

LAST WORD IN ART SHADES:  
THE TEXTUAL STATE OF JAMES JOYCE'S *ULYSSES*

Kelly Lynn Tully-Needler

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Master of Arts  
in the Department of English,  
Indiana University

December 2007

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Kenneth W. Davis, Ph.D., Chair

Master's Thesis  
Committee

---

Jonathan R. Eller, Ph.D.

---

William F. Touponce, Ph.D.

**DEDICATION**

*For James Joyce*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is not customary to thank the dead, but I am the beneficiary of so many who came before: Frank Budgen, John Yeats, William Butler Yeats, Ezra Pound, Harriet Shaw Weaver, Margaret Anderson, Jane Heap, John Quinn, John Rodker, Sylvia Beach, Adrienne Monnier, Maurice Darantiere, Robert McAlmon, Ernest Hemingway, Paul Léon, Morris Ernst, Alexander Lindey, and Justice John Woolsey. In so many ways, these individuals made *Ulysses* possible, and their work was an odyssey equal the epic struggle and the beloved modern epic by James Joyce. The artist and his advocates struggled against institutions and against the time-bound biases of moral judgment.

In a strange replay of that early twentieth-century scandal, the editors, advisors, and administrators of the critical edition of *Ulysses* endured a scandal at the end of the twentieth century. *Ulysses* is a difficult work even with a reliable text; thank you Richard Ellmann, Clive Hart, Philip Gaskell, Peter du Sautoy, Wolfhard Steppe, Claus Melchior, Michael Groden, and A. Walton Litz, for being invested in the daunting task of producing a reliable edition. Most importantly, thank you Hans Walter Gabler, not only for your work on *Ulysses*, but for entering into an email exchange with an unestablished, fledgling scholar like myself.

Likewise, the completion of this thesis met formidable obstacles, and it was only made possible through the grace, kindness, and compassion of many. It was more of a personal struggle than a scholarly one, and so are my thanks deeply personal: Nathan Houser offered me time he did not have to give. Andre De Tienne is a testimony of how to live well. Cornelis de Waal engaged me in countless

conversations about my ideas and taught me many of the principles of editing necessary to write this thesis. Martin Coleman lent me a tireless ear, pushed me to my evangelical core, and encouraged me to get pancakes. Diana Reynolds protected the morale of a workplace I care for very much with her professionalism. Kris Frost often lifted my tired spirits with her penetrating wit and palpable kindness. Johanna Resler shared the sympathy of being a fledgling scholar with me. These people stabilized my crowded mind at work, which helped me contribute to The Peirce Edition Project, learn, and grow.

The Peirce Edition Project and the Institute for American Thought enabled this thesis. For two-and-a-half years, the practical support of the Peirce Project made my education affordable. The Peirce Project also gave me practical experience working on a scholarly edition, which concretized coursework in textual scholarship. I could have read every book on the matter, but still would not have been able to write this thesis had it not been for the deeply philosophical tedium of daily work on the *Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Some commas do deserve passionate consideration.

I have been the beneficiary of the work and spirit of many, both indirectly and directly. So it is with the late Chair of my Department of English, Dr. Christian Kloesel, who was an excellent editor, scholar, teacher, and leader. Mostly, he was an excellent conversationalist, and I was always delighted to encounter him in hallways and on sidewalks.

I am thankful for the work of my thesis committee, but I am, more so, deeply grateful for their guidance in life. William Touponce engaged me in hallway

conversations at the Institute for American Thought. To him, these were probably casual conversations on common interests, but to me, they were uplifting and amusing contributions to my scholarship, and they often revitalized my work. His remarks on my thesis, in an equally casual stroll, were among the most rewarding moments of having finished it. Jonathan Eller recruited me for the important work at the Peirce Project. He is often referred to as my professorial hero. His cunning wit, his erudition, and his expressions of the experience of life have generated the term *Ellerisms* among my family and friends. But more importantly, the most overcommitted man I've ever met responded to my needs with professional generosity and paternal concern, precisely when I needed him most. Kenneth Davis equipped me with the vocational skills of a copyeditor, a priceless skill that has on so many occasions afforded me the opportunity to learn from the material I edit. He introduced me to my favorite work of literature, and in all his knowledge of Joyce's artistry, he never strayed far from the human import of meaning in *Ulysses*. Likewise, in his role as my teacher of ideas, he never strayed from being a teacher in the human way of kindness and compassion. Thank you, Ken, for picking me up after a scuffle, dusting me off, and building me a fire.

And so it is my teachers have at times taken the role of parents, and equally, all four of my parents remain the most important teachers I have. They have tirelessly and bravely supported me, even through my ignorance and follies. If there is a credit to them specific to this work, they gifted me with the love of language, the surrender to emotion, and the desire to know the sympathizing experience of others, which constitute the true spirit of literary study. My Great Aunt and Uncle, Betty and Cal

Fisher, came to Indianapolis to share the memorable occasion of graduation ceremony with me. Thank you for making every occasion of your company memorable. My sister Kathy Jo gave me advice that set the tenor for my graduate study when she said, you must be as interested in the pursuit of the degree as you are in procuring it. It is a lesson for life as much as for scholarship. My sister Kristine and her husband Paul have been a home to me, in spirit as much as in place. They have given me a bed, moved my books, stored my things, sacrificed closets, cooked me food, poured me wine, tolerated my smoke, walked my dog, found me work, lent me money, TIVOed my favorite shows, cut my hair, scraped my windshield, invited me out, let me stay in, showed me the beach, picked me up, dropped me off, booked my flights, found my hotels, given me directions, helped me get lost, shared my thoughts, and mostly, made me laugh. How two people can be at once an escape and a fortification is beyond understanding any study may impart. I am forever indebted to them, and so are any who may read and like this work.

Corinne Renguette, Miriam Barr, and Radhika Avasthi are my friends. Thank you for the solace of your company. Thank you for the generosity of your spirit. Thank you for the power of your laughter. When I am an old woman sitting by my fire, I will know then, as I do now, you are the best outcome of pursuing this degree. I may soon forget the particulars of the history of censorship, or lose my cogency in the abstractions of textual theory, but I will never lose the feeling and thought of your friendship and its impact on my life. Likewise, the friendship of classmates who have perched opposite me on a barstool often have provided the moment of revelation, whether it is in life, politics, society, or scholarship. Thank you Kyle Macintosh,

Gabriel Harley, Martin Coleman, David Agler, Benjamin Alan Peltz, Louis Miller, Kevin Meek, Ben Seal, Emily Dean, and Anthony Armstrong. To the Dubliners and international gypsies who, for a brief space of time, made Dublin a home and an adventure, thank you for your classic Irish wit, which is a canon unto itself. Thank you for the perspective of my cohort, on all things relevant to this postmodern life.

And to my most beloved friend, yes, I may have finished this thesis three years ago if it had not been for you, but without you, I would still be praying for Ithaca. If I had only the lifetime of one day in the world of one place, I would spend it with you in Yellow, in the enchanting homecoming of your company.

I acknowledge these acknowledgments are not customary, but neither was the labor of this thesis, the conditions of its process, nor the contributions made to its completion. It is customary in the acknowledgements of scholarship to thank your influential teachers, your steadfast family, and your reliable friends. I am most grateful for not knowing where you categorically fit among those epithets. My teachers have given me lessons in life, as parents would. My friends have been family in the provision of love and a home. My family members have been friends to me in the guidance of advice and the fellowship of laughter. And all my friends, family, and mentors have been teachers to me, in the loving and courageous ways of how to be a human being engaged, with compassion and courage, in modern struggle of epic proportions. Would I even have understood Joyce's novel without the testimony of your lives? I think not. But if there is one element of your constitution that has blurred the boundaries of your role in my life, it is the same element that has made the blessing of this scholarship also a hardship: caring. You all care. And if it has taken



me a considerable space of time to complete it, it is merely because I am following your lead. Thank you for leading me.

## A NOTE ON TEXTS AND METHODS

The wealth and dispersal of primary materials available to a Joyce scholar necessitated four methods to economize research for this thesis. (1) Research was conducted with facsimile editions of Joyce's documents of composition, rather than original documents. (2) Only published correspondence was consulted. When germinal works of secondary literature cite unpublished correspondence, I have quoted from them. (3) In preparing Chapter 2, which details censorship of serialized versions, I did not collate the Rosenbach manuscript with the *Little Review* and *Egoist* texts. Rather, I relied primarily on the iconic collation prepared in 1975 by Clive Driver.<sup>1</sup> Driver's collation, however, does not always present variant texts accurately, nor is it exhaustive. Variance between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* was also supplemented with that reported in Harry Levin's introduction to the 1975 facsimile of the Rosenbach manuscript, as well as the findings of germinal works on censorship. With these sources combined, Chapter 2 provides a more exhaustive record of censored passages than any of these sources in isolation; however, because I did not personally collate the Rosenbach, the *Little Review*, and the *Egoist* texts, neither can this discussion be considered exhaustive. Once all variance recorded in these works was compiled, the facsimiles of the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* publications were consulted to verify felicitous presentation of texts therein. (4) Laws pertaining to censorship differ significantly between the United States and the United Kingdom. I have focused my research on the history of text in the United States,

---

<sup>1</sup> James Joyce, *Ulysses: The Manuscript and First Printings Compared*, ed. Clive Driver (New York: Octagon Books, 1975). Driver prepared a reduced Photostat reproduction of the 1922 edition and then annotated the 1922 text to indicate variance between it, the Rosenbach manuscript, and the serialized versions.

primarily, because the *Little Review* text was (in all instances but one) the setting copy for the *Egoist* text. In addition, the legal proceedings against the book in the United States set the tenor for book negotiations with publishers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Lastly, this thesis quotes often from *Ulysses*, as well as from published versions of private documents; rarely do these materials conform to standard conventions of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. I have quoted these passages faithfully from their sources.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations.....	xiv
Chapter One: Our <i>Ulysseses</i>	
Introduction.....	1
Literature Survey .....	2
Chapter Two: The Serialization of <i>Ulysses</i>	
In the Beginning.....	27
Joyce's Advocates.....	31
Serial Publication .....	44
Chapter Three: <i>Ulysses</i> , the Book	
Introduction.....	87
<i>Ulysses</i> Goes to Court.....	88
The Effect of the Trial.....	95
The First Edition, Paris .....	119
The First American and English Editions.....	127
Chapter Four: The Second Scandal of <i>Ulysses</i>	
Pre-Gabler Edition .....	140
The Editorial Project.....	143
The Joyce Wars.....	147
The Difficulty of Editing <i>Ulysses</i> .....	159
Chapter Five: The Critical Edition of <i>Ulysses</i>	
Introduction.....	169
Textual Scholarship .....	170

Anglo-American Tradition: Intentionalist Eclectic Editing.....	172
The German Tradition: Historical-Critical Edition.....	181
Gabler’s Method: A Hybrid Approach .....	191
Joyce Scholarship Now.....	205
Conclusion .....	209
References.....	214
Curriculum Vitae	

## ABBREVIATIONS

Works frequently cited are identified by the following abbreviations:

- P* James Joyce, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche (New York: Vintage International, 1993).
- RM* James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, ed. Harry Levin and Clive Driver (New York: Octagon Books, 1975). *When quoting from the Rosenbach facsimile, I have provided two citations: Joyce's inscribed system of episode number and page numbers, separated by a period, and, in parentheses, the bibliographic code of the page in the Rosenbach facsimile.*
- LR* Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap, eds. *The Little Review* (Chicago and New York, 1914–1921). *Some volumes of the Little Review were misnumbered, so I use a month/year, rather than volume/issue, format. Full bibliographic record may be found in References.*
- U1922* James Joyce, *Ulysses: The Manuscript and First Printings Compared*, ed. Clive Driver (New York: Octagon Books, 1975). *See footnote 1 above.*
- U1986* James Joyce, *Ulysses: The Critical and Synoptic Edition*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1984, rpt. in 1986). *Citations of synopsis and editorial essays give a page number. Citations of text proper follow the standard convention of episode number and line number, and are taken from the 1986 second impression.*
- L I, II, and III* James Joyce, *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. I, ed. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Viking Press, 1957; reissued with corrections 1966); vols. II and III, ed. Richard Ellmann (New York: Viking Press, 1964).
- P/J* Ezra Pound, *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*, ed. Forrest Read (New York: New Directions, 1965).
- M* Michael Moscato and Leslie LeBlanc, eds. *The United States of America v. One Book Entitled Ulysses, by James Joyce* (Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1984).



## CHAPTER 1: OUR *ULYSSES*

True there was in nullohs dieybos as yet no lumpend papeer in the waste and mightmountain Penn still groaned for the micies to let flee. All was of ancienry. ... But the world, mind, is, was and will be writing its own wrunes for ever, man, on all matters that fall under the ban of our infrational senses ... and Gutenmorg with his cromagnom charter, tintingfast and great primer must once for omniboss step rubrickredd out of the wordpress else is there no virtue more in alcoholan. For that (the rapt one warns) is what papyr is meed of, made of, hides and hints and misses in prints. Till ye finally (though not yet endlike) meet with the acquiantance of Mister Typus, Mistress Tope and all the little tytopies. Fisstup. So you need hardly spell me how every word will be bound over to carry three score and ten toptypical reading throughout the book of Doublends Jined (may his forehead be darkened with mud who would sunder!) till Daleth, mahomahouma, who oped it closeth thereof the. Dor.

James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*

### INTRODUCTION

In 1977, German textual scholar Hans Walter Gabler undertook the effort of recovering James Joyce's intentions for the text of *Ulysses*. Whether or not he succeeded is still a matter of dispute. Gabler's work came to fruition in 1984, when a three-volume scholarly edition was published by Garland Press. This edition was reprinted in 1986, with a Note on the Second Impression and forty corrections to the text. Also in 1986, Random House and Bodley Head began publication of the new *Ulysses* text in a trade edition. This trade edition is now the most widely read text of *Ulysses*.

Gabler's editorial effort rectified a number of corruptions in the transmission of *Ulysses*, yet regardless of substantial editorial effort, Joyce's masterpiece will remain an unstable text unless we discover more documents of composition. The editorial situation of *Ulysses*, and the text Gabler reconstituted, is best understood

---

Epigraph: James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (New York: Penguin, 1999), pp. 19–20.



through the history of the book's creation and life in print. This thesis provides that understanding; it is a socio-historical examination of the salient documents, texts, and editions of *Ulysses*. As such, it enables examination of the textual reliability of discrete features of the work, and it lays the foundation for competent literary studies, by providing scholars with an awareness of the texts upon which we base our critical interpretations.

