.

FROM MANUSCRIPT TO TYPESCRIPT: THE COLLATERAL PATTERN RECOVERY OF THE FINAL WORKING DRAFT

The direct linear descent of the text from the Rosenbach Manuscript to the lost or extant typescripts for episodes 1-4, 10, 12 and 15-18 is demonstrable – as has been shown specifically for the chapters whose typescripts are largely lost – from bibliographic analysis and a scrutiny of patterns of textual variation. The internal evidence from such procedures conversely yields the clues to the hypothesis of a collateral descent of the fair copy and the typescript from the final working draft for episodes 6-9, 11 and 13-14.

In the internal analysis, linear descent is indicated by a near identity of the text in fair copy and typescript, especially when re-inforced by common error or, as is more often the case, by representations or misrepresentations in the typescript that are explicable as mechanical reproductions of graphic peculiarities or as misreadings of the specific fair-copy inscription. Collateral descent, conversely, is suggested by the absence of such direct links, but it can be affirmed only if it may be ruled out that the typescript is the fair copy's linear descendant at one remove, that is, if the evidence renders implausible or impossible that some lost document of transcription intervened between fair copy and typescript.

It is a main feature of the textual relationship between extant fair copy and typescript for chapters 6-9, 11 and 13-14 that the typescript text presents both alternative readings and significant additions of words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs. If the revision they represent was made on a lost document intervening between fair copy and typescript, one would expect some of the characteristic features indicating a linear descent from fair copy to extant typescript to survive even at one remove. This expectation would be all the stronger if, rather than a document of full transcription, a set of notes for changes and additions were thought to have intervened, in which case the fair copy essentially would still have been the typescript's direct antecedent. Moreover, supplying the textual revisions to the typescript in a set of notes for the typist could hardly have gone without leaving traces in the fair copy, such as marks of deletion or carets for the place of entry of addition text. However, the fair copies of the chapters in question wholly lack such traces. At times, it is true, some verbal or graphic peculiarities occur that appear to link fair copy and typescript and thus might support an argument for linear descent. But their significance is open to interpretation. Conspicuous cases in point are a few scattered pencil strokes in the fair copies of episodes 13 and 14 ("Nausicaa" and "Oxen of the Sun"), coinciding with the beginnings of some pages of the chapter typescripts. They could easily be taken for the typist's markings of his page turns, if

it were not for the fact that in a couple of instances they are erroneous, set against a wrong word identical with the one at which the typescript page correctly turns. Thus they would seem, rather, to have been entered in the fair copy after the typescript had been prepared from a different manuscript.

The circumstances under which Joyce worked also put limits on the likelihood of additional, though lost, documents. On the one hand, since Joyce did not type himself, typing by others would affect his budget. This would have been a restraint on his ordering double typing, albeit that here a few exceptions must prove the rule. Thus, as was shown, pages 3–7 in the extant eight-page fragment of the fourth-chapter (“Calypso”) typescript appear to be retyped, with revisions worked in, from a first typing in line with pages I-2 and 8, and the penultimate episode (“Ithaca”) was worked over so much in the first typing that individual pages were often once, and sometimes twice, retyped as two or three pages, with corresponding page-number extensions. On the other hand, the pressure of time under which the episodes were commonly being made ready would have held Joyce back from writing out the chapters in autograph yet once more beyond the fair copies and with revisions incorporated to facilitate the typing.

The internal evidence and the external considerations together lead to the hypothesis that governs this edition’s understanding and editorial treatment of the textual variation between fair copy and typescript for chapters 5–9, 11 and 13–14. It is assumed that as each of these episodes was being brought to completion in draft, the extant fair copy was copied from the final working draft. Thereafter, the final working draft was further touched up and worked over and then handed to the typist in its revised state. Thereby, not only do the extant witnesses by their invariance in a collateral relationship jointly give evidence of their common source, which thus, though lost as a document, becomes textually recoverable, but by their variation, they also disclose the late phases of composition at the final working draft stage. While the typescript on the whole must be taken to represent the draft text at its most advanced, the fair copy on the whole will be seen to record it in an earlier form.

To declare the text in the typescript a revision of the final working draft text as recorded in the fair copy is, in the absence of the final working draft itself, *essentially a critical judgement*. As such, it relies on the document relationship it posits, which is not independently demonstrable where the earliest extant notation of a chapter text is in the fair copy. Yet where early drafts or draft fragments survive, as they do for episodes 11, 13 and 14, they may be used as touchstones for the analysis of the variation between fair copies and typescripts to assess the relationship of these documents and their texts.

A comparison of the textual states available for these chapters – the draft state, the fair-copy state and the typescript state – first confirms the drafts as early drafts. By the manner and extent in which they vary from both fair copy and typescript, they precede a conjectural final working draft state of their episodes. Advancing beyond the early drafts, the chapter texts have undergone great changes by the time

they reappear, as closely corresponding texts, in the fair copies and typescripts. Nevertheless, much of the early draft text passes invariant to the subsequent extant documents. Significantly, while many early draft readings descend to the fair copy, as is to be expected, others bypass the fair copy and reappear in the typescript. Such a variation pattern positively rules out a linear relationship of fair copy and typescript. It strengthens the hypothesis of a lost final working draft, which it situates after the early drafts on the one hand and before the fair copy and typescript on the other hand. From all early draft and fair copy agreement against the typescript it also supports the assumption that the final working draft was additionally revised after the fair-copying to yield the new typescript readings. In fact, wherever the three textual states can be properly correlated – which, owing to the significant advance of the final working draft over the early draft, they cannot always be – critical judgement does not have to be invoked at all to determine the case for a revision. For example, whereas in episode 11 (“Sirens”) the early draft and the fair copy agree that Tom Kernan was “harking back in a retrospective arrangement”, the typescript reads that he was “harking back in a retrospective sort of arrangement”. The unique typescript departure from the early draft and fair copy agreement validates the typescript reading and no critical debate need arise whether ‘sort of’ constitutes a revisional deletion (in the fair copy) or a revisional addition (in the typescript).

Importantly, the analogous reasoning applies to instances of early draft and typescript agreement against unique fair-copy readings. In episode 13 (“Nausicaa”), early draft and typescript render a sequence of phrases in Bloom’s mind as: “She kissed me. My youth. Never again. Only once it comes.” But the fair copy reads: “She kissed me. Never again. My youth. Only once it comes.” The document relationship establishes the fair-copy sequence as the revised reading, which therefore becomes the critically accepted reading in this edition (810.17-18). That, for episodes 11, 13 and 14, the fair copy thus demonstrably incorporates revisions superseding readings of the typescript is a fact with important implications for the overall assessment of the textual relationship between the collateral documents where, for episodes 5-9, and for episode 11 before the early draft sets in, it must be adjudicated critically. Against the basic tendency, as posited, of the *development from a textual state as represented in the fair copy to a textual state as represented in the typescript*, one is led to expect some unrevised final working draft readings in the typescript, in relation to which the variants in the fair copy are revisions. As distinct from the document relationship, therefore, the textual relationship between the fair copy and the typescript must be weighed and its evidential value assessed to describe adequately the compositional processes at the point of consolidation of each episode.

Advanced thinking in textual scholarship since W. W. Greg has developed the implications inherent in his seminal “The Rationale of Copy-Text” (1951) of distinguishing, and logically separating, text from text carrier or document.¹¹

¹¹ W. W. Greg, “The Rationale of Copy-Text.” *Studies in Bibliography* 3(1950-51), 19-36.

Although there can be no textual transmission without documents, no document as document self-evidently defines the text it carries as a text, that is, as a separable and individually circumscribed textual state or version. A draft manuscript, as a single document of composition, may carry several textual states or versions. Conversely, the revised version of a work in print, according to W. W. Greg's rationale, is normally to be constituted critically only by combining authoritative (and rejecting non-authoritative) text from several documents. From such theoretical considerations the question arises whether distinguishing three separate documents – final working draft, fair copy and typescript – also implies defining three separate versions of the early draft text of *Ulysses* and, more specifically, whether recognising the collateral document relationship between the fair copy and the typescript entails designating their texts as collateral revisions of the final working draft text. The question cannot be settled theoretically. It cannot be answered in the abstract, but must pragmatically take into account Joyce's compositional habits and all evidence of his intentions in the acts of writing that the demonstrable transmissional cross-links of the extant documents yield.

For all chapters where the Rosenbach Manuscript notation served as the typist's copy, Joyce clearly conceived of the text as evolving linearly from draft through fair copy to the typescript intended as copy for his printers. However, experience with the early chapters must have shown him that by laying aside and perhaps discarding the final working draft and relying on the fair copy to represent the text he wanted that could at the same time serve as copy for the typist, it was difficult to maintain the fair appearance of the fair copy. All the early chapters in the Rosenbach Manuscript are full of erasures indicating revisions during the fair-copying; they are often enough marked as well by the typist's pencilings and marginal entries recording further changes conveyed by letters and on postcards. If nothing else, these defacings would have been felt to reduce the fair copy's potential sale value. More importantly, Joyce must have come to realise in the course of the early chapters that the emerging text was still much too fluid and the pressure of revision and expansion too great to be contained in a fair copy alone.

Leaving the fair copy as uncluttered as possible, Joyce began to use the final working draft to receive the continuing flow of changes. By the sixth chapter ("Hades") at the latest, the new pattern was established of having the chapter typings prepared from the final working draft at its state of ulterior revision. In all likelihood, this alternative mode of transmission was in fact inaugurated for episode 5 ("Lotus Eaters"). Yet here, owing to the complete loss of the chapter typescript, it is not possible to determine whether the changes evidenced by the typescript derivations in print, while significant and extensive in relation to the fair copy, were in fact incorporated in the typed text derived from the final working draft or whether they were entered by hand into a typing still made from the fair copy.

Where it occurs, the transmission of the text into typescript from the final working draft does not alter, but rather emphasizes, Joyce's conception of a fundamental linearity in the compositional evolution. That the modified pattern of

textual notation and transmission through the documents in his hand and under his control does not imply a change of attitude to that dominant mode of composition is also suggested by the ease with which the fair copies again re-enter the direct line of descent of the text for episodes 12, 15 and 16 (“Cyclops”, “Circe” and “Eumaeus”). Moreover, the instances where illness (as for episode 10, “Wandering Rocks”) or extreme pressure of time (as for episodes 17 and 18, “Ithaca” and “Penelope”) forestalled altogether the separate inscription of a fair copy point to a basic interchangeability of final working draft and fair copy.

