Palimpsest

Editorial Theory in the Humanities

*Edited by George Bornstein and
Ralph G. Williams*

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

Contents

Part 3. Editing in Other Disciplines

Part 2
Editing Literature

.

On Textual Criticism and Editing:
The Case of Joyce's *Ulysses*

Hans Walter Gabler

The critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses* has raised central issues of textual criticism and editing.[1] It has challenged received paradigms and current methods in the oldest and most fundamental of philological disciplines, suggesting by its practical example how textual criticism and editing relate not only to the evanescent record and mutable transmission of the signatures of the past in documents, but to the creativity of writing in the shaping of language into works of literature throughout the development of the texts. Constructively critical responses to the edition[2] give me the courage thus to circumscribe its position within the debate about texts and textual scholarship carried forward in the English-speaking world of learning, as well as in Germany and France, over the past three decades—a debate from which the edition took its bearings and to which it, in turn, has added fresh dimensions. It is also well known that the edition has been pronounced a scandal. This I take as a sign that its challenge has been felt, and been timely. Its real or supposed errors—a few real, many more supposed, and yet more freely invented—have been held forth, with matchless exclusivity, to procure the wrong, or shall we say: the displaced reasons for a right sense of discomfort with it (right, that is, from a stance that is categorically not that of the edition itself).[3] My comfort in this derives not only from the whole cultural history of the notion of "scandal." It is strengthened equally by the remarkable rise in a general awareness of the problematics of texts that the debate over the edition of *Ulysses* has brought about. Not least, it rests in my different sense of the balance between the edition's achievement and its fallibility. Today, more than seven years after publishing the edition, and close to eight years after

completing it, I consider that, for me, it belongs so much to the past that I do not feel confined to speaking as its originator. I feel free, rather, in my remarks both to elucidate the edition and to respond to it.

The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* is the first full critical edition of any of Joyce's works. On account, and on the strength, of its wide orientation in text-critical thought and editorial procedure, it provides occasion to review current notions of editorial base text and edition text, to consider non-copy-text versus copy-text editing, to differentiate modes and functions of the apparatus, to rethink the central editorial concept and activity of emendation, and to assign the editor a structural position within an edition. The problematics of visual copy and of the use of the computer gain profile from its practice. Last among the issues I have space enough to touch upon here, the role of bibliography in a modern edition from manuscript may be reassessed through it.

The Critical Edition

The history of editing Joyce has seen at most critically reviewed texts in published print, not critical editions. These critically reviewed texts have had adhering to them essential qualities of "practical texts," about which Fredson Bowers observed that they are characteristically prepared by marking up existing printed editions.[4] Collation shows that Robert Scholes's text of *Dubliners* (1967) was so marked up, and Jack Dalton submitted a marked-up copy of the 1961 *Ulysses* to Random House, which I have seen. John McNicholas's apparatus for *Exiles* (1979) could, for reasons beyond his control, take no other form but that of a set of mark-up instructions for the printed text of the play. Even Chester G. Anderson's *Portrait* (1964) text is at bottom a mark-up, not a text established wholly afresh from the *Portrait* holograph; and in its published form, the acknowledged arbitration over readings by Richard Ellmann turned it indeed into a "marked-down" text. Only Anderson's dissertation edition of *Portrait* (1962), were it not for its mode of establishing the text, could be said to have the makings of a critical edition; and Tindall's edition of *Chamber Music* (1954) similarly comes close to meeting the required criteria.

In support of the distinction I am making, I hold that a critical edition is defined by the complex interdependence of a text established from the ground up, and its interfacing apparatus. The apparatus in particular,

which writes the editor and the editor's informed judgment into the edition, is not a separable adjunct, but an integral element in the system of a critical edition, which is doubly centered, on the text and on the apparatus. With this understanding, even the 1986 so-called Corrected Text of *Ulysses* is by itself a mere edited reading text that, on account of being divorced from the apparatus of the 1984 edition, has lost the status of a critical text.

As for alternative attempts to that of the critical and synoptic edition, what militates against a critical edition of *Ulysses* for instance from the 1922 first edition is the textual situation, with its rich survival of documents of composition and prepublication transmission. These offer a wealth of demonstrably authorial variants standing against their alternatives in the first edition, whose intrinsic textual authenticity is broadly uncertain. An edition based on 1922—be it a copy-text edition in Greg's, or a version edition for example in Hans Zeller's sense[5]—would be, for its text, in danger of not reaching a state of definition beyond that of a "practical text." For a version edition, committed to leaving the document text untouched but for the removal of unambiguous printer's errors, this is self-evident. For a copy-text edition, the pull of the copy-text would leave just too large a margin of indifference (in W. W. Greg's sense of the term)[6] for the eclecticism to take effect that the method advocates—and anyhow, the method has not really developed a rationale for working backwards, that is, of emending a copy-text by authorial variants of revision that precede it. Version edition and copy-text edition would amount to much the same thing—yielding practical yet indifferent texts, and large apparatuses jumbling together bulks of authorial and transmissional variants in unwieldy fragmentation.

Copy-text and Continuous Manuscript Text

Sir Walter Greg's "The Rationale of Copy-Text" was pragmatic by intention. Yet its proposition of divided authority, and the editorial practice following from it of constituting a critical text eclectically from textual elements present in two or more documents, held the theoretical implication of a logical distinction of text and document. Fredson Bowers explored the logic when he defined virtual texts, that is, texts not materially present in existing documents, as supplementary editorial stepping-stones towards his critical texts of Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, or of a

range of works of Stephen Crane's.[7] The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* has moved further in realizing the theoretical potential of the logical distinction between document and text. Its copy-text itself, what I have called the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses*, is the text of a virtual document. The edition introduces the notion of the continuous manuscript text as a heuristic device to solve the task of critically editing *Ulysses*.

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

From the record to the edition, the first step in any editorial undertaking is to transcribe the record. With the record spread over multiple documents, its transcription for *Ulysses* takes the form of an assembly of the continuous manuscript text. The virtual continuous manuscript is comparable to a real, heavily revised draft. The editorial task in transcribing such a draft lies above all in disentangling its layers of composition and revision and tagging the textual levels. To assemble the

continuous manuscript text for *Ulysses* is essentially the same procedure in reverse. The textual stratification is apparent from the outset, spread out as it is over the documents that individually carry the elements for assembly. Given that the temporal order of the documents is self-evident or ascertainable by external criteria, the levels of the text and their sequence are commonly not in doubt. The development of the text *of* the virtual continuous manuscript, just as *on* any real multilayered draft, is understood to proceed by composition and revision, where revision may be deletion, addition, replacement, or transposition. These are textual operations, to be tagged by appropriate coding to distinguish them. For a real document, what results is properly a manuscript, or document, edition, often additionally characterized by the indication of inscriptional features (e.g., false starts, erasures, *currente calamo* transformations, inks and writing implements), as well as of the topography of the document (e.g., interlineation, sub- or superscription, horizontal or vertical marginal positioning). The assembly of the continuous manuscript text for *Ulysses* cannot have the same primary document relationship and is therefore less a document than a text edition. In the tagging or coding of the textual operations, it corresponds in type to the document edition, with the important extension that it indexes the textual operations. The indexing helps to trace the continuous manuscript text back to the documents of provenance of its elements. But it is important to note that the assembled continuous manuscript text is not, and cannot be, a diplomatic representation of the documents from which, by assembly, it derives.