## LITERATURE SURVEY

The satellite literature of *Ulysses* is remarkably expansive, especially given the novel's retarded availability in the English-speaking world. Only 27,500 copies were printed between 1922 and 1934 by Dijon printer Maurice Darantiere, and many of them were seized and burned by American and British authorities. In the early 1930s, a German firm, the Albatross Press, offered to take over publication in continental Europe for Sylvia Beach. The first (of four) printings, which bore the imprint "The Odyssey Press," appeared in 1932 with a warning label on the back cover: "Not to be introduced into the British Empire or the U.S.A."<sup>2</sup> Ironically, Joyce's *Ulysses* was easier to come by if one had the good fortune to speak German, French, or Japanese; translations were published in 1927, 1929, and 1932, respectively. Despite the difficulty of obtaining *Ulysses* in the English-speaking world, interest in Joyce's work was widespread, owing to partial serialization and scandalous legal proceedings against the book, proceedings which deemed it obscene and left it banned. Before the novel's legal availability in the United States and the United Kingdom, six book-length studies of it were already in print. Readers had at

---

<sup>2</sup> James F. Spoorri, "The Odyssey Press edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 50, no. 2 (April–June 1956), p. 196. For more on copyright of the early editions of *Ulysses*, see Chapter 3.

their disposal companion readers for understanding the complexity of the novel, without the novel.<sup>3</sup>

If the novel was egregiously withheld from English-speaking readers, good fortune offered some recompense in the relatively quick availability of prepublication documents. In 1933, *Ulysses* was legalized in the United States, only five years before the first installment of Joyce papers was placed in public trust. Joyceans are much indebted to Paul Léon and his wife, Lucie Noel, for the preservation of three collections of Joyce material, housed at the British Library, the National Library of Ireland, and Lockwood Memorial Library at the State University of New York, Buffalo.<sup>4</sup> In 1938, Léon sent notesheets of *Ulysses* composition to Harriet Shaw Weaver, who deposited these notes for the novel, along with correspondence and documents from her personal collection, in the British Library. (This collection also includes many of the manuscripts and presswork for *Finnegans Wake*.) Upon Joyce's death in 1941, Paul Léon placed a suitcase full of Joyce documents in the trust of Count O'Kelly, Irish ambassador in Paris, to be deposited at the National Library of Ireland under the protection of a fifty-year seal. (This collection contains the bulk of

---

<sup>3</sup> In chronological order, these were *When Doctors Disagree: James Joyce and his book, "Ulysses," which has become an international literary sensation*, by Roscoe Ashworth (Jamaica, New York: Brewster Publications, 1922); *James Joyce: His First Forty Years*, by Herbert Sherman Gorman (London: G. Bles, 1926); *A Key to the Ulysses of James Joyce*, by Paul Jordan Smith (New York: Covici, Friede, 1927, 1934); *The Odyssey in Dublin*, by S. Foster Damon (Portland, Maine: Hound and Horn, 1929); *James Joyce's Ulysses: A study*, by Stuart Gilbert (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930); and *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*, by Frank Budgen (New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1934; London: Greyson and Greyson, 1934). The penultimate and last of these works, those by Stuart Gilbert and Frank Budgen, have remained a valuable resource in Joyce studies, for the close personal relationships the authors had with Joyce, and for provision of firsthand testimony of Joyce's process and intentions. They could reasonably be called the first textual studies in *Ulysses* scholarship, if one takes the term *textual studies* loosely enough to include works of its objective: the preservation of authorial intention and the study of an author's writing technique. But they were more of the character of translators, companion readers that suggest meaning and explicate the design of *Ulysses*.

<sup>4</sup> Firsthand testimony of these efforts may be found in Lucie Noel's memoir, *James Joyce and Paul L. Léon: The Story of a Friendship* (New York: Gotham Book Mart, 1950).

correspondence related to the second trial of *Ulysses*, in 1933.)<sup>5</sup> Léon also rescued many of the books and documents the Joyces left behind in Paris in 1939, when the writer and his family fled from imminent Nazi occupation. Lucie returned these to Nora Joyce after the war. On behalf of Nora, Harriet Shaw Weaver arranged for the documents' 1949 exposition at the Librairie La Hune in Paris, after which they were acquired for the Poetry Collection at the State University of New York, Buffalo, arriving in 1950 (one document in this collection was lost en route to the United States).<sup>6</sup> This installment included Joyce's library, holograph drafts from the *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* workshops, typescripts and presswork for the 1922 edition of *Ulysses*, and family portraits (including the artwork of Patrick Tuohy). The fourth significant document made available to the public was the Rosenbach manuscript, the only surviving copy of the novel written in Joyce's hand. In 1954, the Philip H. and A.S.W. Rosenbach Foundation established the Rosenbach Museum and Library to preserve and share the cultural capital the Rosenbach brothers acquired.<sup>7</sup>

Scholars did much to collect and preserve Joyce materials as well. The substantial collection at Yale University, gathered in the 1940s and 1950s, was the

---

<sup>5</sup> A published catalogue of portions of this deposit is available: *The James Joyce – Paul Léon Papers in The National Library of Ireland*, comp. Catherine Fahy (Dublin: The National Library of Ireland, 1992). The catalogue is annotated to represent content as well.

<sup>6</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *U*1986, p. 1862. The catalogue of the La Hune exhibition describes the lost document as “ten large leaves inscribed in ink with fragments of conversation that reappear in heavily altered form in the library episode,” Scylla and Charybdis, of *Ulysses*.

<sup>7</sup> This discussion is in no way exhaustive. Additional Joyce materials are held by private collectors, the James Joyce Estate, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, the Croessmann Collection at Southern Illinois University (which contains correspondence of John Quinn and Ezra Pound, regarding Joyce), Harvard University, Princeton University, the Henry E. Huntington Library in San Marino, California, the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, the New York Public Library, University College, Dublin, the University of Tulsa, etc. This discussion merely serves to outline installments of materials in public trust relevant to textual analysis of *Ulysses*.

work of John J. Slocum, while preparing his 1953 bibliography of Joyce writings.<sup>8</sup> In the 1950s and 1960s, Richard Ellmann acted as an ambassador in bringing forth Joyce material. Ellmann was examining primary documents for his literary biography of Joyce and editing the second and third volumes of Joyce's letters.<sup>9</sup> This scholar played a large role in negotiating subsequent Joyce acquisitions for American libraries. Most notably, he acted as an advisor to Ottocaro Weiss in the significant Cornell University purchase of materials from Nelly Joyce, Stanislaus's widow. These materials were left behind in Trieste by Joyce, and Stanislaus hoarded them for years, intending to write a biography of his brother (which, though far short of completion, was posthumously published as *My Brother's Keeper*).<sup>10</sup> The Cornell collection includes many of Joyce's critical writings, newspaper writings, and documents from the first two decades of the twentieth century. Ellmann also gained the confidence of many of Joyce's friends, family, and associates, including Harriet Shaw Weaver and Sylvia Beach, in order to publish extant correspondence, and he tracked down several documents held by private collectors for inclusion in *Letters*. Beach's papers were also sold to Buffalo in 1962, on Ellmann's recommendation.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon, *A Bibliography of James Joyce, 1882–1941* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

<sup>9</sup> *The Letters of James Joyce*, volume 1, edited by Stuart Gilbert, was published in 1957. I do not mean to be remiss, to mention Ellmann without Gilbert in reference to the *Letters* volumes; I merely do so to illustrate the large role that Ellmann played in bringing out collections that otherwise may have been lost, protected, or destroyed by Joyce's heirs (Georgio Joyce is known to have burned some of his father's papers). Ellmann's diplomacy in dealing with Joyce's family and associates was a feat more extraordinary, I believe, than all his work on Joyce. More on Ellmann's efforts to preserve and publish Joyce material can be found in "Learning to be Joyce's Contemporary: Richard Ellmann's Discovery and Transformation of Joyce's Manuscripts and Letters," by William S. Brockman, *Journal of Modern Literature* 22, no. 2: 253–263.

<sup>10</sup> Stanislaus Joyce, *My Brother's Keeper: James Joyce's Early Years*, ed. Richard Ellmann with preface by T.S. Eliot (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1958).

<sup>11</sup> The 1962 collection of correspondence was edited, first, by Oscar A. Silverman, Chair of the Department of English (1956–1963) and Director of Libraries (1960–1968) at Buffalo, who played a large role in this acquisition for the Poetry Collection. Upon Silverman's death, the Society of Authors

Though these acquisitions of Joyce materials enabled scholarship, the multiplicity of acquisitions also somewhat hindered comprehensive study, for these documents were scattered at different institutions across the globe. For example, in the case of *Ulysses*, extant notesheets are in London. Some additional notes and pre-Rosenbach draft fragments are in Buffalo, New York. Three complete pre-Rosenbach drafts survive, one each for Proteus, Nausicaa, and Oxen of the Sun. The first is in Buffalo; the latter two, however, are each divided between the Buffalo and Cornell collections. The Rosenbach is in Philadelphia. What typescripts did survive are at Buffalo. First *placards* (the French equivalent to galley proofs) are at Harvard. Second *placards* and first page proofs are at Buffalo, and final page proofs are in Austin, Texas. (Recent emergence of previously unknown material adds new locales: now, a draft of Circe is in Dublin, and a draft of Eumaeus is held by an anonymous private collector.) These documents represent only the extant *internal* evidence of *Ulysses*'s evolution in print. For *external* evidence, such as correspondence, the situation is even worse.

In the 1970s, Xerox machines and more sophisticated facsimile reproductions promised to bring Joyce materials to some degree of comprehensive access. Philip Herring published the notesheets for *Ulysses* housed in the British Library in 1972, and followed with publication of the notes and early drafts for *Ulysses* in the Buffalo collection, in 1977.<sup>12</sup> In 1975, Clive Driver and Harry Levin published a facsimile of

---

reconfirmed authorization for the project, under the direction of Melissa Banta. Silverman and Banta's project was published as *James Joyce's Letters to Sylvia Beach* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987). Most of the letters from Beach to Joyce have been held privately by the James Joyce Estate.

<sup>12</sup> James Joyce, *Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum*, ed. Philip Herring (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972) and *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from*

the Rosenbach manuscript, in cooperation with the Rosenbach Foundation.<sup>13</sup> In the mid-1970s, Gavin Borden, enterpriser of Garland publishing, sought the critical and editorial skills of A. Walton Litz, Michael Groden, David Hayman, Danis Rose, and Hans Walter Gabler for publication of the *James Joyce Archive*, a sixty-three-volume reproduction of significant Joyce materials. (Volumes 12 through 27 contain the bulk of *Ulysses* materials, including facsimiles of manuscripts, typescripts, and presswork for the 1922 edition.)<sup>14</sup>

Extant documents relevant to the composition and publication of *Ulysses* continue to emerge. The seal placed on the material that Paul Léon entrusted to Count O’Kelly, now at the National Library of Ireland, expired in 1992, but the now-available documents were culled from a still-protected collection, not to be released for viewing or publication until December 31, 2050. Most recently and most significantly, a previously unknown, pre-Rosenbach draft of the Circe episode was sold at Christie’s New York auction house on December 14, 2000, for \$1,546,000 to the National Library of Ireland. Fortunately, the provenance was easily traced. In a letter (dated April 21, 1921) to John Quinn, patron of the arts who first purchased Joyce’s *Ulysses* manuscripts, Joyce wrote that he hoped Quinn had received the manuscripts of Circe and Eumaeus, and that “As a curiosity I threw in also the 8<sup>th</sup>

---

*the Buffalo Collection*, ed. Philip Herring (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977). Herring’s editions are not facsimile reproductions; these are diplomatic transcriptions.

<sup>13</sup> James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, in two volumes, with critical introduction by Harry Levin and Clive Driver (New York: Octagon Books, 1975).

<sup>14</sup> James Joyce, *James Joyce Archive*, ed. Michael Groden, et. al (New York: Garland, 1977–79). For two autobiographical accounts of work on the *James Joyce Archive*, see “Perplex in the Pen—and in the Pixels: Reflections on the *James Joyce Archive*, Hans Walter Gabler’s *Ulysses*, and James Joyce’s *Ulysses* in Hypermedia,” by Michael Groden, *Journal of Modern Literature* 22, no. 2 (Winter 1998/1999): 225–244, and “The *James Joyce Archive*: A Publisher’s Gift to Joyce Studies,” by Hans Walter Gabler (Genetic Joyce Studies, by the Antwerp James Joyce Center: <http://www.antwerpjamesjoycecenter.com/GJS/JJAGabler.htm>).

draft of the former.”<sup>15</sup> When Quinn sold the fair-copy *Ulysses* manuscripts at auction in 1924 to A.S.W. Rosenbach, he did not include the draft of Circe, and unbeknownst to scholars, it remained within the Quinn family. Sale of the Circe draft soon flushed out a companion foul-paper manuscript.<sup>16</sup> On July 10, 2001, a previously unknown, pre-Rosenbach draft of the Eumaeus episode was sold to a private collector at Sotheby’s London for \$1,213,540. The private collector who purchased the manuscript remains anonymous. This draft (now commonly referred to as “Eumeo,” for its holograph title) was sold by a private collector, who had acquired the draft from Henri-Etienne Hoppenot (French diplomat and writer, 1891–1977). How Hoppenot acquired the manuscript is unknown.<sup>17</sup> On May 29, 2002, the National Library of Ireland announced the purchase of another collection of Joyce manuscripts for the not inconsiderable price of 12.6 million Euros. These documents had been in possession of Alexis Léon, son of Lucie and Paul Léon.<sup>18</sup>

### ***The First Wave: Genetic Studies***

Textual studies of *Ulysses* follow a trend correlative to the efforts and successes of making Joyce’s prepublication documents available for scholarship. The first bibliographic work on *Ulysses* was conducted by R.F. Roberts and published in *Colophon* in 1936.<sup>19</sup> The first scholar to give serious attention to the presswork for

---

<sup>15</sup> *L* III: 40.

<sup>16</sup> *Foul copies* are nascent drafts that do not reach a developmental level suitable for publication. *Fair copies* are manuscripts written legibly and neatly.

<sup>17</sup> For more on the recently discovered *Ulysses* manuscripts, see “Two New *Ulysses* Working Drafts,” by Arnold Goldman, *Joyce Studies Annual* 12 (Summer 2001): [3]–9.

<sup>18</sup> For more on the recent acquisition of Joyce papers by National Library of Ireland, see “The National Library of Ireland’s New Joyce Manuscripts: An Outline and Archive Comparisons,” by Michael Groden, *Joyce Studies Annual* 14 (Summer 2003): [5]–16, and “Notes on the New Joyce Manuscripts,” by Arnold Goldman, *Joyce Studies Annual* 14 (Summer 2003): [3]–4.

<sup>19</sup> R.F. Roberts, “Bibliographical Notes on James Joyce’s *Ulysses*,” *Colophon* 1, no. 4 (Spring 1936): 565–579.

the 1922 edition was Joseph Prescott, whose doctoral dissertation at Harvard University discussed the critical implications of Joyce's holograph revisions (the 1944 dissertation, "James Joyce's *Ulysses* as a Work in Progress," was revised and published as *Exploring James Joyce*).<sup>20</sup> The next scholar to study the evolution of *Ulysses* was A. Walton Litz, who examined holograph notesheets for his doctoral dissertation at Oxford. (This 1954 dissertation, "Evolution of James Joyce's Style and Technique from 1918–1932," was revised and published as *The Art of James Joyce*.)<sup>21</sup>

The availability of the notesheets also galvanized a series of textual autopsies on specific episodes of the novel. These include, in chronological order, studies by Norman Silverstein of Circe ("Joyce's 'Circe' Episode: Approaches to *Ulysses* through a Textual and Interpretative Study of Joyce's Fifteenth Chapter," Columbia University, 1960), Richard E. Madtes of Ithaca ("A Textual and Critical Study of the 'Ithaca' Episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," Columbia University, 1961), Robert E. Hurley of Proteus ("The 'Proteus' Episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," Columbia University, 1963), James V. D. Card of Penelope ("A Textual and Critical Study of the 'Penelope' Episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," Columbia University, 1964),<sup>22</sup> and Robert Janusko of Oxen of the Sun ("The Sources and Structure of the 'Oxen of the Sun' Episode," Kent State University, 1967). All except Janusko were students of William York Tindall at Columbia University.<sup>23</sup> Most recently, Rodney Owen's

---

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Prescott, *Exploring James Joyce* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1964).

