

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All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at 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

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

Critical Edition 1993

Introduction

The seminal invention for James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* was the narrative essay 'A Portrait of the Artist'.¹ The essay survives in Joyce's fair hand (fair as originally written out, that is, before becoming much overlaid by revision and by extended deletions that indicate the text's reuse in later writing), in a copybook belonging to his sister Mabel, and bears the date 7/I/1904.² Submitted to the literary magazine *Dana* (as likely as not in the very copybook), it was rejected within less than a fortnight. According to Stanislaus Joyce in his *Dublin Diary*,³ the rejection would seem to have spurred Joyce on to conceiving of an autobiographical novel, the opening chapters of which he wrote in the space of a couple of weeks. Stanislaus, moreover, claims that while sitting together in the kitchen on James Joyce's twenty-second birthday, 2 February 1904, as James was sharing his plans for the novel with him, it was he, Stanislaus, who suggested as title *Stephen Hero*. Accepting

1 'A Portrait of the Artist' is currently most conveniently available in: *James Joyce: Poems and Shorter Writings*, ed. by R. Ellmann, A. Walton Litz and John Whittier-Ferguson (London: Faber & Faber, 1991), pp. 211-18. The original is photographically reprinted in James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. A Facsimile of Epiphanies, Notes, Manuscripts, and Typescripts*. Prefaced and Arranged by Hans Walter Gabler (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978) (= vol. [7] of *The James Joyce Archive*, 63 vols., ed. by Michael Groden, *et al.*), pp. 70-85.

2 i.e., January 7th, 1904.

3 Stanislaus Joyce, *The Complete Dublin Diary*, ed. by George H. Healey (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1971), pp. 11-13.

this claim, Joyce scholarship has been led by Richard Ellmann's interpretation of Stanislaus's account⁴ (see *JJ*, pp. 144-149) into taking it entire, and at face value. We have all persistently overlooked May Joyce's letter to James Joyce of 1 September 1916, in which she recalls her brother reading the early chapters to their mother when they lived in St. Peter's Terrace, and the younger siblings used to be all put out of the room. May used to hide under the sofa to listen until, relenting, James allowed her to stay.⁵ This intimate personal memory puts the beginnings of Joyce's art in a different perspective. It suggests that he started his autobiographical novel almost a year earlier than has hitherto been assumed, probably some months at least before August 1903 when his mother died. The impulse thus seems to have sprung very immediately from his first experience of exile in Paris in 1902/03. 'A Portrait of the Artist' of January 1904 can appear no longer as seminal for *Stephen Hero*. Rather, defined as the conceptual outline for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* that it has always been felt to be, it stands out as Joyce's first attempt to break away from his initial mode of autobiographical fiction. Against Stanislaus Joyce's idealizing of his brother's triumphant heroism in defying *Dana*, we sense instead the stymying effect of that first public rejection. Digging his heels in, and continuing to write *Stephen Hero*, as in fact he did, was a retarding, even perhaps a retrogressive stage in Joyce's search for a sense of his art and a narrative idiom all his own. *Stephen Hero* was to falter by mid-1905, by which time it was through *Dubliners* that Joyce was freeing himself from its fetters.

In the course of 1904, Joyce wrote three stories for *The Irish Homestead*, 'The Sisters', 'Eveline' and 'After the Race'. They were the beginnings of *Dubliners*. With eleven chapters of *Stephen Hero* written, its immediate continuation preconceived, and ideas for further stories for *Irish Homestead* contribution in his head, Joyce left Dublin with Nora Barnacle on 8 October 1904 for Zurich, a destination that was to be changed en route for Trieste, and Pola. During Nora's pregnancy, Joyce carried *Stephen Hero* forward through its 'University episode'—the only fragment of

4 Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 147-49, subsequently cited as *JJ*.

5 *Letters of James Joyce*, vols. II and III, ed. by Richard Ellmann (New York: Viking Press, 1966), pp. 382-83 [*Letters II*; *Letters III*]. Again, I wish to thank John O'Hanlon and Danis Rose for their help and advice in preparing these present editions of *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

it which survives—and, closely coinciding with the birth of Giorgio Joyce, he suspended work on it in June 1905.⁶ From mid-1905, Joyce turned wholly to the writing of *Dubliners*. The protracted endeavour, throughout 1906, to get the collection published ran insistently foul even as, in 1906/07, he capped the sequence with 'The Dead'.