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

change—again in terms of the manuscript text—accurately occurs between the second and the third proofs. In the continuum of the text's development, it is precisely this moment logically situated at a point between the real documents that the coding index employed in the synoptic presentation aims at and marks.

By reason of asserting a logical independence of the text from the real documents, then, the assembly of the continuous manuscript text, as it presents the textual development synoptically, yields predominantly a text edition. It records—synoptically—the composition and revision by the textual results, not as material and manual processes. Only in the record of authorial operations within single documents does it preserve a modicum of document representation by indicating, for example, for the fair copy, such features as false starts, *currente calamo* changes, in-document revision, or erasures; or, for autograph segments of overlay to the typescripts and proofs, revisions of the revision. Again, however, it transcribes these with a main view to the textual results, and with only a subsidiary and selective attention to the diplomatic record.[8]

Assembling its continuous manuscript text as a text edition, albeit with an orientation towards the document edition in the synoptic visualization of the textual record, the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* takes its stand outside the Anglo-American mode of copy-text editing. Formal copy-text–editing procedures are employed, in an auxiliary capacity, only for lost segments of the Joycean manuscript. Thus, the fair copy and typescript, where for individual episodes of the novel they are collateral, permit the reconstruction of the lost final working drafts, even to the extent of distinguishing their basic text plus one layer of revision as levels of the textual development for the continuous manuscript text. Similarly, the authorial revisions on the lost typescripts of the three initial chapters may be recovered—and distinguished from typist's errors—from the collateral, serializations and first book galleys (*placards*). Even such subsidiary copy-text–editing moves, however—as with reference to the practice of Fredson Bowers in the Virginia Stephen Crane edition they may be termed[9]—cannot obscure the fact that the assembly of the continuous manuscript text, even as it combines textual elements from multiple documents, bears no relation to the critical eclecticism of copy-text editing. The editorial approach is historicist in the sense of the German *historisch-kritische Edition,*[10] and critical only to the extent of verifying and transforming the historical givens of the documents and document relationships into the text presentation of the synopsis. Moreover, the

assembled continuous manuscript text records solely the authorial variation within the textual development it covers, and excludes consideration and record of transmissional variants, except in a minority of instances where such variants get worked into revisions. For the purposes of a comprehensive edition of *Ulysses,* the continuous manuscript text, as prepared by abstracting Joyce's manuscript text from the documents of composition and prepublication transmission, provides but a raw text in need of critical editing. At this point, the continuous manuscript text enters into the functions of a copy-text; and it is here that we move to the more familiar ground of copy-text editing.

Emendation and Copy-text Editing

At bottom, the continuous manuscript text is in need of critical editing because the critical and synoptic edition has set itself the pragmatic goal of providing a critically established text parallel to the published text of the first edition of 1922. This is an arbitrary ambition, not a logical necessity. An editorial presentation of the raw continuous manuscript text would not be inconceivable. It would, in a more literal sense than does the critical and synoptic edition, give *"Ulysses* as Joyce wrote it" (my own words, smacking of the newspaper headline); and perhaps it could be worked more closely than we have chosen into recording what the documents actually say. But the critical and synoptic edition has taken a different path. The continuous manuscript text requires critical editing, at an elementary level, to smooth the seams between its assembled elements. For example, Joyce, inserting and adding over the typescripts and proofs, may at times neglect to provide the requisite modifications of punctuation or capitalization. Or, he may genuinely make mistakes in writing out his text, and perhaps even persist in overlooking them when they were not picked up by a typist or compositor. Or, his orthography may on occasion overstep even the wide limits of OED-recorded historical and contemporary usage.

This begins—but only begins—to indicate a range of situations where the editor will assume the critical task of emending the continuous manuscript text, utilizing it as a copy-text. Both aspects need to be stressed: the emendation is of the copy-text, and the task, as well as the responsibility, is the editor's. This raises questions of what and how to emend, whence to derive the proposed emendations, and how to justify them.

Fundamentally, I would suggest that, in the central editorial activity of emendation, the editor's responsibility takes precedence over authority. It is by no means the case that an editor can invoke and refer to authority—as commonly understood: another document, or the author's intention—in every situation or instance where texts in being critically edited require emendation. As traditionally defined, emendation is designed to oppose the influx of error and corruption in textual transmission. It is resorted to when a text is disturbed by a fault. Emendation repairs the text where its record of authority is deemed to be interrupted and broken. The notion of authority as thus residing in the record implies the assumption that records and documents somehow speak as author substitutes in the way that, of old, legal and political documents spoke the judge and the king, and Holy Scripture was the unmediated word of God. By the emendation of a fault, the text is thought to be "healed" through a reflux of authority restoring it to full authenticity. But it is doubtful whether an emendation has, or can command, such authority and authenticating power. The underlying concept of authority must be questioned.

The problem may be reopened from the type of situation originally defining emendation with reference to preconceptions about authority. The editor of a medieval manuscript, say, judges that at certain points the text being edited is faulty. The editor collates a number of other manuscripts and, as it is commonly understood, emends the text by their authority. But on closer analysis this, I suggest, is not what he or she is doing. The collation yields readings that appear critically superior, and it is on the strength of their superiority that they qualify as emendations. If they have authority in that they represent the uncorrupted authorial text, it is an incidental felicity; for medieval manuscripts, this was a long shot indeed. The paradigmatic editorial situation in the face of corruption may well be that of Lewis Theobald encountering "a Table of green fields" in the folio text of *Henry V,* 2.3, and judging it to be nonsense. Having no rival source to refer to, he conjectured "a babled of green fields" and emended the text accordingly on his own strength as an editor. Yet the situation of conjecture, while highlighting the issue, is marginal. Multiple transmission as the source basis for emendations is more common. What needs to be brought into focus, however, is the nature and quality of authority in emendation. The authoritative quality of an emendation derives from its critical superiority. The authority of a text—be it the text to be edited, or the source text of an emendation—

is an authority inherent in, and conferred by, the contextuality itself of that text; and it must be critically recognized as such, and as so conferred, by the editor.