<sup>21</sup> A. Walton Litz, *The Art of James Joyce: Method and Design in Ulysses and Finnegans Wake* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

<sup>22</sup> Card's dissertation was revised and published as *An Anatomy of "Penelope"* (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1984).

<sup>23</sup> I am pleased to be a second-generation benefactor of the legacy of Tindall's teaching. My professor, Kenneth W. Davis, studied *Ulysses* with Tindall as well. Tindall was the first American scholar to



doctoral dissertation supplemented Litz's work with a study of the evolution of *Ulysses* from 1912 through 1917 ("James Joyce and the Beginnings of *Ulysses*: 1912 to 1917," The University of Kansas, 1980). These studies were not conducted to determine the textual reliability of received texts, but they are studies of artistic design. In other words, the notesheets enable critical interpretations about the meaning of Joyce's work. These studies are representative of the first wave of textual studies of *Ulysses*, which is characterized by the genetic study of composition for the purpose of interpretive literary criticism.<sup>24</sup>

### ***The Second Wave: Call for a Critical Edition***

The second wave of *Ulysses* textual scholarship laid the foundation for a critical edition of the novel. Capitalizing on the work of bringing out the *James Joyce Archive*, a number of scholars who participated in the effort produced new critical interpretations characteristic of the first wave, but Michael Groden's 1977 publication, *Ulysses in Progress*, blends the approach of textual studies of the earlier decade with bibliographic-oriented research: *Ulysses in Progress* presents extensive

---

conduct a course in *Ulysses*. Before the novel was legalized in the United States, Tindall went to Paris and purchased the first edition by Sylvia Beach. He then took the pages from the binding and concealed them from customs officers in the lining of his coat. Upon return to the United States, he reordered the pages, had them bound in wood, and chained the novel to a study carrel in the library at New York University. Enrolled students scheduled reading time with the single copy. (This anecdote is largely the testimony of Kenneth W. Davis, but more information on Tindall's early teaching of *Ulysses* may be found at <http://blog.lib.uiowa.edu/news/2007/03/07/happy-birthday-william-york-tindall/> [Accessed August 4, 2007]).

<sup>24</sup> Philip Herring, editor of the notesheets publications, offers one of the most interesting fruits of genetic study I have encountered. Among those indeterminate mysteries of *Ulysses*, I find the identity of the man in the macintosh the most intriguing, "assuming he is more than Joyce's private joke." In his editing of Buffalo notebook VIII.A.5, Herring discovered that pages 26 through 29 list equivalents for characters of the Hades episode. Within the list, the German word *Tarnkappe* appears, which suggests the comparison of Hades's cloak of invisibility with that of Nordic mythology. In the list, *Tarnkappe* does not appear directly in correspondence with Macintosh, so this explanation for the man in the macintosh cannot be conclusively demonstrated; however, the lists in the notesheets suggest that both the cemetery caretaker, John O'Connell, and the man in the macintosh are avatars of Hades (see Herring 1977, p. 8).

explications about the meaning and design of *Ulysses*, but includes the complicated textual stemmatology relevant to the Rosenbach manuscript.<sup>25</sup> In 1978, Philip Gaskell published *From Writer to Reader*, which featured a chapter on *Ulysses* and made suggestions for its editing.<sup>26</sup> But the loudest scholar who called for a critical edition of *Ulysses* was Jack P. Dalton, who delivered a series of lectures in the late-1960s and early-1970s.<sup>27</sup> Dalton collated several different imprints of the first edition to determine the incidence of textual error, compared printed versions to the primary holograph materials in American universities, and illuminated the circumstances of Darantiere's printshop. Dalton discovered that the first American edition was set from Samuel Roth's pirated publication of *Ulysses*.<sup>28</sup> Dalton also played myth buster on every edition subsequent to the first that claimed its provenance as "definitive" or "corrected." At the time, Dalton was under contract with Random House to edit *Ulysses*. He was never able to publish his edition, but he compiled a wealth of material in examination of textual transmission, and these materials were made available to Gabler's editorial team while the critical edition was underway.

In 1977, the James Joyce Estate gave their blessing to Hans Walter Gabler's petition to edit *Ulysses* anew, and in the years that his project was underway, publications on the textual state of *Ulysses* anticipated the corrected text. By 1979, enough progress on the critical edition had been made to publicly present a sample of

---

<sup>25</sup> Michael Groden, *Ulysses in Progress* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977). Groden's work marks a clear transition from the first wave to the second wave of scholarship. The bulk of the work is interpretive genetic studies of composition; the textual stemmatology of the Rosenbach manuscript is presented in the appendix.

<sup>26</sup> Philip Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

<sup>27</sup> A printed version of these lectures is available in *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium*, ed. Fritz Senn (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1972).

<sup>28</sup> For more information on the first American edition, see Chapter 3 and the introduction to Chapter 4 of this thesis.

the forthcoming work at the annual James Joyce Symposium in Zurich. The paper Gabler gave, “*Ulysses* II.5: Prototype of a Critical Edition in Progress,” was a sample work of the newly edited Lestrygonians episode.<sup>29</sup> In 1980, Hugh Kenner wrote an article for *Harper’s* entitled “The Computerized *Ulysses*: Establishing the Text Joyce Intended,” lauding the computerized methods of Gabler’s editorial team.<sup>30</sup> Groden weighed in on the conversation in 1981 with an article in *Scholarly Publishing* entitled “Editing Joyce’s *Ulysses*: An International Effort.”<sup>31</sup> Gabler again published an update on the progress of his editorial team in 1981, with an article entitled “Computer-Aided Critical Edition of *Ulysses*,” in the *ALLC Bulletin*.<sup>32</sup>

Since the publication of the Gabler edition, the text of *Ulysses* has received a great deal of attention. However, the focus of the attention, the time periods of the conversation, and the interlocutors are distinct, so we may usefully divide this scholarship into the third and fourth waves. The third wave is reaction to the new text of *Ulysses*: scholars asked whether Gabler’s method did justice to this literary work and its author. This wave falls primarily between 1984 and the mid-1990s, and most of the interlocutors are Joyce scholars. The fourth wave is metacritique, where focus turns from the new text of *Ulysses* to the method used in the establishment thereof. During this conversation, scholars ask how Gabler’s editorial method is innovative, effective, and/or useful when working with modernist texts. This wave of scholarship

---

<sup>29</sup> Copies of Gabler’s paper are held by only three libraries worldwide. Because the paper contained extensive excerpts from manuscripts, the James Joyce Estate did not authorize the paper for publication.

<sup>30</sup> Hugh Kenner, “The Computerized *Ulysses*: Establishing the Text Joyce Intended,” *Harper’s* 260, no. 1559: 89–95.

<sup>31</sup> Michael Groden, “Editing Joyce’s *Ulysses*: An International Effort,” *Scholarly Publishing* 12 (1980–81): 37–54.

<sup>32</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, “Computer-Aided Critical Edition of *Ulysses*,” *ALLC Bulletin* 8 (1981): 232–48.

falls largely between 1995 and the present, and the primary interlocutors are textual, rather than literary, scholars.

### ***The Third Wave: Reactions to the New Text of Ulysses***

Early reviews of the critical edition were largely wholesale endorsements of Gabler's success. For example, Hugh Kenner, in the *Times Literary Supplement*, complained of the insertion of one comma but otherwise thought the text restored in all its aspects. Brenda Maddox, in the *Economist*, hailed the greatest success of the edition as the retrieval of five lines of text that reveal the "word known to all men," now commonly referred to as the "love passage."<sup>33</sup> But ten months after Gabler's edition appeared, a newcomer to notoriety in Joyce scholarship emerged, a young postdoctoral Research Associate from the University of Virginia named John Kidd. On April 26, 1985, Kidd presented doubts concerning the reliability of the critical edition at a conference in New York for the Society for Textual Scholarship (STS). Kidd's full-scale criticisms were not published until 1988, when *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* published his 173-page article "An Inquiry into *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*."<sup>34</sup> Kidd remained a dominant figure in the criticism of Gabler's editorial project until 1999, but his 1985 paper, and the journalists who heard it, turned a great deal of attention to the newly edited text.

In 1985, a conference, organized by George Sanulescu and Clive Hart, was held in Monaco to assess the reliability of the 1984 edition.<sup>35</sup> A conversation with

---

<sup>33</sup> Brenda Maddox, "The New *Ulysses*," *The Economist* 85 (June 23, 1984).

<sup>34</sup> John Kidd, "An Inquiry into *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*," *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 82, no. 4: [411]–584. See Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*.

<sup>35</sup> Papers presented at the conference were published in *Assessing the 1984 Ulysses*, ed. George Sandulescu and Clive Hart (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe; Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Nobles Books, 1986). The Monaco conference is discussed at more length in Chapter 4.

John Kidd strengthened Sandulescu's "deep-seated conviction that the 1984 *Ulysses* was very urgently in need of collective assessment."<sup>36</sup> For the conference, Clive Hart, a member of the academic advisory committee to the editorial project, was charged with the responsibility of reporting scholars' concerns to Peter du Sautoy, the acting trustee of the James Joyce Estate. Richard Ellmann, also a member of the editorial project's advisory board, was present and gave a paper entitled "A Crux in the New Edition of *Ulysses*." Ellmann called into question the inclusion of the love passage, the same inclusion that Maddox deemed such a great accomplishment. Ellmann thought Joyce too subtle an artist to have intended this preliminary reading for the published text. Clive Hart also discussed the editorial project's tenets, but his commentary was far more theoretical, in that it engaged the enterprise of scholarly editing at the level of presuppositions. Hart endorsed scholarly editing as correction of nonauthorial corruptions, setting right the wrongs of transmission. Hart did not endorse emendation of an author's inscribed errors.

In addition to the two members of the advisory committee, the presenters at the Monaco conference were largely literary scholars, and their lack of understanding of the tenets of textual scholarship is evident in the substance and means of their feedback. This is not to say the feedback about the critical edition was not important; Joyce scholars have worked long and closely with *Ulysses*, and these scholars can lend confidence to editorial decisions and raise important questions about editorial execution. Yet many of the discussions had the flavor of liking or disliking differences between this new edition and the hitherto received texts.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. xxi.

In 1987, Charles Rossman studied Ellmann's papers at the University of Texas at Austin and published his findings: a great deal of conflict between Gabler's editorial team and the American advisory committee for the project. Rossman's research also revealed motivations by the James Joyce Estate for copyright renewal, which suggested that the project was compromised from the beginning by economic interest. For a year, these issues were debated among Gabler, Kidd, journalists, and Joyce scholars in the *Times Literary Supplement* in London and the *New York Review of Books* in the United States.<sup>37</sup> Yet the debate quickly took on an unseemly quality, plagued with polemic. These exchanges are now commonly referred to as the "Joyce Wars."<sup>38</sup>

Clive Hart and Philip Gaskell did register their particular criticisms of Gabler's editorial effort in a remarkably active way. In 1989, the Princess Grace Irish Library published their book, *Ulysses: A Review of Three Texts*, a veritable toolkit for constructing a text Gaskell and Hart consider more reliable than Gabler's.<sup>39</sup> In this book, the scholars list, in traditional apparatus form, their suggestions for emendations to the three widely available texts: facsimiles of the 1922 edition, the 1961 Random House edition, and the 1986 Gabler edition. Gaskell and Hart relied upon Gabler's Historical Collation to examine the variants between the newly established and the hitherto received texts.

---

<sup>37</sup> For the *NYRB*, see Aug. 18, 1988 (63–65), Sept. 29, 1988 (80–83), Oct. 27, 1988 (100–101), Dec. 8, 1988 (53–58), Jan. 19, 1989 (58–59), Feb. 2, 1989 (pp. unnumbered), Mar. 30, 1989 (43–45), and June 1, 1989 (40–41). For *TLS*, see July 1–7, 1988 (733), July 8–14, 1988 (755), July 22–8, 1988 (805, 818), August 12–8, 1988 (883), Aug. 19–25, 1988 (907), Sept. 2–8, 1988 (963), Sept. 9–15, 1988 (989), Oct. 7–13, 1989 (1109, 1132), Oct. 21–7, 1988 (1175), Nov. 4–10, 1988 (1227), and Dec. 16–22, 1988.

<sup>38</sup> Further discussion of the Joyce Wars may be found in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

<sup>39</sup> Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart, eds., *Ulysses: A Review of Three Texts* (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Nobles Books, 1989).

In 1990, Charles Rossman devoted an issue of *Studies in the Novel* to assessment of the Gabler edition of *Ulysses*. Three important articles appeared in this issue. The first is an article by journalist and scholar Robin Bates, who interviewed Hans Walter Gabler. Bates clearly proceeds from a position of support for John Kidd. The portions of the interview that were published read more as interrogation than dialogue between the journalist and the scholar. Bates's article is important, however, for it was the first instance of Gabler's admission that the transcriptions of Joyce's documents prepared by his editorial team were never collated with the original documents in their entirety. The other two articles are by John Kidd and by Hans Walter Gabler, each stating rather succinctly the positions stated in other venues during the previous two years.<sup>40</sup>

When Kidd issued his 1988 full-scale criticism on the Gabler edition, Hans Gabler did reply, but he did not reply effectively until 1993, in an article entitled "What *Ulysses* Requires," published in the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*.<sup>41</sup> Until then, Gabler's primary defense had been that his edition was edited according to the guiding principles of the Franco-German editorial tradition, an assertion that is not entirely true. Gabler's editorial method was a hybrid of both Anglo-American and Franco-German traditions for the treatment of modern literatures.

---

<sup>40</sup> The special issue of *Studies in the Novel* (Summer 1990) was republished as *A Special Issue on Editing Ulysses*, ed. Charles Rossman (Denton, TX: North Texas State University, 1990).

<sup>41</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, "What *Ulysses* Requires," *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 87, no. 2 (June 1993): 187–248.

### ***The Fourth Wave: Gabler's Method for Modernist Texts***

When the reactive and polemic debates of the third wave waned, textual scholars began to assess the critical edition of *Ulysses*. The expertise of these scholars was sorely missed in the previous decade. Despite this fresh perspective, Gabler's edition was never evaluated by a textual scholar primarily for the sake of determining its reliability; rather, assessments of the edition fell into the discourse of this specialized discipline. In the 1990s, Anglo-American discourse in textual theory culminated in a divisive rift. I call it a divisive rift, not because new thought on the theory of textual production is unwelcome, but because the conversation had become plagued by the same character of self-promotion (or self-defense) as the Joyce Wars. In sum, textual scholarship in the Anglo-American tradition focuses on restoring a text to the author's discernible intentions for publication, but in the 1960s, scholars began to challenge notions of authorship. These challenges asserted that a work of language art is not the work of an individual consciousness, on the grounds that textual production, even artistic creation, is inherently a social act. The challenges cannot properly be called a paradigm shift in textual criticism, because social theorists still have not developed a practice that achieves the concepts, but the challenges to intentionalist editing have certainly been a redirection back to the premises of theory. Gabler's edition emerged in the thick of this, so reviews of the edition were caught in the crossfire of competing theoretical paradigms. The disciplinary context of the evaluations of Gabler's method has engendered a great deal of confusion for nontextuists looking to their colleagues for an assessment of the edition's reliability. Most textual scholars who review or cite the Gabler edition of



*Ulysses* do so to promote their own agenda. For example, primary proponents of sociological theories of text cite the edition as an exemplary achievement; then intentionalist editors correct these claims by noting that Gabler privileges Joyce's holograph inscription in the establishment of his text. In spite of the limitations of analysis, the following offers some examples of the discourse that reviews or cites the Garland *Ulysses*.

