

CRITICAL ESSAYS
ON
BRITISH LITERATURE

Zack Bowen, General Editor
University of Miami

◆

Critical Essays on
JAMES JOYCE'S
A Portrait of the Artist
as a Young Man

◆

edited by
PHILIP BRADY AND JAMES F. CARENS

G. K. Hall & Co.
An Imprint of Simon & Schuster Macmillan
New York

Prentice Hall International
London • Mexico City • New Delhi • Singapore • Sydney • Toronto

Contents



<i>General Editor's Note</i>	vii
<i>Publisher's Note</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	1
PHILIP BRADY AND JAMES F. CARENS	
CRITICAL CRUXES	
Introduction to <i>Stephen Hero</i>	19
THEODORE SPENCER	
Joyce and the Epiphany: The Key to the Labyrinth?	27
ROBERT SCHOLES	
[Stephen's Diary: The Shape of Life]	36
MICHAEL LEVENSON	
The Villanelle Perplex: Reading Joyce	52
ROBERT ADAMS DAY	
[The Aesthetics of Stephen's Aesthetic]	68
CORDELL D. K. YEE	
The Genesis of <i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i>	83
HANS WALTER GABLER	
STRUCTURE, IMAGE, SYMBOL, MYTH	
[Joyce's <i>Portrait</i> and Flaubert's <i>L'Education Sentimentale</i>]	115
DAVID HAYMAN	

[A Slow and Dark Birth: A Study of the Organization] SIDNEY FESHBACH	130
The <i>Portrait</i> as Portrait: Joyce and Impressionism MAURICE BEEBE	142
[Davin's "Strange Woman" and Her Biblical Prototypes] NEHAMA ASCHKENASY	155
[Daedalus and the Bird Girl: Classical Text and Celtic Subtext] F. L. RADFORD	168
The Art of the Labyrinth DIANE FORTUNA	187
THE IMPACT OF THEORY	
[Reading Acts, Reading Warrants, and Reading Responses] JAMES J. SOSNOSKI	215
The Artist as Text: Dialogism and Incremental Repetition in <i>Portrait</i> R. B. KERSHNER	231
Riddles, Silence, and Wonder: Joyce and Wittgenstein Encountering the Limits of Language THOMAS C. SINGER	243
[The Strength and Sorrow of Young Stephen: The Dialectic of Harmony and Dissonance] MICHAEL BRUCE McDONALD	265
Framing, Being Framed, and the Janus Faces of Authority VICKI MAHAFFEY	290
<i>Index</i>	317

The Genesis of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*

HANS WALTER GABLER

James Joyce wrote and rewrote the novel that was to become *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in several phases between 1903 and 1914. He began *Stephen Hero* sometime in early 1903 but, after some seven chapters, attempted a reorientation with the narrative essay "A Portrait of the Artist." This he submitted to the Dublin literary magazine *Dana* in January 1904.¹ Upon its rejection, he fell back with renewed energy on *Stephen Hero* and carried it forward through 25 (of a projected 63) chapters. Broken off in the summer of 1905 in favor of an undivided attention to the writing of the stories for *Dubliners*, *Stephen Hero* remained a fragment.² In September 1907, when the plans for a revision of the fragment had sufficiently matured in Joyce's mind, he began to write *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in five chapters. This reached the state of an intermediary manuscript during 1907 to 1911.³ In 1913–14, the novel was completed. It is represented in its final state by the fair-copy manuscript in Joyce's hand now in the possession of the National Library of Ireland in Dublin. Moreover, complete textual versions or fragments of text from each of the major stages of the novel's eleven-year progression are still extant and identifiable. But it is also true that by far the majority of the materials, the plans, sketches, or intermediate drafts which as a body would have borne witness of its emergence, must be assumed to be lost. Nevertheless, close survey and careful scrutiny of those which survive make it possible to indicate some of the essential aspects of the work's genesis.

I

The only surviving textually complete document of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is the Dublin holograph manuscript. In it, several strata of compo-

This essay was revised for this volume from "The Christmas Dinner Scene, Parnell's Death, and the Genesis of *A Portrait*," *James Joyce Quarterly*, 1975, and "The Seven Lost Years of *Portrait of the Artist*," in *Approaches to Joyce's Portrait*, Thomas F. Staley and Bernard Benstock, Eds., © 1976 by University of Pittsburgh Press. This revision is reprinted by permission of the *James Joyce Quarterly* and the University of Pittsburgh Press.

sition may be distinguished. The manuscript comprises 600 (-1)⁴ leaves in Joyce's hand. Several orders of page-count may be found in the manuscript. The penciled numbering of the pages in Chapters I–III, and perhaps part of that in Chapter V, may be that of Harriet Weaver, who donated the manuscript to the National Library of Ireland. Page totals for each chapter have also been jotted in ink on the back of protective endpapers to Chapters II, III, and IV. They give the page count in a manner similarly found in some of Joyce's later manuscripts, and may be his. Chapter IV has a page numbering in large arabic numerals, mostly in ink, on the verso of the leaves. This numbering runs on without interruption through the first 13 leaves of Chapter V. The sequence begins with "239" for the first text page in Chapter IV and runs to "313" for fol. 13 of Chapter V (*JJA* [10], 741–882).⁵

For a stratification of the manuscript by which to distinguish the order of inscription, and at times of the composition of the text, this page count is the decisive clue. It links all of Chapter IV with the beginning of Chapter V. It also indicates that, inscriptionally, pages "239" to "313" are the earliest section of the Dublin manuscript. The absence of a corresponding page numbering for Chapters I–III suggests that these chapters were inscribed later, an assumption strengthened by the fact that not 238, but 362 manuscript pages precede Chapter IV in the Dublin holograph. Accordingly, it is easy to see that the continuous page count, a vestige apparently of a through numbering of some other manuscript, was abandoned as of no further consequence for the remainder of Chapter V. Inscriptionally, therefore, this would also seem to be later than pages "239" to "313," though why the pattern breaks where it does is not readily discernible. Nor, of course, is it a foregone conclusion that Chapters I–III in their entirety preceded all of the main body of Chapter V in a relative chronology of inscription of the manuscript.

The page numbers "239" to "313" accord with Joyce's numbering habits in the *Stephen Hero* manuscript. To this, however, the numbered pages in the Dublin holograph cannot have belonged, since they follow so clearly from the five-chapter plan of *A Portrait*. They were consequently written at some time after September 1907. Perhaps their text was not conceived before February 1909, though this depends on what precisely Ettore Schmitz (Italo Svevo) read of *A Portrait* in January–February 1909.⁶ The actual pages "239" to "313" belonged, I suggest, to the *Portrait* manuscript that narrowly escaped destruction in 1911, the "original" original which when rescued was sorted out and pieced together in preparation of the final manuscript,⁷ and in which there were "pages . . . I could never have re-written" (*JJ* 314). Contrary to the view that the fourth and fifth chapters of the novel were not brought into shape until 1914, after Ezra Pound's enquiry about publishable material had rekindled Joyce's desire to complete the novel—supposedly while the early chapters were already getting into print⁸—the evidence of the Dublin manuscript indicates that, in 1911, when *A Portrait* was almost anni-

hilated, Joyce had completed Chapter IV and begun Chapter V. Indeed, Chapter IV, the only section of the Dublin holograph which has come down inscriptionally intact from the earlier manuscript, appears also to be the only part of the final text which represents without significant and extensive changes the novel in the textual state of 1911.

As applied to the pre-1911 leaves actually preserved in the Dublin manuscript, Joyce's posthumously reported remark about pages he could never have rewritten would seem to mean merely pages which he saw no further need to reinscribe. It is surely significant that Chapter IV in the Dublin manuscript is the only chapter which to any marked extent shows traces of Joyce's revising hand. Consider the final heightening of the paragraph, steeped in the symbolism of Pentecost, which begins: "On each of the seven days of the week he further prayed that one of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost might descend upon his soul" (4.51–53).⁹ In the manuscript, it originally ended: "to whom, as God, the priests offered up mass once a year, robed in scarlet." This is revised to read: "robed in *the scarlet of the tongues of fire*" (*JJA* [10], 751). Or consider how much denser and richer, how much more both threatening and alluring, becomes the passage which in the manuscript originally read:

No king or emperor on this earth has the power of the priest of God. No angel or archangel in heaven, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself has the power of a priest of God, the power to bind and to loose from sin, the power, the authority, to make the great God of Heaven come down upon the altar and take the form of bread and wine. What an awful power, Stephen!—

By revisional amplification, this becomes:

No king or emperor on this earth has the power of the priest of God. No angel or archangel in heaven, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself has the power of a priest of God: *the power of the keys*, the power to bind and to loose from sin, *the power of exorcism*, *the power to cast out from the creatures of God the evil spirits that have power over them*, the power, the authority, to make the great God of Heaven come down upon the altar and take the form of bread and wine. What an awful power, Stephen!— (4.382–391; *JJA* [10], 793)

Correspondingly, Stephen, in his imaginings of priesthood, as originally worded

longed for the office of deacon at high mass, to stand aloof from the altar, forgotten by the people, his shoulders covered with a humeral veil, and then, when the sacrifice had been accomplished, to stand once again in a dalmatic of cloth of gold on the step below the celebrant. . . . If ever he had seen himself celebrant it was as in the pictures of the mass in his child's massbook, in a church without worshippers, at a bare altar . . . and it was partly the absence of a rite which had always constrained him to inaction.