This plays the emendation squarely into the editor's court. Grounded in critical faculties supported by professional skills, the editor emends on personal responsibility. Divine, royal, legal, or even authorial authority may be felt to be superauthorities holding out the temptation to hide behind them. But the authority inherent in the contextuality of the text is for the editor critically to assess, and, in opposing transmissional corruption, to assert by emendation. On such premises, emendation is the editorial activity by which an editor writes his or her skills and faculties into an edition. Such an understanding needs perhaps to be stressed particularly in the face of current copy-text editing, which has adapted the formal procedures of emendation, originally designed to respond to textual corruption, to the purpose of coping with authorial variation, and has at the same time, significantly, not rethought the concept of authority. Thus, the critically eclectic text, the ideal of copy-text editing in the (Greg)-Bowers-Tanselle sense, is achieved through emending the copy-text by authorial revisions from non-copy-text documents. The emendations are declared to possess superseding authority conferred by authorial intention, and, by such authority, to merge with the authoritative copy-text in fulfillment of the author's final intentions. The superauthorities of the author and his intentions, conceived of as of old before present-day theoretical notions of textual autonomy were formed, tend to obscure the essentially editorial nature of the act of emendation, as well as the editor's structural position in an edition.

Excursus: The Mutations of Copy-text Editing—or,
Palimpsests over a Method

In the discussion that followed the conference presentation of this essay, Jerome McGann questioned why I needed a copy-text, and had I not better abandon the term (or was it the thing itself?) altogether? The question continued to echo through the aftermath of the conference. I could see it was prompted by a sense that *copy-text editing* today has come to connote, if not indeed to denote, a mode of eclectic critical editing oriented towards fulfilling authorial final intentions. Still, I was puzzled: wasn't it McGann's own *Critique of Textual Criticism*[11] that

had revealed to our understanding that copy-text editing had only with time come to serve an intention-fulfilling eclecticism? That therefore the notion of *copy-text* was conceivable outside such connotations? Did it really have to be conceded that *copy-text* had been so preempted as to have become unusable as the term for a standard procedure of editorial pragmatics independent of text-critical ideology? In turning to *The Textual Condition*[12] in its chapter "What is critical editing?", I find McGann's thoughts revolving around much the same questions, at once attempting and not managing to free *copy-text* from the conept of "author's (final) intentions." The reason he fails to reach full clarity is that he sometimes attaches the concept of author's (final) intentions—explicitly, yet wrongly—to the point of origin, and at other times—rightly, though implicitly—to the result of the editorial endeavour. Specifically, it is misleading to say that "today the normative theory is that copy-text should be determined by the criterion of author's intentions" (p. 67). It would be truer to say, and would properly introduce the key term to balance that of *copy-text,* that "today the normative theory is that the edited text should fulfill the author's intentions." The editorial concept subject to theory, and shifting under changing ideologies, is the edited text, not the copy-text. Its determinant is always textual authority, although what that means may also vary according to the precepts of theory governing the conception of the edited text.

Copy-text is a substratum text, conventionally document based, which serves an edited text in ways defined, or co-defined, by the axioms of theory adopted for that edited text. As a concept and term, it is therefore not absolute, but relational. Positing the edited text as an ideal, an intentional, a versional, or a social text will in each case differently determine the choice of the copy-text—but in each case also editorial procedure suggests the advantage of having a copy-text. It is a pragmatic advantage: by conventional rules of procedure, the copy-text serves as the textual reference base for the acts of editing. (Quite practically, the convention has it that the apparatus can afford to be silent where the edited text conforms to the copy-text.) Yet it is not a theoretical necessity. There are modes of editing that do without copy-text. Both strictly documentary and strictly genetic editing, for instance, exclude by definition the concept of copy-text, since both require all features of a textual development and of a document text, qua document text, to be present, and presented, in the edited text. What defines the notion of the copy-text, by contrast, is that the copy-text is the absent text. It is the text

to depart from—that is, both to take as origin, and to deviate from—
in the editing process; whereas it is the edited text that, through that
process, is to be constructed, established, and achieved.

In a comprehensive sense, then, and independent of a theory or ideo-
logy governing the achievement of the edited text, copy-text editing may
be taken as one of two basic modes of establishing critical texts in
scholarly editions; the other mode being that of an assembly of textual
elements without anchorage in a specific document text. (A third mode
of scholarly editing is diplomatic editing. It does not establish a text
critically by emendation and conjecture, but strictly reproduces a doc-
ument text, warts and all, in an edition whose critical burden is carried
by the apparatus and editorial discourse only.) In historical retrospect,
we may see theoretical assumptions of the editorial goal for textual
criticism superseding one another as in a palimpsest, each taking recourse
to copy-text as an expedient of procedural methodology.

The concept for which R. B. McKerrow coined the new term copy-text
was firmly rooted in "old historicism": the base, or copy (more in the
sense of *original,* as of old, than of *reproduction,* as today), and with it
the base text, or copy-text, from which to construct an edition, was a his-
torical given. The textual situations, however, which McKerrow encoun-
tered, and which made determining copy-text problematic, were new in
the history of editing and of text-critical methodology. On the one hand,
conditions of writing and transmission in the age of the printed book had
produced a novel class of substantive witnesses: editions far down the line
of textual descent with fresh, that is revisional, authorial text. On the
other hand, the advances in bibliographical study taught just how trans-
missionally altered and corrupt such derived editions were likely to be.
Faced with the random mixture of transmissional and revisional changes
that were in many individual instances indistinguishable, McKerrow, with
strict historicist fidelity to the document, initially opted for the derived
editions as copy-texts.[13]

By the time of his *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare,*[14]
McKerrow had come to reverse his position, thereby in effect laying the
foundations for present-day critical eclecticism. W. W. Greg codified what
McKerrow no longer lived to implement beyond the declaration of intent
of the *Prolegomena.* Hence, his "Rationale of Copy-Text" did not set out
to undermine the historicist foundations of textual criticism and editorial
procedure. What Greg did—or thought he did—was to strengthen the his-
toricity of the text over that of the documents. With his double proposi-

tion of the divided authority for accidentals and substantives—allowing the text of a superseded document to be chosen as copy-text—and of the rule of the indifferent variant—"when in doubt, follow the copy-text" [for substantives]—he maximized the chances for the edited text to be a superior aggregate of authoritative readings. The authority of the given aggregates of readings lay in their historical authenticity. How much establishing the edited text as an eclectic aggregate amounted to a filling of new wine into old bottles is evidenced by the fact that revisional readings were emended into the copy-text, that is, that its own genuine document readings—revised in the derivative witness—were removed in the same way as were its transmissional corruptions. In truth, the choice of a historically superseded document text as copy-text, and the establishment of an eclectic edited text, though ostensibly maximizing textual historicity, subverted the historicist foundations of the copy-text–editing method. Greg may have avoided facing the issue. But Bowers, as is well known—and in his wake, Tanselle[15]—shifted their ground in rationalizing it. They defended it on the strength of its potential for fulfilling authorial intention. Scholarly editing became author-centered where before it had been focused on the history of the text.[16]

The copy-text–edited text of the author's final intentions is ahistoric, since eclectic, and an aesthetic construct, since—true New Critical child—ultimately ascertainable only in critical terms. So much has never, to my knowledge, been expressly declared by its advocates. But an unease about the ahistoric nature of the eclectic editorial ideal is evident from the emphasis on the historicist functions of the apparatus and insistence on the documentary potential of the emendations and historical collation lists. These permit, so the argument goes, the reconstruction of the real documents and document texts behind an edition. The apparatus has tended to be rationalized more for what the editor *found,* than—as in a genuinely historicist edition, for which the found is self-evidently what the edition normally reproduces—for what he *did* in editing. In a copy-text–edited eclectic critical edition, it is the apparatus only that upholds the historicist legacy of the discipline of scholarly editing. The rift between criticism and scholarship, that quintessential division in the age of New Criticism, which we are accustomed to hold responsible for the mutual alienation of literary from textual studies, thus turns out to run right down the middle of a critical edition under the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle dispensation.