This interchangeability is widely confirmed by the textual relationship of collateral fair copies and typescripts. As authorial transcriptions, the fair copies show ample traces of revision against an earlier state of the text even for those chapters where no early drafts survive. The most clear-cut of these are revisions in copying where the fair-copy inscription starts out in congruence with the typescript but then deletes and reshapes such a beginning. The two Dublin vestals in Stephen’s parable, for instance, “shake out threepenny bits and a sixpence” from their moneybox; or so the typescript says. But the fair copy revises: “a sixpence” is written out, then deleted and changed to the plural form “sixpences” (302.14). Alternatively, one may find overlay in the fair copy recognisable by its interlinear or marginal positioning as afterthought. Thus, in episode 8, Joyce adds between the lines of the fair copy: “Right under the obituary notices too. Dignam’s potted meat.” The corresponding text recurs differently phrased in the typescript, revealing a revision in two stages, sketched in the fair copy and further developed in the typescript. In the example, the typescript reads: “Under the obituary notices they stuck it. Dignam’s potted meat” (362.5-6). This implies that the alteration initiated in the act of fair-copying was entered back into the final working draft and was modified in the process.

If fair-copy overlay recurs invariantly in the typescript, it is of course not possible to decide whether it represents a revision or simply original final-draft text overlooked in the copying. Conversely, where any basic or overlay reading in the fair copy is critically judged against the typescript text to be a revision, the conclusion must be that the revision was not entered back into the final working draft. With regard to the overall textual relationship of fair copy and typescript, the demonstrable cases of feedback from fair copy to final working draft override the failure to re-enter every fair-copy revision into the final working draft. They are decisive for defining the relationship between final working draft and fair copy in light of Joyce’s working process. For the episodes under discussion, while the fair copy may be called a collateral document in relation to the typescript, it is yet mainly, in relation to the final working draft, an extension document for the textual notation at the final working draft level of composition.

What this implies is a fluidity of notation at the culmination of an episode’s draft development, which may be observed throughout the chapter holographs in the Rosenbach Manuscript. Joyce’s habitual use of loose leaves for the chapter fair copies made easy the revision, re-inscription and replacement of individual leaf-

length sections within chapters. They are sometimes betrayed by a difference in the quality or size of paper of an individual leaf intercalated into a uniform surrounding sequence or occasionally by overlapping text. Joyce was usually adept enough in tailoring the seams between pages at such points of replacement so that more often than not one notices merely a difference of ink or an increase in the density of the inscription achieved by employing a smaller hand, narrowing the margin or cramming more lines than usual into a page.

The loose-leaf arrangement seems expressly designed to facilitate a sectional revision in the later phases of the draft composition. Throughout his writing, from the early essay "A Portrait of the Artist" to *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce commonly began his drafting in bound copybooks. It is only his advanced manuscripts that were inscribed on loose leaves. In this regard, the fair copies for the episodes of *Ulysses* may even, as documents, sometimes be regarded as fictions-after-the-fact, that is, as assemblies of the fairest pages from a choice of duplicates of some of them to make up the most presentable holograph. In episode 13 ("Nausicaa"), for instance, some pages of the fair copy were apparently the direct copy for the typescript and would thus, though extant, logically belong to the lost final working draft, whereas other fair-copy pages undoubtedly had (lost) final working draft counterparts. Similarly, in episode 15 ("Circe"), where the fair copy as a whole was the transmission copy, a few extant pages are yet collateral to the transmission and must be held in the Rosenbach Manuscript to replace lost counterparts that, by the evidence of the transmitted text, genuinely belonged to the loose-leaf sequence from which the transmission originated. What such observations cumulatively suggest is that, rather than purposefully producing the distinct documents of 'final working draft' and 'fair copy' as they are logically required to frame our editorial hypothesis, Joyce employed a notation on loose leaves in his advanced drafting precisely to carry forward a continuous manuscript of essentially linear development.

It has been shown, then, that where a final working draft and a fair copy must be logically distinguished, the ongoing revision of the final working draft carried over into the fair copy. In principle, if not always in practice, the revisions initiated in the fair-copy notation were transferred back into the final working draft as the document from which the further linear descent of the text into print originated. If *they were not so transferred, they appear as unique readings of the fair copy and are absent from the text published in 1922*. But to recognise the fair copy as essentially a document extension of the final working draft entails seeing its revisions in line with the final working draft's compositional development. The fair copy's unique readings, consequently – if as unique readings they are judged to be revisions and not earlier text superseded by revision in the final working draft that the typescript makes evident – must be admitted as integral to an edition text established critically in accordance with Joyce's conception of the evolution of the text of *Ulysses* as always directed towards the publication text.

On this basis, the critical edition reclaims some one hundred substantive readings from the fair copy. These are not all of the revisions that, by dint of being performed

in the extension document to the final working draft, failed to descend to the printed text. Editorial decision on each instance of critically ascertainable fair-copy revision must take into account that all revisions not transferred back to the final working draft were absent from the typescripts and proofs. The text was thereby defective in these documents compared with the true revisional state attained at the fair-copy/final-working-draft stage of the compositional evolution. But during the subsequent phases of the pre-publication transmission sustained by the typescripts and proofs, the total text underwent further extensive changes. In their course, the position of earlier revisions from the fair copy was occasionally pre-empted by later ones, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly by an alteration of context implicitly affecting the position of the missing fair-copy revision. In the instances where such a conflict in fact arises, the later revision takes precedence over the earlier one. For example, a paragraph in episode 6 ("Hades") characteristically opens as interior monologue, then switches to narrative, and then, in the fair copy, briefly modulates to interior monologue once more: "Change that soap now. Mr Bloom's hand unbuttoned his hip pocket swiftly and transferred the paperstuck soap to his inner handkerchief pocket *give it a nice smell* as he stepped out of the carriage." Critically, this can hardly be looked upon as anything but a revision of the straight narrative rendered in the typescript: "...to his inner handkerchief pocket. He stepped out of the carriage." Nevertheless, the fair copy cannot be followed to establish the critical text. In the final working draft, to which the revision from the fair copy failed to be transferred, the brief concluding sentence was expanded: "He stepped out of the carriage, replacing the newspaper his other hand still held" (204.30-31). This contextual change establishes a new syntactical balance which an editorial acceptance of both revisions would impossibly upset.

Editorial decision is thus guided not by a critical understanding of the revisional interaction at draft level alone; it also comprehensively perceives and weighs the subsequent textual development. Consequently, the critical imperative of establishing at its final-working-draft point of origin the fully revised state of the text is obeyed with reticence and controlled, again, by the rule of the invariant context. Of the total of the critically ascertainable fair-copy revisions superseding readings of the hitherto received text transmitted unrevised from the final working draft via the typescript and proofs, a minority, as in the example given from "Hades", are refused admission to the critical text in situations where the final working draft context established for them by a fair-copy/typescript agreement was itself subsequently revised. What constitutes the relevant context is in turn critically, not mechanically, determined and delimited sometimes by the sentence or part-sentence, and at other times by the passage, paragraph or paragraph sequence.

FROM MANUSCRIPT TO TYPESCRIPT: "CIRCE"

Joyce claimed that he wrote "the *Circe* episode nine times from first to last". The manuscript materials that survive are the copybook V.A.19, main subject of Norman Silverstein's dissertation of 1960, and the "Circe" pages of the Rosenbach Manuscript. There is a linear, but clearly not a contiguous, connection between the copybook and the Rosenbach pages. If "Circe" may be thought of as progressing in externally unmarked but distinguishable sections, the copybook contains early, in part perhaps the earliest, drafts or sketches of some of them. They do not yet follow the order into which they later settled, and usually they give every appearance of being in volatile compositional gestation.

The Rosenbach pages of "Circe", though in all parts undoubtedly copied from earlier drafts, only intermittently constitute a fair copy. Over considerable stretches they are better characterized as a draft still teeming with revisions and additions. The manuscript's intermediary status between draft and fair copy is also borne out by the motley pagination, which runs as follows: 1-27, 27bis, 28-33, 33a, 34-37, 37a, 38-40, [*40], 41-43, [*43], 44-45, 45a, 46-50; 50(*sic*)-51, 51a-e, 52-56, 56a; 62, 62a, 63-78, 78a, 79, 79a, 80-85.

In this sequence, the extra folios [*40] and [*43] are interleaved listings of some revisions and additions all but illegible on earlier pages, written out for the benefit of the typist (and, indeed, the editor) and occasionally modified. On the verso of fol. 29 may be found, in pencil and in a sprawling adolescent hand (Giorgio Joyce's?), a phonetic approximation of the German words of Sarastro's aria from Mozart's *Die Zauberflöte*, "In diesen heil'gen Hallen". (It is the *Qui sdegno* Ben Dollard is asked to sing in "Sirens", 608.34). The passage is extraneous to "Circe", although a tenuous connection to the masonic motif in *Ulysses* should not be overlooked.

The foliation pattern does not run parallel to possible divisions into draft and fair-copy manuscript pages, but it strengthens the inference to be drawn from their mixture that, facilitated by the manner of inscription on loose leaves, transitions were fluent between the chapter's final draft stages. Joyce undoubtedly attached significance to the claim of nine drafts (though in fact his counting varies in the several letters that refer to the progress of "Circe"). But the mixture of 'draft' and 'fair-copy' pages (with the occasional textual overlap of adjoining pages) and the irregular pagination together indicate strongly that, in the assembly of the Rosenbach Manuscript sequence, usable pages were lifted from earlier draft stages. This appears further confirmed by the frequent alternations in page measurements and paper quality, although these features, in combination with the foliation pattern, sometimes also suggest revisional replacement within the 'ninth draft' itself.

The fluidity of transition between draft levels is particularly apparent from fols. 50 to 63. The foliation number '50' is repeated without alphabetic subdivision. Fol. 50(1), soiled on its verso, marks the end of a sequence of manuscript leaves. The

break in the draft continuum is indicated by the indentation in mid-sentence and the repetition of the last word from the preceding page at the top of fol. 50(2). Fol. 50(2), overflowing for nine lines into fol. 51, which is otherwise blank, is thus clearly a revised copy of a lost antecedent leaf perhaps from a draft earlier than fol. 50(1) (hence possibly the misfoliation). The virtually blank leaf 51 is followed by five extension pages, 51a-e. Page size and paper quality link together the folio sequences 51a-b-c-54 and 50(2)-51-51d-e-52 respectively. Fol. 53, falling into neither bibliographic sequence, may have come either from a different sheaf of paper or from an earlier draft. The processes of neither bibliographic nor textual accretion can be reconstructed in detail. Yet it is notable that the uncommonly extended page no. '51' contains the progressive debasement of the Bello-Bloom encounter; its increasing obsessiveness is therefore revealed as a late draft development.

For fols. 55-56-56a, of which 55-56 are identical in paper and size and distinct from their surroundings (whereas 56a conforms bibliographically to fol. 54), collation reveals that the text in transmission derives from other copy than that of the extant pages. The subsequent pages 57-61 are lost. Beyond the lacuna – the only one in the entire Rosenbach Manuscript – fol. 63 opens with an extensive draft overlap. The first nine lines of the page, deleted in pencil, reappear altered in a revised context in the preceding fols. 62-62a.