But in the text as interlinearly revised in the manuscript, his longings and reflections are enriched and particularized in much detail. Also, as in the preceding passage, the revision results in greater syntactical as well as rhythmical complexity:

He longed for the *minor sacred* offices, *to be vested with the tunicle* of subdeacon at high mass . . . his shoulders covered with a humeral veil, *holding the paten within its folds*, and then, *or when the sacrifice had been accomplished*, to stand *as deacon* once again in a dalmatic of cloth of gold on the step below the celebrant . . . If ever he had seen himself celebrant it was . . . in a church without worshippers, *save for the angel of the sacrifice*, at a bare altar . . . and it was partly the absence of *an appointed* rite which had always constrained him to inaction . . . (4.412–426; JJA [10], 795–97)

Anyone familiar with Joyce's revisional habits in shaping *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* will here recognize in rudimentary form the patterns and procedures which reach such complexity in the processes of composition of the later works. Conversely, although the examples quoted are the only passages in which compositional revision clearly manifests itself in *A Portrait*, these examples, together with our general knowledge of Joyce's later working habits, make us more keenly aware of the likelihood of revision, perhaps even extensive revision, in the course of the emergence of *A Portrait* at lost stages of its textual development.

Pages "239" to "313," salvaged intact from the manuscript of 1911, will not have been the only pages which Joyce "could never have re-written." Such others as there were he apparently recopied, taking advantage in the process of the opportunity for revising and expanding his earlier text. Positive evidence derives from Ettore Schmitz's letter of 8 February 1909, that, for example, certain "sermons" as part of the third chapter then existed. Consequently, they were also in the manuscript of 1911. In one form or another they would textually seem to go back even to February or March of 1904. The notes for *Stephen Hero* at the end of the "Portrait" copybook testify to the plan for the inclusion in Chapter XI(?) of "six lectures," in a sequence outlined as:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1) Introductory, evening before | 1st Day |
| 2) Death | |
| 3) Judgement | 2nd Day |
| 4) Hell | |
| 5) Hell | 3rd Day |
| 6) Heaven morning after | 4th Day ¹⁰ |

In *A Portrait*, by contrast, we have one introduction and three sermons on four consecutive evenings. Of the three sermons, the first, on death and judgment, is not given verbatim, but as reported speech, filtered through Stephen's mind. Only the second and third sermons are fully developed as

insets of pulpit oratory. Hell is the subject of both of them; and despite the preacher's promise in his introduction to put before the boys "some thoughts concerning the four last things . . . death, judgment, hell and heaven" (3.277–279), there is in *A Portrait* no sermon on heaven. In the last part of Chapter III, instead, heavenly mercy comes as an immediate and intensely personal experience to Stephen on the morning after the fourth day of the retreat: "The ciborium had come to him" (3.1584). Revision, then, is indicated not merely between the two extreme stages of, on the one hand, the outline plan for Chapter XI of *Stephen Hero* and its unknown realization, and, on the other, the final version of Chapter III of *A Portrait*, but also as a developmental process in the course of the emergence since 1907–08 of the third chapter of the five-chapter *Portrait*.

About the emergence not only of Chapter III, but of the entire pre-1911 portion of the novel, further inferences are possible from Ettore Schmitz's letter. The only third-chapter matter it expressly mentions are "the sermons." It gives no indication of the chapter's conclusion. By its initial reference to a fragmentary ending of the text it is even open, I suggest, to the interpretation that the third chapter was unresolved in the sections of the work in progress that Joyce allowed his pupil and critic to read. Schmitz feels unable to submit a rounded opinion about the work partly for want of competence, but partly also because the text breaks off at a crucial moment: "when you stopped writing you were facing a very important development of Stephen's mind." At the same time, his letter appears to indicate that, in a discontinuous manner of composition, Joyce had by late 1908 or early 1909 already proceeded beyond Chapter III in his rewriting of *Stephen Hero* into the five-chapter *Portrait*. For Schmitz continues: "I have already a sample of what may be a change of this mind described by your pen. Indeed the development of Stephen's childish religion to a strong religion felt strongly and vigorously or better lived in all its particulars (after his sin) was so important that no other can be more so" (*Letters* II, 226).

This is an obscure comment if referring to Chapter III alone, and to nothing of *A Portrait* beyond it. It makes good sense, however, if considered as a reflection on the first section of Chapter IV which precisely describes "a strong religion felt strongly and vigorously or better lived in all its particulars (after [Stephen's] sin)." Without a knowledge of the subsequent offer and rejection of priesthood and the culminating scene on the beach, Schmitz would not have grasped the ironic implications of the fourth chapter's opening section; nor would he have realized that Stephen's way lay toward art, not religion. But he saw accurately enough that Joyce was "facing a very important development of Stephen's mind." The reference to having a sample of Stephen's altered mind described by Joyce's pen suggests that Schmitz had read a textual fragment drafted for the continuation of the novel beyond the point where Joyce had "stopped writing." Together with the subsequent explicit mention of the sermons, it suggests that, as Schmitz read it, the third

chapter ended with the sermons and the dejection and contrition they caused in Stephen, and that Joyce in 1909 had not yet formulated the last transitional section which by way of Stephen's confession, absolution, and communion links it to the opening of Chapter IV.

With the hindsight of our reading experience, the thematic and narrative logic of that transition seems so clear that it is hard to conceive of any great problems encountered in the writing of it. However, several observations converge which may suggest that Joyce did not achieve it easily. The most important of these derives physically from the Dublin manuscript itself and indicates that the end of Chapter III as we now have it is a very late piece of writing. On fol. 100 of Chapter III in the Dublin holograph, the communal prayer which concludes the last of the hell sermons ends, with Joyce's characteristic three asterisks marking the sectional subdivision, halfway down the page. Below, the final section opens with a clear paleographic break: the pen, the ink, the slope of the hand, and the typical letter formations which remain identical from here on for the last 29 leaves of the chapter are all distinctly different from the style of inscription of the preceding 100 pages, and particularly of that of the two hell sermons on fols. 40–100. As will be seen, there is a distinct paleographic link between Chapter III, fols. 40–100 (*JJA* [10], 557–667), and Chapter V, fols. 112–120 (*JJA* [10], 1089–1105). If, as was argued earlier, the main body of Chapter III was itself retranscribed after 1911 (and probably revised, and perhaps augmented, in the process), the evidence now shows that the final section was inscribed, and therefore added to the main transcription, at yet a later stage. It is conceivable that the end of Chapter III was among the latest sections to be inscribed in the Dublin holograph.

In a first draft, Chapters I–III of *A Portrait* were written between September 1907 and 7 April 1908 (*JJ* 264, 270). They are the chapters that Ettore Schmitz comments on in his letter of 8 February 1909. He praises the second and third chapters, but he criticizes the first: "I think it deals with events devoid of importance and your rigid method of observation and description does not allow you to enrich a fact which is not rich by itself. You should write only about strong things" (*Letters* II, 227). The physical evidence of the Dublin manuscript shows that, in consequence, not only were Chapters I–III written out anew after the near destruction, in 1911, of the earlier *Portrait* manuscript; by inference from the page numbering in the leaves which survive from it, the initial chapters were also augmented by a total of 124 manuscript pages. Beyond a recopying of salvaged text, this bespeaks thorough, and probably extensive revision.¹¹

We know from an entry in Stanislaus Joyce's diary that in September 1907, Joyce's plan for rewriting *Stephen Hero* was "to omit all the first chapters and begin with Stephen . . . going to school" (*JJ* 264). This was the way out of the difficulty over the first chapters of *Stephen Hero* which Joyce had commented on before to his brother (*Letters* II, 90). The new conception was

realized. In the first school episode, the incomplete alteration of the name Mangan to Moonan in the early pages of the Dublin manuscript demonstrates positively a copying from earlier papers.¹² That would put at least this episode of Stephen's illness at Clongowes among the matter contained in the 1911 manuscript, and hence probably into Chapter I as read by Ettore Schmitz in 1909, and, consequently, as written between 8 September and 29 November 1907. No new chapters dealing with Stephen's childhood were written then or later to precede this beginning.

The first chapter of the novel as we now have it, however, opens with a brief section of great significance which on the narrative level relates Stephen's childhood. It represents the final expression of Joyce's original intention to encompass the earliest years in his hero's life. Its consummate artistry, resulting from a great concentration and condensation of thought, imagery, symbolism, and meaning, has often been admired and commented upon.¹³ In the manifold attempts at elucidating the complexity of the opening of *A Portrait*, there seems to be an agreement that, to adopt Hugh Kenner's musical terminology, it functions as an overture anticipating the main themes and developments of the novel. As such, it gives every impression of having been written in view not only of the whole as planned, but of the whole of the subsequent composition as executed, or largely executed, in the details of its narrative progression and symbolism. Though no positive textual proof for this is available, I venture to suggest that the opening section of Chapter I was written at a late stage of the textual genesis of the novel. It had found its shape and place by late 1913, of course, when from the Dublin holograph originated the novel's transmission into print via the typescript prepared from the manuscript. But the opening section with which we are familiar may have formed no part, and (though this is speculation only) may have had no textual equivalent or alternative in Chapter I as read by Ettore Schmitz in 1909 and as contained in the manuscript of 1911.

A general paleographic impression gained from the Dublin holograph is that the final inscription of Chapter II preceded that of Chapter I. An assumption of this order of revision gains support from the observation that at some stage in the seven-year textual history of *A Portrait*, the Christmas dinner scene was moved from Chapter II to Chapter I. This was a revision of utmost significance, to which we shall return. Suffice it here to say that, by all available evidence, Chapter I acquired its final shape in stages, and that Joyce's awareness of its potential for meaning grew over an extended period of composition. Nor would the internal textual evidence of the chapter's growth seem inconsistent with an assumption that Ettore Schmitz's criticism added incentive to the revising of it. Schmitz could hardly have denied "strength" to a Chapter I opening as the present one does, and including the Christmas dinner scene.

