

GENETIC INROADS INTO THE ART OF JAMES JOYCE

HANS WALTER GABLER





<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

©2024 Hans Walter Gabler



This work is licensed under an Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the text; to adapt the text for non-commercial purposes of the text providing attribution is made to the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Attribution should include the following information:

Hans Walter Gabler, *Genetic Inroads into the Art of James Joyce*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0325>

Copyright and permissions for the reuse of the images included in this publication may differ from the above. This information is provided in the captions and in the list of illustrations.

Further details about CC BY-NC licenses are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at <https://archive.org/web>

Any digital material and resources associated with this volume will be available at <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0325#resources>

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-80064-884-5

ISBN Hardback: 978-1-80064-885-2

ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-80064-886-9

ISBN Digital ebook (EPUB): 978-1-80064-887-6

ISBN XML: 978-1-80064-889-0

ISBN HTML: 978-1-80064-890-6

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0325

Cover image: Paul O'Mahony, *James Joyce* (2009), <https://bit.ly/3ZKANwf>

Cover design by Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

Towards a Critical Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, the book which James Joyce had been writing for ten years since embarking upon it in Dublin in 1904, was completed in manuscript in Trieste in 1914. Fifty years later, in 1964, the Viking Press published a 'definitive text, corrected from the Dublin holograph'.¹ Though not critical, and although presenting a text which even the scholar who prepared it does not consider truly definitive, this edition of the novel represents the first attempt ever made to relate its printed versions back to the authorial manuscript. For the first time also—though not published with the text—an account appeared of the textual history of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* from the manuscript of 1913/14 to the Jonathan Cape edition of 1924, the last in which the author himself had a hand.² Some problems of the text and of its transmission have there been recognised and solved. The presence of others has not been noticed and sometimes not even suspected. Nor has all available documentary material relating to the textual history of the novel as yet been recorded. In this chapter, therefore, I propose first to describe and interpret three documents from British libraries, all preserved by Harriet Shaw Weaver and in 1951 and 1952 given by

1 James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. The definitive text, corrected from the Dublin holograph by Chester G. Anderson, ed. by Richard Ellmann (New York: The Viking Press, 1964).

2 Chester G. Anderson, 'The Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 65 (1964), 160-200. This is a but slightly revised version of the Introduction to Chester G. Anderson, '*A Portrait* . . . Critically Edited . . .', unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy (Columbia University, 1962).

her to the British Museum and to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, which clarify essential stages of the publishing history and the transmission of the text, and then to discuss the central issues of an overall textual hypothesis which could form the basis of an editorial approach to create a true critical edition of the novel.

The Egoist Tearsheets

The first printed text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* was serialised in *The Egoist*, London, in 1914 and 1915. Tearsheets from *The Egoist* were circulated in 1915 and 1916 during the sustained, though long unsuccessful, efforts of literary agent James B. Pinker, Ezra Pound, and above all Harriet Shaw Weaver to find an English publisher—and later, when the firm of The Egoist Ltd. had been founded for the very purpose of publishing *A Portrait*, to find a printer in England willing to take on the novel in book form. The search³ ended only when B. W. Huebsch of New York undertook both to publish *A Portrait* in the United States and to supply The Egoist Ltd. with the sheets for 750 copies,⁴ which became the first edition of the book to be published in England.⁵ Over time, successive lots of tearsheets of the serialised *Egoist*

3 It is described in much detail, which often corrects assumptions by Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp. 190 ff., in chapters 5 and 6 of Jane Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson, *Dear Miss Weaver. Harriet Shaw Weaver 1876-1961* (New York: The Viking Press, 1970).

4 The exact number delivered was 768. See Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 128.

5 Contrary to the nomenclature in John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon, *A Bibliography of James Joyce, 1882-1941* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), it is bibliographically correct only to speak of one first edition, the first impression of which was published in two separate simultaneous issues variant merely in the two distinct states of the title page, and issued in two different bindings. The variant title pages are both conjugate in their sheets and were probably printed by stop-press alteration from separate plates for which the identical typesetting of author and title was used. There is distinct type-damage to four separate letters (the 'e' in 'the', the 'a' in 'a', the 'M' in 'Man' and the 'C' in 'JOYCE') which positively secures the identification. Owing to the absence of B. W. Huebsch's publisher's device from the title page of the London issue, its typographical layout differs in the wider spacing between the two lines each for author and title: the lines 'BY | JAMES JOYCE' have as a block been moved further down the page. Beyond that, the variance of the title pages is merely in the alternative imprints. This first edition was never corrected but for a few minor alterations in its plates and ran out in 1950 in its 44th impression, while a second American edition, editorially corrected by Harry Levin, began its run in 1947 and went into many impressions and several separate issues, American and English. The edition named by Slocum-Cahoon 'The First English Edition, English

printing were sent across the Atlantic, corrected and uncorrected, and in complete sets of the text as well as in units of two or three chapters. What has survived of these several dispatches to America now forms three separate complete sets of tearsheets in the Slocum Collection at Yale University.⁶ One of them—EC—A—gains its integrity as a set from having served as the printer's copy for the Huebsch edition (H).

The library of the British Museum in London holds a fourth set of tearsheets. It came to the British Museum from Harriet Shaw Weaver in October 1951. Following Anderson's sigla I shall call it EC—W. This set does not enter the transmission of the text of *A Portrait* beyond the *Egoist* serialisation, but it clarifies some aspects of the transfer into print of the typescript, which itself is largely lost, by providing evidence that none of the censoring cuts which affect the *Egoist* text in its published form were made until the last moment before publication. In its substantive readings, Joyce's text was set up as unimpaired as the typescript transmitted it by the compositors of all three printers employed by *The Egoist* during the serialisation of the novel. The EC—W tearsheets prove that printing-house editors must be held responsible for the cuts.⁷ EC—W contains as an insert the left column of a proof of page 289 (*The Egoist*, 1 August 1914) which begins Chapter III of the novel. It includes the entire five-paragraph passage in print which was subsequently removed from

sheets' (1918) is in truth the second edition of the novel, and it is the 'first English edition' only in so far as it is the fountainhead of the authorially corrected English line of the text. Of the fifth impression of the original American first edition, there was in 1921 once more a separate issue for The Egoist Ltd. in London. This is not the 'third edition' (nor, of course, the fifth). Bibliographically, the reset Jonathan Cape publication of 1924 is the true third edition. As it is reset from the London edition of 1918, it might under the special circumstances governing the textual transmission of this novel be termed the second English edition. It had numerous impressions until it was replaced in 1956 by the reset Jonathan Cape illustrated edition (the third in England).

- 6 These have been seen and described by Chester G. Anderson: see Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp. 186–190.
- 7 Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, pp. 92, 99, and 103 gives vivid accounts of when and how Harriet Weaver was forced to give in to the demands for excision; with respect to the sentences omitted near the end of Chapter IV, Harriet Weaver herself wrote in the margin of Joyce's letter to her of 24 July 1915: '... the managers of the firm objected to certain expressions. . . . That was why the *Egoist* changed printers.' James Joyce, *Letters* II, pp. 355 fn. (Full reference to James Joyce's as yet published letters is: *Letters of James Joyce*, ed. by Stuart Gilbert, vol. I (New York: Viking Press, 1957, 2nd 1966) [*Letters* I]; *Letters of James Joyce*, ed. by Richard Ellmann, vols. II and III (New York: Viking Press, 1966). [*Letters* II; *Letters* III]).

the published version of the full page. A short poem, spaced widely so that it corresponds in length to the excised *Portrait* passage, seems to have been inserted as a filler where the 1 August instalment ends at the bottom of the left-hand column on page 291. Similarly, after the published version of p. 128 of *The Egoist*, 2 August 1915, part of a galley proofsheets is inserted which corresponds to a large section of the text found on p. 128, second column, and p. 129, first column, and contains in print both the brief piece of dialogue censored in publication and the twice-repeated word 'ballocks' subsequently replaced by asterisks. Of particular interest in EC-W, moreover, is the fact that all of Chapter IV is in galley proof. Herein also the two sentences near the end of the chapter, which to Joyce's recorded dismay⁸ had disappeared from the published text, are found in print. Their removal caused some respacing and resetting of lines and indeed introduced one new substantive error in the published *Egoist* text. Further collation shows that the galley proofs of Chapter IV are wholly uncorrected and that, while their correction before publication removed many printer's errors, it also introduced new errors into the text.

EC-W, Harriet Weaver's set of tear- and proofsheets of the *Egoist* serialisation of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, is now bound in hard covers in a volume of sixty leaves, which, but for three exceptions—fols. 3–4, 5–6 and 30–31 being conjugate—are separately mounted. The binding was done after the set's accession to the British Museum, and there are signs that before binding it consisted of three, or rather four, individual parts. The text itself came in three separate bundles, with Chapters I and II each by itself, and Chapters III, IV, and V together in a brown paper folder. The British Museum shelf mark is pencilled on each first leaf of these three sections. Because of a bookbinder's decision, moreover, one leaf and two once-folded sheets of errata to Chapters III and IV (with one single erratum for Chapter V) in Joyce's own hand must now be regarded as the fourth section of the set. These manuscript errata lists, although never an integral part of the set of tear- and proofsheets, once accompanied the text in a green envelope, as is stated in a note in Harriet Weaver's hand on the brown paper folder

8 James Joyce to Harriet Weaver, 24 July 1915, *Letters II*, 355.

to Chapters III–V. After binding, the volume as a whole may now be described as follows:

On fol. iv the *Egoist* text begins as page 50 of *The Egoist* of 2 February 1914. This first tearsheet is backed by a pasted-on sheet of white paper, now smudged and grey, which serves as a title page. On it is written in green crayon between ruled lines: 'A Portrait of the Artist | as a Young Man'; the roman numeral I is centred in parentheses—also in green crayon—under the lower rule. The writing is probably Joyce's own. In the bottom left-hand corner are three notes in pencil in Harriet Weaver's hand: 'Prepared by Mr Joyce', 'No corrections here H.S.W.' and 'Nor have I a copy of those of first two chapters'. In the bottom right-hand corner is affixed a printed business card reading: 'It is requested that all communications respecting this M.S. be addressed to—James B. Pinker, Literary Agent, Talbot House, Arundel Street Strand, London [—] Folio'. The name and address 'James B. Pinker . . . London' have been struck out in pencil and replaced by the pencilled address in Harriet Weaver's hand: 'The Egoist Oakley House, Bloomsbury St. London W.C.'

Fols. 2–6 of the bound volume are the manuscript errata lists referred to above, evidently misplaced by the binder in being inserted here. Fol. 2 is a single leaf and is virtually blank but for the three lines written at the top of its recto: 'Errata | "Egoist." 1/ix/914: p. 330, col. 2, par 8, l. 2: delete "of herrings" | "Egoist" 1/vi/915: p. 95, col. 2 par. 4, l. 14: for "immediate" read "mediate"'.⁹ Fols. 3–6 are two once-folded ruled foolscap sheets with four pages each of manuscript corrections to Chapters III and IV. Fol. 3r is headed 'Chapter III'; fol. 5r is headed 'Chapter IV' in Joyce's hand. To the left and right of the heading 'Chapter III' are additional notes in pencil and probably in Harriet Weaver's hand (all of Joyce's writing being in ink): '[Pages are those of *The Egoist*]' and '*A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* Corrections to Egoist'. Vertical ruled lines in ink divide columns for 'Page | Paragraph | Line | Column | Incorrect | Correct' in the corrections to Chapter III and '. . . [Column | Line | . . .]' in those to Chapter IV.

Fols. 7–16 are the *Egoist* tearsheets of Chapter I; fols. 18–26 those of Chapter II. In the upper outside corners of fols. 18–26 recto and verso

9 The latter correction refers to Chapter V. These were perhaps the two errata of which Harriet Weaver enclosed a slip in her letter to B. W. Huebsch of 24 July 1916. (*Letters* I, 92 f.)

the arabic numbers 1–18 have been written in pencil and have been partly cropped. The asterisked divisions between the subsections of both chapters have been underscored, or scored out, in green crayon. In both chapters also, all columns and part-columns of *Egoist* text not belonging to *A Portrait* have been pasted over with strips of white paper; whole pages have sometimes been pasted together and sometimes been backed with white paper for the same purpose of obliterating extraneous matter.

Fols. 17 and 27 are the front and back covers of Chapter II. 17v and 27r+v are blank. On 17r the inscription, in green crayon, 'Portrait of the Artist | as a Young Man | (II)' is in the same hand as that on the title-page for Chapter I. In pencil, at the bottom of the page, are again the following notes by Harriet Weaver: 'Prepared by Mr. Joyce'; 'No corrections here.—H.S.W.' and 'Nor have I copy of those of first two chapters—H.S.W.'. These cover leaves deserve special attention, and I shall return to them below.

Fols. 28 and 60, again blank but for the inscription on fol. 28r, are of brown paper and were in all probability once conjugate as a folder holding the tear- and proofsheets of Chapters III–V and, in addition, the green envelope with the manuscript corrections to Chapters III and IV. Fol. 28r is inscribed in faded black ink: 'Portrait of the Artist | as a Young Man. | Chapters III,IV.V' in what looks like the same hand as that writing the pencilled notes over the manuscript corrections to Chapter III (fol. 3r) and was in all probability Harriet Weaver's. Added after the roman numeral V in black unfaded ink, and definitely by Harriet Weaver, is: 'from | The Egoist, see Mr. Joyce's corrections to | chapters III+IV in green envelope'.

Fol. 29r consists of the left column only of a page proof of the first page of the *Egoist* instalment for 1 August 1914, and contains in print, as described above, the five-paragraph passage from near the beginning of Chapter III which was cut from the published text. The passage, having once been crossed out in pencil, but with the pencil strokes erased, is boxed in orange crayon. Words from a pencilled marginal note only partly legible can be made out as 'Censored, . . . does not appear in . . . *Egoist* of Aug 1'. Another marginal note in ink between orange crayon lines reads, amusingly: 'This paragraph which was deleted by the printers [sic] is to be inserted as marked'. The marking referred to is

made in the appropriate place in the margin of fol. 30r. Fol. 29v is blank. The *Egoist* text of Chapter III occupies fols. 30–36. All extraneous matter is here simply crossed out in pencil and/or orange crayon. An orange crayon note at the bottom of fol. 36v gives the direction: 'go to Chap. IV'. Fols. 37–42 contain Chapter IV in galley proof, in seven long columns which, except for fol. 42 with columns 'SIX' and 'SEVEN', are printed one to a galley. Each galley, about twice the length of an *Egoist* page, is folded over once and bound into the present volume for the length of its bottom half only. All versos of the galleys are of course blank. Fol. 42 contains in each of its columns one of the two sentences later censored. They are both underscored and marked in orange crayon. Written in orange crayon between the columns is the note 'deleted by printers [illegible name in parenthesis]'. The bracketed illegible name is crossed out in black ink, and beneath, with an arrow to 'printers', the name is given as 'Messrs Jas. Truscott + Son'.¹⁰

Fols. 43–59 are the *Egoist* tearsheets of Chapter V, with all extraneous matter crossed out in blue crayon. Interleaved as fol. 55 is the section of a galley proof containing in print the censored passages from Chapter V, as already described. This galley, moreover, also has proof corrections in thin black ink, objecting to the inking of spaces, to broken letters and to spacings between the regular punctuation and the dashes Joyce used instead of inverted commas to set off direct speech. The corrections have been made in the published *Egoist* text. Later than the proof corrections is the crossing out in blue crayon of most of the text in this galley, leaving only the censored lines circled in black ink, with the marginal note 'these lines were deleted by printers—to be inserted as in original text'. The corresponding note for the place of insertion is to be found in the right-hand margin of fol. 54v. Further down in the galley, the two instances of 'ballocks' are underscored in blue crayon, and blue crayon crosses are set against all three textual corrections to be made. Fol. 55v is blank, and in the left margin of fol. 56r the word 'ballocks' is again twice written in in black ink.