For fols. 62-62a, therefore, an antecedent draft page '62', joining smoothly with fol. 63, must have existed. Conversely, two or three alternative pages '55'-'56' were evidently the copy for the text in transmission. The loss manifest in the disappearance of pages 57-61 comprises also the alternative pages '55'-'56'. Since these pages were all available as the source of the text transmitted, they can at the earliest have disappeared when the "Circe" manuscript was assembled for John Quinn, the New York lawyer and collector who had arranged to buy the *Ulysses* manuscript and was receiving it in batches. The simplest reason for the lacuna is numerical: the number of pages lost equals the number of extension pages to page 51.

The manuscript as a whole is the linear antecedent of its transmissional descendants. From the chapter beginning to the middle of fol. 45, an 80-page typescript was directly prepared from the autograph. The first typist – found after four others had declined to do the work – typed with considerable competence. The later typists refused or were unable to cope with the manuscript. Therefore, two or three amanuenses took turns in first preparing a longhand transcription from the autograph. For the stretch of the manuscript lacuna, the transcription is the earliest source of the text, but it is itself no longer complete and breaks off for a few pages before the manuscript resumes, so that for a brief passage the typescript alone preserves the text.

The most notorious mishap occurred as the typing had progressed to the beginning of the street scene following the departure from Bella Cohen's. Scandalised by the text under his wife's fingers, the typist's husband burnt several

pages of the amanuensis copy, though not of the typescript, apparently, since this continues for a page or two beyond the break in the longhand transcription. Nor was the amanuensis copy destroyed much beyond the break-off point of the typescript. Joyce in desperation ordered a sequence of manuscript leaves back from John Quinn, who after some hesitation sent him photostats. These, covering far more text than was in fact lost, were again transcribed in longhand, less accurately than before, and subsequently typed. But when it came to assembling the printer's copy, Joyce, in cooler blood, realised how much smaller the damage was than originally feared. He used as much as was available of the first typing, supplementing it with only the briefest possible section from the second one. At a point of overlap of the two typescripts, however, this did not prevent the printer from setting up a passage according to the less accurate text. Here as throughout, naturally, the edition is able to establish the text from the autograph against the combined transmissional errors of amanuenses, typists and compositors persisting in the published and hitherto received text.

It may have been while the amanuensis copy of the chapter's second half was being prepared in late February 1921 that Joyce went over the 80-page typescript already in his hands and marked up the two extant copies almost identically, though with a few discrepancies. For the remainder of the text, the amanuenses handed their transcripts back to Joyce for correction and for completion in places where they had found the original illegible. Touching up the text beyond correction by revisions and additions, Joyce, still no doubt in the early spring, carried forward in the amanuensis copy the first marking-up begun in the 80-page typescript. The two extant copies of the typescript section typed from the amanuensis copy were gone over very lightly. A main round of further corrections and revisions was entered on the one exemplar of the complete chapter typescript that was used as the printer's copy for the book. The completion of these corrections and revisions may be dated to September 1921, since they include as their most extensive entry the so-called "Messianic Scene". It was first separately written out in the fairest of Joyce's hands on seven legal-size manuscript leaves (V.A.20) and typed (by one of the typists for "Penelope" and "Ithaca") for insertion at a position indicated on page 54 of the basic chapter typescript. Though postdating the original completion of "Circe" by some eight or nine months, the "Messianic Scene" was the first section of the episode to go into print. It passed through repeated proof stages before the remaining chapter began to be set in type.

THE FINISH: "PENELOPE" AND "ITHACA"

In April 1921, Sylvia Beach of Shakespeare & Co. in Paris and Maurice Darantieri, master printer in Dijon, signed a contract to produce and publish a book ostensibly waiting to go to press. Nobody, not even the author himself, seemed at the time to be fully aware of the book's true state of unreadiness. How far James Joyce's *Ulysses* still was from completion, or abandonment, in that spring of 1921 has been a matter

to astound all historians of the novel's genesis. Indeed, the publishing contract may have been the decisive catalyst that fused the energies necessary to give it final shape during those most intense phases of work, which saw not only the extensive revision and expansion of the sixteen episodes that existed at the time of its signing ("Telemachus" to "Eumaeus"), but also the writing of the two that did not. These were "Ithaca" and "Penelope", which together were to run to 113 pages, or almost one sixth, of the printed book.

Both episodes seem to have grown from fresh ideas of realisation, if not content, in Paris. Until early August 1921, work on them proceeded more or less concurrently. Thereupon, with the first sentence of "about 2500 words" written, Joyce concentrated for about six weeks on "Penelope" alone – at the same time carrying out the greatest bulk of revision in the proofs of the earlier episodes¹² – before finally joining the whole length of the book to "Penelope" through "Ithaca".

"Penelope" – that is, seven of its eight sentences – and "Ithaca" in succession, and in that order, are contained basically as fair draft copies on the right-hand pages in the blue and the green copybook that together now constitute the last sections of the Rosenbach Manuscript. Though ample notes for both chapters survive among the British Library *Notesheets* for *Ulysses*, as well as in the notebook V.A.2, preliminary sketches and early drafts are missing. Yet by the time the copybooks were handed out for typing, they had been reconverted to the state of working drafts by the rich revisional expansion of the text accommodated in the margins and on the left-hand pages.

Joyce appears to have written out the first half of "Penelope", i.e., its first four sentences, probably at one time in the blue copybook. This section he then revised throughout, the first sentence most extensively, by dense clusters of insertions and added to it the fifth sentence, which he then also worked over. For these five chapter segments he found a typist in Robert McAlmon. The typing was done, it seems, sometime within the nine days from August 16 to August 25.

Since Richard Ellmann's biography, the imagination of critics has been haunted by McAlmon's reported remark that Joyce sanctioned some of his textual rearrangements in the typing.¹³ Collation quickly reveals that there is little foundation for McAlmon's boast of partial co-authorship in "Penelope". There are no more than about half a dozen cases in all of a reversed order of phrasing. They are of an accidental kind that could have happened to any typist, and they usually lead to subtle losses of points of meaning. Sometimes deletions, indicated in the manuscript by parentheses, are misunderstood, additions to additions are missed or short phrases in the basic manuscript text between one mark of insertion and the next are omitted, seemingly by inadvertence. Substitutions occur of what are probably McAlmon usages for Joycean ones ('anyway' for 'anyhow' and, repeatedly, 'around' for 'round'). Apart from obviously necessary amendments of

¹² see Groden *passim*, especially chapter 4.

¹³ Ellmann, p. 514.

plain errors in the autograph, only one instance of a change in the typescript section deserves closer critical scrutiny. Molly's memory of her petting encounter with Mulvey "I tormented the life out of him" (1680.35) reads "I tortured the life out of him" in the typescript and has survived so in print. Yet 'tortured' may be dismissed as an instance of lexical substitution by a native speaker of English; 'torment' is a recurring Joycean preference.

Handing out sections of a chapter for typing while the whole was yet unfinished, first practised for "Eumaeus", now became a characteristic mode of procedure under the pressure of time. The constant flow of proofs at various stages of correction demanded much simultaneous attention to the novel's text. Even as McAlmon was typing, Joyce continued to write. Sentences six and seven of "Penelope" were copied into the blue copybook when Joyce got it back. The noticeably decreased neatness of hand especially in the sixth sentence (R, fols. 15-20) may be the visible effect of Joyce's collapse at the Alhambra music hall on 26 August, which induced him for a while to cut the daily working hours from 16 to five or six, and instead to go for eight- or nine-mile walks once or twice a day.

Sentences six and seven received far fewer additions and revisions on the blank left-hand pages in the blue copybook than the preceding ones. The concluding eighth sentence was apparently not yet composed. It is not in the copybook, and on 3 September Joyce outlined his immediate workload to McAlmon as: "I shall give Molly another 2000 word spin, correct a few more episodes . . . and then begin to put the spectral penultimate *Ithaca* into shape." This reference to "Ithaca" in the midst of work on "Penelope" may indicate that it was on copying sentences six and seven of "Penelope", and before handing them out to be typed, that he turned the blue copybook upside down and around to enter from the other end the first eight pages and seven lines of manuscript for the penultimate episode. The extensive augmentation on the left-hand pages, which, for "Ithaca", is confined to this first section of its manuscript, suggests a longish interval between the draft copy and the working-over, perhaps just those further three weeks that passed before the spectral chapter could at last be given full attention.

"Penelope"'s concluding sentence, composed within a twenty-day time span between September 3 and 23, was apparently ready to be copied at a moment when the blue copybook was out of Joyce's hands. A truly fair copy (V.A.22) was therefore written out on legal-size loose sheets, in suggestive conformity with the "Messianic" addition to "Circe" (V.A.20) and the "Metropolitan Police" addition to "Cyclops" (V.A.9). The latter, dateable in fair copy to the first days of October, was sent to the printers in manuscript. The former, of which a typescript was made, is mentioned in a letter to Valery Larbaud in (presumably) the latter half of August. Significantly, the fair copy shows a further revised state of the concluding litany ("Kidney of Bloom, pray for us", etc.) than that given in the letter. The fair-copying from revised draft and the subsequent typing therefore was apparently attended to during those three weeks in September, concurrently probably with the drafting, at least, of the "Metropolitan Police" section for "Cyclops" (contained in draft in the

copybook V.A.2) and definitely with the final inscription and typing of “Penelope”’s eighth sentence.

Following the McAlmon section of the “Penelope” typescript (pp. 1–27), two typewriters that are found also to alternate for the greater part of “Ithaca” in the manner they do for sentences six to eight of “Penelope” make their first appearance. One typewriter has a blue ribbon and features an arabic 1. The other’s ribbon is purple; it has a characteristic wavy line for underscoring, and it requires type substitutions for the figure 1. Certain distinctive typing habits, as well as a different treatment in the early “Ithaca” sections of manuscript enclosures in parentheses (which are to be understood sometimes as deletions, sometimes as part of the text, though in the pages from one of the typewriters they are all treated as deletions), suggest that the two typewriters were used by different typists – who nevertheless must have been working in close conjunction – for as long as the typewriters alternate.

Typewriter/typist B (for ‘blue’) begins to type six pages (1–6: pages 28–33 of the typescript) of “Penelope”, sentence six. Typewriter/typist P(I) (for ‘purple’, substitution I for 1) takes over in the middle of run-on text on manuscript fol. 19, starts the pagination afresh, types eight pages (I-8: pages 34–41 of the typescript), then recommences pagination for one whole page and a second page of five lines (I-2: pages 42–43 of the typescript), which takes him to the end of sentence seven and of the blue copybook text. At this point, the “Messianic” addition to “Circe” may have intervened. Finally, the last sentence is typed, from the separate fair copy, with a third sequence of page numbers I-6 (pages 44–47, 47bis-49 of the typescript).

Joyce did not wait for its completion. Anxious to get the typesetting for “Penelope” started immediately so that Valery Larbaud would be able to read the book’s final chapter as soon as possible and have parts of it translated in preparation for his reading séance scheduled for December 7, he sent a batch of 31 typescript pages to Dijon on 22 September, which was confirmed on the 23rd. On the 24th he wrote a letter to Darantiere to explain to him that what he had received was an addition to “Circe”, to go into the ‘dramatic section’ of the manuscript where the red mark was, and also the beginning of the final episode, of which the rest would follow the next day. In the pages of the second consignment, Joyce explained at the top of page 44 (the beginning of sentence eight) that it was the conclusion of the last chapter and should be joined directly on to the text of the preceding page. On 26 September, Darantiere confirmed that he had received the second batch of typescript pages and understood the instructions.