Therefore, the act of revision by which the Christmas episode was transferred from Chapter II to Chapter I appears to have been undertaken after

February 1909. A still later dating is suggested by Joyce's "Alphabetical notebook." Among its materials, which in their majority are projections for Chapter V of *A Portrait*, and for *Ulysses*, there are just a few entries which indicate that both the Christmas dinner scene and the novel's second chapter were still on Joyce's mind in 1909–10. Under the heading "Pappie," and after an entry which can be dated to Christmas 1909,¹⁴ we find these further entries:

He calls a prince of the church a tub of guts . . .
 He offers the pope's nose at table. . . .
 He calls Canon Keon frosty face and Cardinal Logue a tub of guts.
 Had they been laymen he would condone their rancid fat.¹⁵

At some time after Christmas 1909, then, the dialogue of the Christmas dinner scene must have been revised sufficiently to put these quotations from John Stanislaus Joyce into the mouth of Simon Dedalus. Three further entries in the notebook—one under "Pappie," and two under "Dedalus (Stephen)"—point to Chapter II. The names of Pappie's college friends¹⁶ provide material for the Cork episode; and I take the entries for Stephen Dedalus which read, "The applause following the fall of the curtain fired his blood more than the scene on the stage" and "He felt himself alone in the theatre," to refer, respectively, to the Whitsuntide play, and to the scene in the anatomy theatre in Cork. Taken together, this evidence suggests a late revision of Chapters I and II, possibly sometime in 1910, or, indeed, in the course of assembling the novel after its near destruction in 1911.

II

The last of Joyce's *Dubliners* stories, "The Dead," has been widely interpreted as signaling a new departure in his art, leading to achievements such as the first chapter of *A Portrait*. The two have commonly been viewed in close temporal sequence, since it is known that *A Portrait* was begun in September 1907, immediately after the composition of "The Dead" (*JJ* 264). From the account here given of the state of the final manuscript and of the stages of composition and revision to be reckoned with in the novel's initial chapters, it follows, however, that only Chapter IV can be safely assumed to have existed before 1911 as it survives in the completed novel. Chapters I–III, by contrast, attained their final shape only after that date, and are therefore, in the form in which we possess them, five or more years removed in time from *Dubliners*, and the consummation of its art in "The Dead." Paradoxically, it is Chapter V, although presumably the last to be written, which from the vantage point of the finished *Portrait*, and on the evidential basis of the textual documents still extant, reaches back furthest into the novel's textual history and Joyce's artistic development.

Materials from the textual history have been preserved more amply for the fifth chapter than for the earlier ones. They bear witness to the fact that the transformation of the extant *Stephen Hero* fragment (the chapters which Joyce himself called the “University episode” of that novel) into Chapter V of *A Portrait* passed through several stages of experiment. Since the first thirteen pages of the chapter in its final form were contained in the *Portrait* manuscript of 1911, it appears that the earliest traceable attempts at rewriting preceded its attempted destruction. They seem to have been aimed at only a slight modification-by-condensation of the *Stephen Hero* materials which, one may assume, would have preserved their essentially additive narrative structure. At the end of Chapter XV and midway through Chapter XVIII in the *Stephen Hero* manuscript, we find the entries “End of First Episode of V” and “End of Second Episode of V” (*JJA* [8], 95 and 239). The final *Portrait* text does not realize the linear revisional plan that these entries point to. What materials have been salvaged from the *Stephen Hero* university episode—e.g., the fire-lighting incident with the dean of studies, the music-room scene with Emma Clery, the episode of the Stephen-Emma-Father Moran triangle, as well as numerous brief descriptive and characterizing phrases earmarked for transfer in the *Stephen Hero* manuscript—now reappear out of their earlier order, changed and integrated into different settings and contexts.¹⁷

Against the foil of the original *Stephen Hero* incidents and scenes, Joyce searched for a new novelistic technique and new forms of expression through language and style. Increasingly, the narrative was internalized. The hero’s mind and consciousness became a prism through which the novel was refracted. Characters were functionalized as correlative to theme. A workshop fragment happens to have survived which paradigmatically reveals the inner logic of the process of artistic reorientation.

The document in question is one (and the only genuine one) of the two “Fragments from a Late *Portrait* Manuscript.”¹⁸ An external, purely orthographic indicator, though by its nature a significant one, of the fact that it distinctly postdates *Stephen Hero*, is the revised spelling “Dedalus” (for earlier “Daedalus”) of Stephen’s family name. It also postdates *Stephen Hero* by its introduction of Doherty, alias Oliver St. John Gogarty. The fictional name appears as early as the Pola notebook entries for *Stephen Hero* of 1904.¹⁹ But when Joyce in the summer of 1905 discontinued the writing of *Stephen Hero*, he had not yet reached the point where he would have brought Gogarty into the narrative—although his friends in Dublin who were granted the privilege of reading the finished chapters were eagerly awaiting that moment (*Letters* II, 103). Doherty is not finally cast as a character in *A Portrait*, but reappears as Buck Mulligan in *Ulysses*. The Doherty fragment therefore has justly been viewed as an early vestige of *Ulysses*.²⁰ But by its situational context, it has a place more immediately within a *Portrait* ambience.

The Doherty episode of the preserved fragment constitutes a section of a kitchen scene between Stephen and his mother. On the manuscript leaf, it is

preceded by the last half-sentence from a paragraph which, as A. Walton Litz has observed, appears to be the end of a new rendering of the episode that concluded Chapter XIX (in Joyce's numbering) of *Stephen Hero*.²¹ The pencil addition to the end of Chapter XIX in the *Stephen Hero* manuscript, "If I told them there is no water in the font to symbolise that when Christ has washed us in blood we have no need of other aspersions," is reflected in the fragmentary phrase "shed his blood for all men they have no need of other aspersion." The kitchen scene to which the Doherty episode itself is genetically linked followed, after some pages, in Chapter XX (in Joyce's numbering) of *Stephen Hero*. Vestigially, therefore, the manuscript fragment gives evidence of an attempt at linear rewriting of *Stephen Hero* by a foreshortening of its episodic sequence.

Yet technically and stylistically, at the same time, the fragment exemplifies a breakthrough toward the narrative mode of the final *Portrait*. It begins in the middle of Stephen's mental reflection on his own mixed feelings toward Doherty's habits of mocking and blasphemous self-dramatization, and it breaks off as mother and son, confronting one another over the dregs of a finished breakfast in the midst of general disorder in the kitchen, embark upon a dialogue which would appear to be heading toward a new version of the conversation, in *Stephen Hero*, about Stephen's neglect to make his Easter duty. There, as they talk, Stephen is made to reveal his inner state at length, while his mother is only gradually brought to a realization and awareness of the fact that he has lost his faith. After four wordy pages, the dialogue ends:

Mrs Daedalus began to cry. Stephen, having eaten and drunk all within his province, rose and went towards the door:

—It's all the fault of those books and the company you keep. Out at all hours of the night instead of in your home, the proper place for you. I'll burn every one of them. I won't have them in the house to corrupt anyone else.

Stephen halted at the door and turned towards his mother who had now broken out into tears:

—If you were a genuine Roman Catholic, mother, you would burn me as well as the books.

—I knew no good would come of your going to that place. You are ruining yourself body and soul. Now your faith is gone!

—Mother, said Stephen from the threshold, I don't see what you're crying for. I'm young, healthy, happy. What is the crying for? . . . It's too silly . . .²²

From this conclusion, Joyce in the fragment distills the new beginning of an exchange of words:

—It is all over those books you read. I knew you would lose your faith. I'll burn every one of them—

—If you had not lost the your faith—said Stephen—you would burn me along with the books— (*JJA* [10], 1221–2)

Within the fragment as it stands, however, this beginning (there is no telling where it would have led, since Joyce himself does not seem to have seen his way to following it up; the fragment ends at the top of its last manuscript page) is only the conclusion of a thoroughly internalized scene. It is primarily Doherty, and not his mother, who is Stephen's antagonist, and he is present not in person, but in Stephen's thoughts. It is in Stephen's mind that his coarse and boisterous blasphemies are called up, the "troop of swinish images . . . which went trampling through his memory" (*JJA* [10], 1219). The particulars of Doherty's self-dramatization "on the steps of his house the night before," as remembered by Stephen, all function for Joyce as the artistically objective correlative of Stephen's rejection of church rituals and Christian beliefs. Together with the subsequent description of the dirt and disorder in the kitchen they serve to create the mood of Stephen's dejection and weariness—totally different from the defiant "Mother . . . I'm young, healthy, happy. What is the crying for? . . . It's too silly" of *Stephen Hero*—out of which the dialogue grows, and then breaks off.

The technique in the act of rewriting is one of inversion in several respects. From being displayed in external dialogue, the theme of the episode is presented as a projection in narrative images (centered on the antagonist) of the protagonist's mind and memory. The facts and attitudes which emerged only gradually in the fully externalized scenic narration by dialogue, are now anticipated by the economy of poetic indirection. The fragment of conversation which remains begins on the note, and, in foreshortening, on the very word with which its model ended. Mood and atmosphere are enhanced and incidentally altered; the effect of condensation is great on all levels of thought, language, and character presentation. The overall gain in intensity is enormous. Constituting as it does a point of intersection between the earlier episodic pattern of *Stephen Hero* and the new evolving narrative principles and techniques, the "late *Portrait* fragment" thus reveals the significance of Joyce's intermediary *Portrait* experiments.

What presumably remained problematic, however, was to adhere to the device of presenting as a scene at all the crucial moment in the process of Stephen's separation from home, fatherland, and religion. As a scene, it may have been felt to give still too much personal and emotional bias to an essentially intellectual conflict and decision. In the fragment, of course, it depends, additionally, on the introduction into the larger narrative context of the new and essentially insincere character Doherty. The experiment of using him as a correlative and a mocking projection of Stephen's serious rejection of Christian values was abandoned. This meant that the scene between Stephen and his mother could not take even the shape into which it was tentatively revised. In the final text of *A Portrait*, by further radical narrative condensation, the confrontation of mother and son over the question of the Easter duty was deleted altogether, entering the novel only by way of report in Stephen's final conversation with Cranly.

