GENETIC INROADS INTO THE ART OF JAMES JOYCE

HANS WALTER GABLER

https://www.openbookpublishers.com

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

James Joyce's *Dubliners* Critical Edition 1993

Introduction

A True History, 1904–1914[1]

In the first days of July 1904, probably on the second or on the fourth of the month, the Irish mystic, poet and painter, and close friend of W. B. Yeats, George Russell (otherwise 'AE') wrote to James Joyce inviting him to submit a short story to *The Irish Homestead*—the weekly, self-styled 'Organ of Agricultural and Industrial Development in Ireland'. Russell asked for something 'simple, rural?, live-making?, pathos? ... not to shock the readers' (*Letters* II, 43).[2] The letter was timely. Despite his poverty, the twenty-two year old Joyce was in an expansive, confident mood. His burgeoning romance with Nora Barnacle was entering its fourth buoyant week, and he had begun to circulate among his friends and admirers the (incomplete) manuscript of his autobiographical novel *Stephen Hero*, on which he continued to work energetically.[3] Russell

1 This section, as based on fresh and original research in Dublin, was prepared in collaboration with John O'Hanlon and Danis Rose. Here, and throughout these present editions of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, I am most grateful for their help and advice.

2 Though this letter is undated, from circumstantial evidence and from the chronology of subsequent events we can be reasonably certain that Russell must have written it on, or very shortly after, Saturday 2 July 1904.

3 His sister May lugged the bulky manuscript around to Constantine Curran (then living in Cumberland place, North Circular road, not too far from Joyce's father's house in Cabra) on 23 June. See *Letters of James Joyce*, ed. by Stuart Gilbert, vol. I (New York: Viking Press, 1957, ²1966) (*Letters* I, 55). After Curran had read and returned it, Joyce gave it to George Russell to read. According to Richard Ellmann,

 https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0325.03

included with his letter the current issue of the *Homestead* and advised: 'Look at the story in this paper.' That Joyce did so, and with important consequences for the development—then in embryo—of his *oeuvre*, has thus far slipped through the net of Joycean scholarship and biography.

That part of *The Irish Homestead* for which Russell solicited a contribution was a section entitled 'Our Weekly Story'. In the summer of 1904, however, there was a troubling dearth of copy. The issues of 21 May, 28 May, and 4 June contained no story at all, the section in the issues of 11, 18, and 25 June was taken up by a three-part novelette by Louise Kenny, and the issues of 9 and 16 July again had no story. It follows that the sole issue to which Russell could have been referring was that of 2 July, in which issue there was indeed a story: a short piece written by Berkeley Campbell entitled 'The Old Watchman'. It is a first-person narrative in which the narrator, a twelve-year old boy, recounts the circumstances of the death of an old man he had befriended who had fallen on hard times. If this sounds familiar, then it should; for it would appear that Joyce not only read the story: he rewrote it. Had he called his own story 'The Old Priest', which, but for its subtler complexities of meaning he might have done, then that would have advertised the fact. Even so, he put into 'The Sisters' clues to the source of his artifice. In Campbell's story—which of course had the date of the issue (2 July) just above the title—the old watchman (who it transpires is the son of a former Dean of St Patrick's Cathedral) is sixty-five years of age; in the *Homestead* version of 'The Sisters', the card fixed to the door of the house where the old priest died reads: 'July 2nd, 189—The Rev. James Flynn (formerly of St. Ita's Church), aged 65 years. R. I. P.'[4]

James Joyce (New York: Oxford University Press, ²1982), p. 163, and conventional wisdom, it was Russell's reading of *Stephen Hero* which inspired him to write to Joyce asking for a story for the *Homestead*. But it is surely much more likely—given the tight chronology and given the fact that on an earlier occasion Russell had responded unfavourably to the poems of *Chamber Music*—that Joyce lent him the manuscript only after Russell had approached him. Furthermore, as we shall see, Russell had a more practical reason for writing.

4 There are other, lesser echoes. Campbell's boy usually spoke to the old watchman (he had pleurisy) while he was huddled over his fire basket. Joyce's boy conversed with the old priest while, wrapped up in his greatcoat, he sat by his fireside. The old watchman is not named; though his replacement is: James. Reverberations may be felt, too, even beyond 'The Sisters'. The watchman spent his exile in Australia, which is also where the schoolfriend of Eveline's father went (see especially the *Irish Homestead* version of 4.32-35). The watchman's earlier Dublin prodigality in

By 15 July, Joyce had finished writing 'The Sisters' and, indeed, having already progressed beyond the idea of one story, had formulated an ambitious plan. In a letter to Constantine Curran he announced: 'I am writing a series of epiclets—ten—for a paper. I have written one. I call the series *Dubliners* to betray the soul of that hemiplegia or paralysis which many consider a city'.[5] H. F. Norman, the editor of *The Irish Homestead*, accepted 'The Sisters' for publication on 23 July, making one change only: 'I am changing the name of the Parish quoted in the obituary notice so as to make the details of the story more remote'.[6] He sent Joyce a sovereign in payment. By a curious, sad coincidence, the story appeared in the issue of 13 August 1904, the first anniversary of Joyce's mother's untimely death. In such humble circumstances did *Dubliners*, and, beyond that, James Joyce's prose masterpieces, see their beginning in print.

Joyce adopted a pseudonym for 'The Sisters' and signed the story 'Stephen Daedalus'. He continued this practice with the next four or, possibly, five stories, reverting to his own name only in the summer of 1905, well into his exile. Stephen Daedalus, of course, was the name he had given to the principal character in *Stephen Hero* and the name which he had recently begun to use in signing letters to his friends (see, for example, *Letters* I, 54-55). Apart from the first ('The Sisters') and the last ('The Dead') the *Dubliners* stories were not written in the order of

---

drinking and gambling, albeit clichéd, is not unlike Jimmy's in the finale of 'After the Race'. Lastly, the Electric Tramway Company's watchman at his fire basket would seem an avatar of Gumley, the corporation's watchman at his brazier in Eumaeus, the sixteenth episode of *Ulysses* (and this episode especially, one should recall, has its roots in the story 'Ulysses' originally contemplated for *Dubliners*).

5 See *Letters* I, 55, where 'epiclets' is given as 'epicleti'. This misreading—'Greeker than the Greeks' (*U* 9.614)—has over the years led to deep yet, alas, misguided critical exegesis (see, for example, Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 163). Skeptical at what seemed to him an oblique way of using Greek, Wolfhard Steppe, co-editor of James Joyce, *Ulysses. A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, prepared by Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, 3 vols. (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1984, [2]1986), privately surmised that the word might simply be 'epiclets' (i.e., 'little epics', an ordinary English diminutive). A reading of the original in University College, Dublin, has proved him right. The letter, incidentally, is rather ambiguously dated 'The Rain, Friday'. As there were showers on just about every Friday during that summer, the weather accounts are not terribly helpful. The cricket reports are more enlightening: uniquely, on the morning of Friday, 15 July, there was 'torrential rain' sufficient to put a stop to play.

6 Letter to James Joyce of 23 July 1904, now at Cornell.

their ultimate arrangement. The second, 'Eveline', appeared in *The Irish Homestead* on 10 September, and very likely was composed during the second half of July and/or the first weeks of August. At that time, Joyce had begun to think prospectively about his relationship with Nora, and these considerations certainly inspired, if obliquely, its theme. 'After the Race' was drafted while Joyce raced about Dublin touching friends and enemies alike for the wherewithal to get away from Ireland. The story was completed on 3 October 1904[7] and handed in to the *Homestead* office the following day, just four days prior to Joyce's departure with Nora from the North Wall docks.[8]

James Joyce always considered 8 October 1904 as the date of his 'first' marriage to Nora Barnacle (the 'second' being their civil wedding in London on 4 July 1931). The Joyces, after brief stays in Zurich and Trieste, settled down in Pola in Austria. It was while at Zurich, however, in late October that he began his fourth story. He called it 'Christmas Eve'. A month later, from Pola, he reported to Stanislaus that he had written 'about half' of it (*Letters* II, 71). By this he presumably meant the fragmentary fair copy of four pages which has been preserved.[9] Instead of finishing this story he recast it as, or replaced it by, 'Hallow Eve', which he sent to Dublin on 19 January 1905. 'Hallow Eve' was not accepted by *The Irish Homestead*, nor is it extant today in any manuscript version. (By the end of September 1905 Joyce had retitled it 'The Clay' and 'slightly rewritten it' [*Letters* II, 109]. Subsequently, this title was abbreviated to

7 Joyce wrote from St Peter's terrace to Nora on this day: 'I am in such high good humour this morning that I insist on writing to you ... I got up early this morning to finish a story I was writing. When I had written a page I decided I would write a letter to you instead. Besides, I thought you disliked Monday and a letter from me might put you in better spirits', *Letters of James Joyce*, ed. by Richard Ellmann, vol. II and III (New York: Viking Press, 1966) (*Letters* II, 50). Ellmann has dated this letter 'About 1 September 1904'. This is certainly wrong. The possible contending Mondays are 30 August, 5, 12, 19 and 26 September, and 3 October. On the first date Joyce was still at 60 Shelbourne road; on the second at his uncle's in Fairview; on the third at the Tower; on the fourth back at his uncle's; and on the fifth had a bad cold and was feeling desolate (*Letters* II, 56). Which leaves 3 October. Furthermore, he signed the letter 'Jim', which he did only after his 'famous interview about the letters' with Nora on 9 September.