At last the ground was almost cleared for a final month of work on putting together “Ithaca”. Joyce made a start by heavily revising and expanding its beginning at the other end of the blue copybook. Yet, for at least another week or so, proofreading, plus presumably the final drafting and fair-copying of the “Metropolitan Police” addition to “Cyclops”, still demanded attention. While Joyce was impatient to receive the first “Penelope” proofs, Darantiere kept insisting on the ‘bon à tirer’ for early gatherings of the book. Though he did not explain his own

technical problem, the fact was that his type supply was limited and he needed to distribute (after taking moulds for plates) before he could set new text. Referring his articulated request to Joyce, Sylvia Beach got the curt reply: "I have given the bon à tirer for [gatherings] 6-10 | 11-15 must be returned again | ask him to set the *last* episode and talk less." A letter to McAlmon of 10 October sums up: "am working like a lunatic, trying to revise and improve and connect and continue and create all at the one time."

It was at this point that the green "Ithaca" copybook was introduced. While the episode's beginning was being typed by P(I) from the blue book – again in two separately paginated sections, I-10 and I-5 – Joyce copied a continuation of eight manuscript pages into the green one. It was handed out after Joyce, on getting back the blue book and accompanying typescript, had indicated '16' as the continuation number for the typescript pagination. A new typist (a third), using the purple-ribbon machine, but substituting l for 1, typed pages 16-24, whereupon yet another (a third) typewriter made a unique brief appearance for pages 25-27. Meanwhile, Joyce copied another manuscript section of nine pages (MS pages 9-17) into the blue copybook and again exchanged books with the typists. P(I) returned to work and started a new pagination sequence I-2 (typescript pages 28-29), then was relieved by B for 3-11 (typescript pages 30-38).

"Ithaca" was now advanced in typescript as far as Bloom's and Stephen's parting in the garden. It is where the chapter most obviously subdivides, and, as has been observed, the transition here from garden to house is originally markedly abrupt; it was smoothed over only in subsequent revisions in the typescript and proofs. It is the transition from the second blue book to the second green book manuscript section, and it may represent a transition between a chapter section drafted early (with roots perhaps as far back as the original outlines and drafts for the "Nostos") and later matter, much more recently conceived and developed.

It is easy to see just how Joyce was fighting for time in finishing the chapter. Bloom's physical and mental progression from garden to bed subdivides into two manuscript sections, one in each copybook; the transition from one to the other is again noticeably abrupt (and has remained so). It would seem that, as the end of October was approaching, Joyce had begun copying only the first of these sections. *Since time was also getting ever closer to Larbaud's reading séance and Joyce urgently wanted him finally to get acquainted with "Ithaca",* he hit on the stratagem of a digest, selecting a series of questions-and-answers for an abridged version of the chapter. Taking the typescript as far as it was ready, Joyce asterisked a selection of questions from it with a green crayon. The typists were instructed to copy the asterisked items, using a separate sheet for each question-and-answer segment.

A few bibliographical observations reveal the work pattern at this juncture with some precision. Asterisks in green crayon continue into the second manuscript section of the green copybook. This would therefore seem to have been given to the typists together with the asterisked typescript copy. B prepared the selection from the typescript. P(I) may simultaneously have begun the full typescript from the

green copybook; typescript pages 39–40 are again his (paginated I-2). If so, he was soon told to break off and do the asterisked selection first. Possibly this was when, after a brief interval, the final manuscript section in the blue copybook arrived from Joyce. The delay in its completion (though by perhaps only a day or two) is suggested by the fact that the continuation of the series of asterisks is here executed in red crayon.

With every sign of intense relief, Joyce announced in several letters that he had finished writing “Ithaca”, thus ending the composition of *Ulysses*, on 29 October 1921. Yet with its draft copy complete, “Ithaca” was by no means ready to go to the printer. Its typing was concluded only after the extracts for Larbaud were done. Meanwhile, Joyce began his heavy revision, which – through typescript and proofs – was to augment the manuscript/basic typescript text by a remarkable 34%.¹⁴ Almost half the expansion (16%) consisted of additions to the typescript. On these Joyce concentrated after the completion of the episode in draft copy. With the exception of only three or four instances, all typescript revisions postdate the sequence of excerpts. Many typescript pages were soon so overloaded with additions that they were retyped individually on two, or sometimes three, replacement sheets inserted in the typescript sequence. For many of the retyped page pairs, further revision necessitated second retypings. On 29 November, the printers confirmed that the episode was in their hands ready to be set in type.

This was a whole month after the end of writing *Ulysses* had been announced. The relief expressed on that occasion no doubt reflects in some measure a belief that completing the manuscript still meant what it used to mean for previous episodes. But this should not obscure our view of an important, though subtle, change in Joyce’s mode of composition. From “Telemachus” to “Eumaeus”, the attainment of the final-working-draft/fair-copy stage commonly indicated a point of articulation in the textual development of an episode. Preparatory work of varying degree and intensity was stabilised in a final working draft and a fair copy. An episode was brought to a temporary rest and was, indeed, given over to publication. “Penelope” and “Ithaca”, by contrast – the chapters written while the book as a whole was already going to press – did not reach an intermediate state of rest. The composition extended without interruption from manuscript to typescripts to the successive proofs.

Moreover, with the simultaneous attention to the bulk of the proofreading for the early and middle chapters, “Penelope” and “Ithaca” were written in a dialogue situation with the rest of the book. In the process of intense re-reading for revision, reflection on the complexity of Bloomsday appears to have generated matter both for its modifying expansion in the sections already established and for its final permutations under the perspectives of reverie and catechism. The modifications introduced in the earlier episodes specifically in the light of the ongoing writing of “Penelope” and “Ithaca” cannot, it is true, be pinpointed in every detail or always be differentiated from those that derive from the large collections of notes assembled

¹⁴ see Madtes, p. 61.

over the preceding years of writing. But it is remarkable that the unprecedented addition of entire segments of text to existing chapters, such as the “Metropolitan Police” addition to “Cyclops” and the “Messianic” scene to “Circe”, should be closely associated with the writing of the finale. These segments are, it seems, spin-offs of the last phase of creative composition.

As instances of increased imaginative extension, they may in turn be correlated to the manifold gestures of summing-up and clarification that characterize the final episodes themselves. “Penelope”, written from the new character perspective of Molly Bloom, offers intrinsic justification – and may thus have given a particularly strong incentive – for Joyce to shed fresh light on the book’s cosmos by introducing new aspects, views, facts or evaluations as well as by revealing surprisingly novel facets or connections of previously established ones. “Ithaca”, on the other hand, in summing up also introduces much ramification, and it may seem that there is not always an absolutely compelling reason why many points of detail – such as, for instance, essential circumstances of Rudolph Bloom’s suicide or the date of Mary Goulding’s funeral – should find their late exposition in “Ithaca” rather than be distributed in the manner of comparable material over the early and middle chapters.

Bibliographical exploration of dates and sequences of events reveals that at the time when the “Ithaca” typescript and proofs were revised and expanded – November 1921 to late January 1922 – the printing of the sheets for the book’s early and middle episodes had been completed. To the extent that Joyce’s creative composition is amenable to the analysis of textual criticism, it may be said, therefore, that in the end there was simply no place other than “Ithaca” left to accommodate the richness of detail with which Joyce’s mind was still teeming. Hence, in this work, which so fundamentally breaks narrative conventions, it is nevertheless not wholly artistic design, but also the exigencies of the making of a book that assign traditionally essential expository functions to the novel’s end. To bring such circumstances into focus does not detract from the artistic achievement. As so often under greatest constraints, Joyce’s virtuosity triumphed.

THE EDITION

The composition of *Ulysses* was directed towards publication. It advanced from notes and drafts via final draft, fair copy, typescript and extensive revisions on the typescripts and multiple proofs to its culmination in the first edition of February 1922. The first edition comes closest to what Joyce aimed for as the public text of *Ulysses*. Yet it does not present the text of the work as he wrote it.

This situation raises theoretical, critical and editorial issues of some complexity. The definition required of the status that the work and its text attain on publication and of the degree of textual authority conferred upon the typescripts and proofs by the authorial control over the pre-publication transmission are essentially

theoretical. From the ways in which the control over the pre-publication transmission was exercised in conjunction with a constant compositional alteration of the text arises the critical need to distinguish corrections from authorial revisions and expansions. Together, the theoretical and critical considerations lead to the specific editorial concerns of choosing a copytext for the edition, of declaring the rules and procedures for editorial decision towards the establishment of a valid critical text and of devising forms of apparatus presentation which make those decisions transparent and are commensurate with the nature of the text and textual materials recorded.

This edition's whole rationale is based on the assumption that the legal act of first publication did not validate the actual text thereby made public to the extent of lending authority to its high incidence of corruption. Instead, the act of publication is conceived of as an ideal act, to which the edition correlates an ideal text freed of the errors with which *Ulysses* was first published. Thus, it is taken to be the main business of the critical edition to uncover and to undo the first edition's textual corruption. Thereby, the edition endeavours to recover the ideal state of development as it was achieved through the traceable processes of composition and revision at the time of the book's publication on 2 February 1922.

In this pursuit, the attention turns to the documents of composition and pre-publication transmission. Since these have so richly survived, both the growth of the text and the accumulation of textual corruption can be analysed from them and distinguished. To make the distinction, the documents of composition may be set in opposition to those of transmission. In the documents of composition, the text is held to possess full authority, unless it can be shown to be faulty. In the documents of transmission, by contrast, the text is held to be potentially faulty, unless it can be proved to possess authority.

By a first main division, the documents of composition are Joyce's autographs, and the documents of transmission are the typescripts, the *Little Review* and *Egoist* serialisations, the proofs for the first edition and the first edition itself. But, as has been shown, most, if not all, of the extant autographs are themselves transcriptions and in this respect documents of transmission. The scribe, it is true, was the author himself, but his scribal errors must still be reckoned with and removed where they can be plausibly isolated. Essentially, scribal errors of a simple kind – omissions of words syntactically required, dittography or outright misspellings – do not restrict the overall textual authority of the autographs. It is also true, however, that all extant autographs, as transcriptions, belong to a virtual series that becomes in part real when more than one of its members survive. In principle, each successive authorial transcription supersedes its predecessor. Nevertheless, the predecessor may retain authority in respect of text that, by reason of scribal inattention or oversight, was not transmitted. Such instances of residual authority in the earlier witness may be diagnosed in situations of a linear relationship between drafts and fair copies as well as of a collateral relationship between a fair copy and a typescript bearing witness of a lost final working draft. They involve critical decisions of some moment in the establishment of the edition text.