The elimination of the kitchen scene has broader implications, for it appears that the narrative progression of Chapter V as ultimately achieved is determined no longer by scenes, but by conversations and reflections. This seems to be the result of the later revisional experiments of which, now, the notation of the text in the pages of the Dublin fair-copy manuscript itself bears witness. The final chapter of the novel divides into four sections. They are no longer “episodes” in the manner of the Christmas dinner scene, or the Cork episode, or Stephen’s flight to the seashore at the end of Chapter IV. “Movements” may perhaps be an apter term for them. The second and fourth movements, essentially static, are given to the composition of the villanelle and to Stephen’s diary excerpts. It is only in the more dynamic first and third movements that, by a complex sequence of thematically interlocking conversations, the narrative is effectively carried forward.

As with the novel as a whole, so with Chapter V in particular, the Dublin manuscript helps to distinguish phases of inscription which permit inferences about the order of composition of its parts. Of fols. 112 ff, for example (beginning “What birds were they?” [5.1768; *JJA* [10], 1089]), Chester G. Anderson has suggested, from observations on variations in Joyce’s handwriting, that they may have been among the first to reach the form they have in the Dublin holograph.²³ This is incorrect insofar as Chapter IV is inscriptionally clearly the earliest part of the fair-copy manuscript. Nevertheless, Anderson’s guess conforms with an impression, gained from further comparison, that the particular variation in Joyce’s handwriting observable in fols. 112–20 (through the entire passage that ends “went up the staircase and passed in through the clicking turnstile” [5.1863–4; *JJA* [10], 1105]) recurs also in fols. 39–100 of Chapter III, that is, throughout the two hell sermons (3.538–1170). At the bottom of fol. 39, the new hand sets in with the paragraph beginning “The chapel was flooded by the dull scarlet light” (3.523; *JJA* [10], 555). The change of hand on the same page clearly puts the inscription of fols. 1–39 before that of fols. 39–100. Thereafter, the second obvious inscriptional discontinuity in Chapter III after fol. 100 (*JJA* [10], 677), together with the paleographic likeness of the hell sermon section with fols. 112–20 of Chapter V, suggests—in addition to strengthening the earlier argument for a later inclusion of the final transitional section of Chapter III—that Joyce at this point proceeded directly from the third chapter to faircopying the nine-page opening of the fifth chapter’s third movement. This, as will be remembered, is a passage which richly orchestrates the novel’s symbolism. In tone and imagery, it is particularly close to the latter half of Chapter IV. Since the hell sermons to which in the inscription of the Dublin holograph it is paleographically linked represent text essentially salvaged from the *Portrait* manuscript of 1911, the text of fols. 112–20 in Chapter V, too, may be of pre-1911 origin.

The remainder of the third movement in Chapter V may then not only have been inscribed later, as the change in the style of the hand after “and

passed through the clicking turnstile” on fol. 120 indicates; it may also have been written appreciably later. When the textual continuation was ready to be faircopied and Joyce returned to the middle of fol. 120 to join it on where he had left off writing, the beginning of the last preceding paragraph read: “A sudden brief hiss was heard and he knew that the electric lamps had been switched on in the readers’ room.” This was revised to “A sudden brief hiss *fell from the windows above him*” (5.1860; *JJA* [10], 1105) to correspond to the parallel phrase which occurs within the subsequent text on fol. 131: “and a soft hiss fell again from a window above” (*JJA* [10], 1127). The manner of the revision, undertaken interlinearly on the manuscript page, is reminiscent of the similar revisions observed in Chapter IV and may well support a view that, here as there, Joyce was only after a passage of time returning to text earlier inscribed.

A manuscript section in Chapter V clearly set off as an insert from its surroundings is that of the villanelle movement. Its sixteen manuscript pages are (but for the last one) inscribed with a different ink and a different slope of the hand on different paper. The verso of fol. 95 (*JJA* [10], 1055), which ends the chapter’s first section, is smudged and has yellowed. Similarly, fol. 112 (*JJA* [10], 1089), the first page of the third movement, shows traces of having been outer- and uppermost in a bundle. From this evidence it would appear that, for an appreciable time, sections one and three of the chapter existed separately and apart, and that the villanelle movement was later inserted between them. Further observation shows that the last of the sixteen manuscript pages of the villanelle movement is again on paper similar or identical to that used for the rest of the chapter (although this in fact is a mixed batch). Moreover, the leaf (fol. 111; *JJA* [10], 1087) is also heavily smudged on its verso and bears the mark of a huge paper clip. But for the two lines of running prose at the top, it contains only the complete text of the villanelle as concluding the movement. A closer inspection of the preceding leaf reveals that the words in its last two lines are spaced out uncommonly widely and are not brought out as far to the right edge of the paper as the text on the rest of the page. The article “the” which is the first word on fol. 111 could easily have been accommodated at the bottom of fol. 110. Therefore, fol. 110 was inscribed after fol. 111, or, in other words, fol. 111 appears to be the last leaf of the villanelle section from an earlier inscriptional (and probably textual) state.

That this section in its final state was inserted in its present position in the Dublin manuscript only after the preceding ninety-five pages of text as written were finally faircopied—and appreciably later at that, as witnessed by the smudged appearance of fol. 95v—is clear from the fact that it opens, with the paleographic break described, in the lower third of fol. 95. That the final transcription of the villanelle movement also postdates the writing of fols. 112–20 is rendered similarly probable by the other physical evidence referred to: the different paper of the insert, and the smudging of fol. 112 itself. But

whether the second movement in its original conception is later than the other parts of Chapter V is less easy to determine. On the contrary, considering the marks of wear and tear on fol. 111v, it is not even out of the question that the villanelle section in an earlier unrevised state also belonged to the pages of the rescued 1911 manuscript which Joyce "could never have rewritten." But this, from the evidence, cannot be demonstrated. What the inscriptional stratification in Chapter V of the Dublin manuscript shows, however, is that Joyce did what he later claimed to have done, assembling the chapter by piecing together sections of manuscript. The chapter was by no means inscribed in the fair-copy manuscript in the regular order of the final text (as the other four chapters apparently were in themselves, though they were not written out in the regular order of the chapters), nor was it probably composed in that order.

On the whole, the indication is that the final shape and structure of Chapter V of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* evolved gradually as Joyce was working on the diverse materials which in the end he succeeded in unifying in this final chapter of the novel. In it, the villanelle interlude on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the orchestration of the novel's imagery and symbolism in the opening pages of the chapter's third movement, are seen from the evidence of their inscription in the fair-copy manuscript to have early roots in the chapter's conceptual genesis. The narrative framework which structurally supports these poetically highly imaginative passages is anchored in the sequences of conversations in the first and third movements and their relation to one another. Their relationship, which, as indicated, appears to reflect Joyce's final experiments at shaping the chapter, may also be seen in terms of a history of the text.

It is movements one and three in Chapter V that reuse the largest quantity of *Stephen Hero* materials; and of the two, the first takes the greater share. This section is also that part of the chapter where greatest emphasis is on establishing and maintaining narrative progression in action and in time. That such narrative progression is structured by a sequence of conversations, and no longer by episodes, becomes clear precisely from the fact that *A Portrait* salvages (though often with significant modification) dialogue from *Stephen Hero*, while abandoning the loose episodic framework to which it was there tied. The altercation developing from the fire-lighting by the dean of studies, or the exposition of Stephen's aesthetic theories, are outstanding examples. The close adaptation of a dialogue in dog Latin from *Stephen Hero* to comment upon the issue of signing or not signing the declaration for universal peace in *A Portrait* points to the revisional principle. The corresponding dialogue in *Stephen Hero* counterpoints the reading and reception of Stephen's paper on "Art and Life," an incident which does not recur in *A Portrait*. Significantly enough, this is the only instance where *Stephen Hero* materials have been reused in *A Portrait* totally divorced from their earlier context. The original unity of episode and dialogue has been dissociated.

It is the achievement of the opening movement of Chapter V to develop Stephen's attitudes to church, university, and Jesuits; to show how he scorns the emotional and unreflected idealism which motivates alike the declaration for universal peace and the arguments for Irish nationalism; and to set forth his aesthetic theories all in a sequence of encounters with persons he talks to in the course of half a day's wandering through Dublin, from half-past ten in the morning in his mother's kitchen to sometime in the mid-afternoon on the steps of the National Library. This wandering movement, at the same time, is a narrative representation of Stephen's leaving his home and family and finding the theoretical basis for his art. The first section of the chapter takes him halfway into exile.

The third movement, by contrast, while of course gravitating toward Stephen's final encounter and conversation with Cranly, reflects upon and heightens imaginatively and symbolically the attitudes and the positions he has secured in movements one and two. It will be noted that the third movement begins in place and time where the first ended, on the steps of the National Library in the late hours of an afternoon. Its action consists simply of Stephen's seeking out Cranly and separating him from the group of fellow students in order to walk alone with him and talk to him. The device is so similar to Stephen's sequestering one by one the dean of studies, Cranly, Davin, and Lynch earlier in the chapter as to suggest that at some stage in the genesis of Chapter V there existed a provisional and experimental plan for tying all the conversations on the issues he faces, and his going away from home into exile, to the narrative sequence of Stephen's wanderings through Dublin in the course of one day. It would have been in embryo the plan realized in *Ulysses*.