Seen as a whole, EC–W contains three further sets of markings which should be recorded. In Chapters I–IV, there are two partly concurrent

10 Partridge & Cooper Ltd., whose name appears in the *Egoist* colophon, were a subsidiary of James Truscott and Son. These were the managers with whom Harriet Weaver had to contend. Cf. above, note 7, and Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 91.

sets of line counts. One of them is in short marginal strokes in thin black ink marking every hundredth line of printed text. Starting afresh at the beginning of each chapter, it is almost faultlessly accurate; but it is also purely mechanical, as is shown by the count for Chapter III which begins in the column of the page proof and runs on into the first column of the published text without allowing for the repetition here of lines already counted. The other set, which is present in Chapters I, II and IV only, is in pencil. In Chapters II and IV it, too, marks off roughly every hundredth line, though it is less accurate and usually deviates by several lines from the line count in ink. In Chapter I, the corresponding divisions in pencil fluctuate between eighty-two and 151 lines in length. In each of the chapters where they appear, the pencilled divisions are serially numbered. In Chapter I and II, there are also a few accompanying additions of figures to be found in the margins. In Chapter V there are no line counts. The tearsheets for this last chapter, however, are the only ones to show a few traces of correction beyond the restoring of censored passages. On fol. 43v, a pencilled marginal note specifies 'dashes all through not inverted commas'; on fol. 46r the twice-repeated misprint 'Epitectus' is each time corrected to 'Epictetus', and in close to twenty instances spread over several pages 'aesthetic' is corrected to 'esthetic' in accordance with Joyce's orthography. Finally, there are throughout the text marginal markings in pencil and indelible pencil which draw attention to a series of apparently undesirable passages of text. None of the restitutions of *Egoist* censorings are so marked, but there is a clear connection between all the markings in pencil in that they note passages which have to do with urine and excrement—beginning, indeed, on the first page with the sentence 'When you wet the bed, first it is warm then it gets cold.'—or else might be considered to have a blasphemous ring to them.¹¹ The markings in indelible pencil, present towards the end of Chapter II and in Chapter III only, stand against two instances of Stephen's sexual fantasies.¹²

11 With reference keyed to the Viking [Anderson] text, the passages in question are: p. 7.13-14/I, 13-14; 43.11-18/I, 1261-1277; 44.32-35/I, 1325-1328; 137.24-30/III, 1260-1267; 138.6-9/III, 1279-1282; 151.5-9/IV, 138-142; 192.8-11/V, 639-642; 200.3-5/V, 920-922; 205.22-28/V, 1114-1119; 206.30-32/V, 1158-1160; 211.29-31/V, 1337-1339; 212.5-7/V, 1350-1352; 242.27-30/V, 2424-2427.

12 P. 98.35-99.10/II, 1363-1373 and p. 115.31-116.7/III, 488-499. The same (?) indelible pencil has bracketed a part-column on p. 71, 16 February 1914 (i.e. Viking [Anderson] p. 22.6-37/I, 526-556), but there is no link in contents between this passage and the other two.

Fols. 17 and 27, the front and back covers of Chapter II, give the initial clue to the interpretation of the evidence set out above. The tearsheets for the first two chapters, as was seen, are separately claimed to have been prepared, with the careful pastings and markings in green crayon described, by James Joyce himself. Corroborative evidence that Harriet Weaver's repeated statement to this effect means what it says comes from the nature of the covers. On closer inspection, they prove to be the two halves of a broadsheet-size piece of thin white cardboard, with printed text in Italian which has been pasted over with white paper.¹³ Against the light, the entire text of the two halves put together, though cropped at the top, is clearly legible as four columns of print setting out the rights and duties of tenants of apartment houses: when to pay rent; the duty of heads of families to provide separate bedrooms for children of different sexes over the age of six; strictures on sub-letting, on keeping pets, etc., etc. The text ends in one line of type across the bottom of the four columns: 'Il presente Regolamento venne approvato dalla G[iu]nta municipale, nella seduta del 6 Febbraio 1912.' and is signed 'IL CONSIGLIO DIRETTIVO'. Being printed on one side only of a thin white cardboard sheet, it looks very much like the general regulations for tenants such as one often finds affixed somewhere near the main entrances of apartment houses in countries like Germany, Switzerland or Austria. In Italy, apparently, the imposition of such rules has never been, nor is to this day, customary. But Trieste in its authoritarian Austrian days may have had them.¹⁴ Thus, from the handmade covers to the tearsheets of Chapter II, it would seem that it was indeed James Joyce himself who carefully pasted up the instalments of Chapters I and II of *A Portrait*, and that he did so in Trieste, shortly after 15 July 1914, when Chapter II ended in *The Egoist*. Thereafter, although Joyce did not leave Trieste until June 1915, he would not have been able to attend to the subsequent chapters in the same manner. For, as we learn from his

13 The full sheet either was cut from the beginning, serving as a divider between the chapters and a protective end cover, or else was used by Joyce as a folder for Chapter II, in which case the British Museum binder cut it apart and inadvertently turned fol. 27 upside down.

14 To Professor Giorgio Melchiori of Rome, who was most conveniently at hand in the British Museum reading room when I made this discovery, I am grateful for confirming my guess as to the nature of the document and for supplying the further information here given.

letter to Harriet Weaver of 24 July 1915 from Zurich (*Letters* II, 355), he received no copy of *The Egoist* in Trieste subsequent to the issue of 15 July 1914. The letter of 24 July 1915, itself an acknowledgement of the receipt of the copies to date of *The Egoist* for 1915, specifies that Joyce had 'not yet seen the numbers for 1 and 15 August, 1 and 15 September and 15 December [1914]'.¹⁵

The Joyce correspondence, besides allowing some inferences as to how EC-W as a whole came about in its present state, makes it possible to trace with some accuracy the history of the first two chapters therein, and incidentally explains the care with which they were prepared. They were the first part, submitted by Joyce himself, of the copy for Grant Richards who, on the basis of the contract for *Dubliners*, had first refusal of Joyce's books until 15 June 1919.¹⁶ On 3 July 1914, Joyce wrote to Grant Richards: 'I shall of course, as agreed between us, give you the opportunity of publishing [*A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*] next year in book. If you cannot find the papers I could send you my copies.' (*Letters* II, 335 f.), and on 30 April 1915, to Harriet Weaver '... the first half of the book was forwarded to him by me last July'.¹⁷ In an undated letter, probably late in January, 1915, Joyce further informed Richards: 'My friend Mr Ezra Pound will send you the fourth, fifth and third chapters of my novel so as to save time' (*Letters* II, 336). Richards had apparently undertaken 'to give a definite answer within three weeks after the completed MS was in his possession',¹⁸ and Joyce was anxious to press his decision, as in the meantime James B. Pinker had made an offer to act as Joyce's literary agent. Ezra Pound was to negotiate an agreement with him on Joyce's behalf, and Joyce wrote to Pound on 17 March 1915: 'The rest of the *Portrait of the Artist* had better be sent on to Grant Richards as soon as it is ready. ... If he decides not to publish ... I am quite willing to entrust the disposal of the rights to Mr Pinker'.¹⁹ On 24 March, Joyce wrote again to Richards (*Letters* II, 337) saying he presumed that the complete copy of the book was now in his possession, but the next day he wrote to Harriet Weaver:

15 *Sic*; should be: 1 and 15 August, 1 September and 1 and 15 December.

16 Cf. Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 190.

17 *Letters* I, 80; 'the first half can refer only to Chapters I and II, as no more had yet been published in July 1914.

18 Letter to Ezra Pound of 17 March 1915, *Letters* III, p. 508.

19 *Ibid.*

Mr Grant Richards, publisher, has the right of refusal of [my novel]. I believe the greater part of the novel is now in his hands. If the last instalments (May to August) have been set up I should be very much obliged if you could have a proof of them pulled. I am sure that Mr Pound will send them on to Mr Grant Richards. My reason for troubling you is that, in view of Mr Pinker's offer, I think it is to my advantage to know as soon as possible Mr Grant Richards' decision (*Letters II*, 338).

Ballantyne, Hanson & Co., the printers of *The Egoist* since the February issue (in which Chapter V commenced) had not yet, however, set up type beyond the issue for 1 April. To oblige Joyce, and in order to enable Richards to reach a decision on the book publication, Harriet Weaver therefore, late in March, 1915, risked parting temporarily with the pages of the Chapter V typescript which had not yet been set up.²⁰ This was technically possible because for the May issue, which was a special Imagist number, the serialisation of *A Portrait* was to be interrupted. There was consequently a time lapse between instalments of two months. On 22 April, Harriet Weaver informed Joyce accordingly, specifying when she needed the typescript returned.²¹ Joyce replied on 30 April, (*Letters I*, 79 f.), and on 7 May he wrote to Pinker: 'The fifth chapter of my novel must . . . be returned to *The Egoist* not later than the 20 May as it is needed for the June issue' (*Letters II*, 341). On 18 May Richards rejected the novel,²² whereupon the disposal of the book rights went to Pinker. The copy which Richards had received piecemeal between July 1914 and April 1915 must also have gone to Pinker. Certainly the tearsheets Joyce

20 Late in March 1915 (c. 29 March) Ezra Pound wrote: 'Dear James Joyce: I took the final chapter of your novel to Grant Richards this a.m.' (*Pound/Joyce. The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*. Edited and with Commentary by Forrest Read (New York: New Directions, 1967), p. 33). In a letter of 22 April to Joyce, Harriet Weaver specifies that 'Mr. Pound sent Mr. Grant Richards . . . the part of the M.S. of your novel which has not yet been set up, together with a complete set of the numbers of 'The Egoist' in which it has appeared up to date. I asked for the M.S. to be returned by 20 May. This would give Mr. Richards two months in which to consider it'. For access to those of Harriet Weaver's letters to James Joyce which concern the publishing of *A Portrait*, in photostats of the holograph originals, I am grateful to Miss Jane Lidderdale [see further fn. 32]. While quotations from them here and below are according to my own transcription, reference should be made to the edition of John Firth, 'Harriet Weaver's Letters to James Joyce 1915-1920', *Studies in Bibliography*, 20 (1967), 151-188.

21 See quotation fn. 20.

22 Cf. Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 400.

had sent him from Trieste of Chapters I and II did, as is witnessed by the Pinker business card on the front leaf of Chapter I in EC-W.

How much of the rest of EC-W originally belonged to the Richards-Pinker copy is less easy to decide. Chapter V stands apart in the set because it alone has the deletions of extraneous matter in blue crayon and contains no line counts. Chapters I, II and IV are linked by the line counts in pencil, not present, as the ones in ink are, in Chapter III. Chapters III and IV in turn are linked by the orange crayon used for cancellations and marginal annotations, and, in addition, by the original title inscription in faded black ink on the brown paper folder: 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Chapters III, IV', to which a dot in the centre of the line and the roman numeral 'V' seem to have been added later. (An even later addition on the brown paper folder are the words in permanent black ink: 'from *The Egoist*, see Mr Joyce's corrections to chapters III+IV in green envelope'.) As the handwriting is apparently Harriet Weaver's, the brown paper folder still extant may well have been the one in which she originally, in February/March 1915, gave Ezra Pound Chapters III and IV for Grant Richards' perusal, but whether both chapters in EC-W are still in the identical sheets in which Richards read them is another question. The absence of line counts in pencil in Chapter III suggests that only Chapters I, II and IV have survived in the present set from the earliest discernible moment of its previous history. There is a possibility that the line counts in pencil are traces of Grant Richards' deliberations over the novel. This would put the galley proofs of Chapter IV among the material gathered together for him by Ezra Pound. It would also mean that an earlier set of tearsheets of Chapter III was replaced by the present set (which has no pencilled line counts) some time after EC-W left Richards. On the other hand, Chapter III shares the line counts in ink with Chapters I, II and IV, but not with Chapter V. Logically one would therefore assume that Chapter III in its present state became part of EC-W before Chapter V in its present state did.

It was in July 1915 that Joyce's London friends and agents were most urgently pressed by the author to enter into negotiations about the book publication of the novel with nothing but a wholly unexpurgated text. On 24 July, Joyce read the end of Chapter IV in the January issue of *The Egoist* as forwarded to him in Zurich and discovered that whole sentences had been left out. He wrote immediately to Harriet Weaver

to complain about the carelessness of the printers, adding: 'My MSS are in Trieste but I remember the text and am sending the correct version of [the] passages [in question] to my agent. The instalments printed by Ballantyne, Hanson and Co (February to July) are of course carefully done. I hope the other printers did not set up the numbers which I have not seen. . . .' (*Letters* II, 355). But they had done so; and when, a week later, Joyce had received and read the remaining issues for 1914 (1 August to 15 December), he wrote even more urgently to Pound:

I find that deletions have been made in my novel: in the issues of 1 August and 1 January. Who has the typescript? Can you send me the pages corresponding to these instalments? If Mr Pinker has it you need not send it. If he has the published version I must have these deleted passages typed at once and sent to him as part of the novel which he is submitting to Martin Secker and Co for publication. (31 July; *Letters* II, 358).

Already, however, there was a reply to his letter of 24 July under way from Harriet Weaver, explaining the textual corruptions and reassuring him that the censored passages were not lost. Harriet Weaver wrote on 28 July:

It was because of Messrs. Partridge+Coopers' stupid censoring of your novel that we left them—that is, they had objected once or twice to things in other parts of the paper, but their behaviour over your novel was the crowning offence. They struck out a passage on Aug. 1st of last year. I could not help it. The rest was set up correctly until they came to the latter part of chapter four where as you have seen some sentences were omitted. I then submitted the whole of chapter five to them. They declined to set it up as it stood + so we left them.

I am sorry to say that Messrs. Ballantyne are now acting in the same way. . . .

Mr Pinker has proofs containing all the deleted matter. I hope you will not have this annoyance when the novel comes to be printed in book form. . . .

The deletions of 1 January 1915 were in print in the Chapter IV galleys, and the Chapter III deletion of 1 August 1914 is contained in the column of the page proof prefixed to the Chapter III tearsheets in EC-W. From the absence of pencilled line counts in these tearsheets on the one hand, and the mechanically uniform application therein of the line counts in ink on the other, it seems probable, indeed, that Harriet Weaver, acting upon Joyce's letter of 24 July, supplied Pinker with a complete new set

of Chapter III tearsheets plus the additional column of the page proof for the beginning of the chapter (rather than with this page proof only) for the actual purpose of his submitting the novel to Secker. At the time, however, she may hastily have entered therein pencil markings only, now partly erased or overruled in orange crayon. The orange crayon markings in their turn, which provide a firm link between the extant sheets of Chapters III and IV, would seem to be later than the pencilled deletions of extraneous matter in Chapter III. They were doubtless made by Harriet Weaver also, but at a time when both chapters as they survive were in her hands at once. As the main function of the orange crayon is to mark and draw attention to the censored passages, she may not have applied it to this end until EC-W eventually passed into her hands and was sent by her to various printers and at least one publisher.