The typescripts, the serialised texts and the proofs, by contrast, are on their first and basic level transcriptions by typists and compositors. Situated at one or two removes from the autographs, they vicariously uphold their textual authority only where they do not vary from them. Their departures from the preceding authorial inscriptions of the text are scribal corruptions. Yet if they depart from Joyce's manuscripts by correcting scribal errors of their autograph copy, they may be properly taken to emend the text. And if a typescript departs from a fair copy to which it stands in a collateral document relationship with respect to a lost final working draft, it possesses primary authority, overriding the fair-copy text, on its basic level of typed text in those departures from the fair copy that must be deemed to represent revisions in the final working draft beyond the state at which it was fair-copied. By analogy, the otherwise wholly non-authoritative serialisations may claim authority where by critical estimate they transmit revisions by authorial overlay that were unique to the typescript exemplar from which they were set up.

By such authorial overlay, the typescripts and proofs, on their second level, become themselves documents of composition. Joyce never wrote out a full manuscript of *Ulysses* as a whole, or of any individual chapters, at a stage of composition and revision beyond the final working drafts for episodes 10, 17 and 18 or the fair copies for episodes 1-9 and 11-16, i.e., the chapter holographs that make up the Rosenbach Manuscript. To develop the text in autograph beyond the Rosenbach Manuscript, thereby increasing it by about a third, he used the white spaces in the margins and between the lines and paragraphs of the typescripts and of the successive proofs that he had returned to him as often as was necessary – or, towards the end, as often as the printers would allow it – to complete the process of revision and expansion.

Since by their autograph overlay the typescripts and proofs partially acquire the status of documents of composition, the question arises of how far the authorial presence affects, and penetrates, their basic level of transmissional transcription. If a change or an addition touches text that has been transmitted invariant from a preceding holograph manuscript, one may consider it as revising that autograph notation itself. The compositional level remains clearly distinct from the basic transcriptional level of the document on which the textual development takes place. Conversely, the authorial overlay may touch text proper to the relevant typescript or proof, that is, its textual deviations and corruptions. This is indeed what normally happens, since at each working-over, a transmissional document was proofread. Joyce's proofreading was characteristically corrective. Although one may be virtually certain that he never read proof against copy, his excellent memory and precise sense of his text largely served him in fully reversing the textual corruptions he spotted. Authorial interventions of such kind in the documents of transmission are unambiguously corrections and thus equally clearly distinct from the revisions on the same documents. Yet cases remain where correction and revision interpenetrate and the individual instances call for critical interpretation. Here, on the one hand, one may recognise part-corrections that fail to recapture earlier

readings, although they seemingly aim at restoring them. In view of Joyce's almost pedantic insistence on what he had once written to his own satisfaction, much weight is attached to a felt restorative tendency in part-corrections, and this leads to editorial decisions of fulfilling the corrections. On the other hand, authorial interventions reacting to a transmissional departure may at times incorporate the corruption and revise the text in consequence of it, thus establishing readings of fresh authority that are critically distinct from any preceding textual state and that can only be accepted as genuine revisions.

Finally, the editor must face Joyce's failure to attend to transmissional departures and corruptions in the documents of transmission he worked over so closely and in which many such changes would have come before his eyes repeatedly. Did he, by not intervening, approve of them? Such a notion of "passive authorisation" may be confidently rejected. As said, Joyce probably never read proof against copy. Moreover, in the intensity with which he actively corrected and revised every typescript and proof under the concurrent pressures of creative energy and time lies the main reason that he did not spot more places for correction. Many instances may be shown where Joyce, in correcting one error, overlooked a neighbouring one or where, in revising and adding, he failed to notice that what he revised was not what he thought it was. For example, in the second narrative direction of "Circe", he must have remembered that, in his manuscript, "*the form sprawled against the dustbin . . . snores*" when he added that it '*snores again*' (926.6-8). But the typist meanwhile had misread his handwriting and changed the first 'snores' to 'moves'. More nonsensically, according to the typescript for "Calypso", "you pay eight marks" for a share in the Agendath Netaim planter's company; then, a few lines on, "Can pay ten down and the balance in yearly instalments" (116.37-38). According to the fair-copy autograph, of course, the price for the full share is eighty marks. The final 'y' fell victim to the typewriter's fixed right-hand margin. In the typescript copies corrected in 1918, Joyce noticed and amended the error, but not in the printer's copy for the book or in the several proofs that he corrected and revised. From such cases the edition takes its guidance and classifies the departures from Joyce's autograph notation that were left standing in the documents of transmission as errors and corruptions to be rejected and not as tacit revisions to be followed.

THE COPYTEXT

By common consent, an editor chooses as the copytext for a critical edition a document text of highest overall authority. This eliminates the first edition of 1922 as copytext for a critical edition of *Ulysses*. The first edition admittedly represents the closest approximation to be found in one document of the work at its ultimate stage of compositional development. Yet the analysis of the manuscripts, typescripts and proofs reveals just how extensively it presents a non-authoritative text. According to the precepts of copytext editing, by which editorial decisions gravitate towards the copytext, upholding its readings where possible, an edition of *Ulysses*

based on the first edition would not in a full sense attain the quality or scope of a critical edition, but would remain essentially a corrected edition of the work's hitherto received text.

The text of highest overall authority on which to base a critical edition of *Ulysses* resides in Joyce's autograph notation. This, it is true, is not assembled in a unified holograph manuscript at a state of development corresponding to the first-edition text. The one comprehensive holograph that exists of *Ulysses*, the Rosenbach Manuscript, represents the work only at the point of culmination of the draft composition of its successive chapters. But the autograph notation – or the revisional overlay of lost final working drafts inferred from their collateral descendants – that carries the text forward beyond its final-working-draft/fair-copy state and towards its ultimate stage of compositional development for book publication is present in the typescripts and proofs. It may be thought of as a continuation of the holograph inscription of the Rosenbach Manuscript. Thus, one may define a continuous manuscript text for *Ulysses*, extending over a sequence of actual documents. It is this continuous manuscript text that the critical edition assembles and declares as its copytext.

THE CONTINUOUS MANUSCRIPT TEXT

The editorial concept of a continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses* has an obvious affinity to Joyce's recognised conception of a dominant linearity in the work's compositional development, and it may be said to derive by analogy from the kind of continuous manuscript writing that Joyce was seen to engage in at the loose-leaf stage of his draft composition. As a comprehensive text in the author's own hand, the continuous manuscript text corresponds at its ultimate level to the text of the first edition. If thought of as projected onto a single imaginary document, it will be perceived as a many-layered and highly complex text that carries the dynamics of an extended textual development within it.

Throughout, the continuous manuscript text as defined for this edition sets in at the point of compositional development represented by the chapter holographs in the Rosenbach Manuscript. Since for the majority of the episodes the Rosenbach Manuscript holograph is the earliest, and for all but two of them indeed the earliest complete, surviving notation in autograph, this ensures a comparable extension of the continuous manuscript text for all chapters. It excludes the textual development in the surviving early drafts and from the surviving early drafts to the fair copies from representation in the continuous manuscript text, but it does not preclude referring to those drafts to emend it.

The continuous manuscript text derives immediately or mediately from the Rosenbach Manuscript, the typescripts, the serialisations, the proofs for the first edition, and the first edition itself. It is assembled immediately from the autograph notation on any one or on any two or more of these witnesses if their stemmatic relationship is linear and contiguous, i.e. uninterrupted by lost intermediary

documents or missing pages or page sequences. If, on the other hand, a fair copy and a typescript stem collaterally from a lost final working draft or if documents or part-documents in the line of descent are lost to whose autograph notation only the adjoining extant documents bear witness, the assembly from the extant witnesses is mediate, that is, the elements of the continuous manuscript text pertaining to the missing documents must be established by inference, and thus critically, from the extant ones.

Assembled to present *Ulysses* in compositional development, the continuous manuscript text at the same time serves as the edition's copytext and is edited accordingly. Owing to the double function it thereby assumes, all possible care, circumspection and consistency must go both into its assembly to secure it as the critical edition's copytext and into its emendation and editorial presentation to establish it as the critically edited text culminating in a new reading text. The editorial procedures involved require a comprehensive apparatus notation.

THE EDITION TEXT: PROCEDURES OF EMENDATION

As copytext, the continuous manuscript text is traditionally emended to become the edition text arranged on the edition's left-hand pages. The emendations or refusals to emend are recorded in a lemmatised list of emendations and footnotes arranged at the bottom of the pages. Silent emendations are of two kinds only: full stops supplied before a new paragraph or the opening of direct discourse and full stops removed after 'Mr' and 'Mrs'. The emendations and footnotes at the bottom of the pages are further accompanied by textual notes separately assembled in this volume. The sets of textual notes for the episodes are prefixed by headnotes subdivided into DOCUMENTS, LEVELS and COMMENTS to survey the extant or recoverable stages of composition, to identify the editorial symbols used to index the levels of presentation as they correspond to the stages of composition and to summarise each chapter's specific editorial situation. The emendation and footnoting are formalised to a high degree and verbalised textual notes are consequently kept to a minimum.

The emendations, footnotes and textual notes are signalled by symbols in the edition text and are referred by line number to the left-hand pages. The symbols in the edition text are a circle ^o, identifying an individual emended word defined to extend to the mark of punctuation absent or present after it, or two half circles, ^c and ^s. These are attached to the first and the last word of an emended phrase, or to the last word of one sentence or punctuated part-sentence and the first word of the next (sometimes separated by a later textual expansion) that require emendation in conjunction. The emendation record gives the line reference, repeats the accepted reading as its lemma and sets a closing square bracket. After the square bracket, it cites the authority – or authorities, separated by comma – for the emendation, sets a semi-colon and quotes the rejected reading or readings up to the point of emendation, and beyond it if the emendation entails rejecting a later authorial reading. Transmissional departures – unauthorised changes or corruptions in the

documents of transmission – that lead to an authorial intervention or affect the editorial decision to emend or not to emend, are quoted with the prefixed comment *TD*:. The authority for the acceptance of a reading usually resides in the documents of composition or transmission singly or in combination. A minority of emendations are editorial (signified by a lower-case e) with only partial support from the documents, or with no such direct backing at all. The sigla to identify the witnesses documenting the readings quoted are P for extant pre-Rosenbach drafts; R for the Rosenbach manuscript; B to D for the levels of development in and on the typescripts; and the arabic numerals from 1 upwards for the stages of correction and revision on the successive proofs. The sigla stand by themselves (those for the typescript as tB to tD) to indicate typed or typeset readings. To denote authorial or scribal readings, they are modified by a lower-case a or s: aP means the author in the pre-Rosenbach draft (and aPP, in “Oxen of the Sun” only, denotes the earlier of the early drafts); aR means the author, sR a scribe in the Rosenbach Manuscript; tC or 5 mean the typed or typeset texts at levels C or 5, aC or a5 mean the authorial overlay at those levels; sD means a scribe on the typescript at level D, which in practical terms often is a printing-house reader or a compositor marking up the typescript before typesetting. The lists of errata, comprising the printed list appended to the 2nd impression of the first edition and subsequently some fragmentary sections in Joyce’s hand, their more complete typing in duplicate with some interlineations in the hand of Harriet Weaver and finally the new printed list appended to the 4th impression of the first edition, are cited as p1E, aE, tE and sE, and p2E. If the level and the agent for a change are inferred because the document or the entry in question are lost, the siglum is enclosed in parentheses: (tB) means the typist in a lost typescript, (aC) means authorial overlay on a lost typescript at level C, for instance an entry made only on a typescript exemplar used as printer’s copy for *The Little Review* (LR). This situation may be emphasized by the composite siglum (aC):LR, which means authorial overlay at lost level C by the evidence of LR. By analogy, a composite siglum (aW):tC is frequently employed throughout the chapters of collateral fair copy and typescript relationship for which no early drafts exist. It denotes that the typed text at level C may be the evidence for an authorial reading of the final working draft. It should be understood, however, that the (aW) in this situation is a suggestion from editorial estimate only, rendering (aW):tC a near equivalent to the siglum tC alone, with which it coexists in the emendations list. In footnote entries for the introduction of italics into the text, combination sigla such as tC-aC may be used, indicating that the author attended to the typescript reading (which may in itself be corrupt) only by underlining it. The absence of such underlining for italics in manuscript and typescript is indicated by the abbreviation *NU* (for ‘not underlined’) in sloped small-caps. Sloped small-caps are employed for all editorial comments in the emendations and footnotes. Some of these recur as abbreviations, such as *PNR* (for ‘proofs not returned’) or *PCU* (for ‘printer’s copy unchanged’).

