

110-202

James Joyce Quarterly

Dubliners Issue



University of Tulsa Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104

ROBERT SPOO Editor
MARY O'TOOLE Managing Editor
WILLIAM S. BROCKMAN Bibliographer
JANE CURLIN, JOHN HODGE,
TONI VAN DER MOERE Graduate Assistants

ADVISORY EDITORS

Morris Beja, The Ohio State University; John Bishop, University of California, Berkeley; Helmut Bonheim, University of Cologne; Sheldon Brivic, Temple University; Maud Ellmann, King's College, Cambridge University; Edmund Epstein, Queens College; Sidney Feshbach, City College, City University of New York; Thomas Flanagan, SUNY at Stony Brook; Hans Walter Gabler, University of Munich; Michael Patrick Gillespie, Marquette University; Michael Groden, University of Western Ontario; Clive Hart, University of Essex; David Hayman, University of Wisconsin; Suzette Henke, SUNY at Binghamton; Cheryl Herr, University of Iowa; Hugh Kenner, The Johns Hopkins University; Jules David Law, Northwestern University; Karen Lawrence, University of Utah; Morton Levitt, Temple University; A. Walton Litz, Princeton University; Corinna del Greco Lobner, University of Tulsa; Vicki Mahaffey, University of Pennsylvania; Dominic Manganiello, University of Ottawa; Giorgio Melchiori, University of Rome; Margot C. Norris, University of California, Irvine; Darcy O'Brien, University of Tulsa; Jean-Michel Rabaté, University of Dijon; Marilyn Reizbaum, Bowdoin College; Mary Reynolds, Yale University; John Paul Riquelme, Southern Methodist University; Fritz Senn, Zurich James Joyce Foundation; Mark Shechner, SUNY at Buffalo; Hugh Staples, University of Cincinnati; Weldon Thornton, University of North Carolina; G.J. Watson, University of Aberdeen.

Single Copy Price \$5.00 (U.S.); \$5.50 (foreign)

Table with 3 columns: Subscription Rates, United States, Elsewhere. Rows for Individuals and Institutions with 1, 2, and 3 year rates.

Send subscription inquiries and address changes to James Joyce Quarterly, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK 74104. Claims for back issues will be honored for three months only. All back issues except for the current volume may be ordered from Swets & Zeitlinger, Heereweg 347b, Lisse, The Netherlands, or P.O. Box 517, Berwyn, PA 19312. Back volumes available in microfilm and microfiche from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, or University Microfilms Limited, 18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England.

MATERIAL IN THIS JOURNAL MAY BE PHOTOCOPIED FOR THE NON-COMMERCIAL PURPOSE OF EDUCATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

©1991, The University of Tulsa

Cover: Chalk and crayon drawing by Betty Spoo, madre dell'editore.

CONTENTS

Gnomon is an Island: Euclid and Bruno in Joyce's Narrative Practice <i>David Weir</i>	343
Voices of Unexpected Lyricism in Two <i>Dubliners</i> Stories <i>Lea Baechler</i>	361
Heads and Tails: Rhetoric and Realism in <i>Dubliners</i> <i>Michael Faherty</i>	377
Big-Power Politics and Colonial Economics: The Gordon Bennett Cup Race and "After the Race" <i>James Fairhall</i>	387
Little Chandler's Song of Experience <i>Thomas B. O'Grady</i>	399
"O, she's a nice lady!": A Rereading of "A Mother" <i>Jane E. Miller</i>	407
Joyce's Sexual Differend: An Example from <i>Dubliners</i> <i>Joseph Valente</i>	427
Quincunxial Sherlockholmesing in "Grace" <i>Corinna del Greco Lobner</i>	445
Joyce and Lacan: 'The Woman' as a Symptom of 'Masculinity' in "The Dead" <i>Garry Leonard</i>	451
Distant Music: Sound and the Dialogics of Satire in "The Dead" <i>Bruce Avery</i>	473