To return, then, to the present question: is copy-text editing still today

an available option? The question concerns editorial pragmatics, not theory, but it must—as it can now—be answered from the perspective of the modes of edited texts achieved by the method. McKerrow's historicist edited text was grounded in a document text guaranteed by the integrity of an authorized document. Greg's historicist and Bowers's intentionalist edited texts were, each in its way, grounded in the aggregate of authority of multiple-document readings. Hence, Greg and Bowers in copy-text editing produced eclectic texts, McKerrow didn't. None of their modes of conception of the edited text for a critical edition was in its time complicated by theories of text to assess and question their validity.[17] Of the three, McKerrow, I suggest—in his practice for Nashe, if not in his declared procedure for Shakespeare—is likely to hold up under such theories (with due allowance for his "old historicist" affiliation).

Theories of text rule out eclectic editing. They therefore invalidate not the pragmatics of copy-text editing, but "The Rationale of Copy-Text." For the edited text of a scholarly edition today, there are more options than the historicist text, though alongside the versional text (of a Don Reiman or Hans Zeller), or the genetic text (e.g., the raw synopsis for *Ulysses*), or the editor's text (e.g., the reading text for *Ulysses* or, in a different mode, any conceivable "social text"), it remains a possibility, and often enough a necessity (as for Shakespeare's plays). Similarly, barring the employment of copy-text editing in the service of eclectic editing to fulfill authorial intention does not imply a regress to historicist editing of McKerrowian observance. This has been proven in recent Shakespearean editing. The Wells/Taylor Oxford Shakespeare[18] gives us *King Lear* in two versions. As edited texts, they could not have been achieved without recourse to Q and F, respectively, as copy-texts. Edited versional texts will thus use the corresponding documentary texts as copy-texts. Edited social texts, or production texts, similarly, when one day we have them in editions answering to the theoretical tenets presently under discussion, may in their way be expected to be constructed over the base of the product of the writer's and the printer's art and craft that they set out editorially to affirm—and will therefore use that base as their point of departure and thus, technically, as their copy-text. The *Ulysses* edition conceives of the edited text in yet a different mode, or, more correctly, in a combination of modes—an ideal text, or editor's text (i.e., the critical edition text and its extrapolation, the reading text) allied to a "composition text" (the term is McGann's,[19] and applies most readily to the raw synopsis). The raw synopsis, or what I have called the continuous manuscript text, is assembled,

as explained, without recourse to a copy-text (and one may add the reminder that it is a transitional stage in the overall critical editing of *Ulysses*). The critical edition text, the final result of the editorial process, which appears, overlaid with the diacritics of the synopsis and the symbol references to the footnoted emendations, on the left-hand pages of the edition volumes, is established over the base of the continuous manuscript text functioning as copy-text. It is in a functional sense, therefore, that I am confident of maintaining—indeed, that I would insist on upholding—the notion of the copy-text.

Against the background of such theoretical reflection, one may gain a clearer conception of what is involved, and what isn't, in copy-text editing the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses* and, in the process, emending it. What is essential is to restrict the method of copy-text editing again to the handling of transmissional variants. Since the textual development of composition and revision is attended to in the assembly of the continuous manuscript text before copy-text editing, the copy-text–editing procedures themselves are devoted, and confined, to adjusting the text with respect to its variation within the prepublication transmission. In the establishment of the edition text, and the reading text extrapolated from it, in the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses,* the variance concerned, as it happens, is largely, although not exclusively, a variation of accidentals. The need has already been observed of smoothing the seams of the continuous manuscript text as assembled from multiple sources at different stages of the text's progression through the prepublication documents. To the examples indicated, other types may be mentioned. There are, for instance, the accidentals of the typescript. Over long stretches of the text, the fair copy and the typescript are the collateral witnesses of the lost final working draft behind them. Being the linear antecedent of the typescript from which the book was set up, it is, in terms of the documents, the source of the text's descent, whereas the extant autograph fair copy isn't. The lost, and only to-be-reconstructed, manuscript may therefore be responsible for some of the typescript's accidentals, although typists' changes are also a factor to be reckoned with in accounting for the differences in accidentals between fair-copy and typescript text. On the other hand, these differences may of course also be due to genuine authorial alterations in accidentals introduced in the process of fair-copying from the lost working draft. Contrary to the situation prevailing for substantives (for which it is possible to isolate

the authorial revisions to the lost working draft from the typescript, and on the other side to identify, from the fair copy, some revisions made to the basic working draft text in the course of the faircopying), the accidentals provide little leverage, or none, to determine their status either bibliographically or critically. The procedure adopted has therefore been to emend the typescript and fair copy against each other without a strict formalist rule. The pull of the copy-text—with the typescript, on account of its derivation from the lost revised final working draft, standing in for that section of the continuous manuscript—has made itself felt in a certain permissiveness towards the accidentals of the typescript. Always recorded in the apparatus as documented in the typescript, these have, if accepted, often also been additionally labeled to suggest that perhaps they originated in the final working draft.

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

The copy-text editing of the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses*, in sum, attempts to reconcile the manuscript text and the transmission under conditions of a hermeneutic pragmatism. In the overall textual situation of *Ulysses*, confining copy-text editing—close to the mode in which copy-text editing was first conceived as an editorial methodology— to the field of the transmission, also means confining it largely to establishing the edition's critical text in its accidentals. (Greg's distinction,

though questionable theoretically, cannot easily be denied a practical usefulness.) The edition's substantives, to the large extent that they are its authorial variants of composition and revision, are, in the edition's design, the matter for assembly of the continuous manuscript text. Yet substantives, too, become a category of variants of transmission when, as is the case with the fair copy, the author acted as his own scribe. By the very nature of transmission, errors in the transcription of drafts into fair copy are inevitable (whereas, owing to their compositional status, working drafts as a manuscript class virtually exclude the category of "error.") Consequently, the fair-copy substantives of the continuous manuscript text must be expected potentially to be in need of emendation. Clear-cut slips of the pen aside, editorial acting on the expectation is, however, much limited on the one hand by the survival pattern of the manuscripts—there are not many drafts available against which to check the fair copy—and on the other hand by the implicit stabilizing of the manuscript/fair-copy text in the course of the text's further revisional development. Nevertheless, even allowing for these factors, the collation of the extant pre–fair copy drafts yields substantive variants critically deemed to correct scribal errors of the fair copy. In principle, and in accordance with the edition's emendation procedures for the continuous manuscript text, these have been held eligible as emendations in constituting the critical text. Considering the interlocking of composition, revision and transmission, however, the proviso was observed that the—local—context underwent no further change.[20] Where later authorial changes affected the local context, a scribal variant, though critically identified as such, has been left standing.