After the return of the Chapter V typescript needed as copy for the forthcoming 1 June to 1 September instalments, the Richards-Pinker copy, then in the hands of Pinker, was incomplete. But the *Egoist* printers appear to have had the entire chapter in type by the end of July. Pinker was able to reassure Harriet Weaver, who feared otherwise after the renewed interference of Ballantyne's in the 1 August issue, that he had submitted to Secker not the expurgated but the complete text in galleys of the last two fifth-chapter instalments.²³ The proof markings in the galley slip still extant among the Chapter V tearsheets suggest that Pinker got the galleys from the printers at the end of July when, with the corrections made, the pages for the 1 August issue of *The Egoist* had been imposed. There would have been galleys for him, too, specially pulled, for the portion of the text to be published in September. The February-June instalments would have been in the complete issues of *The Egoist* for these months, as was the case with the copy submitted to Richards (see above, fn. 20), or else already in tearsheets, as in the present EC-W. The present Chapter V tearsheets, however, with their blue crayon cancellations of extraneous matter, were in all probability assembled in Pinker's office after the publication of the last instalment on 1 September, as the blue crayon markings therein are uniform throughout. At the same time, the absence of line counts in ink suggests that the tearsheets which now make up Chapter V in EC-W are not

23 Cf. Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, pp. 104 f.

identical in any part with the state of the copy for Chapter V at the time when the inked line counts were made. It seems possible that the inked line counts were made by Martin Secker & Co. in August 1915. When they refused to publish and returned the novel to Pinker, the makeshift copy for Chapter V was replaced by the present uniform one, incorporating a galley slip for the censored passages only, which would thus be all that remains of the Chapter V copy as submitted to Secker.²⁴ But with Chapter V replaced, EC-W as it now survives was complete. It would thereafter have been *the* copy which Pinker circulated among the London publishers whom he hoped to interest in Joyce's novel. The set passed from Pinker to Harriet Weaver in April 1916, presumably, when Pinker finally consented to the proposed publication by The Egoist Ltd. and the agreement to that effect had been signed by author, agent and publisher. Harriet Weaver duly noted on the title pages of Chapters I and II that they had been 'prepared by Mr Joyce' and changed the return address from Pinker's to that of The Egoist Ltd.

Now may have begun the copy's round not of publishers, but of printers,²⁵ and it was for this purpose, as suggested, that Harriet Weaver emphasised the censored passages for restitution in Chapters III and IV and marked the exact positions of insertion in all three chapters affected by cuts. This seems to have been done in two distinct stages: the markings in orange crayon in Chapters III and IV are earlier, and some at least of the marginal notes and positionings in black ink are later, as witnessed by the black ink superinscription over orange crayon at the end of Chapter IV. Lastly, the manuscript errata lists in their green envelope were included in the set after 25 May and before 9 June 1916 (see *Letters* II, 378-379), and note taken of their presence in permanent black ink

24 A renewed scrutiny of the inserted galley slip reveals an ink stroke in the margin about halfway down the column which does not stand against a correction to be made. It looks like the line-count strokes of Chapters I-IV, but divides off line 2254 of Chapter V as printed. However, if it may be assumed that the cumulation of fifty-three lines of italicised verse in the preceding sections of the chapter was disregarded in the count, the marking would be seen to stand against line 2201 of the regular text, reflecting a next to faultless line-count in hundreds. The observation would help to argue for the correctness of our assumptions about the fates of EC-W.

25 Harriet Weaver had submitted the novel to printers before, while Pinker was still searching for a publisher (see Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, chapter 6 *passim*); refusals from printers were coming in ever faster, so she may for some time have been circulating two copies of the text.

on the brown paper folder for Chapters III-V. The pencilled notes on Chapters I and II, finally—‘No corrections here. H.S.W.’ and ‘Nor have I copy of those of first two chapters. [H.S.W.]’—were obviously also made in two stages, and while the latter would seem the counterparts to the note about ‘Mr. Joyce’s corrections to chapters III+IV in green envelope’, the former may refer to corrections in the sense of reinsertions of censored text and thus correspond to the markings of omissions in Chapters III-V. Again, the latter notes also suggest that EC-W was out of Harriet Weaver’s hands when the marked-up tearsheets of Chapters I and II arrived with a letter from Joyce of 9 June (else she might have transferred the authorial corrections to her copy). By this time the publication of *A Portrait* in New York (and first by John Marshall) was under consideration, to be printed from other copy than EC-W. This set was once more at hand when William Heinemann had been persuaded to read Joyce’s novel for himself and Ezra Pound on 12 July urged Harriet Weaver to send him the complete text.²⁶ She mentions in one of her two letters of 7 September to Joyce that she had sent Heinemann her copy containing ‘the deleted sentences’ and that he had not yet given it back (although he had declined to publish by 19 August). When the set finally returned to her it could serve no further purpose, for the book publication of *A Portrait* was then firmly in the hands of B. W. Huebsch of New York. There is some reason, incidentally, to suspect that most of the observed markings of undesirable passages of text are William Heinemann’s (presumably those in pencil, at least, if not those in indelible pencil), on the grounds that if they were the marks of an earlier reader they would not have been left standing in the margins to catch a later reader’s attention. EC-W remained in Harriet Weaver’s possession until she gave it to the British Museum in 1951.

As a document relating to the publishing history of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, EC-W is thus of considerable interest. In terms of the textual history of the novel, its relevance, while specific, is yet narrowly circumscribed. Of greatest potential value and importance for the establishing of a critical text are its authorial errata lists. Their position must be assessed in relation to the documents central to the textual transmission, and in particular to EC-A, the printer’s copy for H.

26 *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941*, ed. by D. D. Paige (London: Faber & Faber, [1950] 1971), p. 85.

This entails a reconsideration of the nature and date of EC-A.²⁷ Anderson describes EC-A as fully and, except for some additional markings clearly made in the printing house, uniformly corrected in Joyce's own hand, and identifies it with a set of tearsheets dispatched by Harriet Weaver on 31 March 1916—and described by her in a letter of that date—to E. Byrne Hackett. Hackett in his turn sent it on to B. W. Huebsch in portions, beginning on 4 May 1916 (Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 122). By 2 June Huebsch thereupon felt able to make a provisional offer, and on 16 June he proposed firmly to publish the book (Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 123; Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 189). But the copy in which he read the text cannot have been the one he eventually printed it from: EC-A cannot be identified as the Hackett copy. For it is a fact that Huebsch not only agreed to printing 'absolutely according to the author's wishes, without deletion' (*Letters* I, 91), but also made great efforts to obtain copy with Joyce's own corrections. Had he been in the possession of EC-A from the outset, the lengthy exchange of letters about the author's corrections between him, Harriet Weaver and James Joyce himself, extending over more than four months from 16 June to 24 October 1916, would have been pointless.²⁸

In May 1916, it looked as if John Marshall of New York was going to publish *A Portrait*. For The Egoist Ltd. in London, Harriet Weaver was proposing an agreement along the same lines as the one which later came into effect with B. W. Huebsch, namely that sheets of the American printing be supplied for the English edition. James Joyce was interested in the details of correction and proofreading, and an exchange of letters between him and Harriet Weaver in late May and early June establishes what copy and what corrections were available, or were made available, for Marshall. To Joyce's enquiry of 25 May,

I do not know where the proofs are to be read. . . . Would it help in any way if I read and checked the third, fourth and fifth chapters which I have in the instalments from 1 August 1914 to 1 September 1915? If the printers set from them this would weed out some of the errors but of

27 Miss Lidderdale's discussion of the dates and events leading up to Huebsch's publication of *A Portrait* (*Dear Miss Weaver*, chapter 6 *passim*) differs radically from Anderson's hypotheses (Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp. 190 ff.). Being much more fully based on documentary evidence, her account serves as my frame of reference.

28 Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 188 f. is aware of the facts. Curiously, he does not recognise the bearing they have on determining the provenance of EC-A.

course not the new ones which they will put in . . . But it would be almost as much trouble to find the places in the new proofs as the paging will be different. (*Letters II*, 378)

Harriet Weaver replied on 31 May:

I have still the typescript of Chapter V and I am sending this off today to Mr. Marshall asking him to let his printers set up from this exactly as it stands, without adding commas or capitals. As I was stupid enough to destroy the rest of the typescript it would be a help if you would kindly do what you suggest and weed out errors in chapters III and IV. If you will then send them to me . . . I will insert the passages deleted by our printers and forward them to Mr. Marshall. . . . I will despatch to you today cuttings containing chapters I+II and perhaps you will correct them also and let me have them back. I shall ask Mr. Marshall either to send me proofs or have them corrected according to the corrected text.

Before 9 June, when he returned the cuttings of Chapters I and II after taking less than twenty-four hours over correcting them, Joyce had already dispatched separately the corrections for Chapters III and IV (*Letters II*, 379). There can be no doubt that what Harriet Weaver received from him and acknowledged in a letter dated 12 June were the errata lists to Chapters III and IV as they survive in EC-W. As the letter of 25 May seems to suggest, Joyce had his copy of the *Egoist* text of the last three chapters already annotated when he wrote, or else did the annotation while awaiting Harriet Weaver's reply, and he certainly did not spend more than a day or two over tabulating the corrections when she asked for them. The authorial errata lists for Chapters III and IV (EC-W, fols. 3-6) can therefore be dated very narrowly to the first week of June, 1916. Moreover, yet another very definite fact emerges from the correspondence as quoted: at no time between the end of July 1914 and 8 June 1916 had James Joyce had in his possession a full set of tearsheets of *A Portrait*. The set which was sent to Hackett on 31 March 1916 and was passed on by him to Huebsch, if it contained any corrections at all apart from the insertions of the deleted passages as referred to in Harriet Weaver's covering letter (Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 189), cannot have been corrected by Joyce. It cannot, therefore, have been EC-A.

The copy which was thus assembled for John Marshall to print from was described to B. W. Huebsch six weeks later: 'I have written to ask

Mr Marshall to send on to you his copy of the text which contains Mr Joyce's corrections. . . . Mr Joyce would like the book printed exactly according to this corrected text (the fifth chapter being the original typescript).²⁹ For a month Huebsch waited to hear from Marshall and to receive the corrected text from him and then, on 25 August, wrote to him in Quebec, while at the same time informing Harriet Weaver that no contact had as yet been established. Probably still confident, however, that the Marshall copy would soon be in his hands, he added that—subject to Pinker's cabled agreement to certain modifications of the publishing contract—'I shall proceed at once with the setting up of the book' (*Letters* I, 93). But Huebsch never obtained the corrected text from Marshall. In letters of 8 September and 20 September to Harriet Weaver he again specifically mentions this fact, and thereafter the matter is dropped because Harriet Weaver was supplying him with alternative copy.³⁰ By 8 September, still without copy to print from, Huebsch decided to accept an offer Harriet Weaver had made on 19 August (the day she had learnt that William Heinemann was definitely not willing to publish *A Portrait* in England): 'request that you send me the duplicate offered . . . as I presume it contains corrections not to be found in the copy I have'. Harriet Weaver had in fact anticipated this request immediately on receiving Huebsch's letter of 25 August in London on 6 September. Without a moment's delay, she had marked up new tearsheets of Chapters III and IV from the authorial errata lists in her possession and posted them that same evening. Tearsheets of Chapters I, II and V she annotated as far as she was able to from memory—that is, she entered in them the kinds of corrections she remembered Joyce had made in the copy for Marshall—and she mailed them with a covering letter to Huebsch the next day; and she cabled to New York that the Joyce corrections were on their way. But, as she emphasised to Huebsch, she was at the same time sending another set of cuttings of Chapters I, II and V to Joyce, asking him to enter his

29 Harriet Weaver to Huebsch on 24 July 1916, *Letters* I, 93.

30 The reference is here repeatedly to the unpublished Weaver-Huebsch correspondence. I gratefully acknowledge being given permission to use it. It seems safe to say that Huebsch indeed never received the Marshall copy. For had it passed into his hands, he would, even though not printing from it, have handed it over to John Quinn to whom Joyce in 1917 sold all material relating to the first book edition which Huebsch held, and it would now be found in the Slocum Collection at Yale.

authentic corrections and to post them straight to New York to avoid further delay.³¹ Joyce duly corrected them but returned them to the *Egoist* office (*Letters* I, 95), whereupon Harriet Weaver forwarded them to New York on 23 September: 'I have this morning received from Mr Joyce his corrections of Chapters I, II+V of his novel, which I send you herewith [. . .] there seem to be a good many more corrections than I sent you.' The receipt of Chapters I-V as marked up and sent by Harriet Weaver on 6 and 7 September (with Chapters III and IV only containing authorised corrections from the authorial errata lists) was acknowledged by Huebsch on 20 September, though he refused to begin to print from them (he apparently even believed that he had not yet received the complete text of the novel): 'I have received your . . . letters . . . enclosing revised copy of Chapters I, II, III, IV and V. . . I am afraid that it will scarcely be worth while going ahead until we have the complete copy because in the long run we will lose time by making many corrections in the chapters following those above named. I shall not go ahead until I get the rest of the book whether it be from Mr. Joyce or from Mr. Marshall, though the latter seems unlikely'. On 6 October, the authorially corrected tearsheets of Chapters I, II and V had arrived in New York, and on 17 October Huebsch was able to write: 'You will be glad to know that the book is in the hands of the printer and I hope to be able to get it out during the present season'.

31 See the account of the events in London on 6 and 7 September, 1916, in Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 125; and compare with the letter from Harriet Weaver to Huebsch of 7 September as quoted by Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 190. This letter is now found attached to a complete set of tearsheets known as EC-B. Nowhere is there any documentary evidence, however, that 'EC-B' was an integral set of *Egoist* tearsheets from the outset. Rather, from the facts as they now begin to emerge, I would infer that the one and only copy which ever became an identifiable unit was the printer's copy. Not even this copy, however, secured integrity until the printers stamped its sheets with serial numbers. For example, it had not before and probably did not then contain the holograph insert (leaf no. 35). The other sets (EC-B and EC-C) had no natural integrity as physical objects until they became identifiable as catalogued units in the Slocum Collection. I suggest that, at various times, portions of the text (chapters and inserts, sections annotated and not annotated) were shuffled and reshuffled between them, the last time probably by Mr. Slocum himself. For the Quinn sale catalogue still speaks of three sets, *each* 'containing manuscript corrections by the author and Miss Weaver' (quoted by Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 187). But EC-C now has no corrections.

From the documentary evidence of the Weaver-Huebsch correspondence, then,³² it would seem that Huebsch's printer's copy in Chapters I, II and V consisted of *Egoist* tearsheets corrected by Joyce himself between 7 and 23 September, and in Chapters III and IV of tearsheets marked up by Harriet Weaver from the authorial errata lists in her possession on 6 September 1916. Yet Anderson (p. 188) asserts that EC-A, which was undoubtedly Huebsch's printer's copy, is uniformly corrected in Joyce's hand. For the purposes of this article I have not been able to inspect EC-A in the Slocum Collection to ascertain how exhaustive Anderson's description of it is. If Chapters III and IV in EC-A are without question corrected by Joyce himself, this fact would still need to be explained. But it is true that Anderson never considers the possibility of EC-A being a composite copy, while the preceding descriptions of EC-W and the lost Marshall copy argue that it would only follow precedence if it was, and only strengthen the belief that the conclusions drawn from the evidence of the Weaver-Huebsch correspondence are sound. Moreover, even if all non-printing-house annotation in all chapters of EC-A as described is 'in black ink by a pen with a very fine point', the possibility is not ruled out that the corrections were in fact made by two different pens. For it may be observed in the galley-proof insertion in Chapter V of EC-W that proof marking in London (by Harriet Weaver?) was also done with black ink in very fine strokes. In addition, there is at least one piece of internal evidence from variants in compound words which would further urge a re-examination of the agent or agents correcting EC-A. Joyce's intention was to alter a majority of the text's hyphenated words into one-word compounds. But, as Harriet Weaver explained to Huebsch in a letter of 2 May 1917, 'in most places where he had crossed [the hyphens] out, he meant the words to be joined together but the printers have misunderstood and, in many places, separated them' (*Letters* II, 393 fn.). Consequently, Joyce's corrections to the Huebsch edition (and Harriet Weaver's additions thereto) contain

32 Added footnote in 2022: Back in the early 1970s, exploring the genesis of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as I then was, Richard Ellmann kindly brought me into contact with Jane Lidderdale. She had at the time just published her biography of her aunt, Harriet Shaw Weaver. Towards it, Richard Ellmann had lent her his cache of the Huebsch-Weaver correspondence, which therefore I was enabled to peruse in the London house of Jane Lidderdale. Quotes from the correspondence are my transcriptions, unless otherwise specified.

eighty-seven requests to join together separated compounds. Their distribution, however, is sixty-nine (all told) in Chapters I, II and V and only eighteen in Chapters III and IV, of which only nine are corrections to separations introduced in H. Harriet Weaver's instructions—if it was she who marked up Chapters III and IV in EC-A—appear to have been less subject to misinterpretation than Joyce's. What is beyond doubt, however, is that Huebsch's printer's copy was not the set of tearsheets dispatched from London on 31 March, reaching Huebsch via Hackett by 2 June 1916. Consequently, Joyce's manuscript errata lists to Chapters III and IV now surviving in EC-W, which were tabulated in the first week of June, are of an earlier date than is the marking of corrections for these chapters in EC-A. If Anderson's description were found to be valid and the corrections in Chapters III and IV of EC-A are in Joyce's own hand, their authority would confirm that of the errata lists or supersede it in cases of conflict. But if the marking of Chapters III and IV in EC-A was done simply by copying Joyce's manuscript corrections, these represent the only authoritative alterations to the *Egoist* text of Chapters III and IV in preparation of the first book edition.