But the renouncing of church and faith in the final conversation with Cranly could then not have been linked to Stephen's falling out with his mother over his refusal to make his Easter duty. For that, Stephen would have had to be brought back home once more in the course of the day, which would have broken the chapter's continuous outward movement. Perhaps a sequence was temporarily considered which would have brought all conversations into one day without sacrificing this directional principle. The unfinished revision of the Easter duty conversation in the "Fragment from a late *Portrait* Manuscript," by the reference to Doherty's "standing on the steps of his house the night before,"²⁴ would seem to be set in the morning. Perhaps it should be seen as a workshop alternative to the kitchen scene at the beginning of the chapter, which by the evidence of the continuous authorial page numbering in Chapters IV–V was in the 1911 manuscript and, therefore, possibly predates the fragment. It would, however, have very heavily weighted the opening of the chapter which, as it stands, begins so casually; and the different thematic order of the ensuing conversations it would have demanded may well have proved too difficult to bring into balance.

By retrospective inference from *Ulysses* we may catch a glimpse of yet another workshop alternative considered but rejected for Chapter V. The

beginnings of *Ulysses*, we know, grew from overflow *Portrait* materials. Not only did the projected but abandoned Martello tower ending for *Portrait* provide the opening for *Ulysses*. Notably early during the *Ulysses* years, Joyce also had a “Hamlet” chapter in store (cf. *Letters* I, 101). This eventually became “Scylla and Charybdis.” Even as we possess it in the text of the fair copy as completed on New Year’s Eve 1918, it is pivoted on Stephen Dedalus, centered on his aesthetics, and devised as a sequence of conversations. With these characteristics, it may in early conception date back to Joyce’s experiments over the structure and text for the fifth *Portrait* chapter. Set as it is in the National Library, it would have fitted between the chapter’s first movement ending on the library steps going in, and its third movement opening on those steps going out. It would indeed also have fulfilled the one-day time scheme for Chapter V that we have speculatively postulated. It would, however, have shown up the starkness of such a scheme. As an Easter duty conversation in the family kitchen would have unduly weighted the chapter opening, so a heady exchange about Hamlet, Shakespeare, and aesthetics would have overfreighted its middle. The chapter’s progression, without the contrast in tone and mood of the villanelle movement, would have been utterly relentless.

Within the four-part composition of Chapter V as ultimately achieved, several structural principles are simultaneously at work, of which the organization of the thematic and narrative progression in the first and third movements by means of a logical sequence of conversations is the dominant one. Each exchange requires an intellectual counter-position, and Stephen’s dialogue partners are accordingly functionalized as Doherty is in the “late *Portrait* fragment,” though not as strenuously internalized. Of the inferred structural experiments, namely the attempt at confining the chapter’s action to one day, and the sustaining of a continuous outward direction of Stephen’s movements, neither was completely abandoned, or wholly sacrificed to the other. Although the villanelle movement stands between the first and third sections, thereby indeterminately lengthening the chapter’s time span, the third movement still continues in time (late afternoon) and place (steps of the National Library) where the first ends. Simultaneously, by a subtle avoidance of definite place, the illusion at least is maintained of a continuous movement away from home and into exile. The narrative is so devised that once Stephen leaves his home by the kitchen door in the morning of the day on which the chapter opens, he is never visualized as returning there again. Care is taken not to localize his awakening to compose the villanelle in a bedroom of the family house. The Easter duty conversation, which—regardless of its place in the chapter—would have required a setting in Stephen’s home, is eliminated from the narrative altogether. Nor is a specific home setting given for Stephen’s discussion with his mother about the “B.V.M.” in the diary entry of March 24. Both physically and spiritually, in the end, his departure into exile

is represented as an unbroken outward movement sweeping through the entire fifth chapter.

A few but quite specific textual observations finally help to establish the relative chronology of the chapter's four movements. The initial thirteen manuscript pages (of 1911) bring Stephen out of his mother's kitchen and start him on his wanderings across Dublin. The entire first section of the chapter draws copiously on *Stephen Hero*. Once the structural plan for a sequence of conversations had been decided upon, the remainder of the first movement would have followed materially and logically from the chapter's beginning. The third movement, in the integral shape of its final version, is distinctly later than the first, and as it stands in the Dublin holograph it may postdate the original conception of the villanelle movement. Significantly, it is only in the text of the third movement that Stephen is given his (*Ulysses*) attribute of an ashplant.²⁵ Also, the Gogarty figure who commonly goes by the name of Goggins is here once called Doherty (5.2534), indicating a relation of the third movement to the experiments of composition to which the "Fragment from a Late *Portrait* Manuscript" directly, and perhaps the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of *Ulysses* remotely, bear witness. There is no indication of when the finale of the chapter, the diary section, was planned or written. Though ending the manuscript, it may not have been last in composition. It was the villanelle movement, though perhaps drafted early, that in its final version was last inserted in its predetermined position in the holograph, to complete the fair-copy manuscript, and the entire novel.

III

In its four-part structure, the fifth chapter of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is the exact symmetrical counterpart to the first. The childhood overture and two Clongowes episodes, separated by the Christmas dinner scene, are the mirror image of the two movements of Stephen's wanderings through Dublin, separated by the villanelle episode, and the diary finale. Genetically, the novel's beginning and its end appear closely interdependent.

It seems that it was a decision to abandon the sequential or cyclic narrative by episodes as used in *Stephen Hero* in favor of a chiasmic center design that broke the impasse in which Joyce found himself over *A Portrait* (and which may have contributed to the desperate action of the attempted burning of the intermediary manuscript in 1911). The textual history of Chapter V documents this momentous change in the compositional concept, and there is much reason to believe that from the fifth chapter it retroactively affected the entire work. Discounting the overture and the finale, which functionally relate as much to the entire novel as they do to their respective chapters, the

first and last chapters are each chiastically centered on the Christmas dinner scene and on the composition of the villanelle.

Of the three middle chapters, Chapters II and IV are in themselves still basically narrated in a linear sequence of episodes. So is Chapter III, although here the sequential progression is stayed by the unifying and centralizing effect of a concentration on the single event of the religious retreat. But the chiastic disposition of the novel's beginning and end alters the functional relationships within the middle chapters. Chapters II and IV take on a centripetal and a centrifugal direction, and the religious retreat becomes, literally and structurally, the dead center of the novel. If it has been correct to infer an earlier state of Chapter III where four, five, or even six sermons were given verbatim, and therefore of necessity in an overtly sequential manner, then the revision, which essentially left only the two hell sermons as rendered in the preacher's own words, was undertaken to emphasize the chapter's midpoint position in the chiastic structure of the book. Within Chapter III, divided by Joyce's familiar asterisks into three parts, the beginning in Nighttown and the close in Church Street chapel stand in obvious symmetrical contrast. From the close of Chapter II, the Nighttown opening leads naturally into the hell sermon center. The long search for a satisfactory chapter conclusion to lead out of it, indicated by the late inclusion of the final twenty-nine manuscript pages, may reflect Joyce's awareness of how essential for the work's inner balance it was to give the narrative exactly the proper momentum at the onset of its centrifugal movement.

But Joyce's concern in the final shaping of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* was not structural only. It was also one of thematic and symbolic heightening. To this the reorganisation of Chapters I and II bears witness that can be inferred from close textual scrutiny.

In the novel's first chapter, three boyhood episodes follow the overture. The first and the last of these involve the reader intensely in Stephen Dedalus' sufferings away from home at Clongowes Wood College. In between, the Christmas dinner scene stands out in contrast. At the same time, several devices of narrative design, poetic patterning, and thematic development serve to anchor this scene in its given position. Its opening sentence, "A great fire, banked high and red, flamed in the grate" (1.716), appears as the reversal of the preceding fire-to-water modulation of "The fire rose and fell on the wall. It was like waves. . . . He saw the sea of waves, long dark waves rising and falling, dark under the moonless night" (1.696, 700). The night, in Stephen's vision and dream, is that of Parnell's last return to Ireland. It is thus on Parnell that the first Clongowes episode mystically culminates. The motif is taken up and developed as a central theme of the Christmas dinner controversy. In its course, the anti-Parnellite incarnate among the characters is Dante. Consequently, the repeated instances where she and her symbolically green and maroon-colored attributes (brushes first, then [1.713-14]

dress and mantle) were introduced, also provide structural support and thematic preparation for the Christmas dinner scene.

By means of anticipations and projections of later developments, the episode equally points beyond itself in the novel. Stephen, unable to understand who is right and who is wrong in the dispute arising over the Christmas dinner, recalls by association that Dante “did not like him to play with Eileen because Eileen was a protestant” (1.999–1000). Here, in repeating to himself the question—“How could a woman be a tower of ivory or a house of gold? Who was right then?” (1.1003–1005)—he provides himself with the words from which, in the second Clongowes episode, the epiphanous identification of Eileen with the Virgin will spring (1.1257–60). A similar connection is established in Stephen’s thoughts between the Christmas turkey and Mr. Barrett’s pandybat: “Why did Mr Barrett in Clongowes call his pandybat a turkey?” (1.801–2). Here the main motif of the chapter’s concluding section is announced for the first time. Furthermore, the Christmas dinner scene, as it introduces the persons of the inner family circle into the action proper, characterizes not only Dante, whose presence in the novel ends with this scene, and Mr. Casey, who is here given his only appearance, but also Stephen’s father and mother, to whom as characters in the novel our relationship is to a considerable extent determined by their roles in this scene. And it gives us a glimpse, at least, of uncle Charles. At the opening of Chapter II, he will be seen to be of similar importance as friend and mentor to Stephen in his later, as Dante was in his earlier, childhood.

It is not certain that the reader would stop to wonder why uncle Charles should first, and somewhat flatly, be introduced directly into the action of the Christmas dinner scene without bringing with him the full stature of one of the early novel’s important “round” characters which he so vividly acquires later. Yet, surely, many details which we later learn about him—his serene and peace-loving nature, and his sincere piety—would help to explain (as they do in retrospect) his attempts to pacify Simon Dedalus and Mr. Casey, as well as his own calm restraint during the heated argument. The reference to Mr. Barrett at Clongowes and his pandybat, however, must give pause. It appears as a genuinely false lead, for within the fiction of *A Portrait*, it is not Mr. Barrett but Father Dolan who wields the pandybat at Clongowes. While it is true that in the course of the second Clongowes episode “old Barrett” (1.1293) is mentioned in passing as being somehow connected with the disciplinary system in force at Clongowes, there is here, it would seem, a contextual discrepancy sufficient to provide a clue to the discovery not only of successive revisions to the Christmas dinner scene, but also to its repositioning, in the final structuring of the novel, from a place it originally held in the second chapter, to its present location in the first chapter, of *A Portrait*.