The most notable exchange concerning the edition was issued by the two primary proponents of social and intentionalist editing, Jerome McGann and G. Thomas Tanselle. Both have currency in the rigor of their thought and the influence of their work, so we expect to find here the best evaluation of the edition's tenets, successes, and failures; rather, the exchange exemplifies the confusion surrounding the edition. McGann's review, "*Ulysses* as a Postmodern Text: the Gabler Edition," regarded Gabler's editorial work as brilliant for the depiction of *Ulysses*'s composition.<sup>42</sup> Though McGann sometimes uses the language of "socio-historical moments," he does not attempt to dress up the Gabler edition as an example of social editing principles. He simply finds the presentation of the synopsis interesting:

Gabler's is an imagination of Joyce's work, not its reconstitution. Gabler invents, by a process of brilliant editorial reconstruction, *Joyce's Ulysses* (as it were), a work that existed, if it ever existed at all, for Joyce the writer rather than Joyce the author. Gabler's edition does not give us the work which Joyce wanted to present to the public; rather, it gives us a text in which we may observe Joyce at work, alone, before he turns to meet his public.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Jerome McGann, "*Ulysses* as a Postmodern Text: The Gabler Edition," *Criticism* 27 (1985): 283–306. McGann's review was republished in his 1988 publication *Social Values and Poetic Acts* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), pp. 173–194.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285.

It is clear from this statement that McGann is not claiming Gabler's edition as fodder for his agenda, but nonetheless, response from Tanselle was combative. In "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology," Tanselle challenges McGann's claims that the Gabler edition offers anything new to considerations of text criticism:

In the first place, critical editors—by definition—always produce an "imagination" or a "reconstruction" of a past text. Furthermore, is not the distinction between Joyce the writer and Joyce the author a way of talking about two kinds of intention? Editors have regularly distinguished between prepublication or private or artistic intention and an author's more inclusive intention that incorporates various ways of accommodating the expectations or demands of others in the publication process.<sup>44</sup>

Tanselle is not, in this article, assessing Gabler's editorial method or the newly established text of *Ulysses*; rather, he is evaluating McGann's paradigm of text through the vehicle of McGann's review. Tanselle states,

However "postmodern" the edition may be, one may wonder why it interests McGann, for Gabler's aim is to trace the history of the composition of the work, and thus the focus is on Joyce as author, not on the collaborative forces of the production process.<sup>45</sup>

McGann and Tanselle are both right and both wrong. Gabler did do brilliant editorial work, and he did reconstitute a text with the use of many Ur-version documents of *Ulysses*'s composition, primarily the Rosenbach manuscript. But McGann's language makes it seem as if Gabler set out to give us the private version of Joyce's *Ulysses* in progress. Gabler set out to give us the best text we can reconstitute, according to Joyce's discernible intentions, based on extant evidence. Tanselle is right: the distinctions that McGann makes between Joyce the writer and Joyce the author do not differ radically from the ideas and concepts that scholarly

---

<sup>44</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology," *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): p. 108.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

editors have always considered. But Tanselle's treatment of the Gabler edition, as a vehicle for critiquing McGann's paradigm, confuses the reader who seeks an evaluation of Gabler's method and the resultant text. This exchange exemplifies the way in which the Gabler edition of *Ulysses* has been used as a platform from which to espouse competing paradigms of thought.

Additional reviews of the edition have been offered by Michael Groden, in "Foostering Over Those Changes," which is largely a review of the scandal of the Joyce Wars, but which also returns attention to the merits of Gabler's editorial work.<sup>46</sup> David Greetham engaged the dynamics of theory and practice in reviewing both Gabler and McGann, in *Devils and Angels*. This collection of essays was edited with the purpose of uniting literary theory and textual criticism, so Greetham's review explicates the work of Gabler and McGann through Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Greetham employs Gabler's work on *Ulysses* and the resultant synoptic apparatus as an exemplary reversal of (patriarchal) hierarchies of reading-text and apparatus.<sup>47</sup> Vickey Mahaffey also reviewed the Gabler edition of *Ulysses*, but she can serve as an example of a literary scholar who is impressively competent at explicating the value of a correct reading text, but who is clearly just coming to the discipline of text studies. For example, she suggests that the symbols in the apparatus should be simplified, for easier use, but she cannot fault presentation for being complicated when its function is to represent a complicated textual situation.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Michael Groden, "Foostering Over Those Changes: The New *Ulysses*," *James Joyce Quarterly* 22 (1984-85): 137-59.

<sup>47</sup> D.C. Greetham, "The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing," in *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Cohen (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991): pp. 78-102.

<sup>48</sup> Vickey Mahaffey, "Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce's *Ulysses*," in *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bornstein (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

As stated earlier, the discourse of textual criticism is replete with reference to the critical edition of *Ulysses*, yet these references have the poignant feature of being either a point of departure or an example of a particular paradigm of editing. Also, Gabler's edition is oft-cited as an example of editorial crux, in which no text can ultimately be called *definitive*. Studies that refer to the Gabler edition of *Ulysses* in this way include "Does Text Exist?" by Louis Hay, who notes the critical edition of *Ulysses* for its genetic features;<sup>49</sup> "Publishing History: A Hole at the Center of Literary Sociology" by John Sutherland, who treats the critical edition of *Ulysses* as an example of literary sociology;<sup>50</sup> "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and the Modes of Textual Criticism" by Peter Schillingsburg, who cites the critical edition of *Ulysses* merely as representative of text in process, rather than text as product;<sup>51</sup> "Critical Editions, Hypertext, and Genetic Criticism" by G. Thomas Tanselle, who engages Gabler's defense of his edition as distinctly continental in its precepts, distinct from the Anglo-American approach to scholarly editions;<sup>52</sup> "Post-Genetic Joyce" by Michael Groden, who examines genetic textual criticism in light of poststructuralist theory;<sup>53</sup> "Is There a Text in this Discipline? Textual Scholarship and American Literary Tradition," by Philip Cohen, who gives a passing glance to the critical edition of *Ulysses* as a challenge to traditional precepts of authorial intention

---

Press, 1991), pp. 171–91. I do not mean to minimize the value of Mahaffey's voice in the conversation, nor suggest that she is not as much entitled to review the edition as any reader of *Ulysses*. In fact, the Gabler edition, at least among Joyceans, has drawn literary scholars' attention to the work of their colleagues in textual criticism, and this is one of the great silver linings of the debates.

<sup>49</sup> Louis Hay, "Does Text Exist?" *Studies in Bibliography* 41 (1988): 66–77.

<sup>50</sup> John Sutherland, "Publishing History: A Hole at the Center of Literary Sociology," *Critical Inquiry* 14, no. 3: 574–589.

<sup>51</sup> Peter Schillingsburg, "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 58–79.

<sup>52</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, "Critical Editions, Hypertext, and Genetic Criticism," *Romantic Review* 86 (1995).

<sup>53</sup> Michael Groden, "Post-Genetic Joyce," *Romantic Review* 86 (1995).

in Anglo-American scholarship;<sup>54</sup> and “Textual Forensics” by D.C. Greetham, who notes the ambiguity of access in the synoptic apparatus of the critical edition of *Ulysses*.<sup>55</sup> Greetham also extracts four pages of material from the critical and synoptic edition of *Ulysses* for his appendix in *Textual Scholarship*, in which various types of editions are presented.<sup>56</sup> In the body of that work, Greetham briefly discusses the influence of genetic criticism in Gabler’s work. In addition, important work *relevant* to *Ulysses* textual scholarship has continued to emerge.

As stated above, during the Joyce Wars, Gabler defended his edition primarily on the grounds that his editorial principles were the offspring of a different heritage of scholarship, the Franco-German tradition of editing modern texts. Yet until 1995, Anglo-American scholars (if they did not speak French or German) had access to only two voices in the German discourse: Hans Zeller and Hans Walter Gabler. The first translation of germinal articles in German textual criticism appeared in 1995, in a volume titled *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Pierce.<sup>57</sup> In addition, in 2004, the first translation of French essays in genetic criticism appeared: *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes*, edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden.<sup>58</sup> These are valuable tools in understanding the international influences upon Gabler’s editorial methods.

---

<sup>54</sup> Philip Cohen, “Is there a Text in this Discipline?: Textual Scholarship and the American Literary Tradition,” *American Literary History* 8, no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 728–744.

<sup>55</sup> D.C. Greetham, “Textual Forensics,” *PMLA* 111, no. 1: 32–51.

<sup>56</sup> D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1994).

<sup>57</sup> Gabler, Hans Walter, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Pierce, eds. *Contemporary German Editorial Theory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995). The volume was favorably reviewed by one of the doyens of Anglo-American textual scholarship, D.C. Greetham, in *Modern Philology* 95, no. 2 (Nov. 1997): 285–89.

<sup>58</sup> Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, eds. *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

One scholar-journalist has written on the two scandals that bookend the twentieth century: the first publication and the critical edition. Bruce Arnold's *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Life of a Twentieth Century Masterpiece*, is a very engaging and well-written narrative of these two scandals.<sup>59</sup> The first publication of Arnold's work was in 1991, and in 2004, he republished the work, having revised the entire coverage of the Joyce Wars, as *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Sensational Life and Afterlife of a Twentieth-Century Masterpiece*.<sup>60</sup> Arnold largely retracted his entire assessment of the Joyce Wars in the revised edition. Arnold's two works, widely separated by date, when studied side-by-side, are a composite of reactions to John Kidd, as those reactions shifted in the early- and mid-90s. In the 1991 work, Kidd and Gabler appeared as David and Goliath, and Arnold was rooting for the underdog, but he was not equipped to address the larger issues of reliability in the critical edition (though he does a much better job of presenting those issues in the 2004 work). In the 1991 work, this lack of experience in textual criticism made Arnold quite vulnerable to John Kidd's arguments. Kidd had a remarkable way of turning onlookers to his opinion. His arguments were always rigorous and logical; the level of fault occurred at the premise. Kidd also had a deft ability to navigate between the tedium of textual variance and the import of literary interpretation. And he struck the core of emotion among Joyce enthusiasts, asserting that the project was compromised by economic interests. Hence, many journalists, literary scholars, and spectators, myself included,

---

<sup>59</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Life of a Twentieth Century Masterpiece* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991).

<sup>60</sup> *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Life and Afterlife of a Twentieth Century Masterpiece* (Dublin: The Liffey Press, 2004). Arnold's revised and republished work also includes coverage of Danis Rose's reader-friendly edition.

initially leaned toward support of Kidd's ostensible views. Arnold's two publications offer a good portrait of the odyssey of reaction to the new text of *Ulysses*.

In addition, a few scholars have offered some very valuable information on broader literary and social issues that surface when editing a work like *Ulysses*. On the issues of censorship, Paul D. Vanderham was the first to make use of the 1922 edition stored in the National Archives, a copy of the book which was marked by Assistant Attorney Sam Coleman in the 1933 trials and offers a telling record of the allegedly offensive passages of *Ulysses*.<sup>61</sup> A fairly recent study, *Our Joyce*, traces the development of Joyce's reputation, and while the work is also not one of textual scholarship, it does situate Joyce's reputation within the broader struggle of publication.<sup>62</sup> *Joyce's Iritis and the Irritated Text: The Dis-lexic Ulysses*, by Roy K. Gottfried, traces Joyce's eyesight difficulty through the *Ulysses* composition periods of 1917 to 1922.<sup>63</sup> Most notably, Joyceans interested in text should heed the works of Robert Spoo, who holds a Ph.D. in English from Princeton and a law degree from Yale Law School, and practices copyright law at the law firm of Doerner, Saunders, Daniel & Anderson in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Dr. Spoo regularly publishes and speaks on the relationship between copyright law and literary culture.<sup>64</sup> He engages the issues of control of a literary work, such as, how the institution of scholarship canonizes a

---

<sup>61</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

<sup>62</sup> Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998).

<sup>63</sup> Roy K. Gottfried, *Joyce's Iritis and the Irritated Text* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida: 1995).

<sup>64</sup> See Robert Spoo, "Copyright Protectionism and its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in America," *The Yale Law Journal* 108, no. 3 (December 1998); "Injuries, Remedies, Moral Rights, and the Public Domain," *James Joyce Quarterly* 37, no. 3-4 (Spring-Summer 2000)—this issue of the *James Joyce Quarterly* did not appear until 2002 and Spoo's work there was retitled "Joyce and the Law"; "Ulysses and the Ten Years War: A Survey of Missed Opportunities," *Text* 10 [1991]: 107-18; and *Three Myths for Aging Copyrights: Tithonus, Dorian Gray, Ulysses* (Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 2004).

work, while the same work is controlled in the commercial sector by the interests of an estate. His expertise in legal studies offers sound insights about the possibilities and problems for scholars of Joyce's papers and editors of *Ulysses*. Most recently, he was a member of the legal team that filed a law suit against the James Joyce Estate on behalf of scholar Carol Schloss, who recently published her biography of Lucia Joyce.<sup>65</sup>

Yet another scholar has engaged Joyce's work as means for reconsidering the nature of textual "error" and authorial intention. Tim Conley, in a work cleverly titled (by virtue of its punctuation) *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation*, suggests that misreadings and miswritings are valuable critical experiments.<sup>66</sup> The rigor of Conley's work, and his navigation between literary theory and the texts upon which it is based and deployed, is quite impressive. But pushed to its logical conclusions, Conley's argument makes textual reliability, as considered to be the author's intentions for his or her work, a moot point of interest.

The only scholar who has given fastidious attention to the reliability of the newly established text is William S. Brockman, who, for his doctoral dissertation, produced "The New *Ulysses*: An Examination of Textual Emendations to the 'Eumaeus' Episode" (Drew University, 1986). Because the textual stemmatology and extant documents, as well as particular editorial cruxes (often a product of varying narrative technique), vary from episode to episode, Brockman's dissertation offers an

---

<sup>65</sup> For more on Schloss and the biography of Lucia, see Chapter 5.

<sup>66</sup> Tim Conley, *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003).



example of how the newly established text needs to be addressed in the future. But Brockman's approach is very different than this one. This thesis aims

- To discuss the most salient publications of *Ulysses* and evidence of these publications' fidelity to Joyce's intentions.
- To provide understanding of the documents Gabler used to reconstitute the text of *Ulysses*.
- To discuss the cruxes of editing *Ulysses* and Gabler's methods for coping with these.
- To equip any reader or teacher of *Ulysses* with general knowledge and understanding of the critical and synoptic edition, enabling the use of Gabler's scholarship as a tool for research and interpretation.

## CHAPTER 2: THE SERIALIZATION OF *ULYSSES*

No English printer wanted to print a word of it. In America the review was suppressed four times. Now, as I hear, a great movement is being prepared against the publication, initiated by Puritans, English Imperialists, Irish Republicans, Catholics—what an alliance! Gosh, I ought to be given the Nobel prize for peace!