Lest the procedures of emendation be misunderstood by anyone coming to this edition from the previous printed texts of *Ulysses*, it should be stated explicitly that 'emendation' does not mean amendment of the hitherto received text. The divergences between the text of this edition and the hitherto received text are defined as departures of the first and subsequent editions from the work's text as now critically established, and they are thus properly documented in the historical collation list given in this volume. Emendation in the critical edition, by contrast, and in strict adherence to received usage, is of the copytext or its equivalent. In this, it serves the editorial endeavour to preserve and conserve the copytext basis in every detail possible by the copytext's own standards, or by the guidelines of the editorial hypothesis governing the editing. This means in practical terms that wherever autograph notation provides the continuous manuscript text, emendation is essentially confined to the removal of unquestionable errors. Where scribal transcripts (such as non-authorial manuscripts, typescripts or proofs) stand in for autograph notation, emendation is generally exercised to bring the variant forms they transmit into conformity with the recognised habits of the autograph notation. On the whole, this results in an unstandardised and unmodernised text. Inconsistencies of usage and orthography, unconventional spellings, obsolescent word forms and of course the idiosyncrasies of Joyce's punctuation are largely left standing. Normalisation affecting every episode is confined to a consistent introduction of lower-case initial letters for 'street', 'road' etc. in Dublin street names. Joyce became increasingly regular in writing them with minuscule initials; however, where a capital in such a position seems intended to represent graphically the print of an advertisement, the inscription on an envelope or the like, it is of course not reduced by editorial emendation.

The edition text, then, is established by emendation with a main reference to Joyce's autograph notation. That notation, it is true, is subject to change over the years of writing. Therefore, in the process of emendation the editor must respond to the text's continuous development and modification of texture, as well as to the different editorial situations that the individual episodes present. In all, the bulk of the entries in the list of emendations may be discussed under four main aspects.

First, authorial correction in the transmissional documents may be seen to affect in retrospect the continuous manuscript text as first inscribed in autograph. Spellings may be corrected and punctuation may be supplied or deleted in non-revisional ways, i.e., because the punctuation of the autograph was defective or the altered punctuation is more felicitous, syntactically or in terms of Joyce's highly developed sense of rhythmic punctuation, without substantively modifying the structure or sense of the sentences. Such changes are editorially introduced into the continuous manuscript text by way of emendation, not in the form of the genetic synopsis notation (for which, see below).

Second, the manner of emendation of the continuous manuscript text to which the authorial corrections-in-retrospect lead the way is editorially extended with caution by reference to the documents of transmission and, with the greatest

reticence, to the later editions. Typescripts, proofs, the book editions and editorial judgement provide the sources of corrective emendations which, by critical editorial understanding, perfect the styling of the continuous manuscript text according to its developing standards. Additionally, emendation takes account of the circumstance that, at its ultimate point of development, the work was transmitted from manuscript into print under the observation of the author, who is on record as actively approving of and requesting some specifically typographic features of presentation. Emendatory permissiveness thus indicated, however, positively excludes giving way to the sometimes pervasive restylings of the text in typescript (e.g., the heavy re-punctuation of “Eumaeus”) or to the tendencies of standardisation, regularisation and modernisation of orthography and punctuation in both typescripts and print. The two-volume Odyssey Press edition of 1932 in particular, though popularly recognised as the “most correct” of the editions of *Ulysses* in print, is generally eschewed as a source for emendations. By the standards of a critical edition, its correctness – as the historical collation testifies – is bought at the price of a great deal of normalisation and sophistication away from the autograph notation.

Thirdly, and at the opposite end of the textual development, critical judgement and emendatory skill are invoked by the textual relationship revealed in collation between the *Ulysses Notesheets* and the extant early drafts on the one hand and the given chapter holographs in the Rosenbach Manuscript on the other hand. Being transcripts, these are liable to contain open or concealed scribal errors where the author as his own scribe did not revise earlier text in the transcription, but simply made copying mistakes. The *Ulysses Notesheets* are only very occasionally found to supply corrections to individual notations of words in readings either of the deleted or undeleted category in the continuous manuscript text. Much more immediately, it is the surviving early drafts that reveal authorial errors of transmission in the fair-copy transcriptions.

Any re-admission of early-draft textual elements into the continuous manuscript text is performed by way of emendation. It is probable, as has been shown, that some omissions of draft text from the fair copy were inadvertent errors of transcription. These may often – though not invariably – be recognised as overlay to the basic draft text, frequently in hidden positions, e.g., obscured as cramped *interlinear additions*, as *crowded notations in the narrow margins of the manuscript rectos* or in far away placings on the respective opposite verso pages, which were commonly reserved for textual accretions and often filled to the brim. But recognising likely transcriptional omissions does not automatically restore the readings in question to the text. In re-admitting inadvertent authorial omissions in transcription as integral elements of the continuous manuscript text, account is taken of the fact that the continuous manuscript text underwent further major developments without the words or phrases lost in the act of fair-copying. The rule of treatment in these cases is that pre-faircopy readings are editorially re-admitted into their contexts only if these contexts remain invariant both in the act of fair-copying and in the subsequent development of the continuous manuscript text. In

the footnotes a record is also given of further early-draft readings considered but not selected for re-admission. Contrary to the restrictive practice in respect to substantives, the pure accidentals of punctuation from the early drafts may more freely gain access to the continuous manuscript text by way of emendation.

Fourthly, the assembly of the continuous manuscript text from a fair copy and a typescript that stand in a collateral document relationship requires extensive emendation of the extant double textual record, which is often conflicting. In each of two radiating derivative witnesses, a common original in principle has an equal chance of being variantly or invariantly represented. If, as in the present case, one derivation is authorial and the other scribal, the scribal derivation may be more strongly suspected to depart unauthoritatively from the original. To go with the typescript in the matter of revisional substantives does therefore not automatically imply following it in the accidentals of orthography and punctuation. Nor can it be safely followed in all substantive changes. It is probable, and occasionally demonstrable, for instance, that a typist familiar with the English language unauthoritatively substituted synonyms or, as is a common occurrence in scribal transcription, changed the word order of the text. The fair-copy autograph is therefore on the whole the safer guide to an authentic texture of the accidentals and, outside of revisions, also the substantives of the text. On the other hand, being a transcript, the fair copy is prone to transmissional error. Moreover, it may represent the final working draft text with a changed pattern of accidentals, which implies that the typescript in many instances of its readings may not be an unauthoritative departure from the final working draft at all, but rather a faithful representation of it and its different authorial patterning in accidentals. The reconstituted final working draft therefore on all accounts becomes an editorial construct for which there can be no hard-and-fast rule for the derivative witness to follow. The nettle of eclecticism in the constitution of the accidental texture of the final working draft is grasped by introducing a system of double notation of emendations. This means that in every instance of variation in accidentals, and of substantives outside the stages of revision recorded in the synoptic notation of the textual growth in the edition text, the adoption of a variant form from one witness is considered an emendation of its counterpart, leading always to the recording of the rejected variant in an emendation note. Although as a general tendency the fair-copy styling is preferred over the typescript and subsequent printer's stylings, consideration in emending is again given to the subsequent development of the text and to the aspects of presentation connected with the transmission as a whole of the text from manuscript to print.

THE SYNOPSIS

Presented as the edition text of *Ulysses* in compositional development, the emended continuous manuscript text is displayed synoptically by a system of diacritics to analyse its layers of growth. As a form of apparatus to be read and used as a text, the synoptic presentation of *Ulysses* in progress from manuscript to print is the innovative feature of this edition. The synopsis places every revisional variant in relation to others as well as in a compositionally invariant context. Details of the autograph inscription – deletions, erasures, insertions and illegible words or letters – are recorded. The diacritics indicating the successive levels of composition rise by symbols (raised carets in a defined order of rotation), letters and numbers. Arranged mainly above the line so as to interrupt the text's continuum as little as possible, they serve an analytical function and equally allow the compositional process to be traced in reverse from the integral text at its ultimate stage of revision via the antecedent states of the overlay in proofs and typescripts to the substratum of the Rosenbach Manuscript holograph or the final working draft text.

The diacritical system is a notation in symbols of the dynamics of the textual development in the continuous manuscript as deletion, addition, and deletion + addition = replacement, the three aspects under which all revisional operations at the author's hand may be subsumed. For any given element – a mark of punctuation, a letter, a word, a phrase, a sentence, a paragraph – the final state of the text's development is considered reached when it is last fully and correctly written out in the author's hand.

In relation to the documents of composition and transmission, the deletions, additions and replacements fall into the categories of intra- and inter-document changes. Intra-document changes – changes in the same document – are recorded for autograph text only. They occur as *currente calamo* and intra-linear, interlinear or marginal changes in the authorial fair copy or as similar changes in the autograph overlay on the post-manuscript documents of the pre-publication transmission (scribal copies, typescripts, proof sheets). Raised carets in pairs (whose pointing direction rotates to indicate successive layers of intra-document changes) delimit the extent of the text affected by the change. Text enclosed only in carets is pure addition text. Pointed brackets within a caret area mark deletions before replacements. Pointed brackets only with a caret inside the opening bracket mark deletions without replacement. Pointed brackets without a caret adjunct indicate *currente calamo* cancellations or deletions associated with changes whose precise extent cannot be graphically or textually determined.