The Emerging Novel

The time devoted to the writing of *Dubliners*, culminating in 'The Dead', was the gestation period of a fundamentally new conception for the autobiographical novel. Suspending it in 1905 had, as became apparent by 1907, been tantamount to aborting the sixty-three-chapter project of *Stephen Hero* in favour of beginning afresh the five-chapter novel *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Chapter I was written between 8 September and 29 November 1907. Reworked from *Stephen Hero*, it omitted entirely the seven initial chapters of that novel—those dealing with Stephen's childhood—and opened with Stephen going to school (cf. JJ, 264). We may assume⁷ that the Chapter I version of

6 The surviving 'University episode' fragment of eleven chapters—XV to XXV—was posthumously edited (erroneously as Chapters XV to XXVI) by Theodore Spencer in 1944 and subsequently augmented by the text of a few stray additional manuscript pages. (James Joyce, *Stephen Hero*. Edited from the Manuscript in the Harvard College Library by Theodore Spencer. A New Edition, incorporating the Additional Manuscript Pages in the Yale University Library and the Cornell University Library, ed. by John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon (New York: New Directions, 1963).) The *James Joyce Archive*, vol. [8], collects and reprints photographically the 'University episode' and the stray manuscript pages.

The writing of *Stephen Hero*, its relation to *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and its posthumous publication are briefly surveyed—albeit still in accordance with the Stanislaus Joyce/Richard Ellmann view of the origins—in the Appendix to Hans Walter Gabler, 'The Seven Lost Years of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', in *Approaches to Joyce's 'Portrait'*. *Ten Essays*, ed. by Thomas F. Staley and Bernard Benstock (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976), pp. 53-56. An edition reworked from the ground, based on the doctoral dissertation of Claus Melchior, 'Stephen Hero. Textentstehung und Text. Eine Untersuchung der Kompositions- und Arbeitsweise des frühen James Joyce', PhD dissertation, München (Bamberg, 1988), has hitherto remained unpublished.

7 For what follows, see my in-depth analysis in 'The Seven Lost Years ...' [cf. note 5]; and 'The Christmas Dinner Scene, Parnell's Death, and the Genesis of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 13 (1975-76), 27-38. The two essays were integrated into 'The Genesis of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', in *Critical Essays on James Joyce's A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. by Philip Brady and James F. Carens (New York: G.K. Hall, 1998), pp. 83-112.

autumn 1907 included neither the overture of the novel as eventually published, nor the Christmas dinner scene (which at first apparently belonged with material taken from *Stephen Hero* to construct Chapter II of *A Portrait*). By 7 April 1908, the new novel had grown to three chapters, but was making no further progress. In early 1909, it was sections of a work he had become despondent of that Joyce gave a fellow writer to read. Ettore Schmitz, or Italo Svevo—he was, at the same time, Joyce’s language pupil—in a letter of 8 February 1909 proffered supportive criticism of Chapters I–III, in versions prior to those known from the published book, plus a draft opening of Chapter IV. Specifically—if inference may be trusted—the Christmas dinner scene was still apparently in Chapter II, and the conclusion of Stephen’s confession in Chapter III was yet unwritten. Schmitz’s response encouraged Joyce to complete Chapter IV and begin Chapter V. Yet this precipitated an apparently more serious crisis. Sometime in 1911, Joyce threw the entire manuscript as it then stood—some 313 manuscript leaves—in the fire.⁸ Instantly rescued by a family fire brigade, it apparently suffered no real harm and was kept tied up in an old sheet for some months before Joyce ‘sorted [it] out and pieced [it] together as best [he] could’. (*Letters* I, 136) This involved developing and rounding off Chapter V, thoroughly revising Chapters I–III and shaping the novel as a whole into a stringent chiasitic design. It was an effort of creation occupying Joyce for over two, if not an ample three years. On Easter Day 1913, he envisaged finishing the book by the end of the year, but completing it spilled over into 1914. The surviving fair