8 Jim, it turned out, was no Eveline; nor, in their tryst, was Nora.

9 All surviving manuscripts of *Dubliners* are reproduced in vol. [4] of *The James Joyce Archive:* James Joyce, *Dubliners. A Facsimile of Drafts and Manuscripts*, prefaced and arranged by Hans Walter Gabler, ed. by Michael Groden, *et al.*, 63 vols. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978).

'Clay'.) For the next several months, while he waited in vain for good news from Dublin and during which time he decided to dedicate the collection to Stanislaus—he subsequently changed his mind about this—Joyce did not proceed with *Dubliners* but, instead, focused his energies on *Stephen Hero*. In early May, he wrote to Stanislaus promising he would write another story if he knew the result of 'Hallow Eve'. Eventually he began to think seriously about finding another publisher. On 3 June he asked Stanislaus to get permission from the *Homestead* to republish the first two stories. In the next six weeks he wrote the fifth and sixth stories—'The Boarding House' and 'Counterparts'—and sent them to Stanislaus in mid-July, quite possibly in the very manuscripts that still survive. The first of these, 'The Boarding House', is dated 1 July 1905 in the extant manuscript and is the last physically to carry the signature 'Stephen Daedalus'; yet the manuscripts of these two stories are, as documents, so clearly companion pieces that 'Counterparts' too may have borne the name Daedalus on its lost final leaf. Thereafter, Joyce relinquished the pseudonymous pose and signed all subsequent *Dubliners* stories in his own name.

The summer of 1905 was for James Joyce as difficult as it was eventful. His faith in himself and in the life he had created with Nora began to falter. He suspended work on the autobiographical novel *Stephen Hero*, abandoning it in effect as a fragment of twenty-five (out of a projected sixty-three) chapters. About *Dubliners*, however, he remained sanguine, believing (incorrectly as it turned out) that he could find a publisher to bring it out sooner rather than later and that it would bring in some much-needed money. The birth of his son Giorgio on 27 July spurred him on to greater efforts. The seventh story to be written was 'A Painful Case'. It exists both in a draft manuscript (originally entitled 'A Painful Incident'), which at least in part documents the process of composition, and in a fair copy signed and dated 'JAJ 15.8.05'. The eighth story, 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', survives in two fair-copy manuscripts, of which the earlier is dated '29 August 1905', just two weeks later than the fair copy of 'A Painful Case'.[10] 'An Encounter' saw completion

10 For both of these stories, and for 'The Sisters' and 'After the Race', Joyce requested specific information in a letter to his brother of 24 September (*Letters* II, 109-112). Stanislaus authenticated details already present in them and in which, in the case of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', both manuscripts accord. The textual changes

about mid-September 1905 (within three weeks of 'Ivy Day') and was sent to Stanislaus on 18 September. 'A Mother', the tenth to be written, followed within a fortnight. Both of these stories are extant in fair-copy manuscripts.

Although Joyce's original plan (adumbrated in his letter to Constantine Curran of 15 July 1904 quoted above) of a suite of ten little epics was now complete, he had in the meantime changed his plans. Writing to William Heinemann on 23 September 1905, Joyce offered him *Dubliners*: 'a collection of twelve short stories.' On the following day he enumerated the sequence to Stanislaus: three stories of childhood, 'The Sisters', 'An Encounter', and another one (the as yet unwritten 'Araby'); three stories of adolescence, 'The Boarding House', 'After the Race', and 'Eveline'; three stories of mature life, 'The Clay', 'Counterparts', and 'A Painful Case'; and, completing the pattern, three stories of public life, 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', 'A Mother', and the last story of the book (the as yet unwritten 'Grace'). (This arrangement, as we shall see, was subsequently altered at least twice.) By mid-October 1905 the eleventh story, 'Araby', was completed and the twelfth, 'Grace', begun. At the same time, as is indicated by the range of questions in the letter to Stanislaus of 24 September, Joyce was busy revising the existing texts. The opening story of the collection benefitted tangibly from his brother's investigations, as is evident from the few but important variants between the version represented by the *Irish Homestead* printing and the first of the two extant manuscripts for 'The Sisters'. The changes prove that this manuscript postdates *The Irish Homestead* and suggest late October 1905 as its date. It is significant that a first reconsideration of the opening of the book thus apparently coincided with the composition of the then concluding story, 'Grace'.

In the meantime, and apparently at the instigation of Stanislaus, Joyce wrote to Arthur Symons, who replied saying that he thought that Constable's might be interested in both *Chamber Music* and *Dubliners*. Joyce sent them the former but held back the latter, offering it instead to Grant Richards on 15 October, adding, foolishly perhaps, that he believed

---

one finds entered in the second fair copy of 'Ivy Day' (as opposed to those revealed by collation with the first fair copy) are not related to the period and occasion of its composition but to its later history. It was one of several stories over which, time after time, publication difficulties arose.

that 'people might be willing to pay for the special odour of corruption which, I hope, floats over my stories' (*Letters* II, 123). Richards asked to see the manuscript three days later.[11] Both 'Grace' and the revision of the earlier stories were completed by the end of November and he sent the manuscript to Richards on 3 December. He did not then know it, but the nine-year ordeal of getting his book *Dubliners* printed and published had begun.

During the following two months, while he waited for word, Joyce added a new story, 'Two Gallants'. Richards finally responded on 17 February 1906, making Joyce an offer which was accepted. The book was to be published in May or June or in September in a slim crown octavo volume priced at 5/—. A contract followed on 23 February. The previous day Joyce had sent Richards 'Two Gallants' with the instruction that it should be inserted between 'After the Race' and 'The Boarding House'. (This suggests that, perhaps when he sent the stories to Richards, Joyce had interchanged the positions of 'The Boarding House' and 'Eveline' from their order as cited in his letter to Stanislaus of 24 September.) Returning the contract signed on 28 February, Joyce wrote: 'I would like the printer to follow the manuscript accurately in punctuation and arrangement. Inverted commas, for instance, to enclose dialogue always seemed to me a great eyesore' (*Letters* II, 131). He added that he had written part of a fourteenth story ('A Little Cloud'). This was still unfinished on 13 March when he wrote to say that it was to be inserted between 'The Boarding House' and 'Counterparts'. It was finished on 22 April. Before it could be fair-copied and sent, however, the storm clouds began to gather. Richards passed the manuscript of *Dubliners* to his printer on 12 April and instructed him to prepare sample pages. By a stroke of the worst possible luck, it seems that when Joyce had sent him the thirteenth story, 'Two Gallants', Richards had not inserted it into its proper place in the sequence, but had merely placed it on top of the pile. To provide the sample pages, then, the printer chose the beginning of 'Two Gallants' and had at least two pages set up (these survive and are now at Harvard). When reading his compositor's handiwork the printer was horrified, scrawled 'We cannot print this' on the second proof, and sent it back to Richards. On 23 April Richards informed Joyce of the

11 For Grant Richards's side of the correspondence, see Robert Scholes, 'Grant Richards to James Joyce', *Studies in Bibliography*, 16 (1963), 139-60.

printer's refusal and added that he had strong objections to two passages in 'Counterparts'. He returned the manuscripts of the two stories and, further, asked for another word to replace 'bloody' in 'Grace'. Joyce replied three days later, refusing to compromise. A long and protracted correspondence ensued, in which Joyce made some concessions and Richards demanded more deletions (*Letters* I, 60-63, and II, 132-143). Finally, the parties appeared to reach agreement. On 19 June Richards sent back the entire manuscript to Joyce in order that he might make the necessary alterations. On its resubmission on 9 July Joyce stated that he had 're-arranged and renumbered the stories in the middle of the book' and that he had included 'A Little Cloud' in the position that he had earlier indicated. This sequence was to remain stable. He also said that he had rewritten 'The Sisters.' It may be assumed that Richards received the opening story at this time in its second extant fair copy. In 'Grace', by contrast, Joyce had removed only two instances of 'bloody'. These, however, exist undeleted in the extant fair copy, which also incorporates passages following from Joyce's research at the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele in Rome in November 1906 into the proceedings of the Vatican Council of 1870. Among the surviving manuscripts of the *Dubliners* stories, this fair copy of 'Grace' is thus identified as postdating the original negotiations for publication with Grant Richards. Incidentally, it bypasses Richards's censorial strictures.