The inter-document changes of the continuous manuscript text are those that, from being entered on one document, appear typically incorporated in the basic typed or printed text of the next. The document of entry may be lost and the entry itself may consequently have to be inferred from the developed state of the text in the next extant one, whose actual reading at the same time, being derivative of the

missing autograph entry, may be in need of emendation. The textual extent of an inter-document change is delimited by raised opening and closing half-brackets. These are indexed alphabetically and numerically with independent index series for each chapter. An alphabetical index marks a stage of revision at which the chapter was worked over as a compositional entity, i.e., when it was at the final working draft or typescript state of development. A numerical index marks revisions that were undertaken in the bibliographical units of either the galleys-in-page (*placards*) or the gatherings of page proofs for the chapter. Indices in parentheses designate inferred entries on lost documents. An empty pair of parentheses joined to a given index designates an inferred positioning of an extant revisional entry. Asterisked indices designate an editorially construed revision, e.g., the inferred authorial acceptance in retrospect of a transmissional change. Text enclosed only in half-brackets is pure addition text. Square brackets are deletion brackets enclosing text that was valid before revision. Following upon an opening half-bracket, they mark a deletion as part of a revision by replacement. Indexed inside the opening square bracket, they mark a pure deletion. The inter-document changes constitute the bulk of the revisions that the continuous manuscript underwent in its compositional development.

When in the assembly of the continuous manuscript text a lost final working draft must be reconstructed from its collateral derivatives – fair copy and typescript – an increased critical editorial activity is called for to establish the edition text. Basically, the standard rule already formulated for the relative treatment of the textual evidence from both witnesses applies: where the text in the two documents varies, the text in the fair copy (considered to represent an earlier state of the final working draft) is taken to be superseded by the text in the typescript (considered to represent a later state of the text in the final working draft). The change is formatted in the manner of an inter-document change between opening and closing half-brackets. The half-bracket index is (B) (= lost level B). Text found only in the typescript is a (B) addition. Text omitted from the typescript is enclosed in square brackets with the index (B). Text in the typescript that must be considered a replacement of fair-copy text follows upon the fair-copy text placed in square brackets, and the notation sequence is enclosed within the opening and closing half-brackets.

If, on the other hand, the fair copy demonstrably or inferentially provides the revision of the basic reading of the final working draft as represented by the typescript, it is the fair-copy reading that goes to establish the edition text. Yet it should be stressed that the recognition and editorial admission of this situation are subject to stringent rules and restrictions. Where a reversal of the standard fair-copy to typescript direction of the revisional development seems potentially indicated but a bibliographical basis for adjudicating a given change is lacking, the editorial constitution of the text operates on a strict critical basis. Only instances of clear superiority of the fair-copy readings are admitted. Where the variation is critically indifferent, the standard faircopy-to-typescript direction of changes is assumed to prevail. Moreover, since with regard to unique fair-copy revisions, too,

the continuous manuscript text underwent further major developments without these revisions, the rule of the invariant context must also be invoked. Unique fair-copy revisions are not admitted to the edition text if the context established for them by fair-copy/typescript agreement underwent revision in the subsequent textual development. For the instances that pass under all restrictions, however, notation in the synopsis is simply an application by analogy of the standard notation for the latest revisions to the final working draft text. Typescript readings – and therefore readings of the hitherto received text – superseded by the fair-copy revision are placed in square brackets. The mnemotechnic R (for *Rosenbach Manuscript*) provides the half-bracket index. It is not enclosed in parentheses, since the carrier document is extant. The index outside the alphabetic progression of the main series of index letters draws attention to the fact that here in particular, under its sign in the synoptic apparatus, are to be found readings of the continuous manuscript text extraneous to the hitherto received text. Similar editorial signals are given in the cases of critically recognised fair-copy revisions that fall under the specified restrictions. The fair-copy readings in question, if seen in isolation, are held to supersede the typescript readings that yet, in the contextual circumstances, take precedence over them. These instances of fair-copy/typescript variation differ in their nature, if not in their consequences for the established edition text, from the standard variant relationship indicated by the index (B) and square deletion brackets. To call attention to the difference, the half-bracket index V and pairs of wavy deletion brackets are employed.

For a survey of the system of diacritics in the synopsis, the chart of symbols repeated in each volume of this edition may be referred to. For the indices relevant to each episode, the headnotes over the Textual Notes to the chapters and Table 1 appended to this volume should be consulted.

THE READING TEXT

The reading text presented on the edition's right-hand pages is submitted as the new, critically established text of *Ulysses*. Arranged in parallel or near parallel to the synopsis on the left-hand pages, it results as the extrapolation without diacritics of the edition text, i.e., the emended continuous manuscript text at its ultimate level of compositional development. As an established text, it is defended in the footnoted apparatus and the appended textual notes keyed to the edition text.

The arrangement parallel to the Synopsis results in irregular page lengths for the reading text in this edition. Consequently, a through line numbering by episodes is provided as a reference system. Henceforth, the text of *Ulysses* may be referred to not by page and line number, but by episode (1 to 18) and line number of this critical edition. Thus, 15.3562 will mean line 3562 of episode 15 ("Circe"). The line will be found on page 1213 in Volume Two of this edition, but neither the page number – here always an uneven number – nor the volume number is relevant to the reference. Page and line number references to this edition, by contrast, will

always mean the edition text on the left-hand, and even-numbered, pages. It is hoped that future trade editions of the reading text, while differently paginated, will preserve the critical edition's lineation and thus its reference system of through line numbering by episodes.

Two aspects of the typographical presentation of the edition and reading texts require special notice. This critical edition observes Joyce's repeated instructions to his first printers to eliminate end-of-line hyphenation. The return of this edition to a width of type-page similar to that of the first edition has rendered it easier to avoid end-of-line hyphenation without an impossibly high incidence of loose lines. Contrary to all printed editions of *Ulysses*, moreover, this critical edition does not indent direct discourse. It follows Joyce's manuscript practice of indicating the opening of direct speech by means of dashes without indentation and, to emphasize the contrast, of deeply indenting the paragraphs. Thereby, dialogue appears integrated within narrative paragraphs. Direct discourse is not styled to convey an illusion of reported speech. In this, the critical edition recovers an unambiguous authorial intention of fundamental importance to the critical appreciation of the novel's narrative stance.

THE HISTORICAL COLLATION

The historical collation list gives a record of the departures from the new reading text in a selection of previous texts of *Ulysses* in print. The historical collation list is keyed to the right-hand pages by the line numbers per episode, to which it adds the relevant word numbers per line. Its individual entries repeat the word or abbreviated phrase of the established text as their lemma to the left of a square bracket, quote the departures in the collated editions, give a page.line reference to the current Random House edition of 1961 if the departure is there to be found, and, where applicable, define the point or points in the pre-publication transmission where the departure entered or was caused. Errors and oversights, with authorial part-corrections frequently among them, may have been compounded at several stages to cause the reading rejected; in such cases, a string of sigla joined by plus signs is given. If, as sometimes happens, an error fully corrected by Joyce nevertheless persists because the correction was not observed, the siglum given for its entry into the transmission is that of the document following the instruction to correct. The historical collation list is silent on all scribal or printer's errors in the manuscripts, typescripts and proofs that were corrected before publication, it does not record full stops after 'Mr' and 'Mrs' in the collated editions, and it suppresses entries for certain groups of recurring accidentals in episode 15 ("Circe") for which symbols in the edition text indicate that they have been summarily supplied, i.e., parentheses, punctuation or capitals or lower-case letters in connection with the chapter's speech and narrative directions. Where the normalisation applies, entries in the historical collation list are due to other variation. The asterisk in this case is supplied to indicate that the source of the rejected reading does not necessarily agree in the element asterisked. Neither

the historical collation list nor the list of emendations employs the tilde (~) or lower caret that are elsewhere conventional in such lists.

The selection of previous texts of *Ulysses* in print collated for the historical collation list does not comprise the serialised texts, which are, however, intermittently cited in the list of emendations and footnotes. But comprehensive collations are given of the main editions published in Joyce's lifetime: the first Shakespeare and Company edition of 1922, the second Shakespeare and Company edition of 1926, the Odyssey Press edition of 1932, the limited John Lane edition of 1936 and, with it, the unlimited John Lane/Bodley Head impression of 1937 from reduced plates with respect to its approximately 170 changes betraying authorial correction. Of other editions published before Joyce's death, neither the Limited Editions Club edition of 1935 nor the piracy of the 1927 impression of the second Shakespeare and Company edition nor the 1934 Random House edition, which was mainly based on the piracy, have been collated. In place of the 1934 edition, it seemed to serve a more practical purpose to collate the Random House text of 1961. This has yielded a full record of the corruption in the most widely cited of the current trade issues of *Ulysses*. On the basis of the approximately 5000 page.line references provided with that final collation, moreover, the historical collation list may be employed also as a reference conversion table with an average of seven grid-points per Random House page.

TECHNICAL PROCEDURES

A few concluding remarks may finally serve to outline the main organisational and technical procedures followed in the establishment of the edition. Aiming for a critical text to correspond to the ideal state of the work's development as it was achieved through the processes of composition and revision at the time of the book's first publication, an early-version text was first edited to provide a critically and editorially secured foundation for the edition text. The early version was heuristically situated at the point where, for fourteen episodes, the first publishable text was attained. For episodes 1-14, therefore, the early-version text was tantamount to a critically edited text of the *Little Review* serialisation; for the remaining chapters, it was the critically edited equivalent of the printer's copy for the first edition. This intermediary edited text was subsequently augmented by the critically edited segments of autograph overlay from the documents of transmission, i.e., the second level of autograph overlay from the typescripts for episodes 1-14, and the cumulated revisional overlay from the successive proofs for all episodes.

The assembly and critical editing of the text in this manner was supported by the routines of computer processing devised to aid the editing on the basis of TUSTEP, an autonomous system of computer programs for text data processing developed at the computing centre of the University of Tübingen.¹⁵ The main initial computer input consisted of full transcripts of the Rosenbach Manuscript (eye-collated three

¹⁵ see Gabler (1981).

times independently), the chapter typescripts without overlay, the *Little Review* and *Egoist* serialisations, the first edition of 1922 and the second edition of 1926; for stretches of missing typescript, the 1st *placards* without overlay were also input. Machine collation was performed on the witness texts in two groups; the Rosenbach Manuscript, typescripts, serialisations and *placards* formed one group, and the book editions the other. All variants revealed in the first machine collation of each group were checked against the original documents or document reproductions in facsimile (for the Rosenbach Manuscript) and photo-reprint (*The James Joyce Archive* for scribal transcripts, typescripts and proofs) to eliminate all input error. With error-free input, a second machine collation was carried out for the first group of witnesses. This yielded the variant material to edit the early-version text. Based on a computer-file copy of the Rosenbach Manuscript text, it was semi-automatically constituted in its proper stratification of levels of development and supplied with a first main group of emendation notes.