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

lutely clear about these procedures of copy-text editing is that they have not been undertaken under the premise of an obligation to fulfill authorial intention. Authorial intentions may be self-evident, or recognizable, or obscure, or indeterminable. To observe and respect them always plays a significant role in the business of critical editing. Yet they are but one factor in the complex set of determinants through which the critical editing process wends its way. For *Ulysses,* neither an uncompromising rendition of the continuous manuscript text, nor, at the other extreme, a presentation of the first-edition text edited for only a minimum of incontrovertible errors, could be expected to fulfill the author's intentions, let alone his final ones. If this is a novel perspective on basic text-critical positions and editorial attitudes by current conventions, it is an insight arising from strictly confining the activity of copy-text editing to the variant field of transmissional changes. It amounts to a reduction of the methodology's author-centered claims and redefines copy-text editing as an editor's tool for exercising responsibility toward the text. In adjusting the text by way of copy-text–editing procedures, the editor, it must be understood, does not act in a field of definite (let alone definitive) "rights" and "wrongs," but emends in a hermeneutic context. With the eclipse of intention and authority as editorial lodestars, the sharp opposition of error and nonerror also wanes, and emendation assumes the nature of an informed and considered suggestion arising out of the potentialities of the text. Text and emendation then communicate by way of the apparatus, which—no longer a mere material adjunct—marks the trail of the editor's decisions. Writing editorial engagement with the text into the edition, it provides, too, a platform for the reader's rival engagement with the text and the edition (and its editor).

The Apparatus

The preservation of extensive records of authorial writing and rewriting, as in the case of James Joyce's *Ulysses,* is characteristic of recent ages in literary history. In response to this historical circumstance, modern German editorial theory has recognized the difference in kind between authorial alterations to, and transmissional departures from a text. In the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses,* an apparatus of diacritics superimposed upon the presentation of the edition text records, even as it displays synoptically, the compositional and revisional development of

the continuous manuscript text. Conceptually, this synoptic apparatus constitutes the application to the editing of *Ulysses* of an apparatus mode known as *integral apparatus*. The integral apparatus—of whatever design—is the answer of modern editing to the challenge that the dynamics of compositional and revisional variance, such as authorial manuscripts preserve it, present to the scholarly edition. Displaying that variance in context, and sensitive to modern text theory in its emphasis on contextuality and the process character of texts, the integral apparatus permits the study in context of the acts and processes of writing (in so far as their record survives) through which a text was constituted, and constituted itself, under the author's hands.

While it sets a new dimension for the scholarly edition in conception and design as well as in usability potential, the integral apparatus does not displace or supersede the traditional lemmatized apparatus. It merely helps to circumscribe anew for the lemmatized apparatus the applications and functions for which that apparatus mode was originally designed. By a division of functions, on account of which the integral apparatus responds to authorial variation, the lemmatized apparatus serves on the one hand to report the editorial acts of establishing the critical text, and on the other hand to record the text's, or work's, variable documentation. As list of emendations, it is therefore the place to evaluate the editor's engagement with the text; as historical collation, it is the place to survey the text's history in transmission.[21]

Originals and Copies

The critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* has its share of editorial inaccuracies—as who would expect otherwise. That these are—and have been—easily detected is a function of its design, presupposing as it does the existence of the facsimile of the Rosenbach manuscript and the photoreproduction in the James Joyce Archive as visual reference copy to the original drafts, fair copies, typescripts, and proofs that survive.[22] Corresponding to the guidance that visual copy may provide for readers and critics has been the use of such copy in the routine work of establishing the edition. The edition's inaccuracies have been blamed on the use of facsimiles and photoreprints in the place of originals.[23] This is mistaken. This blame, if justified at all, could be aimed at only a fraction of the edition's residue of error. The reliance on copy—an exigency to

be acknowledged for the day-to-day practice of scholarly editing, and controlled within a system of checks and balances, common sense, and calculated risks—is not the cause for the edition's inaccuracies. These are not systematic, or endemic to any methodological fault line of the edition, but are no more and no less than instances of human failure that have slipped by the editorial controls. These provided for all originals to have been seen and analyzed in their inscriptional and material properties before visual copy was resorted to for the editorial routines. Repeated returns to the originals, in their diverse locations, followed, with lists of queries unresolvable from the copies. What appeared unproblematic in the routine editorial work but was nevertheless erroneously recorded was hence liable to slip through the nets of control (as did a spurious Captain Culler), since a complete eye collation of the editorial transcript against the originals was not undertaken. This constituted a calculated risk incurred for reasons of economy. The potential improvement of an already highly precise editorial record (a quality that should not be overlooked in the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*: it boasts—and the verb is used designedly—a total of two misreadings from the Joycean manuscripts not subject to opinion that affect the edited text) was deemed to be out of proportion to the additional investment of time and grant money it would have required. The pragmatic decision did not leave the edition unscathed. Yet to have eliminated a few additional blunders—to have rightly named Captain Buller, which would have been most fortunate—would have been no guarantee against a residue of oversights still remaining. The striving for absolute perfection in a perfectionist discipline such as scholarly editing runs the fundamental—and mindless—risk of infinite recess, to be halted with intelligence and out of a sense of responsibility that ultimately considers not the text, or editorial anxiety, alone.

Undoubtedly, the *Ulysses* edition provides occasion to reflect more generally on the use and the functions of visual copy in modern scholarly editing. The realities of the day-to-day labor are that the scholarly editor can and does not work with and from original documents. Bar exceptional circumstances, his or her resources are copies. The situation is conditioned by distance, and by losses. Yet the degree of loss differs significantly between the orders of materiality, inscription, and textual record. At one end of the scale, a copy, by definition, preserves nothing of the materiality of an original: its size, paper, paper quality, foldings, quirings, creases and tears, its inks, crayon markings or pencilings. At

the other end, the textual record—the conventionalized graphics of let-ters, numerals, and marks of punctuation doubly controlled by the con-ventions of the alphabet, and of grammar, syntax, and semantics—ideally loses nothing in copying. The problematic area is that of the inscription: the positionings, spacings, shapes, and sizes of the marks on paper of a given manuscripts, which (even if they are supposed to be of the controlled orders of the textual record) are random and unpredictable. It is this that modern technology, in providing visual rather than tran-scriptional copy, has succeeded in bringing up for permanent close attention.