At the end of July 1906, Joyce moved with his family to Rome. During August he contemplated rewriting 'After the Race' and he also asked Stanislaus to send him the manuscript of 'A Painful Case' as he wanted to revise it.[12] On 31 August he said that he had 'some loose sheets in my pocket about 5 pages' to add to 'A Painful Case', but that he did not have the energy to continue working. The heat and the inhospitability of Rome oppressed him and he began to feel homesick for the British Isles, 'rashers and eggs in the morning, the English variety of sunshine, a beefsteak with boiled potatoes and onions, a pier at night or a beach and cigarettes' (*Letters* II, 157). By 25 September his nostalgia had grown stronger. 'Sometimes thinking of Ireland it seems to me that I have been unnecessarily harsh. I have reproduced (in *Dubliners* at least) none of its ingenuous insularity and its hospitality' (*Letters* II, 166). It has often

12 *Letters* II, 148. This would seem to indicate that, in addition to the set sent to Richards, Joyce left a spare manuscript of *Dubliners* with Stanislaus in Trieste.

been said that in these words of Joyce lies the germ of the last story of *Dubliners*, 'The Dead'.[13] Yet the conception and execution of 'The Dead' lay still almost a year ahead. More immediately, Joyce added four days later: 'I have a new story for *Dubliners* in my head. It deals with Mr Hunter' (*Letters* II, 168). This story which—at least in this context—never got any further than its title, but which was centred upon a spontaneous act of hospitality, was to be called 'Ulysses'.

Out of the blue, Grant Richards wrote on 24 September 1906 breaking his contract and rejecting *Dubliners*. Joyce reacted by making new concessions, but to no avail. The manuscript was returned on 26 October. A barrister advised Joyce not to waste his money seeking legal redress. Wisely in this instance, he concurred. Summoning up a little energy and turning to his manuscript, he made some corrections: he added the name of the laundry where Maria worked—the 'Dublin by Lamplight Laundry'—to 'The Clay', revised 'Grace',[14] and re-introduced 'bloody' into 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room.' He also thought of another story, 'The Last Supper', about the son of his old landlady, but though he asked Stanislaus to supply details about the incident behind the idea for this story, and also (for the projected 'Ulysses') to send his reminiscences of Mr Hunter (a proto-model for Leopold Bloom), Joyce never wrote it. In early December he sent the partly revised manuscript of *Dubliners* to John Long, the publisher. For the next few months he did little else but read. He did, however, conceive of new 'titles' for stories: 'The Dead', 'The Street', 'Vengeance', and 'At Bay' (*Letters* II, 209)—to add to the already mentioned 'Ulysses' and 'The Last Supper'. In mid-January 1907, Long replied discouragingly and followed this up with a final rejection on 21 February.

In the meantime Joyce had had a bellyful of Rome. He felt it was time he made up his mind to become a writer. He handed in notice at the bank where he worked, packed his bags, and rearrived in Trieste (his palm out to Stanislaus) on or about 7 March. Nora was again pregnant. Joyce's first few months back in the city were spent striving to make ends

13 Though in this story surely the sentiment comes under heavy irony, and the general miasma of frustration and pathos that pervades *Dubliners*, far from being dispelled, is thickened.

14 It is probable that it was at this time that he wrote out the extant fair copy of this story.

meet until, in mid-summer, a few days before the birth on 26 July of his daughter Lucia, he was struck down with rheumatic fever. He spent a few weeks in hospital and another couple of months recovering. During this period of ill health he wrote the fifteenth, final story and capstone of *Dubliners*, 'The Dead'. It was finished on 20 September. Though only fragments of its beginning and end have survived from Joyce's seventy-seven-page holograph, the story's full text, (incompletely) corrected and amended by the author, is preserved in a scribal copy of eighteen typewritten pages and an allograph of thirty-eight pages in two hands, one of them Stanislaus Joyce's.[15] The composition of 'The Dead' marked the end of Joyce's creative engagement with *Dubliners*. He returned to his abandoned autobiographical novel, now entirely reconceived, reorganised and newly styled as *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

Even now the saga of *Dubliners* was not over. On 24 September 1907 Joyce offered the book (now for the first time comprising all fifteen stories) to Elkin Mathews, the publisher of *Chamber Music*. Mathews asked to see the manuscript on 23 October, but laid it aside until after the Christmas season, and finally rejected it on 6 February 1908. When he turned it down, Mathews suggested sending the manuscript to Maunsel and Co. of Dublin,[16] but Joyce, preferring an English publisher, demurred and asked (on 9 February) for it to be returned to him. He next tried Hutchinson's (they refused to look at the manuscript), Alston Rivers (ditto), Sisleys (they wanted Joyce to pay), Greening and Co. (No!), Archibald Constable (No!), and Edward Arnold (No! yet again).

By the end of the year, Joyce began to come around to the idea of having the book published in Ireland and he conceived the idea of sending Stanislaus to Dublin to push the business on. On 13 February 1909 he wrote to Mathews and asked him to arrange for a communication with Hone (Joseph Maunsel Hone, the money behind Maunsel and Co., which George Roberts ran). This was done, and at the end of July Joyce himself (and not as originally planned Stanislaus) went to Dublin to meet Hone and Roberts. The negotiations went well and a contract

15 Only page 29, from the fifth word onwards, is in Stanislaus's hand. The 'family likeness' of the other hand suggests that it may be that of Joyce's sister Eileen.

16 In his letter (now at Cornell) Mathews wrote that he 'mentioned it to Mr. Hone (Maunsel and Co., Dublin) the other day, and he said "Oh, send the ms. on to us, as it might suit us"'.

was duly drawn up and signed on 19 August. *Dubliners* was to appear in March of the following year in dark grey binding with dark red lettering, at a price of 3/6 (*Letters* II, 230-38). Satisfied, and missing Nora considerably, Joyce returned to Trieste in early September.

Two months had not passed before he was back again in Dublin with a plan to set up the first cinema in Ireland. (The enterprise was not, for reasons not entered into here, a financial success.) According to his own account (*Letters* II, 292) it was while he was in Dublin in December that George Roberts first asked him to alter the narrative passage in 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' dealing with Edward VII. He agreed, much against his will, and 'altered one or two phrases'.[17] He returned to Trieste at the beginning of January 1910.

On 23 March Roberts wrote promising the proofs in early April and publication in May. The proofs, however, did not turn up until June, during which month Joyce was 'very busy' correcting them. On 10 June Roberts wrote again and complained that he was still not happy with 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' and asked that the entire passage referring to the late King be removed or entirely rewritten. Joyce corrected and returned both a set of galleys and a set of page proofs. Curiously, the proofs for 'Ivy Day' contained the original—and not the (presumed late 1909) autograph alternative—version of the disputed passage. Publication, scheduled for July, was nevertheless postponed once again. In December, Roberts set 20 January as the new publication date and he sent Joyce another set of the proofs of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room.' He once again asked him to delete or radically to alter the passage concerning Edward VII. The evidence indicates that he sent Joyce a copy of the uncorrected early page proofs. (This point is of importance and we shall return to it later.) Joyce proposed either (a) deletion of the passage with a prefatory note of explanation added, or (b) arbitration as a solution of the matter (*Letters* II, 289). Roberts, infuriatingly, did not reply. On 10 June, at the end of his tether, Joyce wrote again repeating his proposal and threatening—if he failed to receive a reply forthwith—legal action. He further swore that he would communicate the whole affair to the press by way of a circular letter.

17 It is possible that it was on this occasion that he wrote in the 'alternative' passage on folio 16 of the extant (Cornell) manuscript.

For the second time the legal advice received was that it would not be worthwhile to sue. Redirecting himself, Joyce next determined—like Anna Livia in *Finnegans Wake*—to present the case to and to seek the opinion of the King (now George V, Edward VII's son), to whom on 1 August 1911 he accordingly sent the proofs of 'Ivy Day' with the disputed passage clearly marked.[18] Understandably declining to opine, the King ordered his private secretary to return the enclosures. Not entirely displeased with this partial success, Joyce immediately set about putting into effect the next phase of his campaign. First he carefully corrected and revised the moot passage[19] and had a number of slips of it printed (in an attractive art nouveau font, presumably locally in Trieste). He then wrote (on 17 August 1911) his famous 'Letter to the Editor' into which he pasted a copy of the reprinted fragment (*Letters* II, 291-93). Copies of the letter were sent to interested parties such as Grant Richards and to nearly all of the newspapers in Ireland. It appeared in the Belfast *Northern Whig* on 26 August with the passage from 'Ivy Day' omitted and—in full—in the Dublin-based *Sinn Féin* on 2 September. To a man, the major organs refused to publish it, and, in sum, it had no effect on Maunsel and Co.