Independently, while the early version text was being secured, the entire autograph overlay was transcribed from the typescripts and proofs, eye-collated, input in separate lists, tagged with the appropriate level indices and then combined in a single list in reference order. With this list in abeyance, a machine collation was performed between the established early-version and the first-edition texts. This produced a bulk list of variants which, but for the first edition's textual corruption, should have been identical with the hand-made list of all revisional overlay. In fact, the main editorial work now focussed on accounting for the differences of the two lists of the early-version-to-first-edition textual development and of bringing them into agreement. This yielded the second major group of emendation notes to be semi-automatically written into the edition text.

The edition text resulting from all editorial decisions that went into the establishment of the early-version text and the scrutiny of the lists of typescript and proof changes and accretions was, in technical terms, then grafted onto a computer-file copy of the first-edition text. Preserving the page, line and word numbers of the first-edition record as a reference grid to coordinate all computer-based operations, grafting the edition text onto a computer-file copy of the first edition involved replacing by computer program every corrupt element of the first-edition text by its critically established counterpart.

A second computer-file copy of the first edition was left textually unaltered but tagged with the appropriate level indices and sigla to provide the basis for the historical collation list. For the historical collation, the editions of 1932, 1936 and 1961 were additionally input into the computer. Machine collation of the edition text in turn with a clear reading text of itself, the tagged first-edition copy and the subsequent editions provided a composite printout in parallel line arrangement resembling a score that greatly facilitated revising all previously reached editorial decisions.

All procedures as summarised were repeated, with minor variations due to changed textual and editorial situations, for each of the eighteen episodes of *Ulysses*.

Thanks to the high degree of sophistication and systematic integrity of TUSTEP, the technical routines of the editing were largely amenable to automatisisation. At the same time, interactive work at the computer console involving manual interference was also performed at all stages. All manual work on the text was, however, checked by machine collation to minimise human error.

To round off the editorial work, Hinman collations were carried out on a copy each of the first impression and the last impression of the first edition; on a copy each of the first impression and the last impression of the second edition; on a copy of the 1932 against one of the 1939 printing of the Odyssey Press edition; and on a copy of the limited John Lane edition of 1936 against a copy of its impression from reduced plates, issued in 1937 as the first unlimited English edition. The first-edition collation revealed no significant variants beyond those to be expected from the first printed list of errata supplied with the second impression and subsequently worked into the plates. Neither the second-edition collation nor the Odyssey Press edition collation yielded variants attributable to the author. From the collation of the 1936 and 1937 impressions of the first English edition, however, it was possible to isolate, in some 170 changes made to the plates, the results of Joyce's proofreading of *Ulysses* in Copenhagen in 1936. These findings will be published by Walter Hettche and Claus Melchior in the Winter 1984 issue of *James Joyce Quarterly*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In setting forth this edition, the editor gratefully acknowledges the faith and encouragement, support, commitment and constructive criticism of many. The *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* gave a long-term grant unprecedented for a project of this nature in the field of English studies in Germany. It alone made the seven years' work on the edition possible. Without the consent of the James Joyce Estate, moreover, and the courageous backing of the Estate's trustees throughout the years of preparation, this edition could not finally have been made public. Peter du Sautoy, who holds the trust in the Estate that was formerly Harriet Shaw Weaver's, took upon himself an involvement in the undertaking far above the call of duty. It fell to him alone to lead the project further along the road on which in its early days he had set it together with Marshall Best, who did not live to see it completed. With them, Gavin Borden helped to give the edition perspective and, as publisher and friend, held out encouragement as it took shape. To him also, and to his publisher's spirit of enterprise in conceiving and publishing the *James Joyce Archive*, the edition largely owes the favourable conditions under which it was prepared.

The Committee of Academic Advisers appointed by the James Joyce Estate, foremost among them Richard Ellmann, deserves thanks for the aid it gave the Estate. Richard Ellmann's perceptive comments and Philip Gaskell's and Clive Hart's advice to the editor from close work on substantial portions of the edition in progress contributed to sharpening my conception of the text's problems and to regulating my editorial decisions. A. Walton Litz and Michael Groden may be termed the edition's godfathers. Their faith in the enterprise from the earliest days, their acute reflection on fundamental issues and their unstinting immersion in minute points of detail have been carried by professional enthusiasm and conveyed in the spirit of friendship.

That the abstract notion that a critical edition today could and should be established with computer aid became reality is due to Wilhelm Ott and his chief programmer, Kuno Schälkle, of the project team for text data processing at the computing centre of the University of Tübingen. At the time when this edition was entering its decisive planning stages, Wilhelm Ott's pioneering program system TUSTEP, after close to ten years of development, had reached a degree of maturity and sophistication, subsequently to be yet improved upon, that made it an editor's ideal tool. Setting TUSTEP's extensive and highly flexible range of parameters for the edition's specific requirements as well as realising the system's typesetting potential for it have been tasks demanding inventiveness and enduring patience that were performed with dedication and admirable accuracy by Wolfhard Steppe in

consultation with TUSTEP's designers. The systematic and comprehensive reliance on computer aid made possible by the sophistication and versatility of TUSTEP has drastically reformed the editing process. Essentially, it has relieved the editor of much of the mechanical operations commonly attending the task of editing and has allowed him to concentrate on the decisions that render valid the editorial result. Without TUSTEP and its able implementation, this edition would neither be as accurate as we hope it is – although no claim is made that it be free of error – nor so rich in recorded facts; it would not have been accomplished in the span of seven years, short for the magnitude of the enterprise, nor typeset, printed and published within a few months of the completion of the editing.

In perhaps nothing has the editor been more fortunate than in his team of assistants. Wolfhard Steppe's experience and mature understanding of editing enabled him to share throughout in the task of bringing textual problems to their editorial solution. The design of the emendation and historical collation lists owe much to his initiative. Claus Melchior's skill and knowledgeable independence of judgement grew from his beginning work as a student assistant on the project. He and Wolfhard Steppe did the computer-aided editorial groundwork on the majority of the episodes from my instructions. The entire edition's semi-final and final textual states were then reached during nearly three years of conferences between them and myself for which each of us read chapter after chapter of computer printouts of the given edited versions. Claus Melchior tabulated the dates and revisional interconnections of the first edition's proofs, and he verified this edition's emendation and historical collation lists one final time after typesetting against the *Archive* reproductions of the originals. Charity Scott Stokes, alongside her regular employment in the Munich Department of English, was responsible for much of the original record of the autograph overlay on typescripts and proofs and shared with me in the multiple verification of the transcript of the Rosenbach Manuscript. Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon, briefly in Munich, but most of the time in Dublin, prepared the basic transcription of the entire Rosenbach Manuscript, as well as of the extant early drafts (from the manuscript reproductions) and of the *Ulysses Notesheets* (from Phillip Herring's edition) for complementary consultation in the course of the editing. Moreover, even to the last minute they used very sharp eyes on *the edited text and helped to reduce its fallibility*. Harald Beck and Claus Melchior as the first generation of student assistants, and Walter Hettche and Kinga J. Thomas as the second, were mainly in charge of the computer-readable transcription record of all printed versions of the text used for the edition. They ensured its accuracy and completeness with more than routine involvement. Each of them developed an understanding of the edition's objectives and problems that issued in independent initiatives of great value for the common enterprise. Kinga Thomas with much aptitude did editorial groundwork on several episodes. Harald Beck's talents as commentator helped to resolve some textual difficulties conditioned by problems of language, fact and interpretation. Walter Hettche carried out the Hinman collation deemed necessary for the edition and in the process procured the

materials for discovering Joyce's correcting hand in the 1937 Bodley Head edition. For briefer spells, Irene Kappel-Beck, Karl Martin, Astrid Ebnicher and Thomas Jakubiak assumed typing and computer terminal jobs. The edition in its entirety stands as a testimony not least to the responsible and enthusiastic commitment of its team of assistants.

Hugh Kenner and Fritz Senn have buoyed the edition in the spirit of Joyceans. Fredson Bowers has been constantly encouraging, perceptive and shrewd in his advice as is his wont. The colleagues in the English Department at Munich have secured the much-needed institutional backing and have not been sparing of their individual moral support. Willi Erzgräber, Herbert Franke, Wolfgang Frühwald and Edgar Mertner have had the acumen needed to make them, at the right times, the effective spokesmen for the project. Participants in the 1979 James Joyce Symposium in Zurich made useful suggestions, and Werner Suerbaum volunteered a detailed criticism in writing, in response to the edition's prototype of the "Lestrygonians" episode. Don Gifford has worked with, and reported back on, the new reading text in the making. Giorgio Melchiori has commented on the edited text of the early episodes, and Mary Reynolds has provided transcripts of her copy of Joyce's Dante. Ilaria Weise-Furnio and Giambattista Zizzari gave perceptive advice on Joyce's use of Italian. Jaques Aubert and several others puzzled with us over the handwriting at the bottom of "Eumaeus", fol. 39, in the Rosenbach Manuscript. John Boylan microfilmed his personal copy of the 1936 limited John Lane edition for our use in collation. Pieke Biermann in Berlin verified the historically correct postal district for Bleibtreustrasse. Karl Toth helped to decide that Joyce's idiosyncratic Hungarian should not be tampered with.

Jack Dalton contributed his share posthumously. A pioneer in the exploration of the corruption of Joyce's texts in print, he did not live to see this edition or to engage in a debate over it. It was John MacNicholas who was able to persuade Dalton's heirs to put all the materials prepared for a correction of the 1961 Random House edition at our disposal. Their generosity is gratefully acknowledged, as is Jack Dalton's own acuteness of observation that brought to light no negligible number of textual details requiring attention and emendation. His several thousand index cards were checked against our editorial result, and each emendation, if not self-evident *from the early textual witnesses themselves*, where his suggestion agrees with our decision or where we have taken a decision because he saw a problem is individually acknowledged in the apparatus.

The libraries holding the original materials for *Ulysses* have been helpful on my repeated visits to resolve doubts arising from the *Archive* reproductions. The Poetry Collection at the University of Buffalo, in particular, has also made uncatalogued materials available for consultation that shed light on the events of the months during which *Ulysses* was being printed. In the stupendously faithful facsimile of the Rosenbach Manuscript under the editorship of Clive Driver, as in the painstaking collation against the *Little Review* and first-edition texts that he and his staff undertook, the contribution of the Rosenbach Museum in Philadelphia has

been of a very special kind. Our transcriptions of the Rosenbach Manuscript were done independently of the collations offered with the facsimile but were carefully verified against them in retrospect. While where we disagree, we disagree silently, the representation of the Rosenbach Manuscript in this edition has been notably improved in accuracy through comparison with them.

Wolfgang Reiner of pagina G.m.b.H. in Tübingen has overseen the computer typesetting with circumspection, and Ralph Carlson and the staff of Garland Publishing Inc. have finally turned the edition into a book.

Supported by so much help, encouragement and good will, I feel the readier to assume the responsibility that must remain mine for this edition. If, in bringing it to a conclusion, I can think of no editing venture more constantly enjoyable than this one has been of *Ulysses*, our thanks in the end are due to James Joyce.

February 1984

H. W. G.