Modern photographic and photoreprint reproduction retains the tex-tual record not as a transliteration, but as an image of the original inscription. This shifts significantly the demarcation line between what, and what not, of an original may be perceived from a copy. The loss of the original's materiality remains a serious impediment, and is under all circumstances ignored only at the editor's peril. Nevertheless, given a prior visual and tactile experience, and a paleographic and biblio-graphic knowledge, of the original, the visual copy acts as a superior reminder, as well as an incentive to further refinement, to the analytical findings of textual criticism. More importantly still, such copy supports the editorial tasks of transcription and verification of the text. It reduces in number the successive transcriptions required where editions are pre-pared in the traditional way. In the era of computer-based editing and electronic typesetting, the repeated transcriptions may be reduced to one and, bar any number of input corrections, one only. The associated advantage for the textual verification derives from the circumstance that, as observed, the copy better stands in for the textual record than for any other feature of the original. Wherever the text, under the double control of the conventions of writing and of language, is unambiguous, the copy is wholly adequate as a control document to verify it.

The modern visual copy renders a scholarly edition transparent in ways unparalleled before the advent of the technology of photorepro-duction. The opportunity to improve, as well as to check on, the accuracy of the editorial performance, however, is but the lowest order of such transparency. The potential for innovating the format of editions is of greater moment. The availability of visual copy makes practical sense of designing apparatuses both to convey the solutions of editorial prob-lems in terms of the editor's critical understanding of the text, and to function as a system of reference to the writing processes in the originals.

In heightening the transparency of the text itself, this holds out opportunities for a deepened engagement, through an edition, with the work and text edited.

The Use of the Computer

The gains from the computer to establish the *Ulysses* edition were significant, and should be evident. It served to store, verify, and secure the text; collate all input textual states; perform innumerable searches; collocate and format the synopsis; extrapolate the reading text; generate the footnote and appended apparatuses; and set the type electronically for the book publication of both the three-volume edition and the one-volume issue of the reading text. To complement both forms of publication, it also produced the *Handlist,* or word-form concordance, to the reading text.[24]

As the transcription base and storage medium for the text, as well as the typesetting agent for the edition, the computer secured a superior overall textual accuracy (the residue of error notwithstanding—using the computer caused it as little as did the standard consultation of visual copy, while thanks to the computer its incidence is low). In terms of editorial procedures, it transformed conventional routines of collation by radically reducing the need for constant observation of invariance, bringing the variants alone to the focus of editorial decision-taking. To be able to isolate variants as a separate, and heuristically separable, body of text proved of particular advantage in defining the stratifications of the synopsis. Here, the data-processing strengths of the computer were utilized to perform a comprehensive collation of an early-text subedition against the first-edition text and then to match the resulting composite body of variation against a set of individual transcriptions of the document-specific revisions (e.g., the changes authorially written into the typescripts and each successive set of proofs respectively). This—besides helping to separate corruption from authentic text in the printed changes and accretions, which was not a computer-dependent activity—permitted introducing automatically the coding to signal the levels and stages of the textual development. The coding, as diacritical metatext, was thereby generated error-free throughout in its innumerable individual notations. This manner of establishing the synopsis may stand as an example of how the computer was capable of suggesting innovative structures for

the editorial routines. In the case of the lemmatized footnote and appended apparatuses, it was more its organizing and formating strengths that were drawn upon. From a cumulation of computer collations, first, the footnotes were computer-written into the edition text, and the historical collations into the reading text; then, the respective apparatuses were automatically extracted, and automatically supplied with their reference identifications of page line or episode line numbers and lemmas.

For the consistency, transparency, and accuracy, then, of the editorial apparatus in its diverse manifestations, as well as of the presentation in print of text and apparatus, the use of the computer provided a secure guarantee. Yet for recording the document source texts and establishing the edition text, it offered "merely" significant help. The distinction is essential. It follows from the obvious facts that computers cannot verify their input, but can only assist in verifying it; and that they do not take decisions but, again, can at most be directed to presort decision material. With the use of the computer in scholarly editing, it is in the verification of input and the decisions over output that all an editor's critical and control functions are focused. Computer-aided editing therein does not differ from traditional editing in principle, yet it does so in its organization. The difference turns out to be significant. Text verification and proofreading, in particular, instead of occupying the editor through the entire course of the project and reaching a major peak at the end of it, come to be concentrated in its early stages. The textual material of an edition, once transformed into electronic data and verified against the document sources, may be relied upon to stay secure in computer storage if subsequently, throughout the computer-aided editing processes, it remains "untouched by human hands" (that is, if collation, text merging, the generating of apparatuses etc., are automated, running in batch mode, and not performed interactively at the computer screen). The verification itself, while the computer collation facilities may be enlisted to support it, depends exclusively on observant accuracy and corrective precision of the human eye and hand. Original textual readings right or wrong do not result from reliance on the computer. For the subsequent stages of the editorial process, and the critical establishment of the edition text in particular, the case is essentially the same. Computer collation, it is true, will provide the record of textual variation from the textual data as input and verified. But the assessment of the variation and the application to it of decisions of choice in the selection or rejection of readings is a critical activity dependent on editorial rationale and judg-

ment, and as such independent of the computer. However, it should also be observed that, within the entire framework of a computer-aided organization pattern for critical editing, the critically independent decision taking may not at all times be wholly, and as it were innocently, independent of the working environment created by the computer. The editor will be working from computer printouts, rather than constantly from original documents, or copies thereof, directly. Editors in the computer age should be aware that such working at an environmental middle distance may cause faulty editorial decisions.

The Bibliographical Dimension

The challenge of editing Shakespeare, as is well known, taught textual criticism to harness bibliography to its ends. The analytical and descriptive tools of antiquarians, book collectors, and librarians were adapted to serve the textual critic. Around midcentury, *bibliography* and *textual criticism* had become virtual synonyms. Hence the current legacy of a predominantly Renaissance-oriented methodology is not only eclectic copy-text editing. It is also "the bibliographical way." Analytical and textual bibliography belong as a matter of course to the text-critical procedures employed in preparing the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses*.[25] Yet they are not central to its methodology. As an edition, it may serve to reflect upon, and in part reconsider, the role of bibliography in textual criticism and editing.