The First and Second Editions (H and B): Joyce's Corrections and the Printer's Copy for B

With EC-W, Harriet Weaver in 1951 gave to the British Museum a list of corrections to the 1916 New York and London edition (H) of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.³³ It is headed: 'CORRECTIONS. *A portrait of The Artist as a Young Man*. B. W. Huebsch: New York: 1916. The Egoist Ltd: London: 1916.', and bears the typewritten signature on its last page: 'JAMES JOYCE, Seefeldstrasse 73III Zurich VIII'. This is a carbon of a sixteen-page typewritten list with 364 typewritten entries for 365 separate corrections to be made. It is clear that it is yet another copy of Joyce's 'nearly 400' corrections to the first edition.³⁴ These are still

33 Incidentally, she also gave her own complete run of *The Egoist* which the British Museum library did not possess before. Cf. Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 425.

34 364 is the number of corrections counted by Cahoon in Joyce's manuscript list (Y). I count entries (364) and corrections to be made (365; two separate instances of 'public-house' > 'publighthouse' are given one entry). These corrections sometimes involve more than one change. Anderson counts 373 changes (cf. footnote, p. 162).

extant in the original manuscript (Y). Joyce wrote them out in Zurich in April, 1917, and sent them to Pinker in London on 10 April, requesting: 'Kindly have them typed (with copy) and forwarded by two successive posts to my publishers in New York' (*Letters* II, 393). The corrections are also extant in a typescript ribbon-copy (YT). From the description given of YT (Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 197) it would seem that the Harriet Weaver copy of corrections in the British Museum is its carbon copy; I shall call it YTW. A note across the top of page 1 of the list, unsigned and undated, yet doubtless in Harriet Weaver's hand, states:

Copy of corrections made by Mr. Joyce to 1st edition. Sent to Mr. Huebsh [sic] August 16, 1917 but were not made before printing of sheets for 3rd English edition (1921). Were made in 2nd English edition, printed in Southport, 1917. Were made also before printing of Jonathan Cape edition of 1924[.]

But although YTW appears to be the carbon copy of YT as described by Anderson, it differs from YT in that seventeen further corrections are interlined in it in their appropriate positions, in pencil, and in Harriet Weaver's handwriting. Their number establishes a connection to the two handwritten pages with a total of seventy corrections in Harriet Weaver's hand (YW), now accompanying YT, and bearing a note: 'Sent by Miss Weaver May 2/17'. In April 1917, then, James Joyce and Harriet Weaver independently drew up lists of corrections to H.³⁵ Anderson states that of the seventy corrections in YW, seventeen—all of them departures from EC-A in H—are omitted from Y/YT. Harriet Weaver appears to have conflated Joyce's list and her own, adding in YTW the seventeen errors Joyce had missed. The total number of entries in YTW is thus 381, the total of corrections 382.

From Joyce's letter to Pinker of 10 April as quoted, from the fact that he informed Harriet Weaver on 7 July that Pinker had his corrections (*Letters* I, 107) and from Harriet Weaver's note on YTW,³⁶ one might be

Attempting to apply his criteria, I count at least 379 changes. Yet I believe we are all describing the same body of corrections.

35 Anderson has no real ground for assuming (footnote, p. 197) that YW was written before Y: Y was completed by 10 April, YW was compiled between 18 April and 2 May, arriving in New York on 15 May (see below).

36 The note, however, was written at some later date, after 1924; perhaps even as late as 1951.

led to infer that Pinker never forwarded the typescript and carbon he had been asked to prepare but kept them until Harriet Weaver had been alerted to their existence and took it upon herself to send the ribbon copy to Huebsch very belatedly on 16 August, while using the carbon in preparation of her own second edition. But the Weaver-Huebsch correspondence reveals that the facts were different. The corrections seem indeed to have been typed at Pinker's office, and both the ribbon and the carbon copy must have been sent to Huebsch in the manner ordered by Joyce. Huebsch then returned the carbon copy to London at Harriet Weaver's request. When she wrote her explanatory note on YTW she misremembered the exact details: what she mailed to Huebsch on 16 August 1917 was not the whole set of corrections, but only a handwritten list with 16 entries which contained fifteen of the seventeen additional corrections of YTW, plus one correction of a typist's error.³⁷ This one correction is the clinching piece of evidence: it would not make sense if YTW were not the carbon copy of YT, and its entry in Harriet Weaver's short supplementary list, as indeed this whole list itself, is meaningful only if never typescript and carbon together, but merely the carbon copy alone, was in her hands. The list, on one side of a single quarto-sized sheet of writing paper, is still extant among the unpublished Weaver-Huebsch correspondence.

From the letters, the facts can be filled in in greater detail.³⁸ In the latter half of April 1917, Harriet Weaver was beginning to consider bringing out a second edition of *A Portrait*. Ideally, she wanted another joint operation with New York, but as import restrictions forbade the further purchase of printed sheets, she requested to be allowed to buy moulds of the New York edition instead.³⁹ She was aware that the text of the first edition needed correction but did not want to ask Joyce to

37 The date they were mailed to Huebsch, which is authentic, is suggestive: on 16 August, the Brighton printers who at first were going to print the English edition retracted their offer. Thus, Harriet Weaver—despairing momentarily that the book would ever be printed in England—may have wished that all corrections were in the hands of the publisher who alone thus far had the text of *A Portrait* in print. In the event, of course, only the second Egoist Press edition and its descendants ever incorporated Joyce's 'nearly 400' corrections.

38 For the events which lead up to finding a printer in England for the second edition, Miss Lidderdale (*Dear Miss Weaver*, pp. 139 ff.) has drawn upon the Weaver-Huebsch correspondence and largely recorded the relevant details.

39 Harriet Weaver to B. W. Huebsch, 18 April 1917.

correct it as he was at the time suffering acutely from his disease of the eyes. Instead, she compiled her own list of corrections (YW) and sent it to Huebsch on 2 May. It arrived in New York on 15 May, the day after Huebsch, in reply to her request of 18 April, had written to Harriet Weaver:

I have just received from Mr. Pinker a long list of corrections to be made in the plates, but unfortunately I have just printed a second edition from the first plates and unless there is a very large demand for the book, this edition is likely to last for a considerable time. I presume that you have received a duplicate list of the corrections. Under the circumstances, probably you would not want me to send you moulds.

But neither from Pinker nor from Joyce had Harriet Weaver received a copy of the corrections. So, with no hope now of getting the corrected text from New York in either sheets or moulds, she decided to publish independently in England, with a reset text. On 6 June, she asked Huebsch to send her the corrections and suggested he have a copy made for her so as not to endanger the original in wartime Atlantic transit. Huebsch was pleased to oblige:

I take pleasure in enclosing a copy of the corrections. . . . I am keeping a copy of the corrections here for my own use. It will be available for you if disaster overtakes the copy that I am forwarding.⁴⁰

It was not until 28 July (or thereabouts) that the carbon copy from Huebsch arrived in London. But meanwhile, Joyce had notified Harriet Weaver on 7 July that Pinker had his corrections. She replied on 18 July: 'I got your corrections from your agent and the printers now have the book in hand'.⁴¹ The printers she refers to were the Pike's Fine Art Press of Brighton who on 16 August refused to print without deletion. Thus, the corrections as Harriet Weaver got them from Pinker before YTW arrived in London at the end of July did not enter the transmission of the text.

YTW was used to annotate the printer's copy for the second edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, printed in Southport, England, in

⁴⁰ B. W. Huebsch to Harriet Weaver, 9 July 1917.

⁴¹ Pinker must have kept the corrections on file in yet another typescript copy; for the manuscript original (Y) was sold to John Quinn sometime in June, 1917; by 10 July, Joyce had received Quinn's acknowledgement (*Letters I*, 104).

1917—by Robert Johnson & Co., the same printers who had been employed on *The Egoist* by Dorothy Marsden before Harriet Weaver became the editor (Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, pp. 142-43)—and published by The Egoist Ltd. in London in 1918. This printer's copy has survived, and it was given by Harriet Weaver to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, between 10 and 19 March 1952. Yet it was not until 1967 that even the Bodleian Library, alerted by Harriet Weaver's biographers, became aware of the special nature of the volume which Weaver had most unobtrusively entrusted them with. She is said to have brought it along one day 'in her open-top bag' (Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 426). Its relevance to the publishing history and the textual transmission of *A Portrait* has not yet been recognised or recorded. The volume is bound in the original dark green cloth of the London first edition, but as the body of the book is broken completely loose in the spine, the original binding is now merely folded around it. The book has been given a dark green slipcase for protection. A note in ink by Harriet Weaver is tipped in to the front flyleaf:

The pencilled corrections in this copy of the first English edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* were made by me from a list of corrections sent by Mr. Joyce for the second edition, printed in Southport and published by *The Egoist* in 1917. They do not appear in the third edition (1921) for which sheets were again imported from the U.S.A. but they do appear in Mr. Jonathan Cape's edition (reset) of 1924.

Harriet Weaver
4 Rawlinson Road
Oxford
March 10th, 1952

On collation, the majority of the pencilled annotations in the Bodley copy (HB) is found to be a very faithful transcript of YTW.⁴² Of the changes

42 HB is apparently not identical with the copy marked up and given before 16 August 1917, to the Pike's Fine Art Press in Brighton to print from. They returned a book with 'passages marked in blue pencil' to be 'modified or removed'. (Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 142). There are no traces of blue pencil markings in the Bodley volume. The discrepancy in the number of corrections between the handwritten list sent to Huebsch on August 16 (fifteen corrections plus removal of one typing error) and the additional entries in pencil in YTW (seventeen corrections plus removal of two obvious typing errors) may have its explanation here. The fifteen corrections in the handwritten list may have been the result of annotating the copy for Pike's; the two additional ones may have been added to YTW in preparation

called for in its 381 entries, Harriet Weaver fails to delete one comma, deletes another without warrant and fails to change a third into a colon. The identification of the volume as the printer's copy for B, immediately rendered likely by the pencilled alterations and additions in Harriet Weaver's hand to the copyright and printing notices on the verso of the title-page, rests mainly on a set of sparse but unmistakable printing-house markings. For long stretches of the book, there are little pencilled crosses at the bottom of verso pages, or the top of recto pages, at regular intervals of four pages. Sometimes these divide off a syllable or a word or two at the end of a page or the beginning of the next, and the first word or syllable of a recto page is occasionally pencilled in at the bottom of the preceding verso page. B is of course virtually a page-for-page reprint of H, despite its smaller typeface. But inevitably the text on any given page in B does not always coincide with the word or syllable of its counterpart in H. Yet in every case where the text is out by a syllable or a word or two on pages marked in HB as described, the new page beginnings correspond exactly to the marked divisions. Typical compositorial notes like 'Line short' or 'Two short', sometimes initialled by the person who wrote them, finally clinch the matter: the Bodley volume is the printer's copy for B, with the majority of its compositorial stints clearly marked. A further analysis, not yet undertaken, would probably make it possible to distinguish from the markings, from the typographical layout of the pages, and presumably from the treatment of punctuation and the like in the text itself, between two or more compositors.⁴³

The observance of Harriet Weaver's annotations by the printers of B was very faithful. In less than half a dozen instances were her directions misunderstood and the corrections not made according to intention.

of the printer's copy for Johnson's of Southport. As Harriet Weaver then spotted another six misprints and hyphenation errors in the course of annotating HB which were never entered in YTW, it must remain an open question—until all relevant documents can be reexamined in preparation of a critical edition—whether it is merely a happy coincidence that YW and YTW concur in the number of seventeen corrections in excess of Joyce's authentic 365.

- 43 To complete the record, a set of pencilled notations on the back flyleaf (verso) should be observed: '26-41 234-246 280-292 for Sesame book 1942'. If taken as page references, '26-41' comprises the greater part of the Christmas dinner scene in Chapter I; '234-246' the conversation between Stephen, Davin and Lynch until just before the esthetic theory section in Chapter V; and '280-292' the final conversation with Cranly. I have not investigated the relevance of these jottings.

Only one marked correction was not carried out: p. 87.9 in B still reads 'reverie' (for: 'revery') in perpetuation of a typescript spelling which had passed via *Egoist* to H.⁴⁴ Thus all YTW corrections, but for these exceptions, duly entered the text of B. In addition, another six misprints and hyphenation errors, which had eluded both Joyce and Harriet Weaver before, were marked by her and corrected by the printers. Beyond that, Harriet Weaver took it upon her own authority to remove wholesale, from about the middle of Chapter III onwards, all intermediary and final dashes in direct speech, and to introduce alternative punctuation consequent upon their removal where necessary. This altered the entire system of Joyce's designation and punctuation of dialogue in so far as it had survived in print. In the manuscript, there are dashes in place of the 'perverted commas' which Joyce so abhorred not only at the beginning of every direct speech but also before and after interruptions (where in print one is accustomed to commas and inverted commas: i.e.—said Stephen—rather than . . . , ' said Stephen, ' . . .), and at the end, where the dash in fact frequently stands without a further mark of punctuation. In the first printed text of *A Portrait in The Egoist*, this system of punctuation, so conspicuously idiosyncratic, has disappeared from the first two chapters and the first one and a half instalments of the third, and been replaced by initial dashes followed by regularised punctuation (though of course not inverted commas) in the middle and at the end of direct speeches. In these positions, Joyce's dashes—though not his dashes as combining the functions of all punctuation: especially at the ends of speeches periods have mostly been placed before dashes in print—break through only towards the end of the second instalment of Chapter III of 15 August 1914, which was the fourth instalment printed by Partridge & Cooper. These printers had set inverted commas in *A Portrait* (as elsewhere) when they began to print *The Egoist* on 1 July 1914. In their second instalment of 15 July, which was the end of Chapter II, and their

44 The corresponding section of the typescript which served as printer's copy for *The Egoist* happens to survive. Curiously, the typist first spelled 'revery' according to the manuscript, but the final 'y' was altered in ink to 'ie' by an undeterminable agent. Joyce himself did sporadically enter corrections in ink in the typescript, but the 'ie' does not appear to be in his hand. The spelling 'reverie' occurs several times in *The Egoist*. It was successfully eradicated by Joyce himself in all instances but the present one. It is highly probable that the failure to observe his Y instruction at B: 87.9 was spotted and amended by him when he proofread J.