8 It was not the *Stephen Hero* manuscript, therefore, as a persistent legend would have it, but an early *Portrait* manuscript that was thus given over to the flames, a fact which a careful reading of Joyce’s letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver of 6 January 1920 confirms. *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. I, ed. by Stuart Gilbert (New York: Viking Press, 1957, ²1966), p. 136. [*Letters* I]. The year 1911 was one of deep despondency for James Joyce. After intense proofreading of *Dubliners* in the summer of 1910, any hopes of seeing the collection published were dashed by letters from George Roberts both in June and December. Roberts refused to perfect the edition if ‘Ivy Day in the Committee Room’ was not revised—which Joyce would not do (see in more detail the ‘Introduction’ to the critical edition of *Dubliners* in the companion volume to this, pp. 11–15). No solution was discernible. It was the second radical setback in the effort to publish *Dubliners*. If this contributed to Joyce’s act of despair of throwing the *Portrait* manuscript in the fire, as we assume it did, it would seem even more likely in retrospect that Joyce was shaken, rather than buoyed up, by *Dana*’s rejection of the ‘A Portrait of the Artist’ essay in 1904.

copy bears the date line 'Dublin 1904 | Trieste 1914' on its last page. Yet the date '1913' on the fair copy's title page indicates that Joyce's Easter Day confidence was substantially grounded. Chapter IV, together with the opening pages of Chapter V, survive from the manuscript thrown in the fire, while Chapters I-III and V in the fair copy postdate the crisis of 1911. Since Chapter I as we have it was written out later than Chapters II and III, and since, in turn, sections of the Chapter V manuscript appear to coincide with the fair copy of Chapter III through fol. 100, 'putting together' the extant final manuscript meant writing out Chapters I-III afresh after revision, incorporating Chapter IV and the beginning of Chapter V from the earlier manuscript, and completing Chapter V. The stages may have been something like V/III, II, I, followed by the insertion of the final version of the villanelle episode in Chapter V, and the writing of the end of Chapter III, as finishing touches. If this represents Joyce's work on the novel from 1912 to perhaps early 1914, it was undoubtedly in 1913, as the manuscript title page indicates, that the design, and much of the text, was essentially realised.

Leaving the manuscript behind in Trieste when he moved to Zurich in 1915, he retrieved it in 1919 and presented it to Harriet Shaw Weaver for Christmas (*Letters I*, 136). She disposed of the Joyce manuscripts she possessed towards the end of her life and, respecting Nora Joyce's objection to her intention of depositing the *Finnegans Wake* papers in Ireland, she presented instead the fair copy of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* to the National Library of Ireland in 1951.

The Serialisation

On 15 December 1913, Ezra Pound wrote to Joyce asking whether he had anything publishable that he could place for him in any of the British or American journals with which he had connections.⁹ He had heard about the young Irish writer exiled in far-away Trieste through Joyce's fellow Irishman in London, W. B. Yeats. During those vital London years of his passion to discover the new writers and promote the new literature, Pound was specifically associated with *The Egoist* (formerly

9 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), pp. 17f.

titled *The Freewoman* and *The New Freewoman*) under the editorship of Dora Marsden. With the concurrent prospect of Grant Richards finally publishing *Dubliners*, it was the new novel that Joyce wanted Pound and *The Egoist* to consider. To provide copy, he gave his autograph out to be typed, beginning with what was available of it towards the end of 1913, and was also first required. The typed first chapter arrived in London in mid-January. Ezra Pound responded enthusiastically on 19 January.¹⁰ The second chapter, typed by a second typist, followed in late March 1914. *The Egoist* undertook the serialization and began to run *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in brief fortnightly instalments on, as it happened, 2 February 1914, Joyce's thirty-second birthday. The third-chapter typescript reached London on 21 July 1914, as the time approached when it would be needed as *Egoist* copy. The likeliest explanation for the staggered arrival of the chapters is that Joyce was spreading the typing costs. Chapters IV and V in typescript were sent to London only in November, and became available indeed only after a hiatus in the serialisation. This would seem to have been due to the wartime situation. Eventually mailing it not from Trieste, but from Venice, Joyce appears to have held back the Chapter IV-V typescript until he felt sufficiently reassured both that *The Egoist* would continue to appear—even as it had changed from fortnightly to monthly publication—and that it would be safe to dispatch the typescript.