"The Dead" as Novella <i>Thomas Loe</i>	485
CURRENT JJ CHECKLIST (54)	499
NOTES	
Steven Doloff, Judith Barisonzi, Barbara McLean, Paul Barolsky	515
REVIEWS	
<i>"Ulysses": A Review of Three Texts: Proposals for Alteration to the Texts of 1922, 1961, and 1984,</i> by Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart <i>Hans Walter Gabler</i>	523
<i>"Ulysses": Portals of Discovery,</i> by Patrick A. McCarthy <i>Hugh B. Staples</i>	529
<i>The Language of the Devil: Texture and Archetype in "Finnegans Wake,"</i> by C. George Sandulescu <i>John Paul Riquelme</i>	532
<i>The Lost Notebook: New Evidence on the Genesis of "Ulysses,"</i> edited by Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon <i>Michael Groden</i>	535
<i>The Enemy Opposite: The Outlaw Criticism of Wyndham Lewis,</i> by SueEllen Campbell <i>Scott Klein</i>	539
LETTERS	
Mary Lowe-Evans, Hy Grober, Michael Patrick Gillespie	543
CONTRIBUTORS	545

"*ULYSSES*": A REVIEW OF THREE TEXTS: PROPOSALS FOR ALTERATIONS TO THE TEXTS OF 1922, 1961, AND 1984, by Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart. Princess Grace Irish Library, 4. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1989. xvi+232 pp. \$39.95.

For works of literature and their texts, editing is an age-old practice used to counteract the effects of transmission. To control the practice of editing, in turn, there has developed a specialized discipline, textual criticism, which to many today appears both esoteric and hermetic, if not indeed thoroughly hypertrophic. Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart are schooled in textual criticism. In "*Ulysses*": A Review of Three Texts, they call its bluff, saying in effect, Don't feel helpless in relying on the specialists. Do it yourself. From printed texts and a critical edition, derive your own *Ulysses* "closer to what Joyce intended in 1922."

Back in 1973, a charmingly naive plan was hatched at the Dublin Joyce Symposium: to improve the 1961 printing of *Ulysses*, readers were asked to draw up and pool lists of corrections. But what would a would-be corrector at the time have had to go on? Outside the printed text itself, there was next to no evidence accessible to verify correction hunches. With the publication of the Rosenbach facsimile and the *James Joyce Archive*, the situation vastly improved—not to mention the Critical and Synoptic Edition of 1984, the one place where all their information has been processed, recorded, and digested. Gaskell and Hart are able to work on incomparably better foundations, therefore, than anybody would have been in 1973; and it is only natural that they should draw on the repository of the Critical and Synoptic Edition; it is, after all, what such editions are there for. From what they selectively glean from that storehouse, they make their do-it-yourself changing suggestions for three texts: the first edition text of 1922, the long current Random House text of 1961, and the reading text of 1984/86. Theirs is therefore a *Review of Three Texts* in the light of a fourth, namely that on the left-hand pages of the 1984 edition, with all its source notations and apparatuses.

Gaskell and Hart have reservations about a couple of policies for editing the 1984/86 reading text out of the materials and synoptic diachrony of the text on the 1984 left-hand pages. These reservations are few—only two or three—but momentous. Whether or not to accept revisional readings from documents outside the line of

descent; where to catch the text when in doubt about the degree of authority of the transmission; and to what extent, and how, to take account of a fallible author: on these questions, to accept my stance or to admit Gaskell and Hart's strictures leads to perceptibly different texts. Just how perceptible the difference is, the do-it-yourselfer will be able to work out from the third list in the *Review*; and what with the heavy weather that has been made over the critical edition, we may be grateful to Gaskell and Hart for having provided this list. To this extent, the third list in the *Review* is pragmatically useful for the do-it-yourselfer as a guide to what grounds the debate over the critical *Ulysses* covers in terms of the text itself.