third, the beginning of Chapter III, they adopted the styling observable uniformly before in the initial ten instalments printed by Johnson & Co. of Southport. They carried it over even into three full pages of their fourth instalment, the manuscript text of which contains the final dash in three individual instances. With two printing houses conforming to the same pattern of variation in such accidentals, one might be inclined to suspect that the eventual change reflects a change in their copy, i.e. that the typescript made from Joyce's manuscript reproduces the manuscript punctuation of dialogue only from the middle of Chapter III onwards. The fragments of typescript of Chapters I and II which survive—and which will be described in greater detail below—show that this was not so. They contain all dashes, plus (on the typist's own authority) additional punctuation at the ends of speeches, and sometimes most illogically even before speech interruptions, in Chapter I, and an exact reproduction of Joyce's own styling in Chapter II, on which a different typist worked. That it was the first and not the second typist's styling which was eventually adopted by both the Partridge & Cooper and the Ballantyne compositors might indicate that the identical typist typed all chapters except Chapter II (a possibility which, on broader evidence, will be discussed later). The move towards a more complete observance in *The Egoist* of the authorial punctuation of dialogue was, as such, quite possibly the result of editorial direction. The full system of dashes (though augmented by regularised final punctuation) manifests itself in print after Harriet Weaver's taking over as editor, albeit with a delay of three and a half instalments. But the delay is explicable: the first editorial concern was to get rid of the inverted commas. Reference to the typography of the Joyce text in the earlier *Egoist* issues would have been appropriate and sufficient to guide Partridge & Cooper's compositors in the treatment of their second instalment. Thereafter, dialogue is virtually absent from long stretches of the text in Chapter III. Harriet Weaver would only have become alerted to the styling of the typescript as more frequent dialogue resumed in the chapter's second half, whereupon she may have given directions that it be fully adopted in print. This of course is but speculative reasoning. Yet the resulting fact is that the punctuation of direct speech is inconsistent not only in the *Egoist* serialisation but also in the first book edition. It is the lack of uniformity in the typographical appearance of the book which Harriet

Weaver remedied in her preparation of the printer's copy for B in 1917. She then standardised the punctuation of dialogue according to the styling of the initial chapters. The overall appearance of the text in print was thereby improved in the 1918 edition, however unauthorised this second editorial intrusion. One hardly feels called upon, therefore, to argue with Harriet Weaver's restyling. It must at present be left open whether even a critical edition should revert to the punctuation of the manuscript, unless, following the manner of the typist of Chapter II, it were to reproduce all clashes strictly without any additional punctuation in the middle and at the end of speeches. Yet such a procedure would run the very real risk of ultimately obscuring rather than clarifying the text. Moreover, it should be observed that the dashes appear very much as a calligraphic feature of the manuscript; as a visual expression of the individuality of the author in his handwriting, it would take careful collaboration of editor and printer to recapture this satisfactorily on the printed page. To fulfil the author's objective of avoiding inverted commas, it would seem sufficient to maintain Harriet Weaver's styling by preserving merely the initial dash in a direct speech. Nevertheless, it is true that the interference of typist(s), editor(s) and compositors has often altered and obscured the original sentence divisions of the dialogue in the novel. These await full restoration in a critical text.

* * *

New data about the textual transmission of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* have thus emerged from the discussion of three documents from its publishing history. Their influence on editorial decision-making and procedure has been incidentally considered. It now remains to outline a comprehensive editorial hypothesis on the basis of which a critical edition could be envisaged.

The Text from Manuscript to Print

In its authoritative textual witnesses, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* presents an almost classic case of linear and uncontaminated textual transmission. The fair-copy holograph manuscript (D) is the only primary authoritative text of the novel. From it, five texts of secondary authority descend in linear succession: the typescript

(T), the first printed version in the *Egoist* serialisation (E), and the first (H), the second (B) and the third (J) book editions. None of these secondary stages of transmission of the text relates back to any earlier stage than the one immediately preceding it, nor is the text of D ever conflated or 'contaminated' with any of the secondary stages of authoritative transmission.⁴⁵ In establishing a critical text it should therefore be possible in principle to apply W. W. Greg's editorial rule, which postulates that a critical text should reproduce the earliest accessible authoritative text in spellings, punctuation and all other accidentals as well as in the body of its substantive readings, and that variants from the texts of secondary authority be admitted only when they are the result of correction and revision by the author and thus positively supersede the authority of the original reading.⁴⁶ The basic text of *A Portrait* is the author's manuscript. Authorial correction and revision intervened at each stage of transmission between D and J, thus conferring secondary authority on each of the textual witnesses T, H, B and J. It is the extent to which their variants are authoritative which must in each case be determined. For the text in H and B, the documents that contain the intervening authorial corrections and revisions survive. These are the errata lists to Chapters III and IV in EC-W, and EC-A, the printer's copy with Joyce's corrections to Chapters I, II and V, for H; and the 'nearly 400' authorial corrections (Y), plus the printer's copy, HB, for B. Thus the authority, or lack of authority, of the variants in the first and second book editions is demonstrable. The proofsheets of the two, or probably three rounds of correction which Joyce read for J have, however, not been preserved.⁴⁷ The authority of variant readings in J, therefore, can upon close and discriminating analysis of the total B-J variance be established by inference only. Lastly, and most seriously, the typescript made from D and used as printer's copy for E, that is to say one of the authoritative textual witnesses themselves, is almost entirely

45 The texts in the editions of Harry Levin (in *The Portable James Joyce* and elsewhere; cf. Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 167) and of Anderson/Ellmann (1964) are both conflated texts. The latter in particular, which draws on the manuscript, albeit not in a readily controllable manner, which on analysis proves to be unsystematic, provides—in the true technical sense of the word—a contaminated text.

46 Cf. W. W. Greg, 'The Rationale of Copy-Text', *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 (1950-51), 19-36.

47 See the discussion of the Jonathan Cape edition below.

lost. There is consequently next to no documentary evidence available of possible authorial alterations before the text was typed, nor of typists' omissions or commissions, nor of authorial correction and revision of the typescript; nor can, other than by inference, printing-house changes in E be separated from the total body of D-E variance. Here lies the rub; for in view of the large and weighty discrepancy in the text between D and E, it is only by successful differentiation of all these separate stages of authoritative and non-authoritative interference which, hypothetically, the text passed through from D to E that a true critical text can emerge.

[The external facts with which to fill this hiatus in the textual transmission are these. The fair-copy manuscript—bearing the date 'M.S. 1913' on its holograph title-page—was (it is assumed) written out by Joyce between December 1913 and late October/early November 1914.⁴⁸ Chapters I-III were merely copied over from papers (now lost) which had contained them in a virtually final textual stage for several years. But Chapters IV and V were only conceived in their final form during these months and written (though doubtless preliminary material existed for them, too) before they were copied to complete the fair-copy manuscript. The typescript followed the manuscript in hot pursuit, chapter by chapter. As from 2 February 1914 onwards the *Egoist* serialisation, too, was progressing in fortnightly instalments, the inference is that each chapter of the typescript was prepared with considerable haste and received only superficial authorial attention before being dispatched to London. No proof of the *Egoist* text was read by Joyce.]⁴⁹

The internal evidence of the D-E variants should confirm or modify the assumed external facts. In the transmission of the text from D to E, the issues most critically at stake are the nature of the typescript,

48 It should be noted here that no scholar with bibliographic and paleographic expertise has yet investigated the Dublin holograph. Until it has been fully described and analysed, neither the above dates can be given with full assurance, nor is it possible to say whether or not our present conception of how the text of the novel evolved will need to be modified.

49 Note added 2022: This paragraph is left standing, bracketed, for the record of my lines of argument of 1974. It is however the present essay's one paragraph that only summarizes Anderson's findings. The critical edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* of 1993 eventually lays out my own analysis of the novel's composition process, 1907 to 1914. See below, 'James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Critical Edition 1993. INTRODUCTION'.

the evidence (if any) of authorial correction and revision before the typescript left Trieste, and the nature and degree of printing-house interference with the text as it appears in print. Collation reveals most immediately the variation in accidentals. Close to 600 commas have been added in E and superimposed upon a system of commas, colons, semicolons and periods (with only the occasional exclamation or question mark) which has otherwise been left largely intact. As the workmen of three printing-houses in succession set the text for *A Portrait*, it can be asserted that, on the whole, the additional commas were put in by them. The three printers did very nearly equal thirds of the novel: of the total of 123.5 printed *Egoist* columns, Johnson & Co. set 41.5, Partridge & Cooper 41.5, and Ballantyne, Hanson & Co. 40.5 columns (approximately). But the distribution of added commas is such that Johnson & Co. in ten instalments added no more than sixty, or about three commas in each two columns of print, while Partridge & Cooper in eight instalments added 277 (seven per column), and Ballantyne & Hanson in seven instalments 229 commas (fewer than six per column).⁵⁰ There is, moreover, a considerable fluctuation in numbers from one instalment to the next—Partridge & Cooper added sixty-six commas on 1 July 1914, their first instalment, and only eight a fortnight later—and even from page to page and column to column. This quite clearly reflects the punctuation habits of different workmen. Moreover, the scarcity of added commas in the Johnson & Co. section of the text—itsself undoubtedly the work of more than one compositor—reinforces the conclusion that the later inundation of the *Egoist* text with commas was a printing-house restyling of the text. It strongly suggests that the typescript did not essentially alter the manuscript punctuation.

The *Egoist* departure from the manuscript in other accidentals, such as capitalization, and hyphenation or two-word division of compounds, is far more restrained.⁵¹ There is throughout the sections of the three printers a fairly even sprinkling of added hyphenations or

50 The figures for the *Egoist* variants here and below derive from double collation (D-E, D-J) which, though done with all possible care, has not been counter-checked. They should therefore be taken as approximations to indicate relations.

51 To assert that in E 'printinghouse stylesheets triumphed almost completely over the copy in punctuation, hyphening, capitalization, and other accidentals' (Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 185) is much too sweeping a statement. As regards hyphenation and capitalization, it is not true.

compound divisions, and of added capitals. A distinction of typescript and printing-house characteristics does not clearly manifest itself. On the contrary, it seems likely that a good number of compounds were hyphenated in E because they happened to be divided from one line to the next in T, as a good number of others are evidently hyphenated in print because they were demonstrably so divided in D and thus, by inference, entered the text of T with hyphens. Other hyphenations, such as 'good-bye', or the inevitable printed forms 'to-day', 'to-morrow', etc., were undoubtedly made according to a style sheet by the printing-house compositors, and sometimes possibly by a typist before them. Typists' and compositors' habits likewise would seem to be the cause of added capitalization, such as the almost invariable spellings Protestant, Jesuit, Jews, Church, Mass, etc. for Joyce's protestant, jesuit, jews, church, mass. But it is very important to note that the added hyphenations and capitalizations, while of course unauthoritative in the *Egoist* text, are yet not inconsistent with the overall manuscript styling. A large majority of the hyphenated and capitalised nouns and adjectives which occur in the *Egoist* text preserve faithfully the manuscript readings. Hyphenations and two-word divisions of compounds as well as capitalizations were largely eliminated by Joyce himself when he corrected the text for H and B. But his new directions then amount to no less than a systematic restyling of the text in print with respect to these accidentals.

If the sometimes excessively liberal addition of commas in the *Egoist* text is regarded as a special case—and good reason for doing so lies in the fact that Joyce's original punctuation is both unorthodox and extremely light—the general treatment of accidentals in the printed text suggests, even more so than before,⁵² that the workmen engaged on E were careful and competent. This creates a certain 'climate of opinion' for the consideration of the substantive variants. There is, for example, an astonishing number of omissions of single words, phrases and even whole sentences from the text in E.⁵³ Anderson infers, and I believe quite rightly, that in the majority of cases these are typist's errors. In particular, he persuasively demonstrates (pp. 171 ff.) how the style of Joyce's prose

52 Cf. Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp. 178 and 185.

53 I count at least 106 instances of such omission, equalling almost exactly one-third of the total of D-E substantive variance: nineteen instances in Chapter I, twenty-eight in II, twenty-two in III, nine in IV and twenty-eight in V.

by its repetitive rhetoric lends itself to the omission of phrases and sentences. His explanation of such errors by means of literary analysis can often be strengthened by taking note of the bibliographical evidence: where words and phrases are repeated in the text, their inscription on the manuscript page is frequently such that a typist's eye-skip in copying appears to be the most likely mechanical reason for the omission of phrases and sentences. By contrast, the omission of single words, which occurs with fair regularity throughout the text, is not strictly the same phenomenon, and not as clearly explicable by literary or bibliographical criteria. It should, however, by way of hypothesis, and as a calculated methodical expedient, be acceptable to group all omissions together and provisionally to designate all omission in the extant text of E as an area of typescript error. If an omission is thus taken to be an error by principle of method, the question becomes negligible whether in actual fact it was a typist's or a compositor's blunder. The important consequence within the editorial hypothesis is that all variants in question are regarded as not authorised and that the original manuscript readings would demand to be restored in their place. If, on the other hand, the general rule in individual instances appears inapplicable, very good reasons must be found for a textual omission in E to be accepted as an authorial cut and thus to be editorially respected.

Implied by such reasoning is the truth of the assumption that the typescript was only superficially read by the author before being dispatched to London. To infer thereupon from the variants themselves, i.e., from the accumulation of omissions in the extant text of E, that Joyce indeed missed a hundred or more such errors in the typescript would be an argument self-defeating in its circularity unless support for it be found outside the circle. This problem, in its turn, is secondary to the basic question—which yet remains to be tested—as to whether the author gave any attention at all to the text of the novel after completing the fair-copy manuscript (and before correcting E for H). The editorial difficulties presented by the missing typescript would of course be considerably diminished if it could be positively demonstrated that he did not. Answers to the open questions must be sought by scrutinizing those groups of D-E variance that have not previously been analysed, and by relating the omissions to them.

The substantive variants in E—317 in all by my count—are omissions, additions, and substituted readings. The additions are invariably confined to single words. They are few in number and make up a large part of what must be considered corrections of the manuscript text, of which there are twenty-nine in all throughout the novel. These corrections, even if they involve an additional word, are mostly obvious enough, as when ‘shuffling along . . . in old pair of blue canvas shoes’ becomes ‘. . . in an old pair . . .’ (61.20/II, 48),⁵⁴ and they can often easily be accounted for as the unaided work of the typist. That the typist had leeway to correct without specific directions by the author—or that a compositor far from Trieste did so by force of circumstance, should an incomplete or erroneous reading, real or fancied, have survived into his copy—is rendered likely when a miscorrection occurs, or a pedantic observance of grammatical congruence in tense or number sounds conspicuous. Except when miscorrection or style-sheet rectification of grammar are obvious, an edited text will of course accept the complete rather than the incomplete readings, regardless of whether or not the authority of each single addition can be ascertained. In Chapter V at least, if not before, such editorial policy can be justified by observing three individual one-word additions, two of them corrections of incomplete manuscript readings and one a genuine textual revision, which cannot reasonably be explained as anything but authorial in origin. No typist or compositor would have known how to complete the sentences: ‘What was their languid but the softness of chambering?’ (:languid grace; 233.9/V, 2089), or ‘. . . a stasis called forth, prolonged and at last by what I call the rhythm of beauty.’ (:dissolved by; 206.23/V, 1151. ‘ended’ would perhaps have been an unguided guess), nor can anyone but the author be thought to have changed Cranly’s toothpick at 229.33/V, 1972 into a ‘rude toothpick’, thus weaving once more into the fabric of the text the main characterizing adjective for Cranly. On the strength of these variants alone, authorial attention to the text between D and E must be admitted and taken into account as a real possibility. Automatically, it

54 Page/line references are to the 1964 Viking printed text as used in its 1968 reprint in: *James Joyce, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Text, Criticism, Notes, ed. by Chester G. Anderson (New York: The Viking Press, 1968). The quotations, however, give the manuscript readings unless otherwise indicated.

becomes a major concern of the editorial hypothesis to define its nature and extent.