Thoroughly depressed, and living in straitened circumstances, Joyce was at a complete loss as to what to do next. Around this time, also, he (temporarily) suspended work on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.[20] The seasons passed. In 1912 he decided to send Nora—who was

18 This set of proofs—the sole surviving section of the early 1910 page proofs—is now at Yale. It is almost certainly the very set that Roberts had sent Joyce seven months earlier. The twin parallel lines in the margins of pages 193-194 marking the passage (see *James Joyce Archive*, vol. [5], pp. 79-80) might be Roberts's or they might be Joyce's. It is unlikely that when he sent it to the King the passage contained Joyce's autograph corrections and revisions (these would have confused His Majesty) or Joyce's smaller diagonal lines indicating the passage's beginning and end. These, as we shall argue, were added immediately *after* the King's return of the proofs to Joyce.

19 These improvements—which indicate an alteration of Mr Henchy's diction and a decision to remove some 'stage-Irish' spellings and punctuations—are of considerable textual importance in that, made just one year later when his memory was still relatively fresh, they probably correspond to those corrections and revisions made on the lost corrected copy of the early page proofs returned to Maunsel's.

20 Indeed, it may have been at this time that he threw the *Portrait* manuscript in the fire; see the 'Introduction' to the critical edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. by Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993), p. 4.

anxious to see her family once more—with Lucia to Ireland. The new plan was for Nora to intercede at Maunsel's on her husband's behalf. She arrived in Dublin on 8 July and saw Roberts soon after, but to no avail. On another impulse, Joyce decided that he would himself travel at once to Ireland, bringing Giorgio with him. En route, while passing through London he called on Joseph Maunsel Hone. He, however, could do nothing. In Dublin he met Roberts who came up with a new proposal: Joyce could delete disputed passages in 'Ivy Day' and also in 'An Encounter' or, alternatively, he could buy out the book from him, printed and bound, and have it distributed by Simpkin Marshall of London. Joyce said he would think about it, and left for Galway to join Nora. Further negotiations ensued, with Roberts now suggesting that Joyce buy the sheets from him and offer them to Grant Richards. Joyce arranged for a solicitor, John G. Lidwell, to advise him and returned to Dublin. After much haggling and toing-and-froing, threats and counter-threats of legal action, the matter seemed to be settled between them: Joyce would publish the book himself; of the total costs for printing the book, named at £57, he would pay Roberts £30; £15 were due within fifteen days; on receipt, Roberts would let him have 104 copies of the sheets; and, on further receipt of a second £15 within a further fifteen days, he would hand over the remainder of the total of 1000 sheets (*Letters* II, 301-316). But this plan too came to grief in the end when the printer, John Falconer, refused to hand over even one set of the sheets. According to Joyce, Falconer said he was going to break up the type and burn the sheets. According to Roberts, the sheets were in fact guillotined (*Letters* II, 319n.). The following day, 11 September 1912, having managed to obtain from Roberts 'by a ruse' a complete set of proofs, James Joyce left Dublin in utter disgust, never again to return.

Such at any rate is the story that has come down to us. But is it true? There are several serious implausibilities in it. Take the question of the printer's hire: the £57 owed by Maunsel to Falconer for printing 1000 copies of *Dubliners*. This was by no means an inconsiderable sum in 1912. The printer's claim that he cared nothing for that money—or even just for the £30 that Joyce was to have been made to pay—is risible.[21] Hence, whether valued at £30 or £57, one wonders: was the

21 Joyce's later paranoid suspicion that his enemies in Dublin had paid the £57 is equally incredible.

merchandise available at all? Moreover, with 104 copies promised within two weeks, and a remaining 896 another two weeks ahead, the important question does not even begin to be answered of *when* and *why* 1000 copies, and copies of precisely *what* text, may be supposed to have been printed in the first place. While the events considered were those of the summer of 1912, *Dubliners* were set in galleys two years earlier. The surviving galley proofs of 'A Mother' are dated 8 June 1910 and those for 'The Dead' 19 June 1910. Assuming an even progress of work, this dates the galleys for 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', specifically, to the early days of June, which would allow just enough time for Joyce to have corrected and returned them to inspire Roberts's letter to him of 10 June expressing dissatisfaction with the state of the passage on Edward VII. We know also that Joyce was still engaged in correcting proof on 24 June—by which time he must have been working on the early page proofs—and that he completed the task (*Letters* II, 287-88). Final page proofs—made from the corrected early page proofs—are extant for most of 'The Dead'; they extend from sheet R to sheet U and break off when it is clear that the rest of the story, and therefore the remainder of the book, does not stretch to fill another sheet. From the opening of the book, too, late page proofs—sheets A to K—exist up to and partly including 'A Painful Case'. This total of fifteen sheets of late page proofs extant was presumably pulled in June or July 1910. Six full sheets, however, are absent (i.e., sheets L-Q). So technically defined is this as a reservation of space that these sheets may in fact never have been printed. From June 1910, and yet more stubbornly from December 1910, George Roberts was not satisfied with the text as it stood. When, after his June letter, he wrote again in December, the final page proofs for 'Ivy Day' (and with them, by inference, those of the remainder of 'A Painful Case', and of all of 'A Mother' and 'Grace') seem not yet to have been prepared. Nothing happened in 1911 or in 1912 to make him change his mind about 'Ivy Day' or to induce him to give the order for the printing of 1000 copies of the whole of *Dubliners*. Such an order would have been tantamount to a decision to go ahead with publication. The conclusion to be drawn

from these inferences and these facts is that the one thousand copies of the sheets of *Dubliners* never existed.[22]

While in London in transit to Trieste, Joyce tried without success to interest Ford Madox Hueffer's *English Review* in *Dubliners*. He also took it to Mills and Boon, to whom Padraic Colum had given him an introduction. On 13 September he handed over to Mr Boon the set of sheets he had wangled out of Roberts (*Letters* II, 320).[23] Ingenuous to the last, he included as a preface a copy (presumably a press cutting obtained in Dublin) of his letter to *Sinn Féin*. He considered that it would act as a 'selling point' for the book; whereas to the publisher it acted merely as a frightener. Boon had his letter of rejection in the post in less than a week.

In the year that followed, *Dubliners* once again did the rounds. In December, Joyce sent his set of Maunsel proofs to Martin Secker; in February 1913 he approached (for the second time) Elkin Mathews; in April John Long (ditto); and in July he tried Macmillan. There may well have been others. Finally, back at square one, on 23 November 1913 he wrote to Grant Richards and asked him to reconsider his 1906 rejection. Richards, who was a relatively decent chap for a publisher, had in the long interim experienced some twinges, if not pangs, of conscience over his earlier treatment of Joyce, and besides, Joyce did offer to cover part of the expenses of publication (*Letters* II, 324). Richards wrote back at once asking to see the book again. Joyce, still intent on the inclusion of his preface, quickly brought it up to date, entitled it 'A Curious History' (*Letters* II, 324-25) and submitted it, together with the set of Maunsel proofs. It is at this stage, finally, that these can be more specifically identified. As Robert Scholes has demonstrated in

22 Roberts's version, recounted to Richard Ellmann many years later, has the status of one of Hugh Kenner's 'Irish Facts'. Falconer's version, which we know only secondhand from Joyce's letters, must have been an embellishment of the truth made in the heat of the moment. Had Joyce realised such a state of affairs he would of course have lost the title of the broadside 'Gas from a Burner' which—energised with ire—he composed a few days later in the waiting room of a railway station at Flushing in Holland.

23 This fact is of importance as it confirms Joyce's statement that he obtained a 'complete set' of proofs from Roberts. Had it not been complete, he could not have offered it to a publisher while yet in transit; it would have had to be perfected with pages from the manuscript which we know Joyce had left behind him in Trieste.

his investigations of the text of *Dubliners*,[24] Richards's printer's copy was the Maunsel early page proofs. It was a set of these, therefore, that Joyce 'by a ruse' had obtained in Dublin in 1912.[25] With 'A Curious History' and the printer's copy, a title-page was also included (*Letters* II, 330).