James Joyce, *Letters*

### IN THE BEGINNING

Joyce's artistic method makes pinpointing a date for the inception of *Ulysses* an imprecise task. The surviving documents from his workshop would best be studied in continual succession for his entire oeuvre; a continuity of material overlaps the precise divisions of separate publications. Although *Chamber Music* was first published in 1907, Joyce made significant revisions and additions in 1915. Material from critical writings was used in *Stephen Hero*, which in turn was thoroughly reworked into *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. *Ulysses* was originally conceived as a short story for inclusion in *Dubliners*, and the opening Martello Tower scene of *Ulysses* was once intended to be the concluding scene of the earlier prose work, *Portrait*. When Joyce finished *Ulysses*, he harvested a reported twelve-kilo mass of unused material to begin *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>67</sup> In other words, extant documents contain material that eventually found its place in *Ulysses*, but that material was not necessarily composed by Joyce for inclusion in *Ulysses*. For example, material based on the separation of Nora Barnacle from her friend Emily Lyons of Galway (with lesbian undertones) was drafted as character development of Bertha Rowan in *Exiles*. Joyce recorded this character development in November of 1913 on two

---

*Epigraph*: In a letter to Carlo Linati, dated September 21, 1920. *LI*: 147.

<sup>67</sup> In 1984, Gabler reported that Danis Rose and John O' Hanlon recently discovered an early extant notebook for *Ulysses*, yet unpublished, in the documents of the *Finnegans Wake* workshop (*U1986*, p. 1861).

loose notesheets, but it did not find its place in Bertha. Rather, the relationship issued materially into Molly's separation from her friend Hester in Gibraltar for the final episode of *Ulysses*. Particular phrases and passages written in 1913 were transferred to the 1918 *Zurich Notebook* (Buffalo VIII.A.5) of *Ulysses*'s composition.<sup>68</sup>

Scholars who have studied Joyce's workshop generally describe the writer's process as recursive stages. His artistic method consisted of (1) compendious note-taking of daily observation, conversation, and thought. Joyce's daily scribbles were documented on "stray bits of paper, napkins, shirt cuffs, advertisements," any of which might end up in "unlikely places, in books, under ornaments and in pockets."<sup>69</sup> Early ideas could also be recorded on notesheets in the form of very primitive drafts. Scribbles of daily observation were a continual source of addition and revision throughout drafting. (2) Joyce transferred the daily scribbles and primitive drafts to notesheets or notebooks, then harvested the material in the recipient documents for continual composition of (3) rough drafts. Rough drafts could go through several stages of composition—they were always composed leaving wide margins on the rectos and blank versos, for continual revision. Eventually, (4) the rough drafts were fair-copied. (5) The fair copies were submitted to typists and produced in triplicate. (6) The resultant typescripts were, after correction and further revision (and at times, shuffling of the pages), submitted to publishers, and (7) the publishers produced galleys and page proofs, on which Joyce continued to revise and add material.

---

<sup>68</sup> Phillip Herring, ed., *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from the Buffalo Collection* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977).

<sup>69</sup> *L II*: 415. The best description of Joyce's note-taking habits and his slips of paper is the account provided by his friend, Frank Budgen, in *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 175–178.

The metaphors scholars use to depict Joyce's creative process illustrate this expansive network of notes and composition: architectural metaphors include the *scaffolding of Bloomsday* and *mosaic craftsmanship*. Joyce has also been referred to as a *wordsmith*. His craftsmanship has been likened to that of a candlemaker, with the writer continually dipping newly drafted material into notesheets and notebooks to add new layers to the work. Organic metaphors include *evolution* and *autogenetics of text*. My favorite thus far is that used by Philip Herring. Describing *Ulysses*, he notes,

particular ideas moved continually upstream like salmon, briefly stopping off at way stations only to rest. Some died en route; others continued on their destination and became fertile passages in the final draft of the novel. Still others lay dormant until resurrected for inclusion in *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>70</sup>

These metaphors are not merely applicable to *Ulysses*, but represent Joyce's creative techniques in the craftsmanship of his oeuvre.

Despite the difficulty of dating the inception of *Ulysses*, extant working documents and correspondence indicate three signposts of early development: 1906, 1909/1910, and 1914.

### ***1906: The Idea***

The earliest record of Joyce's creative ideas for *Ulysses* dates to September 30, 1906. In a postcard to his brother Stanislaus, Joyce included a P.P.S. afterthought: "I have a new story for Dubliners in my head. It deals with Mr Hunter."<sup>71</sup> Two months later, Joyce wrote again to Stanislaus, this time referring to the new story as "Ulysses."<sup>72</sup> Alfred A. Hunter was a real-life Jewish Dubliner, rumored to have an unfaithful wife,

---

<sup>70</sup> Philip Herring, ed., *Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972), p. 523.

<sup>71</sup> *L II*: 168.

<sup>72</sup> *L II*: 190.

who scooped up Joyce and dusted him off after a scuffle outside a brothel, so Dublin legend and the scholarly tale goes.<sup>73</sup> The “Mr Hunter” story never materialized for inclusion in *Dubliners*; however, the nonfiction events clearly served as a model for the Circean climax of *Ulysses*, which appeared fourteen years later.

### ***1909/1910: Transitional Material***

Between idea and composition of *Ulysses*, Joyce devoted the labor of his creativity to *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Exiles* (1907–1914). The earliest surviving notebook containing *Ulysses* material dates to this time, December of 1909. This notebook, held at the University of New York, Buffalo, is commonly referred to as the Dublin/Trieste *Alphabetical Notebook*, and it holds equal amounts of material for *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*. In retrospect, Joyce noted the inception of *Ulysses* in this timeframe, for he wrote to Harriet Shaw Weaver in November of 1916, stating he had begun his work on *Ulysses* in Rome six or seven years earlier, 1909 or 1910.<sup>74</sup>

### ***1914: The Genesis of Ulysses in Print***

In 1914, Joyce completed *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and turned his attention to the continued development of Stephen Dedalus, as well as his new character, the modern Ulysses, Leopold Bloom. (Joyce took a short hiatus from *Ulysses* to finish *Exiles* in 1915.) Joyce also recognized 1914 as starting point for *Ulysses*, for in March of 1920, he wrote to John Quinn of his “six years’ unbroken labour” on the book.<sup>75</sup>

Much of the development of *Ulysses* lies in the period between 1914 and 1917. In 1917, Joyce began fair-copying the Telemachia; the fair copies were sent to typists, and

---

<sup>73</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 161–62.

<sup>74</sup> *L I*: 98.

<sup>75</sup> *L II*: 460.

the typescripts prepared were sent to publishers for serialization. Given the fairly advanced state of the story in 1917, a wealth of material in the early composition of the novel must be lost, for aside from the *Alphabetical Notebook*, the earliest extant document of composition for *Ulysses* is dated 1917 (Buffalo V.A.3). This is a continuous draft of the Proteus episode, inscribed in a copybook bought in Locarno. The inscription in the copybook is considered a work in progress. Gabler notes, “The general impression it gives is that Joyce began to copy from earlier drafts or sketches, but, in the act of copying, became increasingly involved in revising and expanding the text.”<sup>76</sup> The *Alphabetical Notebook* and the Locarno copybook V.A.3 are the only surviving material of Joyce’s early work on *Ulysses*.<sup>77</sup> Through the auspices of Ezra Pound, 1917 marks the beginning of Joyce’s publication efforts for the work.

## JOYCE’S ADVOCATES

### *Ezra Pound and John Quinn*

World War I prevented Ezra Pound and James Joyce from personally meeting until June of 1920, but the poet and writer were acquainted long before.<sup>78</sup> In 1913, Pound was living in Sussex, acting as literary secretary to Irish poet William Butler Yeats. While in residence with Yeats, Pound compiled an anthology of Imagist poetry, to both

---

<sup>76</sup> U1986, p. 1863.

<sup>77</sup> Other notebooks of the character of early composition survive, i.e., the *Zurich Notebook* (Buffalo VIII.A.5) and the Late Notes for the typescripts and galleys of the 1921/1922 book (Buffalo V.A.2), but these date to 1918 and 1921, respectively. They have been reprinted in volumes 7 and 12 of the *James Joyce Archive*, as well as in Philip Herring’s *Joyce’s Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses*, 1977.

<sup>78</sup> WWI, at least, is the most significant obstacle in their meeting. When arrangements in the summer of 1920 were being made, the following obstacles also populated the list of Joyce’s reservations: currency exchange rates, railroad collisions and railway strikes, detestation of traveling, and dread of thunderstorms. After much insistence from Pound, Joyce finally arrived in Sirmione, obviating dread of thunderstorms by bringing Giorgio with him to “act as a lightning conductor” (L I: 142).

push his new aesthetic agenda and to earn publication and royalties for contributors.<sup>79</sup>

When the anthology was near completion, Pound asked Yeats if he could think of anyone else who might be a suitable contributor. The older poet knew of James Joyce, who had once delivered to him an impressive poem. Yeats knew Joyce to be living in Trieste at the time, and he suggested that Pound get in touch with him.

Joyce received two letters from Pound in December of 1913. The first was an introduction, in which Pound offered his services, briefly outlining the publishers with whom he had connection, what these publishers typically paid (or did not pay), and the advertising value of their publications. This letter had mostly the tone of a business correspondent, but it also set the tenor for a long and beneficial friendship between the two artists.<sup>80</sup> In closing remark, Pound wrote,

I am bonae voluntatis,—don't in the least know that I can be of any use to you—or you to me. From what W.B.Y. says I imagine we have a hate or two in common—but that's a very problematical bond on introduction.<sup>81</sup>

Two weeks later, Joyce received a second letter from Pound, dated December 26. Yeats had found Joyce's poem "I hear an army," and Pound requested Joyce's permission for its inclusion in the Imagist anthology, offering Joyce a guinea and publication in return.

These communications with Ezra Pound lifted Joyce's spirits a great deal. In 1904, Joyce's first published poems and stories had appeared, but from 1905 on, the writer struggled in every endeavor to publish his fiction.<sup>82</sup> He first submitted *Chamber*

---

<sup>79</sup> Ezra Pound, ed., *Des Imagistes: An Anthology* (London: Poetry Bookshop and New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1914).

<sup>80</sup> Forrest Read, ed., *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce* (New York: New Directions, 1965), p. 16.

<sup>81</sup> *P/J*: 18.

<sup>82</sup> Joyce did not have any difficulty with censors in the publication of *Finnegans Wake*, but the serial publishers of the *Wake* searched endlessly through his submissions in paranoia of obscenity. Aside from the *Wake*, Joyce struggled to publish all of his other works.

*Music* to Grant Richards in 1905, but it was rejected and remained unpublished until May of 1907. In November of 1905, Joyce submitted the manuscript of *Dubliners*, again to Richards, but this submission started a contentious exchange of correspondence over the book. Richards repeatedly requested excisions and alterations to the text; Joyce repeatedly resisted making them. Looking elsewhere, the writer procured a contract for the book's publication from Maunsel and Company in 1909, but in July of 1910, fearful of the candor of the book, Maunsel and Company delayed publication, and in 1912, the printer broke up the type. After eight years of struggling for publication, Joyce readily agreed both to Pound's requested permission for his poem and to any help the poet could offer.

Briefing Pound on his publication difficulties, Joyce also sent him the typescript for *Dubliners* and a chapter of *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.<sup>83</sup> Pound immediately became an advocate for Joyce, writing to him in January of 1914, "I'm not supposed to know much about prose but I think your novel is damn fine stuff—I dare say you know it quite as well as I do—clear and direct like Merimee. I am sending it off at once to THE EGOIST."<sup>84</sup> From this moment on, Pound was continually involved in the advocacy of Joyce's craft, corresponding with publishers on Joyce's behalf and writing laudatory reviews when Joyce's work appeared (even, at times, when it did not). Over the course of the next few years, what began as an editorial acquaintance in late 1913 became a friendship of two artists struggling in the impetus of the modernist movement. The

---

<sup>83</sup> An extract of the letter that Joyce sent to Pound, delineating Joyce's publication difficulties, was published in the *Egoist*, I, 2 (January 15, 1914), pp. 26–27, under the title "A Curious History." A reprint of that publication is available in the *Pound/Joyce* correspondence volume, p. 20.

<sup>84</sup> *P/J*: 24.



correspondence between Joyce and Pound gradually gives way from matters of business to matters of artistic design, professional consideration, and mutual feedback.

Ezra Pound's advocacy was supplemented by that of Pound's associate, John Quinn. Quinn's role in the history of modernist art has not been overlooked. B.L. Reid published a thorough biography of Quinn in 1968, which won the 1969 Pulitzer Prize for the genre.<sup>85</sup> But Reid's work has been significantly and regrettably overlooked in the research and secondary literature since. Quinn's patronage, as a collector of his contemporaries' writings and artwork, was only one facet of his role in this history, and Reid's biography of Quinn sheds significant light on the legal proceedings against *Ulysses* as well.

John Quinn was an Irish-American corporate attorney living in New York, who "became a collector of books as soon as [he] ceased to collect marbles."<sup>86</sup> He befriended the Yeats family, and most of the Irish artists in the sphere of their friendship and influence, in 1902. Quinn launched the American reputation of W.B. Yeats in 1903, by organizing a tour of more than thirty lectures, hosting the poet while he was in New York, and circulating his poetry to the leading intellectuals of the day. He acted as a liaison with American publishers for several artists, including George Russell, Joseph Conrad, Richard Aldington, George Moore, T.S. Eliot, Ford Maddox Ford, Lady Gregory, Wyndham Lewis, James Stephens, Rhoda Symons, and of course, Yeats, Pound, and Joyce. Quinn negotiated contracts, advised on publication possibilities, and often, he lent the scrutiny of his legal eye to the task of proofreading presswork for these writers' American publications. He had a long history of buying dozens of copies a

---

<sup>85</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York: John Quinn and His Friends* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5, quoted from a letter Quinn wrote to Pound, dated August 15, 1917.

writer's work when it was published, then mailing these copies to his fellows and friends outside his literary circle. And he gave steady donations to artists and to magazines carrying their work, including *The Little Review*, *The Dial*, and *The New Republic*. While Quinn was still surviving on the modest means of a young attorney, he often solicited additional funds for the arts from his colleagues and associates in legal practice. He bought manuscripts, page proofs, and galleys, insuring that the proceeds of these purchases went to artists rather than publishers. In 1913, he successfully challenged the Tariff Act of 1909, which retained duty of 15 percent on foreign works of art less than twenty-years old, and thereby discouraged collection of modern European art.<sup>87</sup> Quinn carried the burden of fees for the legislative campaign personally, and he composed the new statute of exemption from tariff to read "original" works of art, in an effort to protect the interests of their creators. Quinn's support was not merely legal and monetary. He was often called upon for help with issues ranging from political defense, personal need, financial and legal advice, and artistic management. Most of the artists with whom he had connection expressed deep gratitude for his role in their lives, and they considered him a friend as much as an associate.<sup>88</sup> This efficacy in the promotion of art was carried out by Quinn while simultaneously achieving one of the most successful corporate, tax, and financial legal firms in New York.