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

To assess that relativity in the case of *Ulysses*, it is convenient to distinguish between the prepublication and the postpublication phases of the transmission. For the prepublication, that is, pre-first-edition,

phase of transmission, we have manuscripts, typescripts, and proofs with manuscript overlay, plus the serializations in *The Little Review* and *The Egoist,* as the carrier documents of the text. Commonly, they survive complete, or near complete. Only at times, when there are gaps in a series (such as missing sections of the typescript, or the proofs), are analytical and/or textual bibliography called for to assess the text. For the missing typescripts of the novel's three opening chapters, for instance, this amounts to a full-scale collational plus bibliographical inquiry into the variants of the three (for chapter 1), or else two (for chapters 2 and 3), typescript-derived texts in *Little Review, Egoist* (chapter 1 only), and first book proofs. Here, it is the analytical logic of textual bibliography that serves to establish conclusively that each immediate post-typescript state of the text derives from a different exemplar of the typescript, of which—demonstrably so for chapter 1—two were worked over by Joyce and one remained uncorrected (though not entirely unrevised). Since collation also ascertains that the typescript in its three exemplars (i.e., top copy and two carbons) was typed from the extant fair copy, it follows for the establishment of the text that where all three derivations depart from the fair copy, the reason lies in the typing, and the change is transmissional, but where one agrees with the fair copy, the (always identical) departure in the other two reflects Joyce's post-typing working over, and the change is revisional. The characteristic consequences are readily apparent in the very first paragraphs of the opening chapter.

Thus, for the initial episodes of *Ulysses* a bibliographical argument closes the gap in documentation caused by the loss of the typescript, and in a manner substitutes for that loss. Yet in general terms, it is important to realize that bibliographical investigations do not always in this way yield conclusive results, or if they do, that these results are not always textually, and hence editorially, relevant. Bibliographical inroads were attempted yet inconclusively abandoned, for example with respect to the relationship between the physical makeup of the autograph and the textual transmission for several of the individual episodes. Fold patterns in batches of leaves of the "Circe" autograph, for example, may be strongly suspected to bear a relationship to the history of the text, that is, to the phases of its drafting as well as to its successive typing in segments. That is, a particular matching fold would indicate just the batch of leaves that went to the typist at one specific, though to our knowledge no longer specifiable, time. But it appeared impossible to assemble enough evidence, internal or external, to verify the suspicion

and consolidate it into even merely a concrete sequence of dates. Nor—and this is the sticking point for the editorial enterprise—did what evidence there was seem to hold much promise of mattering in terms of establishing a critical text, or even just of differentiating further the synopsis of the textual development.

Bibliography, then, provided one of several perspectives on the textual situations, though by no means always the decisive one. Bibliographical inquiries were pursued, and their findings scrutinized, for their relevance to the task of editing. But this criterion strictly limited bibliographical investigation per se. At the risk even of errors of judgment as to the methodological choice of invoking or not invoking bibliography, not every form of bibliographical analysis imaginable was carried out. This means among other things that, for aspects peripheral or not apparently relevant to the text, a comprehensive, strictly bibliographical study of *Ulysses,* from the manuscripts through the entire prepublication phase and up to and including the first edition, still remains to be undertaken.

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

Gained from external documentation as well as from survey check collations, this assessment of the variance void of revisional development in the postpublication transmission of *Ulysses* obviously needed verification, and it required policy decisions. Methodically, the policy decisions took precedence. Important among these were those concerning the recording and reporting of variants. With regard to the ins and outs of transmissional corruption (misreadings, misprints, and related errors) and correction in the prepublication phase, it was declared a rule for the edition not to record or report misprints and their correction in

typescripts and proofs that restored the original state of the text. Textual errors, on the other hand, that reached the first edition were recorded and reported in the historical collation. The extension of the rule, *mutatis mutandis,* into the postpublication phase of the transmission seemed logical within the edition's own system. Textual changes by means of correction in the second and subsequent issues of the first edition, and in the second and subsequent editions and their issues, were not for it to record and report in their entirety. This implies that the post-first-edition printing history was not an objective in its own right of the edition. Only the author's own corrections in the postpublication phase were not passed over in silence. They fall, in the main, into two groups: the corrections from Joyce's contribution to the several errata lists, and the corrections critically singled out from a collation yield between the 1936 private Bodley Head edition and its 1937 general-market reprint as the result of Joyce's proofreading.

Again, it was the editorial and hence textual concern that defined the extent and limits of bibliographical procedures. A test collation by Hinman Collator of multiple copies of the three states on different paper of the first edition's first issue was begun but only pursued to a point when it became evident that the expense of labor, money, and time could not be justified for the purposes of the edition's textual objectives. Anyone carrying it on for an analysis of the story of the printing of the first edition would, by contrast, still stand a fair chance of making interesting, strictly bibliographical discoveries about a book production that was unusual in many respects for the twentieth century. Hinman collation was furthermore undertaken to double-check the survey assessment of the nonrevisionary nature of the postpublication textual history within the series of issues of the first (Paris, 1922 to 1925), second (Paris, 1926 to 1930), third (Hamburg, 1932 to 1939), and sixth (London, 1936 and 1937) editions of *Ulysses.* Had—contrary to expectation, or knowledge gained by external documentaton or interedition collation—revision or substantial correction with author participation occurred at any point within these series, the fact was bound to be discovered from comparison of single exemplars of each first and last issue.[26] In one case, and in one case only, the result was positive. Joyce's corrective proofreading of the 1936 Bodley Head edition for its 1937 reprint could be substantiated, and proven to be his only proper proofing of *Ulysses* after finishing his revisions and corrections of the first edition's final proofs in January 1922. What demands the textual concern of the edition could make on

bibliography were fulfilled in these Hinman collation investigations of the postpublication transmission of *Ulysses*.

NOTES

1. James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition,* prepared by Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, 3 vols. (New York: Garland, 1984).

James Joyce, *Ulysses: The Corrected Text,* ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (New York: Random House; London: The Bodley Head; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986). (NB: This, computer typeset identically in all three editions, is the reading text from the 1986 second, and slightly revised, impression of the three-volume critical and synoptic edition. "The Corrected Text" is a subtitle assigned jointly by the James Joyce Estate and the trade publishers.)

2. Michael Groden, "Foostering Over Those Changes: The New *Ulysses,*" *James Joyce Quarterly* 22 (1984–85): 137–59; Jerome McGann, "*Ulysses* as a Postmodern Text: The Gabler Edition." *Criticism* 27 (1985): 283–306; David Greetham, "The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing," in *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory,* ed. Philip Cohen (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), pp. 78–102; Vicky Mahaffey, "Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce's *Ulysses,*" in *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation,* ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), pp. 171–91.

3. John Kidd, "The Scandal of *Ulysses,*" *New York Review of Books,* 30 June 1988, pp. 32–39; and "An Inquiry into *Ulysses: The Corrected Text,*" *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 82 (1988): 411–584. The latter is a disappointing sequel to the unabashed polemics of the former. It amasses materials of an utter heterogeneity and fails to reach out to a rationale of its own. John Kidd's delving into the particulars of *Ulysses* and of the edition is remarkable. In a spirit of professional cooperation, an editor could hope for no better response. Yet in fact, the "Inquiry" suffers from inadequate premises and false assumptions, ignorance of theoretical backgrounds, terminological confusion, and unfamiliarity with the empirics of editing. It selects and suppresses evidence or posits arbitrary categories for text-critical reasoning and editorial procedure. Mistaking the edition—in fact, not merely the so-called Corrected Text, but the critical and synoptic edition behind it—for what it is not and never was claimed to be, it only incidentally succeeds in being objective as critique, and constructive as criticism.