While Joyce waited for news from Richards, a vortex of change entered his life in the person of Ezra Pound, brass band and bandwagon. At first drawn to and by the poetry, Pound soon became an important and influential advocate for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. But he did not lack in engagement for *Dubliners*. Joyce sent him 'A Curious History' which Pound printed in his regular column in *The Egoist* on 15 January 1914. While the surviving correspondence is confusing and perhaps misleading on the subject,[26] it appears that he also sent him some stories. Writing as he did on 19 January that he was forwarding 'the' three stories (one of which was 'An Encounter') to the New York magazine *Smart Set*,[27] Pound must have had them in hand. Perhaps he was even temporarily in possession of the entire collection. That Joyce did assemble at some time after 1910, though more probably after 1912, a complete run of the *Dubliners* stories distinct (and textually different) from Richards's printer's copy is certain, as, apart from two pages of 'A Little Cloud', it has survived. It comprises: (a) the final proofs (pages [1]—160) of 'The Sisters' to 'A Painful Case'; (b) the manuscripts of 'A Painful Case' and 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'; (c) the galley proofs of 'A Mother'; (d) the manuscript of 'Grace'; (e) the (incomplete)

24 Robert E. Scholes, 'Observations on the text of *Dubliners*' and 'Further Observations on the text of *Dubliners*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 15 (1962), 191-205, and 17 (1964), 107-22.

25 This reinforces the inference that the final page proofs for 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'—and probably also those for 'A Mother' and 'Grace'—were never prepared, Roberts having told the printer to stop when he received back the (to him) inadequately revised early page proofs of 'Ivy Day'.

26 For Pound's letters to Joyce of the period, see *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 Paperback, 1970), pp. 24-25.

27 On 14 February he sent on the magazine's reply (delicately described by Pound as a prime 'piece of bull shit'), which though lost was evidently a rejection. Read, *Pound/Joyce*, p. 24, assumes the other two were 'The Boarding House' and 'A Little Cloud' because, in May 1915, at the behest of B. W. Huebsch, *Smart Set* published these two stories. Read's argument is unsound, as the 1915 copy appears to have been provided by Huebsch.

final proofs (pages [257]-320) of 'The Dead'; and (f) the final pages of the manuscript of 'The Dead'.[28] It is thus possible that Joyce sent Pound the whole text in this exemplar.[29]

In the meantime, on 20 January 1914, Grant Richards replied requesting further information from Joyce. This was sent on 24 January (*Letters* II, 328-29). Joyce wrote: 'The book is in the form approved by me, i.e. with one or two slight changes already made'.[30] Richards finally agreed on 29 January to publish *Dubliners*, but shorn of the preface and with the dialogue dashes replaced by quotation marks. He sent a signed agreement on 23 March.[31] Setting from printed copy, Richards's printer bypassed galley-proof stage and in April sent page proofs to Joyce.[32] Joyce quickly corrected and returned these, expecting to see a revise. It

28 At the end of (b) is written 'Next Story of *Dubliners A Mother* in printed proofsheet'; at the end of (c) 'Next Story of *Dubliners Grace* in MS'; at the end of (d) 'Next Story of *Dubliners The Dead* part in book from page 160 to page 320 part in MS'; and at the beginning of (f) 'End of Story *The Dead*': all in the same markedly sprawling authorial hand. The late page proofs themselves (what Joyce calls the 'book', in which the unnumbered title page of 'The Dead' [257] follows page 160) are unmarked. In the *James Joyce Archive*, vol. [4], p. xxx, I essentially identified this mixed-copy assembly of the *Dubliners* text. But I was mistaken in suggesting that Richards's printer's copy was mixed.

29 But if he gave him only a selection, it is not impossible that he sent a typescript, as Read, *Pound/Joyce*, p. 1, holds. *Dubliners* as a whole, it is true, was never typed. But this was a time when Joyce, to prepare copy for the *Egoist* serialisation of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, for the first time in his life employed a typist. In late March or early April (the letter is undated) Pound wrote again, saying that he had sent off 'Araby' to the US, of which again, therefore, he must have had a copy.

30 This would seem to indicate that the prize set of Maunsel early page proofs had meanwhile been lightly marked up. It also implies that Joyce had no distinct memory of the advanced textual state of the Maunsel late page proofs. On both points, see further below.

31 Richards added that his printer had mislaid pages 3-4 and 13-14 of 'The Sisters'. Three days later (on 26 March) Joyce sent off typed copies of the 'Sisters' pages in question (*Letters* II, 392-95). These would most easily have been prepared from the identically paginated 1910 late page proofs that constitute part of the mixed-copy set of the text.

32 In April 1914, the printer's copy was returned to Joyce along with two sets of the Richards page proofs (one of which, unmarked, still survives). The title page was sent back later (*Letters* II, 334). It is possible, also, that the missing pages 3-4 and 13-14 were found. The Maunsel early page proofs remained in Joyce's possession for many years. In May 1917 he described it to John Quinn as 'the only copy extant, so far as I know, of the burned first edition' (*Letters* II, 396). In 1927 he offered the set for sale to A. S. W. Rosenbach (*Letters* I, 252, and III, 161). Rosenbach, and after him other dealers, declined. It is not known when or how or if Joyce eventually disposed of them. Presently missing, they may resurface some day.

never came. Frustrated, he prepared a list of further corrections and sent them on to Richards on 14 May. The corrections were not made, nor has the list itself survived.

Dubliners, by James Joyce, in an edition of 1250 copies, was published by Grant Richards on 15 June 1914. In 1916, B. W. Huebsch of New York bought 504 sets of sheets from Richards and issued them as the first American edition.

The Document Relationships

Of each *Dubliners* story, there was first—after drafts that (save for that of 'A Painful Case') are all lost—an autograph fair copy. In fact, Joyce fair-copied the final draft text of most, if not all, stories more than once. The copies varied only slightly, as is witnessed by the two extant manuscripts of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'. Where only one exemplar survives, such differences as there were, are, as a rule, irrecoverable. Exceptions are 'The Boarding House', where the variants in the single extant fair copy indicate that behind the printed text was another, somewhat revised manuscript; and 'Eveline', which went into the book publication of *Dubliners* in a version—and therefore, doubtless, from a fair copy—significantly different from the text published in *The Irish Homestead*. For 'After the Race', by contrast, also first published in *The Irish Homestead*, the book text, although presumably not printed from the manuscript behind the *Homestead* but from another exemplar, shows very little revision. The opposite is true for 'The Sisters'. For this story, the *Homestead* and the book texts are radically different versions, each represented in one surviving fair copy. Of these, the first-version manuscript, as indicated, was prepared as the original copy of the story for the book as first submitted to Grant Richards in 1905, and thus postdates the *Irish Homestead* publication.

Joyce's original printer's copy for the *Dubliners* volume was a stable set of autograph fair copies which went to Grant Richards for the first time in November 1905, then a second time in June 1906, and finally to Maunsel and Co. of Dublin in 1909. The changes and substitutions in this set were few and specific. The first submission to Grant Richards in November 1905 consisted of the twelve stories originally planned, to which the thirteenth story —'Two Gallants'—followed in February 1906,

while the negotiations over the publication were ongoing. The portfolio was returned in June 1906. In July, Joyce re-submitted it with the second version of 'The Sisters' in place of the first, a replacement leaf or two in 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', and possibly in 'Counterparts', and the fourteenth story, 'A Little Cloud', inserted between 'The Boarding House' and 'Counterparts'. Thirteen of the fourteen manuscripts seen, and in the end declined, by Richards (and preliminarily even handled by his printers, as in the case of 'Two Gallants'), three years later became the copy for Maunsel in Dublin, with the addition now of 'The Dead', written in 1907. For 'Grace', as indicated, Maunsel received a fresh manuscript. The manuscript of the story submitted to Richards has not survived.

The Richards/Maunsel set of manuscripts is not entirely lost. The extant fair copies of 'The Sisters', 'An Encounter', 'A Painful Case', 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' (the Cornell copy), 'A Mother', 'Grace' (being the post-1906 version) and 'The Dead' (with two large middle sections missing) belonged to it. The fair copies preserved of 'The Boarding House' and 'Counterparts', on the other hand,[33] as well as the other surviving fair copy of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' (the Yale copy), are manuscripts slightly pre-dating the assembly of the printer's copy in November 1905. While their pre-dating is suggested by minor, as-yet-unrevised readings, collation nevertheless confirms them as sufficiently satisfactory substitutes for their lost counterparts in the Richards/Maunsel set. With a view to the critical editing, this has implications for the choice of copy-text, a matter to which we shall return.