Thus, the readings substituted in E for good manuscript readings become the focus of attention: they become suspect of being authorised changes. The total number of altered readings is large, but many of them are immediately recognizable as errors (as for example the numerous substitutions of singular forms for the plural, and *vice versa*), or at the very least as being 'indifferent' and thus not even cumulatively strong enough to prove their origin as authorial: definite articles alternate with indefinite articles, or articles with possessive pronouns; 'those' stands for 'these', alternative prepositions are introduced, or the relative pronouns 'which' and 'who' replace relative 'that' as it is frequently used by Joyce. Yet other variants, again clearly errors, are identifiable as simple misreadings of Joyce's handwriting: 'jacket' becomes 'pocket', 'cracked' becomes 'crooked', 'harsh' becomes 'hoarse', 'like' becomes 'little', 'Kenny' becomes 'Kenory', 'slap' becomes 'step', 'burned' becomes 'turned', 'diseased' becomes 'disclosed', 'hear' becomes 'bear', 'head' becomes 'lead', 'true' becomes 'fine', the nonce-word 'nicens' becomes the none-word 'niceus', and the sentence 'A rim of the young moon cleft the pale waste of sky like the rim of a silver hoop embedded in grey sand' is made to read, 'A rim of the young moon cleft the pale waste of sky line, the rim of a silver hoop embedded in grey sand'. Once all such variants are discounted, only very few readings remain which deserve closer attention. There should be no doubt, for example, that in the list of Stephen's classmates in Chapter II:

Roderick Greets

John Lawton

Anthony MacSwiney

Simon Mangan (70.25-28/II.373-376)

The names Greets and Mangan were altered to Kickham and Moonan by the author before they thus entered the printed text in E. There is precedence for the authorial change Mangan > Moonan in the manuscript (Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 170). This renders authorial attention here all the more probable, though it just could mean that an observant typist of his own accord had altered the present reading to bring it into conformity with the others. That this was not the case is suggested by the number of instances in which the name Mangan

still stands unaltered in E. Moreover, it would not do to seek different explanations for two changes at the same point in the text: and the alteration of Greets to Kickham can be authorial only. Similarly, the retitling of 'Father' Barrett as 'Mr' Barrett at 30.1/I, 801 in the Christmas dinner scene in Chapter I would seem to be a Joycean correction. Authorial correction and revision further manifests itself where identical changes are spaced out in the text. For example, the 'avenue of limes' which leads up to Clongowes—and it was apparently an avenue of limes—is an 'avenue of chestnuts' throughout the manuscript. In print, the change has been consistently made once each in Chapters I, II and III.⁵⁵

These few variants taken together confirm that Chapters I to III received authorial attention at the typescript stage of transmission. Apart from 'chestnuts' > 'limes' (24.10/I, 601) and 'Father' > 'Mr' (30.1/I.801), however, there is in Chapter I only one more variant—'in the square' > 'there' (43.24/I, 1283)—for which, under the guidelines of the hypothesis here developed, authority can be claimed with some confidence. The remainder of the substituted readings in this chapter are either obviously erroneous, or misreadings of Joyce's handwriting, or else too indifferent in character to be made out as authorial in origin. The situation in Chapter II is similar. To Greets > Kickham, Mangan > Moonan, and 'chestnuts' > 'limes' (93.11/II, 1167), it would again seem safe to add only one or perhaps two more variants: 'turning back in irresoluteness' > 'turning in irresolution' (83.31/II, 839-840); and 'watching her as he undid her gown' > 'watching her as she undid her gown' (100.35/II, 1433-1434).⁵⁶ There is admittedly a group of three further variants which, occurring within a few pages of each other, might suggest an intermittently closer authorial attention to the

55 The revision is a fascinating instance of a redoubled recall of fact. I put on record here, in 2022, that when this essay in 1973 had already gone to press, a visit to Clongowes revealed to me the double lining of the avenue: one line of chestnuts, one of limes.

56 This is a fascinating variant. Stephen also notes 'the proud conscious movement of her perfumed head' which accompanies the undoing of the gown. Moreover, the next paragraph in the text makes it clear that Stephen and the young woman stand apart in her room: '. . . she came over to him and embraced him. . . ' 'Watching her as he undid her gown', therefore, which very clearly is the manuscript reading, appears to be a genuine Freudian slip of the author. It need not, of course, have been corrected by him. A typist or compositor would have been capable of spotting the inconsistency.

typescript: 'arching their arms above their heads' > 'circling their arms above their heads' (74.6/II, 497), 'the old restless moodiness had again filled his heart' > '... had again filled his breast' (77.20/II, 618), and 'the patchwork of the footpath' > 'the patchwork of the pathway' (79.1/II, 670). However, careful scrutiny of the original readings as they look in Joyce's handwriting makes it virtually certain that 'circling' and 'breast' are really misreadings of 'arching' and 'heart'. The apparent cluster is thus reduced to a single variant. By noting further that 'footpath' in several other instances throughout the novel is Joyce's unvaried term for 'pavement', one is led to reject 'pathway' as a typist's or compositor's unauthorised substitution.

Thus, where variants in E are substituted for good manuscript readings, Chapter I appears to contain but three, and Chapter II a maximum of five authorial corrections. Of this total of eight, six (or five) show concern with factual accuracy ('Mr' Barrett, and 'limes' [twice]) or internal consistency of the text (Kickham, Moonan, 'limes' again, and 'he' > 'she', if this was an authorial correction). The two others seem concerned with a greater appropriateness ('there' as substituted for 'in the square') or fluency ('turning in irresolution') of expression. Under the criteria by which these eight variants were separated from a host of erroneous or indifferent readings, no variants at all—except the third instance of 'chestnuts' > 'limes' (108.34/III, 242) early in Chapter III—can be made out with assurance in Chapters III and IV. It is only in Chapter V that the correcting and revising hand of the author is again unmistakably present. The corrections here appear to have been made as reticently, or superficially, as in the first two chapters, but, where they occur, to have been made for similar reasons. Owing to the length of the chapter, their total number is slightly higher than before. Yet six of them, that is two-thirds of a total of nine, are clustered within twelve pages of the printed text. 'His toothpick' > 'his rude toothpick' (229.33), which represents both a stylistic improvement and a concern for greater precision, has already been referred to. Precision and factual accuracy is also the aim of 'Drumcondra' > 'Lower Drumcondra' (188.32/V, 519), 'unesthetic emotions' > 'not aesthetic emotions' (206.10/V, 1138) and 'northward' > 'southward' (238.23/V, 2278), while improvement of style and expression predominantly motivate the changes 'benevolent mirth' > 'benevolent malice' (210.27/V, 1299), 'ringless' > 'toneless'

(227.22/V, 1890),⁵⁷ 'old swans' > 'a game of swans' (228.20/V, 1923), and 'brief hiss' > 'soft hiss' (232.32/V, 2076). To this latter variant, the ninth and last in the list: 'brief hiss' > 'swift hiss' (226.27/V, 1860) is related, which however would seem to require emendation. At 232.27/V, 2071: '... and a soft hiss fell again from a window above', 'soft' is the original manuscript reading, while at lines 226.27/V, 1860 and 232.32/V, 2076 the manuscript still has 'brief hiss'. In revision, 232.32/V, 2076 follows 232.27/V, 2071 to read 'soft hiss'. But surely it is the sentence at 226.27/V, 1860, which in the manuscript reads 'A sudden brief hiss fell from the windows above him . . .' that both occurrences on p. 232/V, 2071, 2076 are meant to recall. The revision was presumably retroactive, the author going back to alter 'brief hiss' on p. 226/V, 1860 after having unified the readings on p. 232/V, 2071, 2076 to 'soft hiss'. I take it that 'swift hiss' at 226.27/V, 1860 is an error of the E compositor, who misread 'soft' as it was written by hand in the typescript, and would therefore emend to 'soft hiss' on the strength of the parallel revision at 232.32/V, 2076.

Thus, in the field of substitute readings, where initially all variants were suspected of being authorial in origin, the number of authoritative changes in the *Egoist* text has been narrowed down to a total of eighteen. All other variant readings substituted in E for good manuscript readings, that is something like half of the 317 D-E substantive variants, must consequently be classed as unauthoritative. This large group of variants, then, seems in view of a projected editorial hypothesis to be practically identical in nature with that of the omissions, and by our comprehensive analysis it is thereby suggested that all substantive variants in E, with the exception of a small number of narrowly definable and identifiable readings, are unauthorised. This is a result attractive in its consistency and, though essentially hypothetical, it gains in probability from the three-pronged approach to the evidence as divided into three distinct groups of variants. It should be recalled at this stage, however, that the entire large group of the omissions was approached above with the initial expectation of a total lack of authorial interference and has so far been only provisionally designated as an area of exclusively unauthorised variation. Before final conclusions are

57 This revision, to avoid a quibble on Dixon's signet ring, is comparable to the E->H authorial change of 'trunk' > 'body' at 201.15/V, 967 to avoid a pun on the preceding 'whinny of an elephant'.

asserted, the omissions should therefore be briefly surveyed once more with regard to the fact that a certain degree of authorial attention to the text has meanwhile been ascertained. The authorial correction of the text was, it is true, evidently reticent and probably superficial, and to have established it as a fact cannot therefore in principle change our conception of the group of the omissions taken as a whole. Critically assessed in aggregate, they indicate that they were largely typist's errors which went by unnoticed in the author's reading of the typescript. In the three chapters in particular that contain more than one authorial variant each, there is not a single omission which, by its nature, suggests that it, too, might be authorial in origin. It is only in the latter half of Chapter III that doubts arise whether all omissions observed should be blamed on the typist (or compositor). At the rhetorical climax of the last of the hell sermons there is a passage which in the printed text has three separate omissions in brief succession:

O what a dreadful punishment! An eternity of endless agony, of endless bodily and spiritual torment, without one ray of hope, without one moment of cessation, of agony [limitless in extent,] limitless in intensity, of torment [infinitely lasting,] infinitely varied, of torture that sustains eternally that which it eternally devours, of anguish that everlastingly preys upon the spirit while it racks the flesh, an eternity, every instant of which is itself [an eternity, and that eternity] an eternity of woe. Such is the terrible punishment decreed for those who die in mortal sin by an almighty and a just God. (133.10-20/III, 1106-1115)

According to the rules established by Anderson for the treatment of omitted phrases,⁵⁸ which have in principle been accepted above, there is no alternative to regarding these omissions as three errors by the typist. But thus to regard them means to accept that he nodded three times separately in rapid succession, and yet in a curiously systematic way. On literary grounds, on the other hand—and therefore by reasoning that lies outside the area of textual analysis based on the transmitting documents—it is tempting to see the author at work here, pruning an excess of repetitive rhetoric for the sake of stylistic improvement, and a heightened rather than a lessened impact of the words. Under this aspect, the three separate errors of the typist would appear transformed

58 Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 177, singles out this passage as one of his examples.

into a single tripartite authorial cut. Were this to prove the only example in the text where omission became suspected of being authorial in origin, an editorial decision to respect it as such would be very hard indeed to defend, however much one's instinctive literary feeling were averse to restoring the full manuscript wording. But, very tentatively, something like a case can be made out for a repeated incidence of authorial cuts in the second half of Chapter III, whereby these would become identifiable and separable as a group from the other omissions, and thus editorially acceptable as readings in the variant form of the printed text. Three such omissions occur a few pages after the passage quoted which could also conceivably be due to a desire to reduce a repetitiveness of expression (as indicated):

Was that then he or an inhuman thing moved by a lower [soul than his] soul? His soul sickened at the thought. . . . (140.1-2/III, 1342-1343).

Confess! He had to confess every sin. How could he utter in words to the priest what he had done? Must, must. Or how could he explain without dying of shame? Or how could he have done such things without shame? A [madman, a loathsome] madman! Confess! O he would indeed to be free and sinless again! Perhaps the priest would know. O dear God! (140.14-20/III, 1354-1359).

He could still escape from the shame. [O what shame! His face was burning with shame.] Had it been any terrible crime but that one sin! Had it been murder! Little fiery flakes fell and touched him at all points, shameful thoughts, shameful words, shameful acts. Shame covered him wholly like fine glowing ashes falling continually. (142.24-30/III, 1434-1440).

As it happens, it is in close vicinity to these passages that a later intentional deletion is recorded. The first of the errata on EC-W, fol. 2, is 'delete "of herrings"' and refers to 'Frowsy girls sat along the curbstones before their baskets [of herrings]' (140.26/III, 1365). This may be pure coincidence, and it proves no more than that Joyce was in fact capable of making a cut in *A Portrait*—an attitude of authorial self-criticism not readily evident otherwise in this text. This deletion has no intrinsic similarity to the four examples of omission in E here considered, and it can hardly be taken to reinforce an assumption that they are of authorial origin. If it were true that they are all genuine cuts, then this would indicate that the latter half of Chapter III, portraying as it does Stephen's

intensely painful self-torture, gave particular pains in the writing and was textually fluid for longer than any other section of the novel. However, in the absence of the Chapter III typescript, any argument of textual or of literary criticism in relation to the variant passages must remain highly speculative.

On the whole, then, the variant readings in E caused by the omission of words, phrases and sentences from the manuscript text can now confidently be declared unauthoritative, as can the large majority of those variants in E that are substitutes for good manuscript readings. Conversely: on the basis of the preceding analysis, we consider, out of a total of 317 substantive variants between D and E, only eighteen substitute readings, most of twenty-nine corrections of incomplete or obviously erroneous manuscript readings, and possibly six omissions (occurring in four passages in the second half of Chapter III) as authorised. With respect to the body of D-E variance, provisional rules for establishing a critical text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* may be set out as follows:

Of the variants in E,

1. *Admit* all corrections of incomplete and erroneous D readings that are not obviously either miscorrections or style-sheet rectifications of grammar and syntax;
2. *admit* eighteen authorial corrections and revisions;
3. *do not admit* other substitutes for good D readings, whether or not they seem individually possible as variants;
4. *do not admit* readings in E that are the result of omission of single words, phrases, or sentences of the D text (with the possible exception of six such variants in the second half of Chapter III);
5. *do not admit* the E variation in accidentals.⁵⁹

59 These are provisional rules, as the facts and inferences concerning the subsequent rounds of authorial correction by which they must be augmented and modified have not yet been discussed. Yet they are also the central rules for establishing a critical text, as the results of a comprehensive analysis of the body of D-E variance must form the basis for any editorial hypothesis and procedure. It may be appropriate therefore in their light to indicate statistically whether 'the definitive text, corrected from the Dublin holograph . . . published in 1964 by The Viking Press, Inc.' has a claim to being definitive. Of the total of substantive variants, that is 317 by our

The Typescript

The hypothesis developed in the preceding pages for the total of the substantive D-E variance, a hypothesis which in turn must serve as the basis for a comprehensive theory of the textual transmission capable of governing editorial decision in establishing a critical text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, has, it is true, a narrow foundation. It depends on an evaluation of those variant readings in E which are substitutes for good manuscript readings; and only if, by this evaluation, it is ultimately correct to accept no more than eighteen such variants as authoritative, is it valid editorially to reject the other *Egoist* readings which belong to this group and, furthermore, to conclude by analogy that a great majority, if not all, of the *Egoist* variants resulting from the omission of manuscript readings are also unauthoritative. It is most fortunate, therefore, that—contrary to previous assumptions—there is no need to trust exclusively in the soundness of a logical construct. Rather, it has in fact been possible to trace large fragments of Chapters I and II of the Trieste typescript against which our hypothetical assumptions can be tested.