4. Fredson Bowers, "Practical Texts and Definitive Editions," *Essays in Bib-*

liography, Text, and Editing (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), pp. 412–39, esp. pp. 416–17.

5. Hans Zeller's understanding of the distinction between Anglo-American copy-text editing and German version editing, while touched upon in "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–64, comes out most clearly in "Struktur und Genese in der Editorik: Zur germanistischen und anglistischen Editionsforschung," in *Edition und Wirkung,* ed. Wolfgang Haubrichs, *LiLi. Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975), Heft 19/20, pp. 105–26. A discussion of this and related pieces on principles of textual criticism according to the German understanding of the discipline may be found in my "Unsought Encounters" in Cohen, *Devils and Angels,* pp. 152–66.

6. W. W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950): 19–35, esp. p. 32; also in *Collected Papers,* ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), pp. 374–91, esp. pp. 387–88.

7. Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling,* ed. Martin Battestin and Fredson Bowers, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974). (See esp. p. lxxi.) For "The Text of the Virginia Edition" of Stephen Crane, see pp. xi–xxix (esp. p. xvi) of Stephen Crane, *Bowery Tales,* ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969). Fredson Bowers's methodologically creative development of copy-text editing is the particular subject of "Multiple Authority: New Problems and Concepts of Copy-Text," *The Library,* fifth series, 27 (1972): 81–115; reprinted in *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), pp. 447–87.

8. Separating text presentation from document representation is more easily posited as a principle than executed in practice. Privileging the text over the document record reaches an impasse, for example, with regard to manuscript erasures. Such erasures are material to the document, but at the same time they have a text quality. Under the former aspect, their exclusion from the record would be defensible on the edition's own premises. Under the latter aspect, erasures would be incorporated in the text assembly for the edition's synopsis. Yet it is regrettably true for specifically circumscribed areas—e.g., chapter 2— what John Kidd has misleadingly generalized for the edition, namely that the record of erasures is not complete.

9. See note 7.

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

11. Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

12. Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

13. *The Works of Thomas Nashe,* ed. Ronald B. McKerrow (London, A. H. Bullen, 1904), 2:197.

14. Ronald B. McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939), pp. 17–18.

15. G. Thomas Tanselle's main contributions to the debate over copy-text have been sufficiently important for him to extract them from volumes of *Studies in Bibliography* and republish them as *Textual Criticism Since Greg: A Chronicle 1950–1985* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1987). In *A Rationale of Textual Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), he draws a sum of his views on the historicist obligations and documentary affinities of critical editing.

16. Peter Shillingsburg, *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice,* rev. ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), states categorically: "The authorial orientation has been for thirty or more years the dominant one in American scholarly editing" (p. 31).

17. Hans Zeller, in his 1975 *LiLi* essay, questions the validity of eclectic copy-text editing under the perspective of a structuralist theory of text. In "Unsought Encounters," I analyze the productive tension between structuralist and post-structuralist notions of text in German editorial theory (for both, see above, note 5).

18. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works,* gen. ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986); William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works, Original-Spelling Edition,* ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988).

19. McGann, "*Ulysses* as a Postmodern Text," p. 292.

20. The proviso has repeatedly required explication, most recently so by way of my letter to the editor in *James Joyce Quarterly* 28 (1990–91): 1017–21.

21. The distinction between authorial and transmissional variants stands at the core of German text-critical thought. German scholarly editing may be said to be oriented—and to have been oriented, even under a succession of paradigms of method—in essence towards the development of texts under their authors' hands. This is a larger theoretical field than can be dealt with within the confines of this article. I have repeatedly indicated my allegiance to the basic German tenets on variants and apparatus, e.g., in "The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses,*" *Text* 1 (1984): 305–26; "The Text as Process and Problem of Intentionality" *Text* 3 (1987): 107–16; and "Textual Studies and Criticism," *The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin* 20 (1990): 151–65. "Unsought Encounters" (see above, note 5), it is hoped, may be further inducive to exploring the positions of German editorial theory there outlined.

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

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

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

25. So should enumerative bibliography belong. But in surveying the printing history of *Ulysses,* the edition shows itself uninformed about some limited-edition resettings prior to 1984. The oversight is regrettable. It is, however, irrelevant to the editing.

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

Contributors

Betty T. Bennett (American University) is the editor of the three-volume Hopkins edition of *The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* and author most recently of *Mary Diana Dods, a Gentleman and a Scholar.*

George Bornstein (University of Michigan) is editor of the two-volume Cornell edition of *W. B. Yeats: The Early Poetry* and of *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation,* as well as author most recently of *Poetic Remaking: The Art of Browning, Yeats, and Pound.*

Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt (New York University), Consultant for Renaissance Art to the Vatican Museums, is the author of *Leonardo and Central Italian Art* and editor of the forthcoming *Michelangelo Pittore* (Acts of the Vatican International Conference).

Clayborne Carson (Stanford University), Director of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Papers Project, is editor of *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.,* and author of the forthcoming *Black Leaders, Black Movements.*

David Noel Freedman (University of Michigan), is General Editor of the Anchor Bible Series and author most recently of *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy.*

Hans Walter Gabler (University of Munich) is the editor of the most provocative recent edition of modern literature, the three-volume *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition,* as well as of *The James Joyce Archive.*

Philip Gossett (University of Chicago) is General Editor of *The Works of Giuseppe Verdi,* of the *Edizione critica delle Opere di Gioachino Rossini,* and of the forty-three volume *Early Romantic Opera.*

David Greetham (CUNY Graduate Center) is editor of *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa's Translation of Bartholomaeus Anglicus' De Proprietatibus Rerum* and author of *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction.*

Jerome McGann (University of Virginia) is editor of the Oxford *Byron: The Complete Poetical Works* and author of *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism.*

Barbara Oberg (Yale University) is Editor of the Papers of Benjamin Franklin and Senior Research Scholar in the Department of History.

Peter L Shillingsburg (Mississippi State University) is editor of *The Works of W. M. Thackeray* and author of *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age.*

Gary Taylor (Brandeis University) is General Editor of the Oxford *Complete Works of William Shakespeare* and author most recently of *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present.*

Ralph G. Williams (University of Michigan) is editor of *Marcus Hieronymus Vida: De Arte Poetica.*

James E. G. Zetzel (Columbia University) is co-editor of F. A. Wolf's *Prolegomena to Homer* and author of *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity.*