The Maunsel edition, though never published, went through three stages of proof in 1910: galleys, early page proofs and late page proofs. Each stage is documented by surviving fragments. Galleys exist for 'Counterparts', 'A Mother' and 'The Dead'. Of these, only those for 'A Mother'—the only surviving state of the 1910 typesetting for this story—comprise the complete text. For 'Counterparts', we have only a fragment of one galley slip, but the story is contained in full in the extant batch of late page proofs. 'The Dead' runs to fourteen galleys, with the end, to the length of probably one galley slip, missing. The early page

33 Their present location at Cornell, as part of the Stanislaus Joyce collection of Joyceana, would seem to identify them as vestiges of the set of *Dubliners* manuscripts held by Stanislaus (see above, fn. 12).

proof stage has been preserved for 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room' alone. For this story, in its turn, this is the only surviving state of the 1910 typesetting. The late page proofs only survive, finally, in a batch of two segments. The first contains the run of the projected book through its gathering K and breaks off four pages into 'A Painful Case'. The second segment, comprising gatherings R through U, sets in with the opening of 'The Dead' and ends a few pages short of the story's and the book's conclusion. The missing gatherings L-Q—which, as was argued above, were probably never printed—would have contained the major part of 'A Painful Case' and all of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', 'A Mother' and 'Grace'. With 'Ivy Day' and 'A Mother' in early page proof and galleys respectively, this means that only 'A Painful Case', except for a four-page opening, the entire 'Grace' and the conclusion of 'The Dead' are wholly unrepresented in any state of the 1910 typesetting. When Grant Richards rescinded his refusal of 1906 and offered to publish *Dubliners* in 1914, the Maunsel early page proofs became his printer's copy. The page proofs Joyce received, corrected and returned in April 1914 were the only proofs provided for the first edition. They survive in one unmarked set.[34]

The Transmission of the Text Through the Documents

Each *Dubliners* story reached its final stage of manuscript revision in the fair-copy exemplar incorporated in the Richards/Maunsel set of manuscripts. The galleys typeset from this set show conspicuous house styling, especially in the punctuation. In a first round of proof-reading, Joyce appears to have concentrated above all on removing hundreds of commas. He continued the process in proof-reading the early page proofs. At this stage, he also turned his attention to a restyling of compounds: the late page proofs show an extensive elimination of hyphens, and compounds now appear as either one-word or two-word formations. Exactly the same proof-reading labour was in 1915/16 exercised on *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. There, as can be demonstrated,

34 All surviving Maunsel and Richards proofs are reprinted in vols. [5] and [6] of *The James Joyce Archive*: James Joyce, *Dubliners. The 1910 Proofs and Dubliners. The 1914 Proofs*, prefaced and arranged by Michael Groden, ed. by Michael Groden, *et al.*, 63 vols. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977).

Joyce's markings were often ambiguous, resulting in two-word divisions where he wished one-word formations. Without the corresponding documentary evidence for *Dubliners*, it cannot be determined which of the individual two-word compounds in the *Dubliners* late page proofs were meant by him as one word. Along with the restitution of Joyce's light punctuation in the galleys and early page proofs, and his restyling of compounds in the early page proofs, one may note a certain amount of lowering of capitals in a manner typical later for *Portrait* and *Ulysses*; and, of course, at both proof stages much necessary correction of typos was carried out. Most importantly, both the galleys and the early page proofs received an even spread of revisions. Though not numerous, they are significant throughout. The revisions made in the early page proofs are recoverable only in so far as the late page proofs survive, where, however, they stand out distinctly as authorial changes. In truth, all proof corrections, restylings and revisions that we claim as authorial must prove themselves by their kind and quality, since marked proofs have been preserved neither of the galley nor of the early page proof stage. Joyce's proof-reading on the Maunsel edition is traceable only by its results.

The circumstance that the early Maunsel page proofs served as printer's copy for Grant Richards helps to define with fair precision his proof changes to the Maunsel galleys. It is the textual state resulting from these, otherwise lost (except in the case of 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room'), which is represented in the 1914 typesetting, even though there is some indication—confirmed by inference from Joyce's letter to Richards of 24 January 1914 (*Letters* II, 328-29)—that the Richards printer's copy was touched up with additional corrections. On the other hand it is true that, derived as it is from the Maunsel early proofs, the first-edition text basically lacks the final round of Maunsel corrections and revisions. Marking the 1914 proofs meant repeating much of the work done once before on the Maunsel proofs. Again, a considerable accretion of commas was removed; compounds, which had re-acquired hyphens in large numbers, were again restyled without them, though not as consistently and radically as in the two rounds of Maunsel proofing. In so far as memory served, moreover, some of the final Maunsel revisions were once more introduced. Yet in all, Joyce did not gain control over the first edition to the extent he wished. He requested

in vain that dialogue be styled not with 'perverted commas', but with the dialogue dash. Barred the opportunity, on which he had counted, of proofing revises, he drew up a list of corrections—a list which has not survived—only to find when the book was out that this, too, had been disregarded and that, furthermore, not all the changes marked in the proofs he read had in fact been carried out. After publication of the first edition, a further autograph list entitled 'Dubliners / Misprints' was assembled and still exists (see *James Joyce Archive*, vol. [4], pp. 51-63). It is not clear whether this is the list prepared by Joyce in 1915 for a putative second Grant Richards edition, or a revised version made in 1917 for B. W. Huebsch. The typed version of the list, however, was almost certainly made in 1917 (*Letters* II, 392-95). Beyond it, there is no evidence that Joyce attended to the text of *Dubliners* in his lifetime.

Hence, and in sum, it is not the Grant Richards first edition text of 1914, but the text of the Maunsel late page proofs of 1910, incomplete though these are, which represents *Dubliners* as most closely and consistently under Joyce's control in print.

The Choice of Copy Text

In the given situation of documents and textual transmission, Joyce's autograph is the obvious document to select as providing the base text for a critical edition. To edit from it could most easily be put into practice if, for each of the fifteen *Dubliners* stories, the autograph exemplar from the Richards/Maunsel set of manuscripts were still available. In fact, as indicated above, the Richards/Maunsel autograph does survive complete for six stories —'The Sisters', 'An Encounter', 'A Painful Case', 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', 'A Mother' and 'Grace'—and fragmentarily for a seventh, 'The Dead'. For the remaining eight stories, the text of another document must stand in for the text of the lost Richards/Maunsel autograph. The text so vicariously eligible either precedes, or derives from, that in the lost autograph. In six cases, there is no real choice: it is the derivation, namely the 1910 typesetting in its only surviving state in the late page proofs, which provides the earliest extant documentation of the text for 'Araby', 'Two Gallants', 'A Little Cloud' and 'Clay', as well as—discounting the *Irish Homestead*'s heavily house-styled printings of the early story versions—for 'Eveline' and 'After the Race'. Yet in two cases—'The

Boarding House' and 'Counterparts' —an autograph manuscript and the 1910 typesetting hold out rival options. Favouring the 1910 setting would be the fact that the finally revised manuscript text stands behind it. Also, the state in which the 1910 setting survives, namely that of the late page proofs, incorporates the full range of Joyce's corrections and revisions. Yet, while these are definable and can be isolated (meaning that they may thus also, by way of emendation, be worked into another copy text), what remains undefinable is the incidence and extent of modification of the textual surface—in spellings, capitalisation, punctuation, word division and even perhaps wording—by compositors and in-house proofreaders. The autograph manuscript happily extant—even though it was not the actual copy for the typesetting—provides at the very least a welcome check on such potential modification. More positively, it gives a text fully authenticated in the author's hand, as against a text which, having passed through the hands and minds of scribes, typists, or in this case printer's compositors, must be assumed to have been infringed in its authenticity. Hence, given the option between an autograph shown by collation to be very close to the lost final autograph manuscript and a twice-worked-over typesetting from that lost autograph, it is the extant manuscript which, on balance, may be preferred to stand in for its lost near-descendant.

In the present edition, Joyce's autograph manuscripts therefore hold the copy-text wholly for eight stories, and partly for a ninth ('The Dead'), while the Maunsel typesetting, in the state of the late page proofs, provides the copy-text for six stories. 'The Dead', finally, offers a situation of somewhat greater complexity. The sections missing from its autograph manuscript survive in two immediate derivations: on the one hand in the 1910 galleys, and on the other hand in a transcript partly typed and partly written out in two hands (Eileen[?] and Stanislaus Joyce's). While the typist and the family amanuenses were clearly more faithful to Joyce's punctuation, their general accuracy is highly variable and their copying is, on the whole, a thoroughly amateur performance. Thus the option, arbitrary as it is, has been for the professional typesetting job. Choosing the 1910 galleys as copy text for the sections of 'The Dead' missing from the autograph manuscript serves also to bring the copy-text basis, in this instance too, most closely in line with the selection of the 1910 typesetting as copy text for those stories whose autograph manuscripts are wholly missing.