The typewritten fragments of the text of *A Portrait* come from the possession of Dora Marsden, founder of *The Egoist*, and still its editor when the first ten instalments of Joyce's novel were published. They contain the text for most of these ten instalments. Of sixty-eight numbered typewritten pages of Chapter I, only pages 1-15, that is the

count, twenty-nine (by our count) are corrections in E of manuscript error. This leaves 288 instances on which editorial decision must operate. Giving the editors the benefit of the doubt in the case of the possible six authorial cuts in Chapter III, we find that in 158 out of the 288 instances the editorial decision follows the rules here postulated, while in 130 instances it goes against them. The ratio of (what we would regard as) correct to incorrect is thus 55%:45%. Taking into account that several 'correct' decisions were in fact anticipated by the author in the course of his repeated subsequent corrections of the text, this is tantamount to a flat 50:50 ratio of hit and miss. Corresponding figures for the treatment of accidentals—which by reason of Joyce's fairly systematic later restyling of hyphenations and capitalizations could in any case not be based on the D-E variation—have not been worked out. Nor has the treatment in the Viking text of substantive variance in the later editions (H, B, J) been systematically analysed. The impression that it, too, is somewhat haphazard—and particularly so with regard to the J variants on which hypothetical inference must again operate—stems from cursory observation only. It would seem that these facts and conditions are due to the lack of a comprehensive and logically consistent hypothesis of the transmission of the text of *A Portrait* from the Dublin holograph (1913/14) to the third book edition (Jonathan Cape, 1924). This lack prevents the 1964 Viking edition from fulfilling the standards of a definitive text.

entire first instalment plus three sentences of the second, and the single pages 53 and 59 are missing. Of Chapter II, for which the page numbering starts afresh, pages 1-9 and 17-27, plus six lines of p. 28, are extant, which correspond to the first, the third and part of the fourth *Egoist* instalments of that chapter. The last fragment breaks off in the middle of the last *Egoist* instalment of the novel published under Dora Marsden's editorship. There are seventy-one pages and six lines of typescript in all. Upon collation against both D and E, a great number of readings, variant and invariant, in the text of these typewritten pages immediately suggest that they are indeed part of the Trieste typescript. Yet wherever there is no significant variation between the text in the typescript and in E, the process of transmission could, of course, be thought of as reversed. Order and direction of transmission are determined by those readings or typographical characteristics only which are invariant between D and the pages of the typescript, but variant between these and E. It is thus above all the reproduction in full of Joyce's manuscript system of dashes in dialogue in the typewritten pages, as against the absence of intermediate and final dashes in all dialogue in Chapters I and II in E,⁶⁰ which places the text of these pages firmly between that in D and in E and identifies the fragments as part of the Trieste typescript (T). Consequently, such instances of variation between D and T as the apparent, or indeed obvious, misreadings of Joyce's handwriting also attain value as evidence to secure this identification. They demonstrate, furthermore, that T was copied directly from D. That the extant fragments of typescript in their turn were used as printer's copy for E is not merely rendered likely by the circumstances of their preservation, but is also demonstrable from errors of a typographical nature in the typescript,⁶¹ and by a large number of marks (crosses, queries, and the like) which would seem to have been added in the printing house.⁶²

60 See above, pp. 44-46.

61 In particular, the typewriter used seems to have had no key for underlining. The underlinings in T which copy underlinings in D to indicate italics in print were done by hand and are missing in all those places in T where E fails to italicize.

62 This discussion is based on xerox copies of the extant pages which were kindly put at my disposal by Mrs Elaine Bate who now owns the originals, and to whom I am grateful for permission to use the copies for the purposes of this article. Since the article went to press, I have had the opportunity of inspecting the fragments themselves. They are the ribbon-copy typescript originals, on white typewriting paper 22.5 x 28.4 cm., uniformly watermarked CROXLEY MANIFEST BANK

When so much has been established, both the D-T and the T-E variance which occurs within the stretches of text preserved can be more closely analysed. In accidentals, D-T and T-E variation is clearly distinguishable. In both chapters, additional commas are very rarely indeed introduced in T. The Chapter I pages add four commas, the Chapter II pages add three. The typical typescript error in punctuation is rather one of omission of commas. Thirteen manuscript commas are missing in Chapter I, of which some have been restored in print and some not, and nine commas are missing in Chapter II, only one of which has been restored in E. The adding of commas to the printed text, although comparatively restrained in Chapters I and II, is thus clearly a compositorial commission. The increase in capitalizations, on the other hand, is pretty evenly distributed between T and E, while the printers again are responsible for the greater part, though not all, of the additional hyphenation of compounds in E. By contrast, it is the rare substantive variant that originates in E. What earlier collation established as D-E variance in substantives is in fact seen to be variation between D and T. This is as it should be according to the basic assumptions of our hypothesis for the transmission from D to E of the entire novel, and it is gratifying to find it confirmed for the sections of T preserved. A grouping of the D-E substantive variants, undertaken hypothetically before for the sake of a coherent textual theory, can now be based on firmer evidence. Moreover, to determine the exact source and point of origin of a variant becomes a practical necessity for defining the nature and degree of authority of the recovered intermediary textual witness.

| LONDON under a rampant lion, facing left, which holds in its front paws a standard, unfolding over its head and bearing the inscription LION BRAND. The ribbon ink, originally of a blackish colour, has been affected by damp and has largely turned purple. Each of the chapters separately was once stapled together very close to the left paper edge. Every sheet shows holes in the upper right-hand corner which appear to be the marks of the compositor's copy-holder. The rust-marks of paper clips indicate that the fragmentation of the typescript is of an early date, in all probability resulting from the manuscript's handling in the printing house. The authorial corrections can without much difficulty be isolated from the several stages of annotation in evidence. Page II.17, which is the first leaf of the last of the extant fragments, bears the inscription in watery-blue ink 'Portrait of The Artist as a young Man | by | James Joyce'. The handwriting is Ezra Pound's. The Dublin holograph, which I have also meanwhile been able to inspect, shows a series of pencil marks throughout Chapter I which in ten instances divide off page-beginnings of the typescript, and in two instances specify an (authorial?) re-paragraphing of the text, carried out in the typescript.

The omission from the typed text of words, phrases and sentences presents once again the crucial textual problem. D does not indicate any omissions. On the evidence of the typescript, it is no more likely that they represent authorial, and thus authoritative, cuts at a lost stage of transmission between D and T. As T was demonstrably typed from D, such a lost stage could in any case not be thought of as yet another full transcript of the text intervening between D and T. At the most, the possibility of authorial direction in the form of oral or written instructions to the typist might be considered if the omissions were hypothetically posited as authorial cuts. But not a single variant outside the group of the omissions would help to strengthen any speculatively posited authorial attention to the text between D and T. Even the simple corrections evident in T of incomplete or obviously erroneous manuscript readings could have been made by a typist on his own initiative; it need not be assumed that the author was consulted for them. The correction of one incomplete manuscript reading, indeed, which was not caught by the typist, is entered in T in the author's hand ('wondering' [66.23/II, 228]), thus allowing the inference that the others of its kind were done by the typist and consequently, on the evidence of this group of variants, no authorial correction intervened between D and T.⁶³ All further circumstantial evidence considered above, moreover, which suggests that the variants due to omission of manuscript readings were errors in typing is in no way invalidated by any new evidence from the typescript. The responsibility for the considerable degree of deterioration from manuscript to print of the text of *A Portrait* is still largely on a typist. He had to take all blame *in absentia* before. Now the extent of his inattention to the text can be more firmly assessed. With respect to omissions, the typewritten pages reveal that errors of omission were corrected, the corrections always being typed in, in only a few instances when they were caught in the course of the typing. A systematic reading by the typist of the finished typescript against copy seems not to have taken place. Beyond that, there is only one instance in the entire seventy-one

63 If it could be assumed that the conditions under which the typescript came about remained fairly constant throughout the five chapters, one would expect to find those corrections of incomplete manuscript readings in Chapter V which appear to be clearly authorial similarly to have been written into the typescript. This would agree with the evidence from authorial correction/revision and definitely indicate one round of authorial attention to Chapter V only.

pages and six lines of typescript preserved where the author himself caught a typist's omission and corrected it. It is this instance alone which must take all burden of proof,⁶⁴ in so far as proof can be supplied by the typescript, that the omission of manuscript matter in print was due to typescript error and does not represent intentional authorial cuts. The manuscript sentence: 'Perhaps that was why they were in the square because it was a place where some fellows wrote things for cod' (43.24) is rendered in the typescript as: 'Perhaps that was why they were because it was a place. . . '. The author adds 'there' above the typewritten line, indicating the place of insertion by a caret between 'were' and 'because'. Clearly, 'in the square' are words erroneously omitted by the typist. The error was caught by the author (as so many of its kind were not) and corrected without collation against the manuscript.⁶⁵

The typescript thus bears marks which unmistakably show that it was read by James Joyce himself, though they indicate at the same time that his reading, too, did not take the form of a thorough collation against the manuscript. This goes some way towards explaining why, as errors, the many omissions of manuscript readings should have been so

64 Proof, that is, as distinct from 'first-degree' inference from facts such as the inscription of the words on the manuscript pages which were observed earlier, to render plausible the explanation that the omissions were typist's errors; or 'second-degree' inference to the same effect, taking the form of conclusions drawn by analogy from an analysis of a different group of variants which were inferentially also declared to be non-authorial.

65 As it happens, 'there' seems on literary grounds to be a definite improvement over 'in the square', referring as it does to both outdoor and indoor locations in that square. The evidence of T creates a paradoxical situation, even an editor's dilemma. 'there', it is true, is confirmed to be authorial, as was hypothetically assumed before the T fragments came to light. At the same time, it is revealed not as a revision undertaken in view of the original reading, but as a spontaneous correction of a typist's error. As an instance of alternative phrasing it was never intended to replace, but rather to restore the reading which had accidentally got lost. What on first sight appears to be an authorial second thought is really an attempt to recover the wording of a first thought. Editorially this means that the original reading 'in the square' should be given preference over the authorial correction 'there', contrary to the general rule by which authorial corrections should replace original readings in a critical text, and despite the subjective judgement that 'there' be preferable to 'in the square' in its context. The editorial decision to adhere to textual logic over literary judgement is inevitable because the situation is not unique in the course of the transmission of *A Portrait*: when reading the E text for H, and H for B, Joyce belatedly spotted several further typescript errors of omission which he corrected without recourse to his manuscript. The results of his correction always differ from the original readings, though never, except in the present case, for the better.

consistently overlooked. Moreover, few and far between as are the marks which signalize Joyce's presence, they are also proof that his reading (as hypothetically assumed) was perfunctory only, and probably hasty. In the extant fragments of typescript there are only three instances in all of substantive authorial correction. In addition to the insertion of the omitted 'wondering', and of 'there' for the omitted 'in the square', the third authorial correction is 'Father' > 'Mr' (30.1). The part of our hypothesis that posited a scarcity of authorial corrections among the *Egoist* readings that replace good manuscript readings would thus also seem to be confirmed by the typescript. As it has already been shown that the text appears to have been given no authorial attention between D and T, it follows that all variants of this kind, too, were introduced by a typist and are non-authoritative, and that authority belongs only to those variant readings that are seen to have been entered in the author's hand in T. On the narrow basis provided by the extant fragments of typescript, this is an argument mainly by negatives. None of the passages of text in Chapter II where authorial correction was assumed are preserved in T, so that it cannot be positively shown that those variants alone are authorial in origin which were hypothetically singled out as such, although it is apparent from as much text as is extant that no other variants replacing good manuscript readings are authorial of which this was not expected. The same is true for the much longer fragment of Chapter I. Of the three variants in this chapter hypothetically assumed to have been authorial, the assumption has been confirmed without reservation for one (Father > 'Mr'), and with some modification, not touching on the fact of its authorial origin, for a second ('in the square' > 'there'). The third member of the group, however, is still invariant in T: the manuscript 'avenue of chestnuts' leading up to Clongowes is still an 'avenue of chestnuts'. The reading must have been altered between T and E.

If it is to be maintained that 'limes' for 'chestnuts' is an authorised variant, an influx of authority in some form must be assumed at a stage of transmission after the typescript was authorially corrected to the extent observable in its extant fragments, and before the printed *Egoist* text as typeset and proofread was published. This assumption is strengthened by the observation that 'limes' for 'chestnuts' in Chapter I is not an isolated instance of significant T-E variation. (There is no

corresponding variation in the Chapter II fragments.) For the extant text of Chapter I, there is a total of nine substantive T-E variants. In two instances, T copies the manuscript readings correctly and there are marks of the printer's pen or pencil set against them in T, which suggest that the subsequent E variants originated in the printing house and are therefore unauthorised. In the remaining seven instances, on the other hand, T also varies from D and it is the original manuscript reading which has in each case been restored in E.⁶⁶ In three of these seven cases, the T variant is an error to which the manuscript reading is the obvious alternative; a compositor or printing house proofreader could easily have made the correction. Yet, in the remaining four cases, the correction of the T error can have been made only from a knowledge of the manuscript reading as restored. There are thus five instances of substantive T-E variation—interestingly enough confined to the second and third *Egoist* instalments—which make it an inevitable conclusion that the text of Chapter I, or part of it, was referred to an authority in the course of transmission between extant T (as authorially corrected) and E. In other words, the *Egoist* text of Chapter I was to some extent authoritatively proofread before publication. One possible explanation of this fact would be that proofsheets of the chapter, or of the two instalments concerned, were sent to Joyce in Trieste. No further indication, it is true, derives from a collation of corrected T and E that this was the case, nor is any documentary evidence available from letters or the like to show that Joyce ever proofread any part of the *Egoist* text. Yet if the typescript used as the *Egoist* printer's copy was the only copy of T which ever existed, the variants observed would allow no other conclusion.⁶⁷ If, however, T was typed, say, with a carbon copy, and thus

66 These seven instances are: father > uncle > father (26.11/I, 673); he had got > got > he had got (28.8/I, 739); or > [om.] > or (32.5/I, 876); Let it > let us > let it (32.8/I, 879); opinions > opinion > opinions (34.14/I, 953); MacManus > MacManns > MacManus (38.27/I, 1107); about it > about > about it (53.1/I, 1616). The variant chestnuts > chestnuts > limes occurs at 24.10/I, 601.

67 If it were assumed that as much text as made up the first three *Egoist* instalments was set up at once by the printers on receiving Chapter I in manuscript, then it would be possible to imagine that proofs of instalments two and three were passed to and fro between England and Trieste in the last days of January/early days of February 1914, while the first *Egoist* instalment of 2 February was already appearing. The change chestnuts > limes is involved, which is identically repeated in Chapters II and III. To ascertain when, where, and by what agent it was introduced into the final *Egoist* text in its first instance would carry implications for the timing of the

existed in duplicate, one might assume that the copy of T which did not serve as printer's copy contained the additional corrections, entered by hand by the author and/or typist, and was used for proofreading by some agent other than the author. No immediate proof is available as to which of these explanations, if any, is correct. Nevertheless, authoritative proofreading assuredly took place between the corrected T and E. It did not broadly affect the text, and the few variants involved assert their authority mainly on their own strength.

The hypothetical concept of the transmission of the entire text of *A Portrait* from D to E, such as it was derived from a comprehensive collation and analysis of these two textual witnesses, is thus in no way invalidated by further investigation of the transmission processes as controllable in those sections of the intermediary textual witness, the typescript, which happen to have been preserved. For most of Chapter I and for substantial fragments of Chapter II, that is for those stretches of text which correspond to the extant pages of typescript, the postulates of our hypothesis have been fully confirmed, and a clear differentiation of the several stages of transmission of the text from manuscript to print is amply indicated. The question that remains to be answered is what further inferences may be drawn for the full text of the novel by extrapolation from the positive facts established about the transmission of the first two chapters. The most important fact not yet considered of the extant fragments of T is that each of the first two chapters was typed by a different typist. This is clear from a difference in spelling habits: in the Chapter II fragments of the typescript, the name of the novel's hero is consistently spelled 'Stephan'; it was probably the author himself who painstakingly changed the spelling back to 'Stephen' in almost every instance. Moreover, Joyce's system of dashes in dialogue is regularly complemented by additional punctuation at the end, and sometimes rather illogically also in the middle, of direct speech in Chapter I, whereas in Chapter II the manuscript punctuation of dialogue is copied faithfully without additional marks of punctuation. Statistics derived from the incidence of substantive variance further corroborate a differentiation of typists. There is an average of 2.3 substantive variants per printed column in the 27.5 columns of *Egoist* text for Chapter I, as against an

completion of both the authorial fair copy and of the typescript for all of Chapter II, and the beginning, at least, of Chapter III.

average of 3.9 per column for Chapter II. Leaving out of account the 3+5 variants in Chapters I and II, which are with some certainty authorial corrections and revisions, the figures are 2.2/3.7. These figures comprise substantive variants of typescript and printing-house origin. But since it can be positively established that the printing house compositors were responsible for only a minority of the substantive D-E variants—in the sections of the text preserved in typescript, the compositors in Chapter I introduced nine out of fifty-three, or roughly the sixth part of the substantive variants, and in Chapter II three out of twenty-nine, or approximately only one-tenth—the averages per column of printed text give a fair indication of the relative trustworthiness of the two typists. The Chapter II typist was significantly less faithful to copy in substantives (though more so in accidentals); his spelling 'Stephan' may even suggest that his native tongue was not English.