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man appeared in instalments in *The Egoist* from 2 February 1914 to 1 September 1915. Owing to difficulties the printers made for fear of prosecution, *The Egoist* employed three printers in succession, and even so the text did not escape cuts from printer censorship. The first paragraph of Chapter III, a couple of sentences in the bird-girl conclusion to Chapter IV, and a brief dialogue exchange about farting plus the occurrence (twice) of the expression 'ballocks' in Chapter V were affected. James Joyce did not read proof on the *Egoist* text.¹¹ Nor, beyond Chapter II, did he receive the published text to read until sometimes many weeks or months after publication. (The wartime disturbances in communication, again, are the obvious

10 See Pound/Joyce, p. 24.

11 Except possibly on the second and third instalments; see Hans Walter Gabler, 'Towards a Critical Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 27 (1974), 1-53 (pp. 44 f.).

reason.) Nevertheless, he spotted the censorship cuts immediately, was able to provide the missing fourth-chapter sentences *verbatim* from memory and insisted on an entirely uncensored text for the book publication.

Towards the First Edition

In the spring of 1915, several months before the run of the *Portrait* instalments in *The Egoist* ended, Harriet Weaver, assisted by Ezra Pound, and soon by J. B. Pinker, the well-established literary agent who, in May 1915, added Joyce to his extensive list of authors, embarked upon a protracted search for a British publisher of the novel in book form. Grant Richards had the right of first refusal, contracted with the publishing of *Dubliners*, and declined. Martin Secker and, after long deliberation, Gerald Duckworth followed suit. Ezra Pound's attempts to interest John Lane—who in 1936 was to publish *Ulysses*—and the tentative approach that Viola Hunt made at Pound's instigation to T. Werner Laurie, were unsuccessful. Duckworth's rejection of January 1916 was based on the reader's report of Edward Garnett which documents how categorically *A Portrait's* construction and style were beyond the expectations, and therefore the powers of perception, of a most esteemed literary reader of the time.¹² Nor did the book fare better with William Heinemann, who in mid-1916 was given it for consideration, even though Harriet Weaver had on 30 November 1915 already proposed founding The Egoist Ltd. expressly to publish *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Yet, just as the established British publishers had refused to take on the novel, British printers now proved unwilling to touch it uncensored. (The recent legal proceedings against D. H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* no doubt influenced their attitude.) The course that remained for Harriet Weaver was to look to the United States in the hope of arranging with an American partner to supply her with import sheets for a British edition. The promise of a satisfactory arrangement with John Marshall collapsed when Marshall absconded to Canada. It was with B. W. Huebsch of New York that a joint venture finally succeeded.

¹² Garnett's report is quoted in Ellmann, *James Joyce*, pp. 403-4.

The Book Editions

B. W. Huebsch had become aware of James Joyce through Grant Richards, who throughout 1916 negotiated with him to publish *Dubliners* in the United States with sheets imported from England. (The edition was brought out in December 1916, only a few weeks before that of *A Portrait*.) He was alerted to *A Portrait* through E. Byrne Hackett, an Irish-American bookseller and small-scale publisher to whom, on Ezra Pound's recommendation, Harriet Weaver had sent a set of tearsheets from *The Egoist*. Hackett forwarded these to Huebsch, who on 16 June 1916 offered 'to print absolutely in accordance with the author's wishes, without deletion' (*Letters* I, 91). Providing him with copy to allow him to do so was now the trans-Atlantic challenge. The Hackett tearsheets, although provided with slips and marginal additions restoring the censored passages, were uncorrected. A fully marked-up set of tearsheets was in the hands of John Marshall with corrections by Joyce himself in Chapters I and II, authorial corrections transferred into Chapters III and IV by Harriet Weaver from lists Joyce had sent her,¹³ and Chapter V in the original typescript. All attempts failed to obtain them for Huebsch. On 6 September 1916 Harriet Weaver sent him a substitute copy with Chapters III and IV marked up according to Joyce's lists, but Chapters I, II and V corrected merely on the strength of her own recollection of Joyce's changes or, with respect to Chapter V, merely her unaided impressions. Huebsch wisely refused to start printing from this copy, awaiting rather the receipt of Chapters I, II and V in exemplars Harriet Weaver had concurrently sent to Joyce freshly to mark up. These she was able to forward to Huebsch in late September. They reached New York on 6 October, and on 17 October Huebsch confirmed that the book was in the hands of the printer. The printer's copy—set EC-A, according to Chester G. Anderson's sigla—is made up of Chapters I, II and V with James Joyce's autograph corrections plus some clarifications of these in Harriet Weaver's hand, and Chapters III and IV marked up in Harriet Weaver's hand alone from Joyce's lists.¹⁴ On the typesetting for the book,

13 They are still extant and bound in with another set of *Egoist* tearsheets now in the British Library; see my 'Towards a Critical Text...', pp. 3-15.