Pound and Quinn became acquainted through the obvious social network of the Yeats family. Their mutual respect lie in the recognition that each was often working for the benefit and welfare of others as diligently as on their personal affairs. Joyce came to Quinn's attention when Pound entrusted the much-traveled manuscript of *Portrait of the*

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., p. 199.

<sup>88</sup> This represents only Quinn's support of literary artists. His patronage and support of post-impressionist painters and sculptors is at least as impressive.

*Artist as a Young Man* to the attorney. Quinn helped negotiate the publication of *Portrait* with B.W. Huebsch of Viking Press, and thereafter purchased the page proofs of *Portrait* (produced by the *Egoist* when serializing the novel). No Irish writer since Synge had interested Quinn so personally and directly as Joyce, and Quinn was visibly stirred by the news that Joyce's art had often been denied an audience due to ingrained prejudice.<sup>89</sup> Quinn tried to get *Exiles* published and produced, but he failed everywhere he tried. Still, he purchased the manuscript of that work as well in an effort to relieve some of Joyce's financial distress.

Quinn and Pound's relationship had significant effects upon fate and text of *Ulysses*. Also, Pound would eventually be the connection between James Joyce and his first publishers for *Ulysses*: Harriet Shaw Weaver in London and Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap in Chicago.

### ***Harriet Shaw Weaver***

Harriet Shaw Weaver was one of eight children, raised in Frodsham, a country town in Cheshire, in a loving and deeply religious family, members of the most evangelical form of the Church of England.<sup>90</sup> Theatre and dances were not permitted, and the reading of the children, though strongly encouraged, was strictly regulated, especially that of Harriet and her sisters. In her late age, Harriet shared with Robert McAlmon an experience of her young life that greatly impacted her social leanings.<sup>91</sup> Weaver's mother inquired as to what book was absorbing so much of Harriet's interest, and when she replied "*Adam Bede*," her mother was aghast and forbid her to finish the novel. Created

---

<sup>89</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 276.

<sup>90</sup> The early life and work of Harriet Shaw Weaver is largely recounted from Jane Lidderdale's valuable biography *Dear Miss Weaver* (New York: The Viking Press, 1970).

<sup>91</sup> Robert McAlmon was American writer whose work Weaver published in the 1920s.

by George Eliot, an author known to be living with a man who was not her husband, the novel's heroine mothered an illegitimate child. Such reactions and governance of young women's reading was not uncommon in Weaver's time, but to a young woman sensitive to the acceptance of her family, the incident left a strong impression on Weaver. While never disrupting her loyalty to her family or her respect for their views, the incident deepened her sympathy with progressive social views.

Weaver and her siblings received a classic Victorian education from a very competent governess, Birdie Spooner, who, in spite of the religious strictures of Weaver's parents, held progressive political and social views for the time. This governess's main influence on Weaver was in politics and economics, and she encouraged Weaver's frequent visits to the public library, as well as her ever-expanding secret reading list. As Weaver grew older, she continued to question the mores of her family, religious institutions, and nation state. John Stuart Mill provided the most formative political philosophy for Weaver, and his individualism gave her "form for unformed thoughts and at the same time struck as revelation."<sup>92</sup> She found in *On Liberty* a strong justification for the freedom of thought she craved and would eventually champion, and the *Subjection of Women* cultivated her commitment to women's issues.<sup>93</sup> Yet, as her own views began to shift and change, she became increasingly inward in the expression of her position as a woman and a citizen. Weaver quietly learned the capacity to listen intently, and grew into a thoughtful and compassionate adult, whose conflicts of family and social views developed, not a rebel, but a woman described by most who knew her as reserved.

---

<sup>92</sup> Jane Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 32.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Weaver was also a keen and practical businessperson, and her early work aligned both her social competence and such skills. In her young age, Weaver's cousin Eleanor Davies-Colley requested Weaver's help working for the Invalid Children's Aid Association, where Weaver served as honorary treasurer for several years. Davies-Colley then became an accomplished surgeon, the first woman FRCS, and the next professional endeavor of the two cousins established two hospitals staffed by and for women. While Weaver's role in these accomplishments was always the administration of business, her sympathy with women's issues grew. She subscribed to a new independent periodical called *The Freewoman*, a journal dedicated to feminist issues, and she joined the Free Discussion Circle, a group of approximately eighty people, who gathered periodically to debate and promote social reform. In this circle, Weaver befriended Dora Marsden, the founder, editor, and lead-writer of the *Freewoman*, and Rebecca West, British-Irish feminist and novelist. While the *Freewoman* largely devoted its pages to feminist effort, much beyond the scope of propaganda for suffrage, the greater aim of the paper was freedom of thought and of speech, and the editors aimed to interest both men and women. To this end, Rebecca West established pages featuring literature, and she enlisted Ezra Pound as the publication's literary editor. In his initial duties to the publication, Pound secured payment for literary contributors, and he quickly turned the one-page literary portion into five pages. He (and several subscribers) suggested the title of the publication change, to speak more directly to the wider audience sought. In the December 1913 issue, the *New Freewoman* completed its thirteenth issue and was transformed into its better-known successor, *The Egoist*.

Just as Ezra Pound was called upon to develop this portion of the publication, Marsden and West called upon Weaver to look after the *Egoist's* business, in part by virtue of their friendship and in part because of the large financial contribution Weaver made, which established her as a shareholder in the publication. Weaver was impressive and effective in her work on the *Egoist*, and in several instances, she saved the publication from going under. As Marsden's and West's work became increasingly devoted to their own writing, Weaver became increasingly responsible for the welfare of the publication. Most of the correspondence between Weaver and Marsden regarding Weaver's promotion to managing editor was destroyed by Weaver in 1944. Uncomfortable with the life of usury her parents' legacy established, Weaver desired earned independence. She saw her inheritance as hers in trust, and, ever inclined to the privilege of privacy, she did not want her work or financial contributions to the publication to be perceived as acts of charity. Many of her donations to the publication and payment to contributing artists were entered into the accounts and presented to fellow shareholders as anonymous. The lack of correspondence at the change of management leaves most of the dealings unclear, but what does emerge from surviving letters is that Marsden and West, when they resigned from the journal, had to strongly encourage Weaver to take over.<sup>94</sup> She did so just in time. Pound had just submitted *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* for serialization in the *Egoist*, and where Marsden had been a merciless editor, Weaver was committed to the integrity of the text as the author had written it. At this time, Weaver's commitment to authorial intention was not loyalty to the artist, as she did not yet know James Joyce, nor was it loyalty to his craft. This was

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., p. 161.

simply a matter of principle to the new managing editor of the *Egoist*, and she often sustained the financial burden of correction to proofs personally.

Over the course of Joyce's lifetime, Harriet Shaw Weaver would become one of the most significant persons in the writer's life. Beginning May 14, 1919, Weaver became Joyce's steady benefactress, at the first anonymously. The arrangements for her benefaction were managed by the financial institution Monro, Saw, and Company. In response to Joyce's repeated inquiries about the identity of his benefactress, Joyce received a letter, dated June 14, 1919, in which Weaver's financiers wrote,

Briefly, the qualities in your writing that most interest her are your searching piercing spirit, your scorching truth, the power and startling penetration of your 'intense instants of imagination'. As such qualities are greatly lacking in most writers of the day, when they do show themselves, and especially when accompanied as in your case by a very unusual and astonishing power of expression, our client counts it a misfortune that they should not be given as free scope as is possible in the circumstances and therefore has done what she can to further this end.<sup>95</sup>

True to this testament, Weaver gave Joyce as free a scope as possible. Her service to Joyce's literary and financial management lasted the rest of his life and beyond. Her benefaction enabled Joyce to write *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* without the necessity of teaching English lessons to support his family. This benefaction was steadfast, despite Weaver's fears of Joyce's drinking habits, her observations of the lavishness with which he spent her legacy, and her misgivings about his narrative experiments in the *Wake*. Weaver even paid for Joyce's funeral, supported Lucia Joyce's psychological treatment, and supported Joyce's widow and heirs for two years while the writer's estate was being settled. In his literary biography of Joyce, Ellmann states,

---

<sup>95</sup> L II: 445.

She made no demands upon him, and gave up projects of her own so that he might get on with his, resolved to offer his genius the reward which the world had so far withheld. Her benefaction did not make Joyce rich; no amount of money would have done that; but it made it possible for him to be poor only through determined extravagance.<sup>96</sup>

Weaver's significance in bringing *Ulysses* into print was far more than that of a publisher: she was the artist's benefactress, as well as a lifetime financial and literary manager.

### ***Margaret Anderson***

In many ways, the first publishers of *Ulysses* were alike in commitment to publishing Joyce's text, in championing freedom of speech, and in commitment to social reform. They also shared the sympathizing experience of reproof for progressive views (as did Pound), but their personalities were radically different. In his later years, Ezra Pound described his first visit with Weaver in a letter to Weaver's biographer, Jane Lidderdale: "Certainly no one has left an image more definite in outline than H.S.W. ... H.S.W. in whatever group—not like silence, come gradually, but like a sudden stopping of all noise."<sup>97</sup> This quiet reserve of Weaver's personality was a direct contrast to the outspoken personality of *Ulysses*'s first American publisher, Margaret Anderson, who staked much of her life in the reward of stimulating conversation and printing radical thought. Where Weaver felt the social responsibility of inheritance, Anderson embraced predictable poverty for the sake of promoting freedom of speech in the arts. (She even spent a willful homeless summer living on the shore of Lake Michigan in Chicago.) Where Weaver dealt with her family mores by compartmentalizing her life, Anderson willfully defied her patient parents.

---

<sup>96</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 481.

<sup>97</sup> Jane Lidderdale, *Dear Miss Weaver*, p. 74. Pound's letter to Lidderdale is dated July 12, 1962.



Extending her teenage willfulness beyond the domestic sphere of her household, Anderson wrote a letter to Clara Laughlin, literary editor of a religious weekly called the *Interior* (later titled the *Continent*), expressing her frustration with the strictures imposed upon women by family and domesticity. Laughlin thought Anderson a bright young girl and soon brought her to Chicago, where Laughlin employed Anderson as her assistant. Hence, Anderson's editorial work began when she was fairly young. Where Weaver had to be prodded to put any of her ideas in print—and even then, under a pseudonym—Anderson, Laughlin's young apprentice, soon began writing book reviews for the *Continent* and the *Chicago Evening Post*. When Laughlin resigned her post as literary editor, she suggested Anderson as her successor. Anderson readily accepted and was readily accepted by the magazine's managing editor, for the terse literary judgment she offered the publication.

Anderson's work for the *Continent*, however, became unsatisfying when her literary judgment was rebuked for remission of moral judgment. At the age of twenty-one, she wrote a laudatory review of Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, declaring it a very fine piece of work. She did not, however, speak to the moral nature of Dreiser's book. Letters from protesting subscribers poured in, many of which charged Anderson with incompetence for not stating that *Sister Carrie* was immoral. Such a thing had never occurred to her. As she tells,

The [managing] editor of the *Continent* urged me not to give up my book page but to state facts as they were, which simple process would keep me out of trouble. This sent me from paroxysms into paralysis.

What facts? And what do you mean—as they are?

Very simple, said the simple man. When a book is immoral, say so.

How will I know?

That's one thing that everyone knows, he said kindly.<sup>98</sup>

Impatient with such strictures, impatient with life in which “nothing inspired was going on,” and “sensing the modern literary movement which was about to declare itself,” Anderson impetuously determined to start her own magazine, devoted to the seven arts.<sup>99</sup> Where Weaver reluctantly accepted charge of the *Egoist*, Anderson enthusiastically and proactively founded a venue of publication that championed freedom of speech, devoted to the arts. Hence began *The Little Review*.

Shortly after the *Little Review*'s first publication, in 1913, Ezra Pound sent forth his first *Blast* manifestos from London. In this way, the editors came to each others' attention, and they began to correspond. In 1917, Pound suggested he function as foreign editor for the *Little Review*, and Anderson “hailed the occasion.”<sup>100</sup> Pound wrote,

I want an ‘official organ’ (vile phrase). I mean I want a place where I and T.S. Eliot can appear once a month (or once an ‘issue’) and where Joyce can appear when he likes, and where Wyndham Lewis can appear if he comes back from the war. DEFINITELY a place for our regular appearance and where our friends and readers (what few of ‘em there are), can look with assurance of finding us.<sup>101</sup>

Anderson was happy to yield the pages of her magazine to this cause; it was precisely the kind of avant-garde literature the *Little Review* intended to publish.

In March of 1917, Pound took post as foreign editor of the *Little Review*, and he solicited Joyce for a contribution. Joyce, recovering from his second battle with debilitating iritis, was unable to send more than well wishes for the fortune of the magazine. He replied, “As regards excerpts from *Ulysses*, the only thing I could send

---

<sup>98</sup> Margaret Anderson, *My Thirty Years' War* (New York: Covici, Friede, 1930), p. 34.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.

<sup>101</sup> *P/J*: 91.

would be the Hamlet chapter, or part of it—which, however, would suffer by excision.”<sup>102</sup> (The Hamlet chapter Joyce referred to is *Scylla and Charybdis*.) The novel was well under way, however, and in the fall of 1917, Joyce began to copy out his final draft of the *Telemachia* for serialization in the *Little Review* and the *Egoist*. Once copied, these manuscripts were sent to Claude Sykes, an actor and writer living in Switzerland. With the loan of a typewriter from Joyce’s friend Rudolph Goldschmidt, Sykes typed *Telemachus* and *Nestor* in December of 1917, *Proteus* in January 1918. Throughout the typing of the *Telemachia*, Joyce would often send by post a revision or addition to the text. Sykes, ever patient, incorporated them as best he was able in the pace of typing. While typing, Sykes prepared Joyce’s typescripts with two carbon copies. When the resultant three copies and the manuscript were returned to Joyce, the author reviewed, corrected, and revised two of the three copies of the typescript, then sent them to Ezra Pound. Pound, in turn, sent the typescripts to Joyce’s publishers. Joyce was dissatisfied by the typescripts that Sykes prepared. He wrote to Weaver in March of 1918,

I have sent the first episode of the *Odyssey* to Mr Pound but I must apologise for the very bad typescript. I shall try to have the following episodes done better. I hope it is legible in spite of the typist’s mistakes.<sup>103</sup>

As is evident, Joyce used the typescripts Sykes prepared despite his dissatisfaction with them.

## **SERIAL PUBLICATION**

Joyce began sending the duplicate typescripts to Pound in December of 1917. Pound reviewed Joyce’s work, then sent one copy of the typescript to Margaret Anderson of the *Little Review* and one copy to Harriet Shaw Weaver of the *Egoist*. Both of Joyce’s

---

<sup>102</sup> *L I*: 101.

<sup>103</sup> *L I*: 112.

publishers were forewarned of the difficulty of publishing *Ulysses*; their responses were, as their temperaments would predict, quite the opposite. In March 1918, Joyce wrote to Weaver, suggesting that if she had trouble with her printers, she consider having the paper printed in Paris. At the time, Joyce was willing to cede the book rights of *Ulysses* to Weaver, but confessed, “I am sure it is in more senses than one a Greek gift.”<sup>104</sup> Weaver was too keen a businessperson to be susceptible to a Trojan horse; resistance of her printers and complaints of her subscribers limited the number of *Egoist* installments to five portions of the novel. Instead of battling the establishment, so to speak, Weaver found other means of bringing *Ulysses* to the public.