The Editing

The critical editing of *Dubliners* may be assessed by closely following the constant interaction of text and apparatus. The edited text forms the main section of the edition. It presents the copy text as critically modified by the acts of editing. These acts of editing are recorded in the apparatus. Setting them in relation to all textual material drawn upon in the editing, the apparatus is laid out in two main divisions: the notes and emendations, and the historical collation. The historical collation—to define the second apparatus division first—records the differences of the documents of transmission—the manuscripts, proofs and the published editions selected for collation—from the edition's text. The published texts singled out for collation in this edition are two only, the 1914 first edition and the Viking edition of 1967, prepared by Robert Scholes. This narrow selection is justified by the fact that—the autograph list of 'Dubliners / Misprints' apart—the author at no time had a hand in the numerous editions and re-issues of *Dubliners* after 1914, and in his lifetime. The historical collation, in thus situating the edition's text in relation to the selection of the work's text instantiations that it considers, ranks second in the apparatus division, a condition acknowledged by its placement as the second appended apparatus list at the end of the edition. Ranking first in the apparatus division are the notes and emendations which report and record how the edition's text was arrived at and established. Their prime function is emphasised by the further sub-division into the listing of the emendations of accidentals appended first, after the text section of the edition, and the record of verbal emendations—together with notes critically confirming the copy text, or otherwise briefly commenting on the edited text—arranged at the foot of the text pages.

The interaction of the edited text and the divisions and sub-divisions of the apparatus may be illustrated from 'The Dead'. Basically, the edited text reproduces the copy text, which, for the story's first section—defined as a section purely by the document situation—is provided by the fragment of the nineteen initial leaves still extant of Joyce's fair-copy autograph. (The paragraph beginning 'Lancers were arranged' (15.402) ends at the bottom of manuscript leaf 19 with the words: '...an Irish device and motto'.) The autograph text (MS) has been collated with

the 1910 galleys (10G), the 1910 late page proofs (10), the 1914 proofs (14P), the 1914 first edition (14) and the 1967 Viking edition (67). Where all these collated witnesses agree, the fact is implied by the absence of any apparatus entry. If and when one or more of the witnesses offers a variant giving no cause to modify the reading of the (autograph) copy text, the textual difference is recorded in the historical collation, for example as: 15.23 Fullam,] Fullham, 14P; Fulham, 14, 67; or as: 15.70-71 out of doors] out-of-doors 14P-14, 67. The apparatus entry provides a reference by line number, according to the through-line numbering implemented in this edition for each of the fifteen *Dubliners* stories, and identifies the reading from the edited text by repeating it. The reading from the edited text may be the reading of the copy text upheld, as it is in these examples, or it may be an emendation replacing the copy-text reading. Reference and reading, or lemma, form an entry head marked off by a closing square bracket. Thereafter follow the collations, that is, the readings from the various documents and document states compared to the copy text, and as they compare to the reading of the edited text. This is the apparatus entry proper and should be read for its absences and presences. Absent from it is the mention of those collated readings which agree with the lemma. Present in the apparatus entry are only those document readings collated which differ from the copy-text reading upheld, or the emendation established, in the edited text. Thus, in the first example given above, the apparatus entry indicates that the spelling and punctuation 'Fullam', is the reading of the copy text, since in the entry no mention occurs of the manuscript, which here is the copy text, and that furthermore the Maunsel galleys and late page proofs, also not mentioned, share this form. Then it states that the first-edition proofs (14P) alter the spelling, while retaining the punctuation, to yield 'Fullham', and that the first edition (14), followed by the Viking edition (67), offer the second variant form 'Fulham,'. In the second example, the three words 'out of doors' are shown to have become hyphenated in the first-edition proofs, and retained as hyphenated through the first and Viking editions.

If and when, on the other hand, a collated witness offers a variant deemed to correct or revise the copy-text reading, this results in an emendation. The variant is introduced into the copy text to replace its original reading, thereby transforming the straight reproduction

of the copy text properly into the presentation of the edited text. The emendation may be required because the copy text is faulty (this used formerly to be the only situation recognised in textual scholarship to call for emendation): a copy-text reading may be misspelled; or the punctuation may be wrong, or create ambiguous sense, by syntactic rules. Spellings and punctuation are the so-called accidentals of a text, and it has become customary to record the corrections and modifications of spelling and punctuation in a separate list of emendations of accidentals. The alternative to a given copy-text accidental will as a rule be found in a collated text, whence the editor will import it into the edited text; or the editor conjectures and introduces it on the strength of an original critical assessment.

The decision and the responsibility to emend are always the editor's. Always, and as a rule in each individual instance, an apparatus entry is provided. Certain types of silent emendation may however be specified and declared. Thus, the present edition does not record absent or present full stops after 'Mrs' and 'Mr', nor does it report accidentals marking the opening or closing of dialogue (dashes, inverted commas), unless in association with a collation record of other marks of punctuation. An apparatus entry of emendation will give, as the first item after the entry head, a source siglum for the emendation. Then, the entry's collation record regards the transmission from the copy text to the source point of the emendation only, leaving the variant history of the reading in question to be related in the historical collation. This emphasises the distinctive functions of the main divisions of the apparatus. The list of emendations analyses the transmission to justify the establishment of the edited text, while the historical collation renders the history of the text through all its documented readings. There is hence a regular and designed repetition of entries in the main divisions of the apparatus.

With accidentals, it is often at most a moot question whether a given variant in a collated document is of authorial or transmissional origin. The case is—or it may be—different with verbal variants, the so-called substantives of the text. While it is doubtless within the power of a typist or compositor versed in the language to rectify the obvious verbal slip, the quality of an authorial verbal correction by which to emend the copy text usually very soon becomes critically recognisable. With verbal changes, considered to be of most immediate concern to an edition's

reader and user, convention has it that substantive emendations be subdivided from the emendations of accidentals. When an author correcting proof works over a transmissional record of his text, he will as often as not extend his labour to revising it. Hence, it has become editorial procedure in copy-text editing to consider authorial post-copy-text revisions as a type of correction by which (as in instances of correction of error) to emend the copy text. It is to highlight the emendation of the copy text by revisions in particular—constituting, as it does, the core of the method of copy-text editing—that the apparatus lists substantive emendations at the bottom of the text pages. This, too, is the place for notes, designed in analogy to the emendation entries, though lacking a siglum. On the one hand, these notes may be concerned with affirming the given copy-text reading (specifically against the attractiveness of the received reading which, if not added to the note, will be found in the historical collation). On the other hand, and more importantly, these notes open glimpses into the pre-copy-text history of the text, indicating acts of revision within the copy text when it is a Joycean autograph, or giving pre-revision readings from *The Irish Homestead* in the case of 'Eveline' and 'After the Race', or the galley-proof fragment in the case of 'Counterparts'.

For 'The Dead'—to return to our specific area of illustration—Joyce's autograph survives beyond leaf 19 in only two fragments —the single leaf 57, and leaves 74 to 77—to furnish the copy text for the edition. For the sections of the story missing in the autograph, the text in the galley proofs becomes the copy text. The galley proofs derive directly from the autograph, as does, collaterally, the typescript-and-amanuensis copy. The variants of the latter are reported in the apparatus, as a matter of course. Frequently, too, the typescript-and-amanuensis copy serves to emend the copy text. Indeed, as collateral to the copy text, it is highly likely that its text can correct the copy text. Not only, apparently, is it closer to the lost autograph in its pattern of punctuation than is the text of the galleys. In substantives, too, it stands about as good a chance as the text in the galleys to preserve an autograph reading. Thus, corrective emendation, which is always a significant aspect of the critical editing where a state of the 1910 typesetting furnishes the copy text, features, if anything, more strongly in the establishment of the text for 'The Dead' than for the remainder of the *Dubliners* stories. Revisional

emendation, moreover, enters into its usual role. Here as throughout—and regardless of whether the copy text resides in the autograph or in a derived document—it requisitions for the critical text the variants deemed revisional changes in the late page proofs of 1910 and the 1914 first edition.

Thus, to specify by a few further examples from 'The Dead', the edited text allows Gabriel Conroy at 15.63-64 to reassure his aunts with the words 'Go on up. I'll follow', according to the text in print, though against the copy text, which lacks the two phrases. Similarly, it makes Gabriel anticipate his after-dinner speech as 'an utter failure' (15.136), not as 'a complete failure'; and it specifies that Gabriel's father was an employee of the 'Port and Docks' (15.150), not of the 'Post Office'. These are examples of emendation of the copy text as residing in the autograph. The collation pattern recorded in the apparatus shows that they answer to revisions performed in marking up the 1910 galleys and the 1914 proofs respectively. For the changes at 15.63-64 and 15.136, the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs, which derive from a set each of the 1910 early page proofs, agree in the revisions against the manuscript and the—unmarked—1910 galleys. Only if a parallel set of these galleys was marked with the revisions could they have become incorporated in the early-proof typesetting and thence transmitted both to the 1910 late proofs and the 1914 proofs. At 15.150, on the other hand, the revised first-edition text stands alone against the manuscript, the 1910 typesetting in both its surviving states (galleys and late proofs), and the extant unmarked 1914 proofs—in a parallel (and now lost) set of which, therefore, the change must have been marked.