14 This corrects Anderson's description of them as corrected entirely in Joyce's hand (Chester G. Anderson, 'The Text of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young*

no proofreading other than Huebsch's house proofing was feasible. Joyce was pressing for publication in 1916; this was even stipulated in the publishing contract. On 29 December, a few copies were ready and bound to justify the date 1916 on the first edition title page. In January 1917, the edition was on the American market, and 768 sets of sheets (for the 750 ordered), printed as a separate issue by stop-press alteration of the title page, arrived in London to be bound and marketed by The Egoist Ltd.

Joyce found the first edition extensively in need of correction. By 10 April 1917, he had drawn up a handwritten list of 'nearly 400' changes, which he sent to Pinker to be typed and forwarded in ribbon copy and carbon by two successive posts to Huebsch in New York. Yet by the time they arrived, Huebsch had already printed 'a second edition from the first plates' unaltered. Harriet Weaver, who was also considering a second edition, refrained from extending her joint venture with Huebsch when she discovered that freshly imported sheets would not contain Joyce's changes. She obtained the carbon copy of the corrections, augmented its 364 entries by another seventeen items from a list of seventy corrections which she herself had prepared—the remaining fifty-three items on that list coincided with Joyce's own corrections—and used it to mark up an exemplar of the English first edition (American sheets) as printer's copy for the reset English second edition published under the imprint of The Egoist Ltd. in 1918. (Harriet Weaver later gave this copy to the Bodleian Library in Oxford, where it is now shelved.) The third English edition under the Egoist imprint published in 1921 was bibliographically another issue of the first American edition. It once more used sheets imported from the United States. Huebsch had, in reprinting for the third time, forgotten or chosen to disregard the ribbon copy of Joyce's 1917 corrections which he still held (and which, decades later, he gave to the Poetry Collection of the State University of New York in Buffalo, where they still survive).

In 1924, Jonathan Cape took over *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and published the 'fourth English edition', which, in strict bibliographical terms, was the book's third edition. With the proofing and revising of *Ulysses* fresh in his memory, Joyce appears to have proofread the Jonathan

Man', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 65 (1964), 160-200 (p. 188)) and confirms the inference drawn in my 'Towards a Critical Text ...', p. 19.

Cape *Portrait* more thoroughly and consistently than any other of his books after their first publication. None of the actual corrected proofs have been preserved, but he mentions reading proof on the Cape edition on two separate occasions in letters to Harriet Weaver in the summer of 1924, from Saint-Malo. On 11 July, he reports on work done before he left Paris, which involved resisting suggested censorial cuts—Sylvia Beach records her ‘amazement at the printer’s queries in the margins’¹⁵—and insisting on the removal of the ‘perverted commas ... by the sergeant-at-arms’ (*Letters* III, 99 f.). The letter of 11 July refers to an enclosure to demonstrate that Cape had complied on both counts—that is, agreed to print without cuts, and reset all dialogue—and thus suggests that Joyce received two sets of proof in Paris. On 16 August, he reports that he has sent off revises to Cape. Unless these were the second proofs which by inference he received in Paris, Joyce would thus have read three rounds of proof on the Cape edition. This marked the end of his attention to the text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in his lifetime.

This Edition

The present edition is a copy-text edition of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Its copy text is the text in James Joyce’s fair-copy holograph, preserved in the original in the National Library of Ireland and photographically reprinted in the *James Joyce Archive*.¹⁶ To establish the critical text and the apparatus, the surviving fragments of the typescript, the surviving *Egoist* galleys, the *Egoist* serialisation (1914-15), the first edition (B. W. Huebsch, 1916), the second edition (The Egoist Ltd.,

15 Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company* (London: Faber & Faber, 1960), p. 56.

16 James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, MS 920 and 921 in the holdings of the National Library of Ireland.

James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. A Facsimile of the Final Holograph Manuscript*. Prefaced and Arranged by Hans Walter Gabler. 2 vols. (New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977) (= vols. [9] and [10] of the *James Joyce Archive*).