Here an important point needs to be made: from the fact that Gaskell and Hart have no—or, as they say, “only minor”—quarrels with the left-hand page of 1984, it follows that a text established by application of their mark-up list to the 1984/86 reading text remains a thoroughly critically edited text. The textual-critical groundwork has been done, and it remains editorially valid because it remains inscribed in every word and phrase and spelling and mark of punctuation that Gaskell and Hart do not expressly propose to change. Consequently, their 1986-plus text differs in category from their 1922-plus and 1961-plus texts. These, if realized from the mark-up lists of the *Review*, would retain all the quaintness, the dilettante inconsequence, that would have resulted from that 1973 correction scheme. “We have not re-edited *Ulysses*” is what Gaskell and Hart emphasize, but it is an attitude or gesture of self-limitation one can, if at all, only afford when, as for 1984/86, the work of critical editing has already been performed.

I need go no further than the first few pages of the *Review of Three Texts*, or of *Ulysses*, to demonstrate the implications. For 1922, in the seventh line of the text, Gaskell and Hart would wish to see “Jesuit” with a capital “J” reduced to lower-case “jesuit.” This is fine, and according to Joyce’s intention, so far as it goes, but they do not propose to add an exclamation point. Of course not, they will say, for, while R has this exclamation point, and some fifty more, none of the derived texts retain them according to R’s pattern. However, once the evidence is there, there is no short-cut to dealing with it systematically to account for all that the transmission is responsible for, and why. In the present instance, the capital “J” acceded, and the exclamation point got lost in the typescript; and, to add to the complications, the typescript is lost.

Yet it is demonstrable that the typescript existed in three copies, and that from each derived a different printing of the opening of *Ulysses*. In the top copy and two carbons, the typescript also lost, for

example, the “s” of “slow,” turning “a long slow whistle” into a “long low whistle” (2.24/1.24). If one is convinced, as Gaskell and Hart are, that “low” is an error, they still have the choice to retain “low” as sanctioned somehow by the transmission. But if they restore “slow,” how can they afford not to restore the chapter’s sequence of exclamation points, arguably of greater semantic moment than “low” *versus* “slow,” let alone upper- against lower-case “j” in “jesuit”? Again, how do they distinguish between “low,” the reading in all three typescript copies, and “country” for “land” (2.10/1.10) in all three typescript copies? Certainly not by any overriding principle; for if they did, they would attempt to treat them alike. Instead, they declare one a typing error – “slow” losing its initial “s” – and the other a revision in all three typescript copies. This is a possible rationalization of one’s preferences, yet is it probable? or demonstrable?

The rationalization of critical preferences may be something textual critics and editors all come to sooner or later; yet the methodology of textual criticism is all geared to making the judgment calls later rather than sooner. A survey of the three typescript derivations – *Little Review*, *Egoist*, and 1922 – reveals that where all three of them agree, they seem to follow the “slow” – “low” pattern: they suggest error rather than triple-document revision. The counter-pattern is even clearer: where two agree against the third, the quality of revision is distinct. To perform such analysis postpones the moment when nothing but a judgment call will help. It may be that in the end one will feel so strongly that “country” (in all three typescript copies) is the author’s revision that one must declare, and act on, one’s belief that it is the odd example out in an otherwise consistent variant pattern; but then one must invoke the whole background of variant analysis and lay one’s cards on the table. As I said, one simply cannot cut short textual-critical considerations in establishing a text.

Hence, there can also be no avoidance of formulating certain principles for textual decision. Gaskell and Hart, though in general they keep well out of the way of any theoretical discussion, make it quite clear for instance that they can accept no readings from documents outside the line of the text’s descent in determining for themselves just how *Ulysses* should read. Yet in their mark-ups for 1922 and 1961, and within the first and third episodes alone, they salvage four such major readings from proof-sheets outside, because parallel to, the ones in the line of descent (20.29/1.340; 78.16/3.79; 82.17-18/3.151-52; 86.24/3.227-28). So the do-it-yourselfer should be warned: the mark-up suggestions for 1922 and 1961 are not only selective, they are haphazard. Alerted to errors in these printed

editions, he or she should be aware of being left in the dark about the status and authenticity of the text resulting from the "Alterations to 1922" and the "Alterations to 1961" of the *Review of Three Texts*.