Beyond 15.406, the breaking-off point of the initial autograph fragment, the copy-text to be confirmed, or else to be emended, is the galley-proof text. That it represents authentically the unrevised text of the lost autograph is best attested when the galleys and the typescript-and-amanuensis copy conform in a given reading; and conversely, it is against such agreement that the variants making their first appearance in later print—in the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs in conjunction, in the 1910 late page proofs alone, or in the first-edition text alone—are to be made out as revisions. Such is the case when Miss Ivors' brooch no longer bears 'an Irish device and motto', but only 'an Irish device' (15.406); or when Miss Ivors uses the racier term 'rag'

(15.421) for 'paper' to disparage the *Daily Express*. These revisions—both identifiable as revisions to the galleys, since the 1910 late page proofs and the 1914 proofs agree in them against the extant unmarked galleys and the typescript—become the edition's critical readings by emendation of the copy text. When the galley copy text and the typescript-and-amanuensis copy disagree, there may be a doubt as to which of them represents the lost autograph. In the case of a name, 'Clohissey's' at 15.432, which is the typescript reading, the galleys have 'O'Clohissey's'. Without further textual evidence, this, being the copy-text reading, would become the edition reading. But in fact, the form attested in the typescript re-appears in the 1910 late page proofs, no doubt as a deliberate correction. This suggests that the typescript reading in this instance derives authentically from the autograph and supports the decision to emend the copy text accordingly. In yet another type of situation, one is faced with an imperfectly achieved revision. At 15.523, 15.525 and 15.528 it is clear from the galley/typescript conformity that the authentic unrevised term is 'row' by which Gretta Conroy refers to the altercation between her husband and Miss Ivors; and Gabriel, in rejecting it, picks it up. In all three occurrences, the 1910 late page proofs change the term to 'words' (and alter the agreement in the verb). The fact that the 1914 proofs continue to read 'row' means that the change was a revision performed in (one set of) the 1910 intermediate page proofs. For the first edition, it is only for the third occurrence that the change was once more introduced in the course of marking up the 1914 proofs. Hence, by comparison to the 1910 late page proofs, the first edition offers an apparently hybrid text. This may be intentional or not; Joyce's final intention could at best be surmised. But a surmise is not strong enough to support a critical text. Not the author's intention, therefore, but only the documented history of the text can ultimately be claimed to constitute the objective foundation for a controlled subjective editorial decision. In the present case, that decision has privileged the treble revision documented in the 1910 late page proofs. The establishment of the critical text is fundamentally conditioned by the work's text itself and the critical assessment of its historical givens in transmission.

This is emphasised yet once more, and perhaps most strongly, by a passage characterizing Gabriel Conroy's mood during his final

conversation with Gretta at night in the hotel room. It contains a sentence not heretofore present in the published text of *Dubliners*. The words, according to the double evidence of the galleys and the amanuensis copy, are: 'The irony of his mood changed into sarcasm.' Joyce's awareness of the presence of the sentence in the text at the time when he revised the early page proofs for the abortive 1910 edition is attested by the fact that he made an alteration in it. 'The irony of his mood soured into sarcasm' is the wording in the 1910 late page proofs. In the 1914 proofs, however, the entire sentence is missing, and we cannot know how and why it disappeared. That Joyce himself deleted it, is a possibility; but it is undemonstrable, and is also less than probable, since the 1914 proofs otherwise show no evidence of revision in that set (since lost) of the 1910 early page proofs which served as their copy. Even less is there evidence anywhere in *Dubliners*—except perhaps in 'Counterparts' and 'Ivy Day in the Committee Room', where, however, Joyce was contending with outside forces of censorship—that, from writing the text and affirming it by revision ('changed' to 'soured'), he would turn round and opt for an outright deletion.

The absence of the sentence from the 1914 text hence offers feeble grounds to infer an authorial intention on which to establish a critical text. Therefore, privileging once again the late 1910 state of the text over its 1914 state, the critical edition incorporates the sentence (15.1478). In justification, again, it refers to the history of the text, and quite specifically to the manifest history of the authorial writing culminating in the 1910 late page proofs. The reader and user of the edition, on his and her part, should however not fail to be aware of the conditionality and, in terms of the editorial rationale, the systemic contingency of the editorial decision. That is, the editorial choice should be recognised as the considered option it is.

It is, of course, the editorial apparatus which must guide such recognition. The apparatus is categorically not an adjunct to the text, but an integral element of the edition. The ways in which the editing shapes the edition into a critically established text are based on the discourse of the apparatus. Formalised in the meta-language of symbols and sigla according to received conventions, the apparatus situates the established text in relation both to the text's history and to editorial judgement and decisions. The text's history, specifically, is written into

the edited text as well as into the apparatus. It may be comprehended and assessed, consequently, through entering into their dialogue. In a copy-text edition, the copy text may be thought of as providing the base line for the historical orientation. In the case of revisional emendations, it is the text's prospective history which is written into the edited text, since a change which occurred at a post-copy-text point in time is, as it were, anticipated by being incorporated in the edited text. Correspondingly, the text's retrospective history is written into the apparatus. The relationship is reversed for corrective emendations. For 'The Dead', when the galley-proof copy text is emended in accidentals according to the typescript-and-amanuensis copy, the governing objective is to 'backdate' the text by establishing the edited text to conform to the autograph state of syntactical and rhythmical articulation. The apparatus record consequently accommodates almost the entire prospective textual history.

Under such tenets for critical editing, editorial judgement and decision operate on the authorial writing in its document manifestations. It was a consequence of traditional author-centred copy-text editing to lock editorial activity in the finality of intention. The underlying theoretical concept was one of textual closure. Against it, the orientation towards the historicity of the writing process answers to the notion of an essential openness of the text. In editorial terms, textual openness is materially manifest in a text's progression through composition and revision, as well as through states and forms of transmission that are both authorially and 'socially' conditioned. Responding to the text's openness, editorial acts, judgements and decisions must equally be thought of as essentially open. They are informed, yet conditioned and relative, rulings on issues with which, in turn, one may take issue. Against the background of the recorded history of the text, the editor's and the reader's and user's assessments must necessarily interlock. The critical edition, formerly conceived as a scholarly demonstration of authorial and authoritative 'rights' and 'wrongs', is thus moved into a field of critical interchange where assessments of the degree and quality of the editorial solutions for given textual situations become significant categories of reception for the genre of scholarship termed the 'critical edition'.

The text of this edition, while offered as a reading text broadly within the standards and conventions of modern professional printing and publishing, endeavours yet to maintain the character of a scholarly edited text in preserving essential features of irregularity in the recoverable authorial writing. Word forms and word divisions, spellings, capitalisation and punctuation have been neither normalised nor modernised, nor have typographical matters such as abbreviations or ellipses been standardised. The emendations undertaken,[35] or the refusals to emend, are recorded in the apparatus, with a few specific exceptions. The absence or presence of full stops after 'Mr' and 'Mrs' is not noted, nor are quotation marks (inverted [or, as Joyce called them, 'perverted'] commas) surrounding dialogue speech reported, except when joined with emended punctuation. Full stops lacking in the copy text at the end of paragraphs have been supplied silently. At the end of dialogue speech they have been silently supplied only where the copy-text original is wholly unmarked, or marked by a dash only. Joyce's intermediate dialogue dashes have been explicitly emended. Taken together, this means that Joyce's manuscript habits of marking off the segments of dialogue speech by dashes have neither been followed, nor fully recorded. The patterns and effect of the manuscript mode of setting out dialogue is illustrated, and may be studied, in the draft and fair-copy texts from autographs included in the edition's section 'Manuscript Traces'. The convention adopted in this edition's main text, however, is that of opening dialogue dashes only, placed flush left. It is the typographical solution answering to Joyce's own strong views on the marking of dialogue which, in print, and at his forceful instigation, was realised in the third edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1924) and has now become the common feature of the critically edited texts of *Dubliners*, *A Portrait* and *Ulysses*.

The present edited text and that of Robert Scholes's Viking edition of 1967, while not concurring in every word, are close in their readings. Yet as a critical text established afresh from the earliest sources of the

35 It should be made quite clear that 'emendations' are to be understood as emendations of the copy text, and not in terms of changes in relation to the previous, unedited or edited, editions. Emendations, often drawing on the transmission, may in fact result precisely in agreement with the text in earlier print.

writing and transmission, our edition encompasses, beyond the words of the text, the totality of its presentation in print. Reading *Dubliners* in the critically established patterns of Joyce's punctuation and word forms gives a different feel, subtly altering the shadings of the sense, for this early Joycean text.