When statistical calculations are extended over the remaining chapters of the novel, it is remarkable that the higher incidence of variation and error per column of printed text is confined to Chapter II. The corresponding figures for Chapters III-V (with and without authorial variants, and giving the typist the benefit of the doubt by assuming that the omissions in the latter part of Chapter III are authorial) are 2.4:2.1/2.35:2.35/2.1:1.9. They are thus very close to the incidence of variation in Chapter I (2.3:2.2). Noting that when the printed text introduces Joyce's dashes in dialogue from halfway through Chapter III onwards, it does so not in the strictly faithful manner of the typescript of Chapter II, but rather according to the pattern of that of Chapter I, combining the dashes with additional punctuation, one is tentatively led to conclude that the identical typist was employed on Chapters I and III-V, while a second person typed Chapter II only. The general uniformity of the kind of variants introduced and errors committed would appear to support the conclusion. The uniformity, it is true, extends over all five chapters. The statistics alone would, in the absence of any part of the typescript, not be very reliable as an aid to differentiating typists, since their figures indicate a varying amount only, and not a difference in nature of variants and errors. But once a second typist for Chapter II has been identified by several aspects of his extant handiwork, it is of no great consequence that he happened to be prone to the same kind of failings towards the manuscript as was the typist for Chapter I.

What is important is inferentially to conclude that he was responsible for Chapter II only, and thereupon to recognise that both the statistical figures and the uniform nature of the variants—that is, quantitative and qualitative arguments together—go to indicate that Chapters I and III-V in the typescript were the work of one other person, and one only. If, then, this conclusion is correct, it should greatly aid an editor in his evaluation of the total body of the D-E variation in substantives and, in particular, increase the assurance with which he posits that only a small minority of the substantive variants in E are the result of authorial correction and revision of the typescript.

Finally, the facts and inferences can be played with to speculate about the relative timing involved in the completion of the several sections of the manuscript and the typescript. By two typists, Chapters I and II could have been typed simultaneously. At least, it is not impossible to conceive that they were begun at about the same time, or else that their typing overlapped for some days, or a week or two, if it was Joyce's intention to get as large a section of the novel as possible to London as quickly as possible after Ezra Pound's enquiry of 15 December 1913 about printable material. But Chapter II was certainly not completed in typescript when Chapter I was, or they would have been dispatched together. Actually, the same typewriter may have been used for both: there are no typed underlinings in either chapter, and parentheses have regularly been substituted by dashes. Thus it is equally possible that they were typed in short succession after each other. It is not known when Chapter II arrived in London. But Chapter III, although belonging to that part of the novel which is assumed to have existed in final form since 1908, did not get there until 21 July (Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 354). Perhaps a second typist was employed on Chapter II because the first one was unavailable between January and July—unless the completion of the typescript for Chapter III was delayed by an interruption in the writing out of the fair-copy manuscript between Chapters II and III, or in the course of Chapter III. Only a physical examination of the manuscript itself might throw light on the circumstances under which Chapter III was copied out and typed.

On 1 August the war broke out, cutting off almost completely all postal connections between England and Austria. On 1 September, Chapter III ran out in *The Egoist*, and on 11 November Joyce managed to

dispatch the typescript of Chapters IV and V via Switzerland. Provided that the typescript was completed in the regular order of the chapters, I would tend to infer that the typing of Chapters III to V proceeded at a fairly even pace between July and October, and consequently that there was no last-minute rush in the writing of the novel itself. The hiatus in publication between 1 September and 1 December has been taken to indicate that *The Egoist* caught up with James Joyce too soon (Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 354; Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp. 182 ff.). But surely it was primarily due to the outbreak of the war. It was probably an editorial unwillingness to have to break off in the middle of a chapter in case *The Egoist* would not be able to continue publication at all which made the instalments of Chapter III on 1 August, 15 August and 1 September as long as they are. At the rate of publication of the previous chapters, Chapter III would probably have lasted until October. Chapter IV is short, and if it was begun to be typed soon after completion of Chapter III in late July, it ought to have been ready sometime in August and could, but for the war, have been dispatched to London to succeed Chapter III without gap in *The Egoist*. After Chapter IV, there was still Chapter V to be typed, which is by far the longest chapter, constituting almost one-third of the entire novel. It is the state of its text in E which indicates that it was probably completed in typescript under no special time pressure. It has the lowest incidence of substantive variation and error and, moreover, it was given greater authorial attention in the typescript than any of the previous chapters. By contrast, Chapter IV is perhaps the only chapter which appears not to have been authorially corrected at all. Had it, by November, been sitting about in typescript for so long that Joyce in the end forgot to read it? Or was Chapter IV perchance the last of the chapters to be written? It is perhaps significant that it is the only chapter of which several of the fair-copy manuscript pages still show signs of thorough stylistic revision. It is also the chapter which Joyce in July 1915 claims to remember so well as to be able to restore the censored sentences without the aid of his manuscript. A thorough analysis of the manuscript might throw light on the question, and also serve more generally as a test of whether the preceding speculative inferences about the successive completion of manuscript and typescript are tenable.

The Book Editions

Our final discussion of the stages of transmission of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* from the first printing in *The Egoist* to the 1924 Jonathan Cape edition must be brief. The publishing history has essentially been dealt with by Chester G. Anderson. He has also considered many of the editorially relevant facts and inferences to be derived from it in his discussion of the *Egoist* tearsheets which served as copy for H, and the Y corrections of H for B (see pp. 186 ff., 196 ff.). In so far as a modification of his views proved necessary, this has been given in the course of our analysis of EC-W, YTW and HB. Beyond that, it may suffice to summarize somewhat categorically to what extent the text of the novel as published in H and B may be accepted as authoritative. With respect to substantive readings, all those corrections and revisions represent a final authorial intention editorially to be respected that James Joyce himself carried out in full view of the text as transmitted invariant from the manuscript. There are no problems here in so far as the several rounds of authorial attention to the text are documented in EC-A and Y. The one question not previously considered is whether the Y corrections are the only stage at which the author modified the final text for B. There are at least two substantive variants in B which would seem to warrant a closer investigation. At 215.27/V, 1478, the text in B reads 'When they passed through the passage beside Kildare house . . .', as against ' . . . beside the royal Irish academy . . .' in H, and at 96.11/II, 1273 'ineffectualness' (H) is altered to 'ineffectiveness' in B. Neither Y nor HB contain directions for these changes. But as late as 25 November 1917, more than two months after the Southport printers had begun setting up B, Harriet Weaver was writing to Joyce: 'All your corrections have been made, including those you asked for in your last letter'. A careful scrutiny of all H-B variants, still to be undertaken, must endeavour to ascertain which were the additional changes which Joyce had requested; there can be little doubt that at least the first of the two alterations quoted were among them.

With respect to accidentals, the situation created by the author's corrections prior to H and to B is somewhat more complex, and for an editor methodically quite intriguing. When faced with the close to 600 additional commas in the text of the *Egoist* serialisation, Joyce went about restoring the light punctuation of his manuscript with considerable

determination. This process continued into Y. His paramount concern doubtless was for the rhythms of his text, the essential qualities of which—'to liberate from the personalised lumps of matter that which is their individuating rhythm'—had been early adumbrated in the very first paragraph of the narrative essay 'A Portrait of the Artist' of 1904. Yet for the flexible rhythms of his novel, its semicolons and its colons, placed and distinguished from each other with great subtlety in the manuscript, are as important as its commas. It is surely an indication of the author's increasing distance in time from a state of complete immersion in the work that, in the course of his corrections, he was much more permissive towards the printers' alterations of the original semicolons and colons. As for the commas, of course, many of those added by printing-house compositors were left standing in the text despite all authorial efforts to eradicate them. There can be no question for an editor but that he reproduce in a critical text as closely as possible the manuscript pattern of punctuation.

However, Joyce's attention to the accidentals of the text as printed in fact took two directions. As has been noted above, his reduction of next to all capitalization, and his preference in print for compounds written together as one word, are tantamount to a restyling of the text with respect to these accidentals. In so far as it can be positively ascertained that they were made by the author, the changes are part of the total authoritative correction and revision of E and H. As such, they invalidate, in part, the pattern of the manuscript inscription which cannot be editorially restored whenever positive authorial direction is given to depart from it. Neither, however, should a critical editor (as opposed perhaps to a publisher's editor) for the sake of a new typographical consistency, and in an attempt to finish what the author began, go beyond his alterations. Quite a number of original capitalizations and word divisions in fact survived Joyce's restyling. These cannot but be left untouched in a critical text, which will thus, in the treatment of accidentals, appear thoroughly inconsistent.⁶⁸

68 It is well to emphasize, however, that it appears to have been James Joyce's own concern for a pleasing typographical appearance of his text in print which motivated his changes of such accidentals as capitalizations and word divisions. With this in mind, it may be recalled that the question was raised and left open above whether consistency in the treatment of accidentals should in fact be extended to the adoption of the manuscript system of dashes in direct speech. On pragmatic grounds, I would

Inconsistency of the kind just advocated, however, is really an expression of editorial consistency based on a systematic enquiry into the extent of authority in each substantive textual witness. With regard to Joyce's *Portrait*, such consistency should be firmly extended to the last of the substantive texts, that of the Jonathan Cape edition of 1924 (J). Because its proofsheets have not been preserved, it presents greater textual problems than H and B. What attention James Joyce gave to it can only be inferred from external facts and the internal evidence of textual variants. A complete collation of B and J to ascertain all internal evidence has not yet been undertaken. But more is to be known of the external circumstances pertaining to this last phase of authoritative publication of the novel than has hitherto been realised. As mentioned by Anderson, Joyce reported to Harriet Weaver from Saint-Malo on 16 August 1924 that he had been reading revises for Jonathan Cape for ten days and had dispatched the proofs that day.⁶⁹ The company ledgers show that the book went into print on 28 August.⁷⁰ Antedating the August letter is a letter to Harriet Weaver of 11 July 1924, also from Saint-Malo. It states: 'Then Mr Cape and his printers gave me trouble. They set the book with perverted commas and I insisted on their removal by the sergeant-at-arms. Then they underlined passages which they thought undesirable. But as you will see from the enclosed: They were and, behold, they are not' (*Letters* III, 99 f.). I take this to mean that Joyce had received two sets of proofs from Jonathan Cape before 11 July. The context of the letter ('I left Paris in the usual whirl of confusion . . .') suggests that the second set arrived in Paris after Joyce's eye operation of 11 June and before he left for Saint-Malo on 6 or 7 July. Probably this was the set which he showed to Sylvia Beach who records her 'amazement at the printer's queries in the margins'.⁷¹ The author's refusal to cut at the request of

defer a decision in this matter until, by way of a practical experiment, a few sample pages were set up in type so as to show whether both printers and readers could within reason be asked to cope in full with the Joycean unorthodoxy of punctuation in dialogue. Robert Scholes in 'Some Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*: "The Dead"', *Studies in Bibliography*, 15 (1962), pp. 200 f., discusses the matter of Joyce's dashes in *Dubliners* and the later works. He has reduced Joyce's usage to initial dashes only in his Viking edition of *Dubliners* (1969).

69 Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 199, and *Letters* I, 220.

70 Information by courtesy of Messrs. Jonathan Cape, London.

71 See Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company* (London: Faber & Faber, 1960), p. 56; and cf. Anderson, 'The Text ...', p. 199.

the printers had apparently been accepted by 11 July. 'The enclosed' in the letter to Harriet Weaver would seem to have been some token of consent from Cape to publish the text entire. The question is whether Joyce voiced his refusal by letter only or in a note accompanying the return of the corrected second proofs. Should he indeed not have had the time or energy to read them in the 'whirl of confusion' before his departure from Paris, one might be left to wonder whether the proofs with the printers' underlinings were the revises which were finally not read until August. But Joyce was not only habitually prompt in matters regarding the publishing of his books, but, as the letter of 11 July also records, he was able after the eye operation to see to the proofing of the instalments of the French translation of *Ulysses* due to appear in the review *Commerce* (Ellmann, p. 562). It is therefore likely that the second proofs were returned before he left for Saint-Malo, however superficially they may have been read. If this was so, the revises which he corrected for ten days in August were the third round of proofs read on the Jonathan Cape text.

James Joyce, then, obviously took full advantage of the one and only opportunity he was ever given to see *A Portrait* through the press. Of course, this does not mean that the edition into which he poured his efforts ten years after the completion of the manuscript presents a text to override all previous texts. The inevitable deterioration of the text in ten years of transmission has not been remedied in the edition of 1924. Nor has the text been extensively revised. Even a cursory perusal of J will satisfy an editor that the authorial proofreading was not by any means on the scale of Joyce's reading and revising in proof of the text of *Ulysses*. The comparison with the later work indeed emphasizes the remarkable reticence against change and revision which Joyce showed towards the text of *A Portrait* at every stage of correction. By analogy to the earlier rounds of authorial correction of the text, it should be expected that the proofreading of J which did take place affected both accidentals and substantives. That Joyce paid attention to the accidentals is proved, for example, when J, restoring the manuscript punctuation, reads: 'What is this your name is?' (50.1/I, 1508) against the typescript error perpetuated through B: 'What is this? Your name is?' But it is an exceptional case when it can be proved on internal evidence that the author was responsible for a variant in accidentals. Generally, the lack of documentation prevents editorial acceptance of such variation. The

substantive variants in J, on the other hand, are susceptible to evaluation by which it should be possible satisfactorily to identify the authorial corrections and revisions. For example, the manuscript sentence: 'The doomsday was at hand.' (113.11/III, 397) was transmitted invariant through H. B, by the authorial direction of Y, changed to 'Doomsday', yet J reverts to the manuscript wording 'The doomsday' in what must be considered as the author's final decision on this reading, overruling the revision of Y. Similarly, the typescript error 'fellows' at 43.19/I, 1278 was transmitted unnoticed through B. J restores the singular 'fellow' of the manuscript. Finally, a subtle revision at 77.35, 'moment' for 'movement', indicates the author's care in proofreading. With 'movement' the manuscript had picked up 'a movement of impatience' of 77.28/II, 625, which itself is a recollection of 74.28/II, 517 and is only incidentally woven into the description of the situation of tension in the conversation between Heron, Wallis and Stephen (76.27-78.18/II, 588-652). Only in the 1924 re-reading of the text did Joyce himself realise that the proper reference of line 77.35/II, 632 should be to 'a shaft of momentary anger' of 77.12/II, 610.

Three sets of ground rules for establishing a critical text for James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* may thus be established:

1. Base a critical text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* on the holograph manuscript (D) of 1913/14.
2. In accidentals, accept the manuscript system of punctuation. Follow authorial directions as contained in EC-A and Y to restyle the manuscript capitalizations and word divisions.
3. In substantives, accept all authorial correction and revision as documented in the fragments of T, in EC-A and Y, or as ascertained by inference from an evaluation of the total body of substantive variance between each of the authoritative editions. Except for the corrections of incomplete manuscript readings in E (in so far as they are not manifest miscorrections or stylesheet rectifications of grammar and syntax), reject all non-authoritative variation in substantives.

With our present knowledge of the publishing history and the nature of the textual transmission of the novel, a critical edition, and maybe even a definitive text, of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is not impossible to attain.