To assess whether the do-it-yourselfer may hope to be better served by the "Alterations to 1984," let us consider some Gaskell and Hart items randomly chosen from one chapter, "Aeolus." Gaskell and Hart start from the critical edition's premise that the line of descent of the published text goes from a lost working draft to the extant typescript, from which the proofs were set up. All but four of their objections to the establishment of the text (they are unhappy with 29 wordings or spellings altogether in the reading text of the chapter) have to do with their perspective on the typescript.

From types of suggestions for change that they do not make, it is apparent that they accept that the Rosenbach fair copy of the chapter was copied from the lost working draft, and that it was so copied before that working draft was further revised prior to being handed out for typing. From a collation of the fair copy and the typescript, it is possible to identify that further revision, which in the synopsis of the critical edition has been designated with the diacritical siglum (B). Gaskell and Hart have no quarrel with the (B) level of the synopsis.

Yet from the objections to the establishment of the text in the critical edition that they do have, it is doubtful whether they sufficiently consider that in order to identify what belongs to (B), it is necessary also to determine what does not belong there. What belongs and what does not belong turns up initially without distinction in the collation of the fair copy and the typescript. What distinctions can be made then spring from the assessment of the collation yield.

The collation, first of all, establishes, as a background to the variance, that high degree of identity between the extant documents from which we conclude that they were each copied from the same (lost) source document. The majority of the variants between the documents—those whose significance springs to the eye—then argue that the lost working draft was revised after Joyce wrote out the fair copy, and before the typist prepared the typescript from it. Yet not every variant between the fair copy and the typescript can be attributed to that authorial round of revision (i.e., that which constitutes the (B) level of the synopsis). Buried among the differences between the fair copy and the typescript are also, undoubtedly, typing errors, and possibly departures from the lost working draft made when Joyce wrote out the fair copy.

When we are confident that a given variant in the typescript

belongs to the (B) level of revision, we are also confident that the fair copy represents the unrevised working draft. Such confidence, let it be noted, is a critical one. For the purposes of editorial decision, moreover, it acts as an *a priori* assumption. In other words, we can never be absolutely certain that every variant editorially labelled (B) does in fact belong to this category, with the working draft (unrevised) reading documented in the fair copy, and the revision documented in the typescript. Yet we always first assume that this is the case, and for an individual variant to be classed otherwise there must be some good reason. The mirror image situation in particular—the unrevised reading documented in the typescript, and the revision in the fair copy—must fight high odds to prove itself. The critical edition admits only two such instances. Gaskell and Hart object to the resulting established text, though they evade the complexity of the required reasoning for or against the critical text.

At 294.6-7 (7.802), the typescript reads “thing in a child’s frock, Myles Crawford said.” The fair copy has: “thing, Myles Crawford, [sic] in a child’s frock.” The critical edition takes it that here the typescript represents the lost working draft and the fair copy a revision, even as it were a revision in action. Two considerations speak in favor of this assumption: one, that the stylistic *frisson* created by the interpolated *inquit* indicates the revision in the direction from typescript text to fair copy text on critical grounds; and two, that Joyce’s scribal error, the omission of “said” (which the critical edition then supplies by way of emendation), helps to validate the critical assessment: the attention given to the act of revision in copying deflected the attention from the scribal mechanics of copying.

Gaskell and Hart would seem to acquiesce in the critical evaluation of the variant. When they reject the Rosenbach reading for the established text, they do so because it is a unique reading in a document outside the line of descent. With it, in their judgment, go some one hundred readings of the critical text, all indicated by the R diacritic. This is straightforward enough. The trouble comes when one realizes that they tend to lump all “unique Rosenbach readings” together, largely disregarding textual-critical distinctions between them.