To trace the compositional process, it is necessary to go back to the planning notes for *Stephen Hero*. As entered on the blank leaves in the copybook

containing the manuscript of the 1904 narrative essay "A Portrait of the Artist," these provide for a "Christmas party" in the eighth chapter, in a central position between "Business complications," "Aspects of the city" and "Visits to friends," "Belvedere decided on."²⁶ In a letter of 7 February 1905, furthermore, James Joyce reminds his brother Stanislaus that "Mrs Riordan who has left the house in Bray returns . . . to the Xmas dinner-table in Dublin" (*Letters* II, 79). If the wording "Christmas party" in the notes may leave room for doubt,²⁷ the letter is unequivocal in giving a Dublin setting to the Christmas dinner episode in *Stephen Hero*. It was doubtless assigned to the Christmas of 1892, a few months before Stephen (like James Joyce) entered Belvedere College. It is probably significant that Sullivan²⁸ identifies Mr. Barrett of *A Portrait* as Patrick Barrett, S.J., a scholastic stationed at Belvedere College. The name would seem to point to the survival into *A Portrait* of textual vestiges from *Stephen Hero*.

In the *Portrait* paragraph immediately preceding Stephen's recollection of the name Mr. Barrett had for his pandybat, the purchase of the Christmas turkey is related. Stephen's father "had paid a guinea for it in Dunn's of D'Olier Street" (1.797), a poulterer and game dealer in Dublin's finest shopping district. But, as the family is still living in Bray at the time of the Christmas scene in *A Portrait*, one wonders—while not discounting Simon Dedalus', *alias* John Joyce's, predilection for living in style even in progressively adverse circumstances, which would presumably stretch to buying the Christmas turkey from only the choicest of poulterers—why the bird could not have been procured from somewhere nearer home. At least, Dun's of D'Olier Street, a ten-minute walk at the most from 14 Fitzgibbon Street off Mountjoy Square, the first of the Joyce residences in Dublin (*JJ* 35), would be a more natural place to buy it if the family were already living in the city, as the Daedalus family was at the time of the Christmas dinner episode in *Stephen Hero*. When the Christmas dinner scene was rewritten for *A Portrait*, therefore, materials of the *Stephen Hero* Christmas dinner episode appear to have been reused.

From the evidence of various textual details, it may be assumed that, as *Stephen Hero* was rewritten to become *A Portrait*, the scene initially retained the position it held in *Stephen Hero*. In fact, the very survival of the narrative detail about Dunn's of D'Olier Street is the more easily accounted for if the episode was originally cast in Dublin surroundings not only in *Stephen Hero*, but in *A Portrait* also. Similarly, John Casey's opening of his story "about a very famous spit" amuses by the unbashful expedient employed to relate the story to a new setting for the scene in the novel. "It happened not long ago in the county Wicklow" is how John Casey might have begun in Dublin; "It happened not long ago in the county Wicklow where we are now" (1.964–66) is how he begins in Bray. Also, that sentence about Mr. Barrett, "Why did Mr Barrett in Clongowes call his pandybat a turkey?" (1.801) would cause no disturbance at a point in the novel corresponding to the

episode's position in *Stephen Hero*. One is struck by the specification "Mr Barrett in Clongowes" and its reinforcement, as if in afterthought: "But Clongowes was far away." (1.803) This is just a little curious when Clongowes is the only school Stephen has so far experienced and from which he is away for a brief Christmas leave only. It would better fit the situation in Chapter II where he has left Clongowes never to return. At that point, too, Stephen's recollection of Mr. Barrett's pandybat would not, as in the final text, have the signaling force of a first mention of the pandying motif. Rather, it would appear as but an incidental memory of the disciplinary atmosphere of Clongowes, introduced only when, as readers, we had already shared Stephen's gruesome experience of unjust punishment at Father Dolan's hands. At the same time, a passing reference to "old Barrett" in the boys' conversation, establishing that Father Dolan was not the only punishing agent at Clongowes, would have prepared us for Mr. Barrett. There would be no danger of reacting to him as to a false lead in the novel.

The strongest reason for assuming that the Christmas dinner scene was still set in a Chapter II context in an early *Portrait* draft is the way in which, even in its final form, it presents uncle Charles. He is essentially not characterized in the scene itself, and there is almost no previous indication that he belongs to the family circle. His proper introduction follows at the beginning of Chapter II. Here, in the summer after the Clongowes events, he energetically does all the shopping at Bray, and often covers ten or twelve miles of the road on a Sunday with Stephen and his father (*cf.* 2.73–76). In the autumn, he moves with the family to Dublin, where he soon "[grows] so witless that he [can] no longer be sent out on errands" (2.220–21). The uncle Charles of the Christmas dinner scene is this feeble old man, confined to the house, left behind when Simon Dedalus and John Casey go for their Christmas day constitutional. He sits "far away in the shadow of the window" (1.723–24) and does not join in the other men's banter; nor is he given a thimbleful of whisky to whet his appetite. When all take their seats for dinner, he has to be roused gently: "Now then, sir, there's a bird here waiting for you" (1.784).

The novel's final text still shows the episode's initial place:

He went once or twice with his mother to visit their relatives: and, though they passed a jovial array of shops lit up and adorned for Christmas, his mood of embittered silence did not leave him. . . . He was angry with himself for being young and the prey of restless foolish impulses, angry also with the change of fortune which was reshaping the world about him into a vision of squalor and insincerity. Yet his anger lent nothing to the vision. He chronicled with patience what he saw, detaching himself from it and tasting its mortifying flavour in secret. (2.243–52)

Here is the right time of year; and the violent quarrel between Dante, Mr. Casey, and Simon Dedalus, all dear to Stephen in their several ways, may very well have served as the crowning epiphany to alter Stephen's view of the

world about him. It is indeed Stephen's mood and state of mind at this point which provide the final clue that it was the first *Portrait* version of the Christmas dinner scene removed from Chapter II (and not its *Stephen Hero* prototype taken directly from that novel's eighth chapter) which was inserted, with careful, though not flawless adaptation, into the episode's final position in Chapter I. Stephen's detachment and his role of patient chronicler as here described explain admirably the style and point of view which make the scene stand in such striking contrast to the Clongowes episodes which now surround it.

In speculating (for there is not sufficient evidence to support safe inferences) about the shape of the novel's second chapter in detail before the Christmas dinner scene was removed from it, two alternatives, basically, may be considered. Either the present sequence of three disjunct epiphanies (2.253–356), exemplifying what Stephen saw and detachedly chronicled, was inserted to fill the gap; or else, the narrative units coexisted in a climactically additive structure, culminating in the disastrous Christmas dispute. The latter view gains support from a comparison with the notes for Chapter VIII of *Stephen Hero*. All materials which were there planned for narrative execution are contained in the second *Portrait* chapter in its final state, plus the Christmas dinner scene. This would imply that, in terms of its narrative structure, the initial draft of the second *Portrait* chapter was not radically distant from its *Stephen Hero* prototype. By retaining a markedly episodic pattern it would have held an intermediary position comparable to that of those lost stages of composition occurring in the process of remolding Chapter V.

When, however, the Christmas dinner scene was repositioned, the shape of the new novel's second chapter changed, and despite the evidence suggesting that Chapter II was simply foreshortened by the length of an episode, we need not assume that in its final form it represents merely a torso of the narrative structure of the earlier version. At least one paragraph in the final text suggests revision after the Christmas dinner scene's removal which involved a reportioning of the chapter possibly extending to a substitution or addition of text. The paragraph in question concludes the present sequence of epiphanies and describes Stephen's attempt, unsuccessful for hours, to write a poem to E—— C—— the morning after their parting on the steps of the last tram the night before. As he doodles, he remembers himself similarly "sitting at his table in Bray the morning after the discussion at the Christmas dinnertable, trying to write a poem about Parnell . . ." (2.367–69). He failed (as Joyce, in the corresponding autobiographical situation, reportedly did not). The presence of this reminiscence in the final text suggests that the Christmas dinner scene in at least one of its earlier forms, and so possibly in its first *Portrait* version, was followed by the description of a scene in which Stephen wrote a poem about Parnell. It is possible even that the paragraph in the present final version preserves in part the text of that description. The writing of the poem to E—— C—— would appear to be a substitution for

the writing of the poem about Parnell. The event which occasions the poem to E—— C—— must be considered to hold the structural place of the Christmas dinner scene before its removal. That is, the epiphany about Stephen and Emma on the steps of the tram moved into this position by the same act of revision that removed the Christmas dinner scene.

Considering the Christmas dinner scene in its present revisional position, one may note several textual details still betraying that the episode was not original to Chapter I. From the portrayal of Dante in it, for example, references to her green and maroon-colored attributes are conspicuously absent. The green and maroon mark young Stephen's way of grasping the opposition in Dante's shifting allegiance to Michael Davitt and Charles Stewart Parnell. Since the colors are otherwise so consistently associated with the Parnell motif in Chapter I, it is not easily conceivable that they should not in some manner have been woven in if the Christmas dinner scene from the beginning had been written to follow the first Clongowes section and had been evolved directly from it.