For Joyce’s American publisher, Pound had warned Anderson of the difficulties that might arise publishing *Ulysses* in the United States. Yet when Margaret Anderson read the opening paragraph of *Proteus*, she declared, “This is the most beautiful thing we’ll ever have. We’ll print it if it is the last effort of our lives.”<sup>105</sup> Anderson’s determination proved itself; she continued to print *Ulysses*, in the face of formidable threats from authorities, until she was prosecuted for her publication. The earliest publication of the novel was considerably determined by the temperaments of its publishers.

Twenty-three installments—thirteen and a half episodes—of *Ulysses* were set in type and printed for the *Little Review* from 1918 to 1920, yet only twenty of those installments reached Anderson’s subscribers. Three installments were suppressed by the

---

<sup>104</sup> *L I*: 112.

<sup>105</sup> Margaret Anderson, *My Thirty Years’ War*, p. 175.

U.S. Post Office, in revocation of second-rate mailing privileges for the magazine.<sup>106</sup> The installments that did reach the public were often censored en route to publication.

### ***Suppression and Censorship***

#### **Telemachus and Nestor**

As indicated in Joyce's letter to Pound (quoted above), Joyce anticipated suppression of *Ulysses*. Pound shared Joyce's concerns. Having first received the Telemachus episode, Pound wrote to Joyce,

I suppose we'll be damn well suppressed if we print the text as it stands. BUT it is damn well worth it. I see no reason why the nations should sit in darkness merely because Anthony Comstock was horrified at the sight of his grandparents in copulation, and there after ran wode in a loin cloth.<sup>107</sup>

To a twenty-first-century reader, it is difficult to understand the suppression of Joyce's novel, especially of an episode as seemingly harmless as the first. Pound's amusing reference to Anthony Comstock implies that offense of a sexual nature threatened suppression of the Telemachus episode. If so, we can posit the "unclean loins" of a milkwoman might have posed this threat, or perhaps the candor with which Buck Mulligan gossips about Seymour and Lily, a red-headed woman who may, by virtue of the color of her hair, buck like a goat. In addition to writing Joyce, Pound also wrote to John Quinn, worried about suppression of the Telemachus episode. On December 29, the poet told the art patron, "The Joyce is worth being suppressed for," but Pound proceeded to ask about particular cases. Pound wanted to know whether or not urination was considered, by legal definition, lascivious, stating that there was no question what Joyce

---

<sup>106</sup> Scholars often tally the suppression of episodes at four, but those calculations use the word *suppression* loosely, for they include the prosecution of the Nausicaa episode, which was not suppressed, but prosecuted after its mailing.

<sup>107</sup> *L* II: 414.

was referring to, “under the softened and refined term ‘water.’”<sup>108</sup> Joyce had already composed the following passage for serialization: “When I makes tea I makes tea, as old mother Grogan said. And when I makes water I makes water.”<sup>109</sup> Aside from concerns of lascivious or obscene material, evidence indicates that offense of a political nature was also a threat to the first episode of Joyce’s novel.

Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap<sup>110</sup> were able to print and mail an uncensored text of *Telemachus* in the United States, but Weaver did not complete publication in the *Egoist*. Weaver’s printer in London did set the episode up in type; galleys (dated March 1, 1918, in Weaver’s hand) survive, but the episode was never published. It is unclear whether Joyce knew that Weaver’s printer produced the surviving galleys or not, but Joyce was aware that Weaver’s printers were not a viable option for following through with publication. Three weeks after the galleys were produced, Joyce suggested the magazine be printed in Paris.<sup>111</sup> (Joyce made this suggestion because, at that time in Great Britain, printers held liability for the publication of licentious or obscene material, rather than publishers and distributors.) Pound was either unaware that a London printer did produce the surviving galleys, or he considered their second thoughts final. On March 29, Pound wrote to Joyce, “The *Egoist* printers wont set up the stuff at all.”<sup>112</sup> So in March of 1918, the *Little Review* saw the episode through print, publication, and mailing, without any reaction from the authorities charged with censorship, but in London, the printers refused to give their blessing to publication, after having produced galleys.

---

<sup>108</sup> Quoted in B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 291.

<sup>109</sup> *U*1986, p. 22.

<sup>110</sup> Jane Heap (1883–1964) moved to Chicago in 1901 to study at the Art Institute of Chicago. In 1912, she helped found an avant-garde theatrical group, Maurice Browne’s Chicago Little Theatre. Heap met Margaret Anderson in 1916 and the two women became business partners in the production of the *Little Review*, coeditors, and lovers.

<sup>111</sup> See *L I*: 112.

<sup>112</sup> *P/J*: 131.

Consideration of the difficulty Joyce had publishing *Dubliners* sheds some light on this transatlantic difference and the sensitivity of Joyce's public with regard to political dissent. The candor of *Dubliners* that worried Grant Richards in London and George Roberts at Maunsel and Company in Ireland was political dissent. *Dubliners* was written in the literary style of realism, and with *Dubliners*, Joyce intended to effect social change. He wrote to Richards on June 23, 1906,

It is not my fault that the odour of ashpits and old weeds and offal hangs round my stories. I seriously believe that you will retard the course of civilization in Ireland by preventing the Irish people from having one good look at themselves in my nicely polished looking glass.<sup>113</sup>

Richards was most concerned with derision of British imperialism. Ten months after Joyce had procured a contract with the London publisher, Richards wrote to Joyce, asking him to omit one of the stories and passages in others. This started a contentious exchange between the publisher and writer, which lasted three months and only escalated in dispute. Richards's printer refused to typeset "Two Gallants" and "An Encounter," and Richards had blue-penciled excisions in "Counterparts," "Grace," "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," and "The Boarding-House." The publisher even requested excision of the British slang *bloody* at every instance of its occurrence. Joyce was willing to make some of the requested alterations to the text, but not without the assurance of a prefatory note, to be written by him and published along with the work, explaining the necessity of these revisions. Richards declined this compromise, so Joyce sought council with an international jurist in Rome, who simply advised him to omit as Richards suggested. Joyce declined to do so, and Richards returned the manuscript to the writer, failing to deliver on contractual obligations.

---

<sup>113</sup> L I: 63.

Looking elsewhere, Joyce procured a contract with Maunsel and Company in July of 1909, but in December, George Roberts, manager of Maunsel, wrote to Joyce, begging the writer to alter a passage in “Ivy Day in the Committee Room” that referred to the late king, Edward VII. Taking the bull by the horns, Joyce wrote to George V, asking him if the passage in dispute could in any way be offensive to the late king, but George V’s private secretary responded, “It is inconsistent with rule for his Majesty to express his opinion in such cases.”<sup>114</sup> In addition to protecting respect for the monarchy, the editors at Maunsel and Company also wanted to protect the reputation of Dublin; Roberts requested the author alter every nonfiction reference to places in Dublin, but Joyce declined to do so, arguing the necessity of these details on aesthetic grounds. After more than two years of corresponding, struggling to get the book published, Joyce went in person to Dublin to attempt a compromise, but the encounter was ineffective. George Roberts, Maunsel’s representative, told Joyce that the book’s “implications were anti-Irish and therefore out of keeping with his aims as an Irish publisher.”<sup>115</sup> The encounter ended with the printer breaking up the type, and vehemently informing Joyce that every copy already produced would be burnt the next day. Evidently, neither British imperialists nor their subjects were ready for Joyce’s realism, much less the depiction of Irish paralysis in consequence of imperial subjugation.<sup>116</sup>

For Telemachus, also, we can ascertain the derisive social commentary encapsulated in Stephen Dedalus’s free thought. Through Stephen, Joyce offers the same

---

<sup>114</sup> *P/J*: 22.

<sup>115</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 328.

<sup>116</sup> Pound saw Joyce’s realism not as problematic, but as exoneration for Joyce’s work. In a letter dated June 19, 1920, Pound wrote to John Quinn, “In the stories of his early eccentricities in Dublin, I have always thought people neglected the poignant feature, i.e., that his ‘outrageous’ remarks were usually *so*” (*P/J*: 179). Yet, the “usually *so*” was precisely what caused problems getting *Dubliners* into print.



criticism of British imperialism found in *Dubliners*. To this criticism was added a derisive commentary on the subjugation of the Irish people through the means of Christian doctrine. Though Pound refers to suppression with reference to the Comstock laws, which pertain to obscenity, these politically charged elements of Joyce's work are a plausible explanation for the difficulty publishing *Telemachus* in the United Kingdom. Weaver did not publish episodes of *Ulysses* until January of 1919, and *Telemachus* was never among those episodes published. *Nestor*, on the other hand, was the first episode printed, unexpurgated, in the United Kingdom in the January–February 1919 issue of the *Egoist*, and it passed through the mails in the United States uncensored. Yet the criticism of imperialism in *Nestor*, especially in a serialized version, was far more subtle than that in *Telemachus*.

### **Proteus**

If we define censorship as the act of exercising control over the dissemination of information or artwork to the public, then, despite Pound's advocacy of Joyce's craft, Pound acted as the first censor of *Ulysses*. It is unclear exactly when Pound began expurgating Joyce's text. Evidence confirms that the poet excised passages in the Calypso episode; evidence cannot, however, confirm that omissions that occurred in the Proteus episode were excisions by Pound.

In the *Little Review*'s publication of the Proteus text, our Protean dog never urinates on the rock. He sniffs, and he digs under the rock, but his cocked leg and both urinations are wholly absent. This event is present in the Rosenbach manuscript of the Proteus episode, and, as stated earlier, Sykes used the Rosenbach as exemplar when

preparing the typescripts. The typescripts prepared by Sykes, which would carry evidence of alterations to the text, are lost. Joyce's passage in the Rosenbach manuscript follows:

He slunk back in a curve. Doesn't see me. Along the edge of the mole he dawdled, smelt a rock and from under a cocked hindleg pissed against it. He trotted forward and, lifting again his hindleg, pissed quick short at an unsmelt rock. The simple pleasures of the poor. His hindpaws then scattered sand: then his forepaws dabbled and delved. Something he buried there, his grandmother. He rooted the sand, dabbling and delving and stopped to listen to the air, scraped up the sand again with a fury of his claws, soon ceasing, a part, a panther, got in spousebreach, vulturing the dead.<sup>117</sup>

The *Little Review*, however, printed the text as follows (line breaks are felicitous to the publication):

... He slunk back in a curve. Doesn't see me. Along by the edge of the mole he dawdled, smelt a rock and from under a edge of the mole he dawdled, smelt a rock. Something he buried there, his grandmother. He rooted the sand, dabbling and delving and stopped to listen to the air, scraped up the sand again with a fury of his claws, soon ceasing, a part, a panther, got in spousebreach, vulturing the dead.<sup>118</sup>

The repetition of the text on two lines suggests that the omission of the urination could have been a mistake on the part of Anderson's printer. In cases in which we know that Pound excised Joyce's text, the poet left sensible text in the wake of his blue pencil. However, it is possible that the corruption of text was a consequence of blue-penciled instructions to delete the passage. Even though Pound did not censor Joyce's "softened and refined term 'water'" in the Telemachus episode, the poet may have feared that this passage contained a reference to urination too overt to pass through the mails. In the absence of the typescripts Margaret Anderson received from Pound, and within the limits

---

<sup>117</sup> *RM* 3.13 (P46 L57–58 N46 – P46–47 L58–59 N46–47).

<sup>118</sup> *LR* May 1918, p. 41.

of published correspondence, we cannot conclusively determine whether Anderson's printer or Pound was responsible for the omission in *Proteus*.

### **Calypso**

The Calypso episode suffered Pound's first known expurgation of Joyce's work. Only one page of the typescripts created by Claude Sykes has survived, and that page does not belong to the copies submitted for serial publication. The excisions made by Pound, however, are evident from correspondence and the serial publications themselves.

Joyce's work risked suppression of the *Little Review* because of its content, but the venue in which it was published made censorship a very probable outcome. Margaret Anderson told John Quinn that the installments she was receiving from Joyce were "very frank," and Quinn warned Anderson and Pound that the language must be "toned down." He reminded them repeatedly that different standards of censorship prevailed for books and magazines, and that books could get away with things that would draw quick suppression upon a magazine. In addition to the venue of a magazine, Joyce suffered guilt by association. Margaret Anderson's political campaigns had already brought the *Little Review* under scrutiny of the Post Office officials charged with suppression of subversive literature.

In 1913, Margaret Anderson befriended Emma Goldman. Goldman was a Lithuanian-born anarcho-communist, feared to the degree that J. Edgar Hoover, in Goldman's deportation hearings of 1917, declared her the most dangerous anarchist in the United States.<sup>119</sup> Anderson was not shy about supporting Goldman's political position either. Just after attending a public lecture by the activist, Anderson wrote an editorial for the third issue of the *Little Review*. In her autobiography, she explained,

---

<sup>119</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), p. 18.

I wrote an article beginning with a passionate question as to why anyone wanted to own property, why people didn't live as brothers, and why didn't they understand the anarchist religion. I lauded Emma Goldman. Her name was enough in those days to produce a shudder. She was considered a monster, an exponent of free love and bombs. Her lecture was my first contact with the astounding truth that popular legend is usually in direct contradiction to the facts. It seemed to me that any average intelligence should have been equal to the feat of seeing Emma Goldman as she was: a whole-hearted idealist—oh, very ideal—with humanity as her personal problem.<sup>120</sup>

Anderson devoted many pages of her magazine to announcements of Goldman's lectures and public appearances. The editor's support of anarchist activism peaked in the December 1915 issue, where she encouraged active resistance in an editorial titled "Toward Revolution." Reacting to the execution of union activist Joe Hill, Anderson wrote,

Why didn't someone shoot the governor of Utah before he could shoot Joe Hill? ... Why doesn't some one arrange for the beating-up of the police squad? That would be a good beginning. Or set fire to some of the factories, or start a convincing sabotage in the shops? ... For God's sake, why doesn't some one start the Revolution?<sup>121</sup>

Anderson's 1915 editorial was not suppressed: the Espionage Act was not passed until June 15, 1917, shortly after the United States entered the war. (The Espionage Act established that publication of information that interfered with the American war effort was a criminal act, and it gave the U.S. Post Office the authority to revoke mailing privileges for subversive literature.) Yet the *Little Review* issue scandalized Chicagoans. The district attorney told a *Chicago Tribune* reporter he was ready to bring charges against Anderson the minute officials gave the word. The editorial also officially

---

<sup>120</sup> Margaret Anderson, *My Thirty Years' War*, p. 54–55.

<sup>121</sup> *LR* December 1915, p. 5.

registered the publication on the radar of the United States Post Office as a “‘Publication of Anarchist tendencies’.”<sup>122</sup>

At the turn of 1916/1917, Anderson’s enthusiasm for anarchism changed. In the August 1917 issue, she published an editorial entitled “What the Public Doesn’t Want.”<sup>123</sup> Here, she restated her political position, as well as her thoughts on the social role of the Arts. Recounting the years of her strong support for the tenets of the political camp, she said she had long given up the cause, confessing at the same time, “I still grow violent with rage about the things that are ‘wrong’, and I probably always shall. But I know that anarchism won’t fix them.”<sup>124</sup> The pages of her magazine had already reflected this shift in the editor’s priorities. As she had originally planned, art, literature, and criticism took the front pages once again, and the back matter still supported the cause of dissenting voice. Often, if a publication was revoked from the mails, Anderson ran an advertisement for its sale at newsstands. This included one for the Masses Publishing Company, which boldly challenged the government and promised criticism of the war effort in its pages. But Anderson’s shifted priorities did not abate, in any way, the watchful eye of the authorities. In the ensuing years of the First World War, government officials and the general public suffered their greatest sensitivity to any trace of Bolshevism or Anarchism.