The second R revision in the chapter may serve to clarify the options for such distinctions. At 286.24 (7.708), the typescript reads “Ah, bloody nonsense. Only in the halfpenny place!” The fair copy has “Ah, bloody nonsense. Psha! Only in the halfpenny place.” From the critical apparatus notation and the context, it should be clear what the critical edition did: it assumed that Joyce here, in

writing out the fair copy, doubled Crawford's interjection, present already at 286.21 (7.706), and accepted the punctuation with it in the fair copy (full stops rather than exclamation points at "nonsense" and "place," the reason for this being the exclamation point at the second "Psha!"). However, it should be equally clear to anyone studying the critical edition carefully that the textual situation holds two further editorial options. The first is the standard and obvious one, namely to class the variant with the (B) level revisions: the fair copy would be considered not to depart from, but to represent the unrevised state of the lost working draft, and Joyce would in revision of it have deleted the second "Psha!" and added two exclamation points. By evading the issue of the exclamation points—here again their disregard for the variants of punctuation and the possible interdependence of verbal and "accidental" variance much weakens their proposals—Gaskell and Hart give no indication whether this is their view, or whether this variant for them represents simply another case of a unique Rosenbach variant inadmissible on principle. What cannot be their view—or they would have let "Psha!" stand at 7.708, albeit on other grounds than did the critical edition—and what is not ours but what *is* theoretically a third option, is that "Psha!" was the reading of the lost working draft but was accidentally dropped in the typing. (Be it that the exclamation points are the lost working draft's or the typist's—this is a genuinely undecidable question—a scenario to rationalize the third option, should one care to entertain it, comes readily to mind: the typist would have typed the exclamation point of "nonsense!" and picked up again after that of "Psha!".)

What in the case of the presence or absence of the second "Psha!" is only a distant option—namely an error of the typist in copying the lost working draft—is for other variants between the fair copy and the typescript a probability. It is here that we encounter a serious flaw in Gaskell and Hart's assessment of the textual situation. For the sentence "A bevy of scampering newsboys rushed down the steps, scattering in all directions" (304.6/7.955), they suggest that Joyce changed "scattering" into a second "scampering," and thus would reject the assumption of the critical edition that the repetition of the adjective was a typist's slip. They believe, further, that Joyce expressly deleted "with a y" from "symmetry with a y" at 250.6 (7.168), or "Yes." from "Number? Yes." at 252.25 (7.219), or "I" from "and I knew" at 274.21 (7.532), or "smiling" from "he said smiling grimly" at 314.5 (7.1072); or that it was the author's responsibility that the genitive got grammatically normalized as "of Cicero's" at 256.3 (7.270), or the relative pronoun Britished to "who" at 300.1 (7.890), or

(Irish colloquial?) “those” turned into “these” at 254.4 (7.232). This, surely, is drowning the baby in the bathwater and resisting “unique faircopy readings” with a vengeance. Or, more soberly, it is a failure to incur the critical risk of identifying typist’s errors as one of the three possible reasons for a unique – but in each such case the only authoritative – reading in the “document outside the line of textual descent.”

The “Alterations to 1984,” then, as this sample demonstration shows, are as inconsistent and unsystematic in their way as are those to 1922 and 1961. We could go on and argue Gaskell and Hart’s proposals case by case, to some perhaps an enlightening exercise. Yet essentially, this has already been done in the Critical and Synoptic Edition. It holds, albeit in the manner of shorthand notation by which its apparatuses (synopsis, footnotes, textual notes, and historical collation) interlock with the text, both the material basis and the reasoning to entertain, and either occasionally to accept or to reject Gaskell and Hart’s readings for a text of *Ulysses*. As a spin-off of the critical edition of 1984, as of the debate it has elicited, the *Review of Three Texts* may further help to strengthen the realization that texts in transmitted and published as well as in critically edited forms are not inviolable givens, but that instead readers must engage in and verify them. This, the do-it-yourselfer is invited to do by way of the “Alterations to 1984” proposed in the *Review of Three Texts*, yet his or her toolbox lies not in the Gaskell and Hart volume, but in the Critical and Synoptic Edition upon which the *Review* also builds. The *Review of Three Texts* may serve as a guide to, if as less than an example of how to use it.

Reviewed by Hans Walter Gabler
University of Munich