On the other hand, it appears that three passages, at least, were added wholly or in part to adapt the scene to its Chapter I setting. They are 1.802–9, or possibly 802–16 (that is, all of the paragraph after "But Clongowes was far away," and possibly much of the subsequent paragraph, too); 1.990–1011, and 1.1058–1073. These passages extend the point of view established as Stephen's and maintained throughout the remainder of the first chapter. They display the schoolboy's thought pattern, his stream of consciousness triggered by smells, warmth, the sensation of "queerness," the sound of a voice, things nice or not nice, and his worry over the meaning of words, and over the rightness or wrongness of things. Without them, the episode is constructed almost wholly by dialogue which, with the emotional reactions of all the characters to it (including Stephen's), is told by a narrator, verging on the omniscient, from the vantage point of an outside observer.

By inference, the dialogue structure, still predominant in the episode's final form, represents the shape of the scene before it was adapted to fulfill the functions of its Chapter I position. Yet the adaptation did not apparently leave the dialogue entirely untouched. Simon Dedalus' emphatic outburst, in response to John Casey's suggestion that the Irish priests "hounded" Parnell into his grave: "Sons of bitches! . . . When he was down they turned on him to betray him and rend him like rats in a sewer. Lowlived dogs!" (1.943–5) is imaginable in an earlier foreshortened form confined to canine imagery alone. The phrase "and rend him like rats in a sewer" is a reference to the square ditch at Clongowes (*cf.* 1.126–7 and 269–70; and see below) and would thus appear a late addition. Moreover, near this point in the dispute we find two further utterances of Simon Dedalus' which would seem to be late additions to the *Portrait* text because, from the evidence, they were made by John Joyce only at Christmas 1909 when James Joyce was at home in Dublin from Trieste. In his "Alphabetical notebook.," below an entry datable to Christmas

1909, Joyce reminded himself about several of his father's idiosyncrasies and characteristic remarks.²⁹ "He offers the pope's nose at table," and "He calls a prince of the church a tub of guts," "He calls Canon Keon frosty face and Cardinal Logue a tub of guts" are the entries which refer to "There's a tasty bit here we call the pope's nose" (1.903) and "Respect! . . . Is it for Billy with the lip or for the tub of guts up in Armagh [i.e., Cardinal Logue, archbishop of Armagh]? Respect!" (1.923-4) Just how much altogether the earlier dialogue of the Christmas dinner scene was retouched or rewritten cannot be determined. From the instances that can be made out, however, it is clear that the episode was adapted with some care to its new position in Chapter I.

In James Joyce's childhood, the quarrel between John Joyce, John Kelly, and Hearn Conway which grew so noisy that it was heard by the Vances across the road, broke out over the Christmas dinner in 1891, when the Joyce family was still living in Bray (*JJ* 34). It was by an act of "poetic license," developing and responding to the narrative logic of *Stephen Hero* as it unfolded before him, that Joyce there gave the Christmas dinner scene a setting in 1892 and in Dublin, molding it into the experience of an older Stephen who had, we may assume, an increased understanding of the events he witnessed. That is the direction the scene's exposition still points to: "And Stephen smiled too for he knew now that it was not true that Mr Casey had a purse of silver in his throat" (1.733-34). Exact autobiographical correspondence was not Joyce's primary concern. This circumstance should be borne in mind when, in *A Portrait*, the episode again takes place in 1891. 1891 was the year of Parnell's death. In the final *Portrait*, Chapter I is a chapter as much about Parnell and Ireland as about Stephen and Clongowes, and its strength derives from this thematic correspondence which establishes significant reference to areas its schoolboy world by itself does not reach.

It is Parnell's death and burial which provide the symbolic focus for the beginning of the novel. In order to make the historical event assume structural control over the fiction, the two and a half years, from September 1888 to April 1891, which James Joyce spent at Clongowes Wood College are condensed into Stephen's one year, autumn 1891 to spring 1892, at that school. James Joyce and Stephen Dedalus were at no time contemporaries at Clongowes. In Stephen's year there, the action proper of the novel opens on the day when he changes from "77" to "76" the number in his desk indicating the days which remain until he will rejoin his family. Christmas Eve is the day which the *Portrait* text, by means of Stephen's dream on the night when his fever develops, establishes as the date of reference for his calculation: "Holly and ivy for him and for Christmas" (1.476-77). According to the calendar, then, the novel opens on a day which falls exactly between the day of Parnell's death (October 6th) and that of his burial (October 11th). There can be no doubt about the significance; nor indeed of the fact that Joyce intentionally established the correspondence. For in the Dublin holograph of *A Portrait*, he

erased the numerals which were first given as “thir(ty?)–seven” and “(thirty?)–six and wrote in their stead “seventy–seven” and “seventy–six” (1.101–2 and 282–3; *JJA* [9], 19, 45).

The seventy–sixth day before Christmas is October 9th. The next day Stephen is taken to the infirmary. He has a fever fantasy of his own death. They give him no medicine, but in the evening, as the fire rises and falls on the wall, he sinks into a recuperative sleep. In it, he has a dream or vision which synchronizes his time and Parnell’s. The scene which he sees under the dark moonless night is that of Parnell’s return to Ireland’s shore as the ship which carries his body approaches the pierhead. The harbor is Kingstown; the time is daybreak of 11 October 1891, the day when the Irish buried their dead hero. By extension of the sequential numbering, it is the morning of the 74th day before Christmas. Thus, at the end of the first *Portrait* episode Stephen does not die like Little; he recovers. There are for him no “tall yellow candles on the altar and round the catafalque” (1.598–99). In Stephen’s sleep of convalescence, Parnell’s death stands for his own: “He is dead. We saw him lying upon the catafalque” (1.709). Parnell dies so that Stephen may live. That is why, in the novel, Parnell’s return across the waves of the Irish Sea to be mourned by his people and buried in Ireland’s soil, and Stephen’s return to life from a sickness–to–death (as he imagines it) are synchronized to take place during the same night and early morning hours of 11 October 1891.

From the vantage point of this moment of structural significance, one may discern patterns in the fictional web and their links with real events. It was the seventy–seventh day before Christmas, the first day specifically mentioned in the story (though the action proper does not set in until the next day), which saw the incident that caused Stephen’s illness: “Wells . . . had shouldered him into the square ditch the day before . . . It was a mean thing to do; all the fellows said it was” (1.265–69). According to the calendar, this was October 8th. The narrative development of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, then, proceeds from the meanness and injury Stephen suffered at the hands of a schoolfellow, and fellow Irishman, on the first post–Parnellite day in Irish history.³⁰ And it was on October 8th of another year, 1904, that a young Irish couple, James Joyce and Nora Barnacle, left Dublin’s North Wall for a life of exile. With the superior touch of the artist in full control of his narrative, Joyce thus ensures that in a novel which leads into exile the beginning prefigures the end.

Here, to be sure, the allusion is indirect and thoroughly submerged. But the synchronization of Stephen’s and Parnell’s time on the morning of October 11th is tangibly present in the narrative. It suggests further significant correspondences among the events from which it derives. It is true that, if the novel’s succession of events is directly projected onto the historical calendar, they are not simultaneous. But it is worth observing that a day or date for Parnell’s death is not given in *A Portrait*. If time may be thought to

be condensed (silently, in the fiction) into the three days which in Christian countries are customarily observed between a death and a burial in remembrance of the three days of Christ's crucifixion, harrowing of hell, and resurrection, then time at the opening of *A Portrait* is seen to be moralized to link Parnell's betrayal and death with Stephen's fall, at the hands of Wells, into the square ditch at Clongowes. There, "a fellow had once seen a big rat jump plop into the scum" (1.126–7 and 269–70). In the Christmas dinner scene, as we have seen, Simon Dedalus is made to say of Parnell: "When he was down they turned on him to betray him and rend him like rats in a sewer." On Stephen's side of the equation, the assumed parallelism of significant action is strangely supported by the actual fact that, in 1891, October 8th, the day Stephen is shouldered into the square ditch, was a Thursday; October 9th, the day he falls ill and, in the evening, hurries to undress for bed saying his prayer quickly quickly "before the gas was lowered so that he might not go to hell when he died" (1.405–6) was a Friday;³¹ October 10th, the day in the infirmary, a Saturday; and October 11th, when Stephen revives at the break of day, a Sunday. On Parnell's side, a similarly significant patterning of the events is prohibited by historical fact: Parnell died on October 6th and was buried on the sixth day thereafter. All the novel can do—and does—is not to relate such fact when it does not tally with the symbolically charged patterns of the fiction. Only pure fiction would permit a narrative of pure significance. But by the patterned interaction of history and fiction as found at the opening of *A Portrait*, and throughout the novel, not only historical event and calendar time are moralized. The fiction, too, Stephen's early schoolboy experience (thoroughly insignificant by itself), acquires symbolic stature.

Significant structure, then, derives here not from an analogy of Joyce's autobiography and the fiction, but from an interaction of history and the fiction. The distinction needs stressing, since it has been through biographical bias that earlier criticism has failed to perceive clearly the meaningful and precise interrelationship of historical event, calendar time, and the narrative in Chapter I of *A Portrait*.³² It remains most remarkable, of course, that the narrative detail by which everything falls into place, that is, the "right" number of days which separate the events of the first Clongowes episode from Christmas, and thus also from the Christmas dinner, was not present in the text until introduced by revision in the faircopy manuscript. Only then was the chapter's symbolic potential finally realized. James Joyce creatively responded to the disposition of the narrative and the juxtaposition of episodes that he had brought about. The observable act of revision in the final manuscript thus additionally contributes to proving that the Christmas dinner scene only late in the novel's textual history found its present position in Chapter I. Before it did, no particular significance would have attached to the numbers in Stephen's desk; any numbers would have served.