The photo reprint in the *James Joyce Archive* provides a reliable reproduction of the textual record of the original manuscript. For the terminological distinction between textual, inscriptional and material record in originals and visual copy, see my essays ‘On Textual Criticism and Editing: The Case of *Ulysses*’ in *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities*, ed. by George Bornstein and Ralph Williams (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), pp. 195-224; and ‘What *Ulysses* Requires’, *PBSA*, 87:2 (1993), 187-248.

1918), and the third edition (Jonathan Cape, 1924) have been collated against the fair copy; and the marked-up *Egoist* tearsheets, the surviving separate lists of corrections, Harriet Weaver's marked-up printer's copy for the 1918 British edition, and published and unpublished correspondence itemizing textual changes have been checked. From the textual materials so collated and assembled, the edited text has been constituted.¹⁷ Apart from emending obvious slips of the pen and authorial copying errors, it maintains the wording, spelling and punctuation of the copy text. Yet onto this have been grafted: first, the author's revisions, few in number, effected successively in the typescript, the serialisation and the book editions of 1916, 1918 and 1924; second, the authorial, or authorially instigated, restyling of capitalization and compound formation without hyphens (i.e., compounds in one word or two words) achieved successively in the book editions; third, the styling of dialogue with opening flush-left dialogue dashes only, as realised by authorial direction in the Jonathan Cape edition of 1924. According to the general concept of copy-text editing, the text in this edition is thus a critically eclectic text.

The textual situation which obtains for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*—draft material preceding the fair copy has not been preserved, nor was the text extensively revised in its straight passage from fair copy to print—suggests a mode of critical editing substantially different from that devised for James Joyce's *Ulysses*.¹⁸ The methodology of copy-text editing holds out the requisite technical procedures. It stipulates that, from the transmission, the text in one document—or 'copy'—be selected as the edition's base text. By conventionalised operations of critical editing, the base text, or copy text, is then transformed into the edited text. The principal rule of method is to follow the base text in spelling and punctuation, as well as in such related features as paragraphing, word division, capitalizing or italicizing. A critically edited text, however, is not a diplomatic text: it does not aim at being faithful to the base text in all its inscriptional or graphic peculiarities, such as slips of the pen,

17 Except for letters, all manuscript materials relevant to the constitution of the text have been photographically reprinted in *The James Joyce Archive*, vols. [7], [9] and [10].

18 James Joyce, *Ulysses. A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, prepared by Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, 3 vols. (New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984; ²1986).

misspellings or printing errors, nor in false starts (other than reporting them in the apparatus), spacings, lineation or pagination. Therefore, subsidiary rules regulate the altering of the (base or) copy text.

Altering the base text means emending it, and emendation in copy-text editing is of a double nature. In one respect, emendation removes the base text's imperfections and transmissional corruption. It corrects (or may correct) authorial misspellings, or restores words accidentally dropped from a manuscript copy; or corrects copying, typing or printer's errors, or undoes house styling and other effects of the text's fashioning by publishers' editors. In another respect, emendation replaces good and authentic readings of the base text by their respective authorial revisions—equally good and authentic, but superseding the base-text readings by authorial intervention and change—as found in authoritative document texts other than the base text. In other words, the copy-text-edited text—as against, say, a version-edited text—is not definable in relation to any one historical document (whereas the base text, or copy text, is of course so definable). It is, rather, an eclectic text, constituted by grafting authentic (succeeding) textual revisions onto the authentic (preceding) substratum of the copy text.

Copy-text editing thus telescopes a textual development into one text, the edited text. Under, and on account of, its method of procedure, such an eclectically edited text is never an historical, but is always an ideal text, a text as it never historically existed. (Indeed, though assumptions and methods of critical editing may vary, no critically edited text is a text as it ever historically existed.) To produce such an ideal text by textual scholarship and critical editing is commonly justified by the claim that, as edited, it fulfils the author's (final) intentions. But this means taking an ideological perspective on the procedural solution of a pragmatic task. From the outset, an editor faces the situation that an author's intentions may be considered fulfilled in a general way in each manifest historical documentation of the text—say, an accomplished draft, a fair copy, the printer's copy, the first edition, each authorially revised edition. The document texts provide the editor with an historical series of intentional moments. Copy-text editing as it has methodologically evolved is recognised as one way of solving the pragmatic task of reconciling these successive moments. It observes authorial intention and invokes it as a superior consideration in each instance of adjudicating authenticity

in variant readings among the documented states of the text. Yet the legitimacy is moot of claiming final authorial intention for the resulting editorial product. At the most, an edited text may claim to represent a text of composite authenticity. This is a claim which the textual situation for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* permits.