IV

To sum up: from Stanislaus Joyce's testimony we know that James Joyce began to write *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in September 1907. By 7 April 1908, he had finished three chapters. These, we must assume, were first drafts of the novel's first half which do not as such survive. During the remainder of 1908 no more than partial drafts of Chapter IV appear to have been written. In February of 1909, Ettore Schmitz's praise and criticism of the three completed chapters, plus, apparently, an additional early stretch of narrative of Chapter IV, gave Joyce encouragement to continue with the novel. The only certain knowledge we have of his work between 1909 and sometime in 1911 is that he completed Chapter IV and entered upon the composition of Chapter V. All of Chapter IV and the first thirteen manuscript leaves of Chapter V survive intact in the Dublin holograph from the *Portrait* manuscript which was nearly destroyed in 1911.

Notes or draft materials for Chapters I–IV of *A Portrait* are generally absent, and all of Chapters I–XIV of the *Stephen Hero* manuscript, in particular, is lost. If an inference from these facts is possible, Chapters I–IV of *A Portrait* were by 1911, or even perhaps as early as sometime in 1909, considered essentially completed. Joyce's "Alphabetical notebook" contains materials used almost exclusively in Chapter V of *A Portrait*, and in *Ulysses*. Its inception appears to date from the months of Joyce's visit to Dublin in 1909,³³ where, while he was separated from his manuscript, his memory of persons and incidents would have been refreshed and enriched.

By Joyce's own dating in retrospect, the incident of the near destruction of the *Portrait* manuscript occurred in the latter half of 1911. This was a true moment of crisis in the prepublication history. The "charred remains of the MS" (*Letters* I, 136) remained tied up in an old sheet for some months, and thus it was in 1912 that the writing of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* entered its culminating phase. According to the mark of division set by the manuscript pages that were transferred physically into the Dublin holograph, Joyce's post-1911 labors were threefold. He composed all of Chapter V, or approximately the last third of the book, in its final form. From it, he devised an essentially new structural plan for the entire book. This involved a reorganisation of Chapters I and II, centered on repositioning and revising the Christmas dinner scene, that intensified symbolical historic and mythic correspondences in the text. Chapters I–III were recopied in their entirety. The operations were interrelated and interdependent, and the creative achievement, one may well believe, was on a scale that would have required the best part of two years' work.

In 1913, when the title page of the Dublin holograph was dated, the end appears to have been well in sight. On Easter Day 1913, Joyce himself envisaged finishing his novel by the end of the year (*Letters* I, 73). He may,

however, as so often, have underestimated the time he would need to complete it. He signed the final manuscript page "Dublin 1904 Trieste 1914," and the sections of text which apparently were last included in the manuscript, such as the end of Chapter III and the revised villanelle episode, may not have reached their final form much before they were required as copy for the Trieste typist in, presumably, the summer of 1914. But it is a conclusion from the preceding genetic critical approach that, in essence, the novel attained the shape and structure in which we now possess it during 1912 and 1913. Despite all vicissitudes and misfortunes of his day-to-day life,³⁴ these were two years of concentrated creativity for James Joyce, as he was forging and welding together *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

Notes

1. The narrative essay appears to have given the origin for the date-line at the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*: "Dublin 1904/Trieste 1914." A photoreprint of "A Portrait of the Artist" is available in [vol. 7] of *The James Joyce Archive [JJA]*. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), pp. 70–94. It has been reprinted, with many oversights and errors, in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: Text, Criticism, and Notes*, eds. Chester G. Anderson and A. Walton Litz, Viking Critical Library (New York: Viking Press, 1968), pp. 257–68. In a more reliable text, it appears in Robert Scholes and Richard M. Kain, eds., *The Workshop of Daedalus: James Joyce and the Raw Materials for A Portrait of The Artist as a Young Man* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1965), pp. 60–68.

2. From freshly assessed evidence, I argue in the "Introduction," pp. 1–2, to James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993), that Joyce indeed began his autobiographical novel sometime in the first half of 1903, that is, almost a year earlier than has hitherto been assumed. That he probably wrote just the first seven of the projected nine times seven (=63) chapters before setting down the narrative essay in January 1904 is indicated by the fact that the notes on the blank leaves of the "Portrait of the Artist" copy-book concern *Stephen Hero* from Chapter VIII onwards. If taken with these modifications, the "Appendix" to Hans Walter Gabler, "The Seven Lost Years of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*," in: Thomas F. Staley and Bernard Benstock (eds.), *Approaches to Joyce's Portrait. Ten Essays*. ([Pittsburgh:] University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976), pp. 53–56, should remain essentially valid. A subsequent in-depth study, however, is Claus Melchior, "Stephen Hero: Textentstehung und Text. Eine Untersuchung der Kompositions-und Arbeitsweise des frühen James Joyce." Diss. München, 1988.

3. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 264, 314, subsequently cited as *JJ*.

4. The one missing leaf is the first of the "Fragments from a Late *Portrait* Manuscript" (*Workshop*, p. 107), now at the British Library. It has been incorporated in its proper place in the photoreprint of the Dublin holograph (*JJA*, vols. [9] and [10]).

5. The actual numbers are 239–41, 243–313. But, with no lacuna in the text, this is apparently a simple error in the numbering, as Harriet Weaver noted when she checked the manuscript: "evidently a mistake for 242. H.S.W."

6. *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. II, ed. Richard Ellmann (New York: Viking Press, 1966), pp. 226f. [*Letters II*]

7. *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. I, ed. Stuart Gilbert (1957; New York: Viking Press, 1966), p. 136. [Letters I]

8. On this point Anderson (Chester G. Anderson, "The Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait . . .*" *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 65 [1964], pp. 182–84) and JJ, 354, basically agree. I follow these authorities in "Zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik des *Portrait*," in Wilhelm Füger, ed., *James Joyces Portrait: Das "Jugendbildnis" im Lichte neuerer deutscher Forschung* (Munich, 1972), p. 22; and also—though with a cautionary footnote after first looking into the fair-copy manuscript—in "Towards a Critical Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*," *Studies in Bibliography* 27 (1974): 28.

9. All references (by chapter.line numbers) are to James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993; and New York: Vintage International, Vintage Books, 1993). Italics indicating revisions are mine.

10. JJA [7], p. 86; *Workshop*, p. 69.

11. Quantitatively, however, it is unlikely that the earlier text was augmented by a full 50 percent, as the addition of 124 pages to the original 238 might suggest. As compared to the inscription of Chapter IV, the columns of text in the freshly inscribed chapters are distinctly narrower, especially so throughout Chapter I. This factor alone would account for many more pages in the new manuscript portion.

12. As noted in Anderson, "The Text," p. 170n.

13. See especially Hugh Kenner, *Dublin's Joyce* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1955), pp. 114–16.

14. "He gave me money to wire to Nora on Christmas Eve." JJA [7], p. 145, and *Workshop*, p. 103.

15. JJA [7], pp. 145–6, and *Workshop*, p. 104.

16. Ibid.

17. In his 1944 edition of *Stephen Hero* (New York: New Directions), Theodore Spencer judged Joyce's red and blue crayon markings in the manuscript to be cancellations. See his "Editorial Note," p. 18. The evidence has meanwhile been thoroughly reconsidered by Claus Melchior (see above note 2).

18. JJA [10], pp. 1219–1222, and *Workshop*, pp. 107–08.

19. *Workshop*, p. 85.

20. A. Walton Litz, *The Art of James Joyce* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), Appendix B, pp. 132–35.

21. *The Art of James Joyce*, p. 137.

22. *Stephen Hero* (New York: New Directions 1944; 1963), p. 135; JJA [8], 441–43.

23. "The Text," p. 179n.

24. JJA [10], p. 1220, and *Workshop*, p. 107.

25. Four times, at 5.1770, 1805, 2069 and 2233.

26. JJA [7], p. 92 and *Workshop*, p. 73.

27. "Party" is an odd word to use for the family Christmas dinner; the reference just might be to the children's party of which Epiphany no. 3 (JJA [7], p. 54 and *Workshop*, p. 13) gives the conclusion, subsequently slightly, if significantly, varied in 2.322–49.

28. Kevin Sullivan, *Joyce among the Jesuits* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 92. Curiously, "Mr" Barrett of *A Portrait* is titled "Father" Barrett in the Dublin holograph, and even in the original inscription of the typescript copied from the manuscript. The change from "Father" to "Mr" is one of the very few alterations Joyce himself made in the typescript. The late revisional touch establishes particularly clearly that the character subsequently referred to in *A Portrait* as "old Barrett" (1.1293) and "Paddy Barrett" (1.1450) is thought of as "a scholastic not yet admitted to the priesthood" (cf. Chester G. Anderson and A. Walton Litz (eds.), *A Portrait . . . : Text, Criticism, and Notes* [New York: Viking, 1968], p. 494) and would seem to confirm Sullivan's identification of the historical character prototype.

29. Cf. above, note 15.

30. Parnell died in England on 6 October, but the news only reached Ireland on the 7th (see, impressively, *Workshop*, pp. 136–37). October 8th, therefore, can properly be said to be the first post-Parnellite day in Irish history.

31. In bed, “the yellow curtains”—yellow like the candles round the catafalque—“shut him off on all sides” (1.422–23). Stephen hears the prefect’s shoes descending the staircase. They guide his feverish imagination to a black dog with eyes as big as carriagelamps, and the ghosts of inhabitants of the castle long deceased. The prefect comes back the next morning to take Stephen to the infirmary. Is he, by fleeting association, Stephen’s guide, as in a *Divina Commedia*, in a descent to hell?

32. Arnold Goldman, “Stephen Dedalus’s Dream of Parnell,” *JJQ* 6 (Spring 1969), 262–64, anticipates important elements of the present argument, but remains puzzled by inconsistencies between Joyce’s biography and the fiction.

33. The notebook gives the appearance of having been arranged, and begun with a run of its first entries through most of the alphabetical headings, at one time. Consequently, the dateable entry under “Pappie” (see above, note 14) takes on significance for the dating of the whole notebook.

34. *JJ*, chapters 20 and 21 *passim*.