In the present critical edition, the copy text provides spellings, (a dearth of) capitalization, and a pattern of punctuation—in the delicate and rhythmically aware balance of colons, semicolons and, above all, a light use of commas—that are James Joyce's rather than those of a typist or printer's compositor. Being a fair copy derived from drafts, it must be assumed to hold its share of authorial copying mistakes. Since the preceding drafts are no longer extant, these may be indiscernible. But those discernible are few, and as easy to spot as to repair. In the course of the early printing history, on which Joyce took direct or mediated influence, a few verbal revisions were introduced, moreover, which are clearly identifiable so as to be established, by emendation of the copy text, as valid readings for the edited text. Yet the early printing history also brought about verbal and non-verbal alterations—changes in substantives and accidentals—which Joyce in part positively embraced, in part perhaps approved, or which he sometimes may have acquiesced in and occasionally let pass in silent protest—or which he never noticed. It is the editor's critical task to survey these and to declare rules and procedures for their admission or rejection in establishing the edited text.

The largest contingent of textual variants editorially to contend with are some 371 substantive differences between the fair copy and the serialisation. Some are verbal changes, but the majority manifest themselves as absences of fair-copy words and phrases from the serialised text. The fair copy carries no direction for changes or cuts. Did the author cut and change in the largely lost typescript (he could not have done so in proof, since he did not proofread the serialisation), or are the absences typist's and/or compositor's errors of omission? The analytical studies of the question undertaken have put the onus on the typist, or typists.¹⁹ Again and again, the figures of verbal repetition in the intricate rhetoric of the *Portrait* prose would seem to have caused

19 Anderson, 'The Text ...', pp.171-78; Gabler, 'Towards a Critical Text ...', pp. 31; 39-47.

the copyist to lose his place, and the arrangement of the text in the visual image of the fair copy pages appears often enough to have induced such eye-skip.

Once the typist has been identified as the main perpetrator of the 371 substantive changes between fair copy and serialisation, a very clear pattern emerges by which a small group of eighteen variants out of the total of 371 may be critically singled out as Joyce's revisions.²⁰ The present edition emends its copy text by these eighteen revisions, but upholds it for the remaining 353 instances where the serialisation, and all subsequent printings before Chester G. Anderson's edition of 1964, departed from it. In so doing, our edition asserts the authenticity of the text of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as it stands in Joyce's holograph fair copy. Whether it thereby also fulfils the author's final intention is ultimately unanswerable. There is no getting away from the facts that a) the typescript passed under Joyce's eyes (although there is strong indication that he only attended to queries marked by a thin lead pencil—Stanislaus Joyce's?—and did not read the typed text, and hence did not catch the typist's omissions at this initial stage); b) Joyce carefully prepared the serialised text as printer's copy for the first American edition; c) he similarly attended to the first-edition text, aiding Harriet Weaver in preparing the printer's copy for the first English edition; and d) he read two or three rounds of proof on the Jonathan Cape typesetting of 1924. What is recoverable as authorial intention from these rounds of authorial attention to the text is only what becomes positively manifest as written-in authorial revision, or as external instruction (e.g., in directions or comments by letter): the large-scale restoring of, and thereby the overall desire to restore, the manuscript punctuation; the changing of the manuscript system of capitalisation and compound formation; the introduction of a few verbal changes; and finally the insistence, for the 1924 edition, on the dialogue marking by initial dashes instead of the 'perverted commas' which Jonathan Cape had set in first proof (*Letters* III, 99 f.)—and the placing of these dashes flush left with the margin. In all these respects of positive restoration and change, the edited text realises a textual authenticity backed by final authorial intention. It cannot, and does not, however, claim to do so in respect of the typist's omissions of fair-copy text. Here, on the strength of

20 See Gabler, 'Towards a Critical Text ...', pp. 31-35.

the manuscript, the edited text overrides the tradition of the text in pre-publication and published transmission as, between 1914 and 1924, it passed repeatedly under Joyce's eyes. In restoring the typist's omissions, this edition asserts the authenticity of the manuscript. The edited text is thus a critically eclectic text of composite authenticity.

On the textual surface, the edition here offered does not essentially differ from the edition advocated in 1974,²¹ where minutely it does, the difference lies in that it adheres without exception to the rule of hypothesis by which the omissions of manuscript text from the typescript/*Egoist* text are due to the typist, and refrains from realising editorially the few instances of authorial cuts which, within a limited area of Chapter III, it seemed possible critically to isolate.²² While the critical distinction remains an attractive possibility, the possible critical gain would not outweigh the real loss in editorial consistency. But even though this is the copy-text edition which, on the grounds of its textual documentation and pattern of transmission, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* requires, the thinking behind the methodological option has developed since I put forward my first notions of how to realise it.

Under the premises of critical eclecticism, and its formal concomitants of copy-text-editing procedures, to propose, as the result of scholarly editing, a text of composite authenticity amounts to a refocussing of the objective of the methodology. As indicated, the orthodox goal of copy-text editing has been a text fulfilling the author's final intentions. The shift in the editorial attitude and approach advocated is from an overriding orientation towards the author to an orientation dominantly towards the text. To be sure, common denominators remain. The edited text of composite authenticity does not neglect or deny the author: both final intention and composite authenticity are author-related concepts. And, on the other hand: the text of final intention as well as that of composite authenticity, since eclectically arrived at, are at bottom editorial constructs. Nevertheless, there are clear distinctions. In the endeavour to establish final authorial intention, the editor will engage primarily with the author and the ultimate authority with which the author is taken to endow the text. Under such premises, the text is seen as dependent on, and functionally as subordinate to,

21 Gabler, 'Towards a Critical Text ...', p. 53.

22 Gabler, 'Towards a Critical Text ...', pp. 36-38.

the author. In striving for an edited text of composite authenticity, by contrast, the editor engages primarily with the text in the cross-currents of its processes of composition, revision and transmission.²³ In the dialectics of writing and rewriting which characterise these processes, the author becomes as much a function of the text as the text of the author, and 'ultimate authority', if not indeed both notionally and practically unattainable, resides in the text. What the concept of the text of composite authenticity foregrounds is the aporia of all critical editing, namely that an edited text is always an editor's text. This is particularly true of an eclectically edited text, the conventional invocation of the author and (final) intentions notwithstanding: an author's text (rather than an editor's), as definable historically and in terms of compositional structure, can by definition not result from eclectic assembly. This is the second aporia that must be faced: theory would categorically rule out the construction of an eclectic text; yet in practical terms, a critically eclectic text established by the rules of copy-text editing is, under the given circumstances of documentation and transmission, the optimal solution of the pragmatic task of editing a work such as James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

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 authorial writing of the copy text. 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,²⁴ 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

23 Under the premises of such engagement, the edition of *Dubliners* (see the companion volume to this edition) does not, because it cannot, aim for a text of composite authenticity. Its edited text is oriented towards authorial writing and the history of the text. This follows from the different textual situation obtaining for *Dubliners*, and is a theoretical repositioning not in kind, but in degree, responding to the pragmatic givens of editorial practice.

24 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.

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 section 'Manuscript Traces' to the critical edition of *Dubliners*, or of course directly in the *James Joyce Archive* photo reprint of the *Portrait* holograph. The convention adopted in this edition's main text, however, is that of flush left opening dialogue dashes only. 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*.

This critical edition introduces for each chapter a through line numbering independent of the pagination that is identical also in the simultaneously published Vintage edition. In the printing, end-of-line hyphenation occurs in two modes. The sign '=' marks a division for mere typographical reasons. Words so printed should always be cited as one undivided word. The regular hyphen indicates an authentic Joycean hyphen. For an understanding of the status, structure and function of the apparatus of this edition, the explications in the companion edition of *Dubliners* ('Introduction', pp. 24-32) may be profitably consulted.

The present edited text and that of Chester G. Anderson's Viking edition of 1964 do not drastically differ. Anderson was the first carefully to explore the Dublin holograph of *A Portrait*. Yet for his 1964 edition he was forced into textual compromises. These our edition eschews when merging into its edited text the words and punctuation of Joyce's fair copy with the changes in wording and restyling of capitalisation and compound formation of his later revisions for *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