Shortly after the Espionage Act was passed, the *Little Review* fell victim to suppression, not for an editorial by Anderson, but for a piece of literature. Mailing

---

<sup>122</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, 1998, p. 18. Vanderham conducted research at the National Archives. The notation that the *Little Review* is a ‘Publication of Anarchist tendencies’ is included and so noted in ‘List of Periodicals, Pamphlets, Circulars, Etc., Held to Be Non-Mailable, January 18, 1918,’ Case File 50839, Records Relating to the Espionage Act, World War I, 1917–20, Office of the Solicitor, Records of the Post Office Department, Record Group 28, National Archives, Washington D.C.

<sup>123</sup> *LR* August 1917, pp. 20–22.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

privileges for the October 1917 issue were revoked for featuring Wyndham Lewis's "Cantleman's Spring Mate," a short story critical of militarism. This suppression is catalogued at the National Archives in the Post Office's "Lists of Subversive Literature, WWI,"<sup>125</sup> but the decision of Judge Augustus N. Hand was issued under Section 211 of the United States Criminal Code. This code forbid mailing of any information or instruments in the prevention of conception or the act of abortion, but it contained the language Judge Hand needed to suppress a work of literature deemed indecent or immoral:

Every obscene, lewd, or lascivious, and every filthy book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other publication of indecent character and every article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception or inducing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use ... is hereby declared non-mailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post-office or by any letter carrier.<sup>126</sup>

The application of this law to the suppression of Lewis's story outraged Anderson, Heap, and Pound. In response, Ezra Pound wrote an article for the *Little Review* denouncing the decision of Judge Hand. Anderson showed John Quinn the proofs for Pound's article, and Quinn angrily "chucked it out." The attorney then wrote a letter to Pound, cautioning him against lining up with the "sex advocates" of literature. Quinn attempted a pragmatic explanation to Pound, stating,

There are many provisions in the law that are absurd. I have run up against them. But, Christ, I haven't wasted my time in trying to reform them. I have left that up to the long-haired nuts of the bar associations. ... Nobody ever regarded the law, common or statute, as perfection, and the man that discusses it on the assumption that it is a perfect instrument shows his inexperience.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 18.

<sup>126</sup> As reprinted in "The Classics Escape," by Ezra Pound, *LR* March 1918, pp. 32–33.

<sup>127</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 344.

Despite Quinn's sympathy with the difficulty Joyce had publishing *Dubliners* and *Portrait*, he had no intention of mounting a crusade against censorship laws. Quinn felt very strongly that *Ulysses* should be expurgated for publication in a magazine, with the text restored for book publication. The strength of Quinn's reaction elicited a promise from Margaret Anderson not to run the article. Pound also responded to Quinn's advice.

Pound revised his article for the *Little Review*, mounting his attack more at the law and less at Judge Hand. In the article, he stated, "I confess to having been a bad citizen, to just the extent of having been ignorant that at any moment my works might be classed in the law's eye with the inventions of the late Dr. Condom."<sup>128</sup> Arguing the absurdity of applying this law to the suppression of literature, he then promised to print the statute of Section 211 in the *Little Review* until the law changed. Anderson ran Pound's revised article, and when Quinn read it in the March 1918 issue, he was furious. Quinn was most angry because Anderson and Heap had solicited his advice then ignored it, and that the editors ran the article after promising not to. Writing to Pound in March, Quinn again warned the poet about the realities of the law and tried to impart a sense of logic to tactics. The attorney told Pound that the magazine already fell under the definitions of suppression and prosecution, and that if the editors continued to publish subversive material, they would lose the publication. Quinn also registered his complaints with Joyce's frank epithets in the Telemachus episode, "scrotumtightening" and "snotgreen." Anderson's publication carried the *défi* "Making no compromise with the public taste" on the cover of the *Little Review*, and in an exasperated state, Quinn

---

<sup>128</sup> *LR* March 1918, p. 32.

suggested the phrase, “or commonly accepted ideas of decency and propriety” be added to it.<sup>129</sup>

In the midst of these exchanges, Pound received the Calypso episode from Joyce. Pound was trapped, “among his wish to placate Quinn, his own reluctant recognition of practicalities, his respect for his own editorial integrity, his hatred of censorship in principle, and his immense admiration for Joyce’s work.”<sup>130</sup> Pound wrote to Quinn about *Ulysses*, conceding that Joyce wrote with “a certain odeur-de-muskrat,” but Pound insisted that the “odeur” was vital to Joyce’s intention and achievement.<sup>131</sup> Pound also believed Joyce’s writing was strong medicine necessary to free America from its moral anemia. Despite this defense of Joyce, Quinn’s precautions must have made an impact on Pound, because the poet also informed Quinn that he had he cut twenty lines from Joyce’s next installment, and that he had written Joyce to explain his excisions. The letter Pound wrote to Joyce also survives. On March 29, 1918, Pound wrote,

Section 4. has excellent things in it; but you overdo the matter. Leave the stool to Geo. Robey. He has been doing “down where the asparagus grows, for some time.

I think certain things simply bad writing, in this section. Bad because you waste the violence. You use a stronger word than you need, and this is bad art, just as any needless superlative is bad art.

The contrast between Blooms interior poetry and his outward surroundings is excellent, but it will come up without such detailed treatment of the dropping feces.

Quinn is already in a rage over my reference to the late Doctor C. in the March number. Quinn, by the way, has been in hospital for a major operation, and we cant have him worried unnecessarily.

Perhaps an unexpurgated text of you can be printed in a greek or bulgarian translation later.

I’m not even sure “urine” is necessary in the opening page. The idea could be conveyed just as definitely.

---

<sup>129</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 345.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 344.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 345.



In the thing as it stands you will lose effectiveness. The excrements will prevent people from noticing the quality of things contrasted.

At any rate the thing is risk enough without the full details of the morning deposition.

If we are suppressed too often we'll be suppressed finally and for all, to the damn'd stoppage of all our stipends. AND I can't have our august editress jailed, NOT at any rate for a passage which I do not think written with utter maestia.

Hence these tears.<sup>132</sup>

Pound tried to convey the concern about the loss of stipends and the threat of complete and final suppression, but in his letter to Joyce, he embedded his editorial decisions in judgments of an aesthetic nature.

Pound left the word *urine* on the opening page of the Calypso episode for publication in the *Little Review*. The overdone violence Pound refers to is most likely Joyce's use of the word *cunt*, for this was altered by Pound.<sup>133</sup> When returning from Dlugacz's with his breakfast kidney, a gray cloud casts a shadow over Bloom's mood. Bloom's thought turns to

A barren land, bare waste. Volcanic lake, the dead sea: no fish, weedless, sunk deep in the earth. No wind could lift those waves, grey metal, poisonous foggy waters. Brimstone they called it raining down: the cities of the plain: Sodom, Gommorah, Edom. All dead names. A dead sea in a dead land, grey and old. Old now. It bore the oldest, the first race. A bent hag crossed from Cassidy's, clutching a naggin bottle by the neck. The oldest people. Wandered far away all over the earth, multiplying, dying, being born everything. It lay there now. Now it could bear no more. Dead: an old woman's: the grey sunken cunt of the world.<sup>134</sup>

Readers of the *Little Review*, however, never received this text as Joyce wrote it. Pound replaced the word *cunt* with the word *belly*—a substitution with significant ramifications for the meaning of the passage and Bloom's character development. The largest excision,

---

<sup>132</sup> *P/J*: 131.

<sup>133</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 32.

<sup>134</sup> *RM* 4.7 (P58–59 L73–74 N60–61).

however, occurs at the close of the Calypso episode. As Pound's letter makes clear, his greatest concern was Bloom's visit to the jakes, and the poet cut the entire closing scene of Calypso.

Joyce was not pleased by Pound's expurgations, and though he had no recourse for those made in the *Little Review*, he did demonstrate concern for the restoration of his text in subsequent negotiations for book publication. On August 11, 1918, Harriet Shaw Weaver wrote to B.W. Huebsch, on behalf of Joyce:

As regards *Ulysses* he asks me to say that the fourth episode as published in the June issue of the *Little Review* is not the complete text and that the excised paragraphs must be reinstated and the altered ones restored before publication by you. In the third episode, published in the March issue, a few sentences had also been excised and these should be restored too.<sup>135</sup>

To discern censorship of the Lotus Eaters episode becomes a bit trickier than those of the Telemachia or Calypso. As for the Telemachia, the Rosenbach manuscript was clearly the exemplar from which Claude Sykes prepared typescripts. Hence, though lost typescripts make it difficult to confirm deliberate expurgation of Proteus, the variant between the Rosenbach manuscript and the *Little Review* texts can confidently be called a transmissional error in a continuous line of textual descent, quite possibly, Pound's instruction to delete. For Calypso, surviving correspondence makes the variants between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* evident expurgation. For Lotus Eaters, however, and several other episodes that comprise the first half of the novel, something curious in the line of textual descent occurs.

---

<sup>135</sup> L II: 419.

### ***What Is the Rosenbach Manuscript?***

For a moment, let's deviate from the conversation of censorship to discuss precisely what the Rosenbach manuscript is. John Quinn first purchased Joyce's manuscript of *Ulysses*. The manuscript took its place among the most impressive collection of modernist artwork of the time. But in 1923, Quinn's large apartment had become so crowded with artifacts that the attorney decided to have an auction and reduce his collection significantly. Quinn felt the documents in his collection had become a responsibility, rather than an artifact that could be displayed and enjoyed, and he put two-thirds of the eighteen-thousand piece literary collection up for sale, intending to use the proceeds to buy more visual art. In January of 1924, *Ulysses* sold to art collector Dr. A.S.W. Rosenbach. By virtue of this provenance, we commonly refer to this artifact as the Rosenbach manuscript, but we could more properly refer to it as the Rosenbach manuscripts, for it is a collection of eighteen distinct holograph documents, one for each episode of the novel, written out over a period of four years.

For episodes 1 through 3, the Rosenbach manuscripts served as setting copies for the typescripts prepared by Claude Sykes. In textual scholarship, we call this *linear descent*. This linear descent is evinced by surviving postcards, from Joyce to Sykes, instructing revisions. The corresponding revisions are penciled into the Rosenbach documents, not in Joyce's hand. But the transmission beyond the Proteus episode is different. For episodes 6 through 9, 11, 13, and 14, the Rosenbach manuscripts were *not* used as the exemplars when preparing typescripts. Upon investigation, a different transmission of text becomes manifest—both the Rosenbach manuscripts and the surviving typescripts were prepared from the same document source. In textual

scholarship, this is called *collateral descent*. For the episodes that bear the collateral relationship, Joyce was working from a final draft. In each instance, the writer copied the Rosenbach manuscript from this final working draft, then returned to the draft and continued his revisions and additions to the text. The revised final working draft was then submitted to his typists. In every instance of collateral descent, the final working draft, which served as the typists' exemplar, is lost.

The collateral relationship is evident when we compare the documents in the Rosenbach collection to typescripts (where they survive) or printed text. The typescripts or printed texts contain numerous revisions and additions, which can be attributed only to James Joyce. For episodes 4 and 5, the question of collateral-versus-linear descent is open to interpretation. Michael Groden groups episode 4 with collateral descent and episode 5 with linear descent. Hans Walter Gabler groups episode 4 with linear descent and episode 5 with collateral descent. It is possible, however, that portions of each fall into each category, thus leading to Groden and Gabler's differences of interpretation. Greater access to original documents would be necessary to weigh in with a personal opinion on the textual stemmatologies of these episodes.

Why would Joyce take the time to write out a manuscript that he did not intend to use as a submission copy to his typists? The schedule of serialization kept him to task, not without discipline and stamina. The most obvious explanation, though published correspondence cannot substantiate it, is that Joyce copied the collateral documents for sale. He had previously received money for the sale of his manuscript of *Exiles* and for the page proofs of *Portrait*. He was aware of the possibility of selling his documents of composition. From January to April, 1918, Joyce was composing *Calypso* and *Lotus*

Eaters. He was desperately in need of money, and good fortune sent him some. On February 27, Joyce was summoned to the Edgenössische Bank of Zurich, where he was informed,

A client of the bank who is much interested in your work knows that you are in bad straits financially, and wishes to give you a kind of fellowship. We have 12,000 francs deposited to your credit. You will receive a thousand francs a month beginning March 1.<sup>136</sup>

Joyce later discovered that his benefactress was Mrs. Harold McCormick, daughter of oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller, who was living, as was Joyce, in Zurich at the time. The need for money could have caused Joyce to write out a fair copy, set aside for sale; the benefaction could have prompted Joyce to write out a fair copy to serve as a gesture of gratitude or to insure continued support. The latter possibility is at least supported by what happened in the fall of 1919.

On October 1, 1919, Joyce went to collect his monthly fellowship from the bank and was told that his credit was cut off. When McCormick withdrew her funds, Joyce sent the manuscripts of *Ulysses* to her, hoping this gesture would incite her to reinstate her benefaction. Instead, Joyce received a kind (though unexpected) shove toward independence. October 13, 1919, McCormick wrote to him:

Dear Mr. Joyce:— Thank you for the fine manuscript,—which I am glad to keep for you with the understanding that, when for any reason, you want it, you have only to write for it. As the Bank told you, I am not able to help you any longer financially, but now that the difficult years of the war are past, you will find publishers and will come forward yourself, I know.

Wishing you a good journey. Sincerely,

Edith McCormick<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 422.

<sup>137</sup> *L II*: 454. Joyce did receive the return of his manuscripts, as of July 9, 1920 (see Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 481).

So, the events of McCormick's benefaction coincide with copying the Rosenbach version of episodes 4 and 5.

Collateral descent continues through episode 14, with episodes 10 and 12 excepted. For episode 10, the relationship is one of linear descent, but it was quickly composed directly from notes, and, having been composed during one of Joyce's fits of iritis, half of it was dictated to Frank Budgen. The episode-10 document in the Rosenbach collection is thus half in Joyce's hand and half in Frank Budgen's. Once the Rosenbach document of *Wandering Rocks* was prepared, it was quickly sent to the typist. Episode 12 is also linear descent, but 13 and 14 are collateral. This alternation also coincides with negotiations for sale of *Ulysses* manuscripts to John Quinn. Serialization ended after episode 14, and for the remaining episodes, the documents of the Rosenbach were used as exemplars to prepare typescripts Joyce then submitted to his publisher.<sup>138</sup>

As stated above, the explanation that Joyce fair-copied some of the documents for the sake of sale cannot be substantiated with certitude. Hans Walter Gabler plausibly suggests the following explanation: When the fair-copy of documents comprising the Rosenbach collection did serve as the typists' setting copy, these documents are full of erasures indicating revisions, as well as the typists' penciling and marginal entries. Perhaps these defacings would have been felt to reduce the fair copy's potential sale value, and "Joyce may have come to realize in the course of the early chapters that the emerging text was still much too fluid and the pressure of revision and expansion too

---

<sup>138</sup> Not all of the Rosenbach Circe episode was the exemplar used by Joyce's typists. Some of Joyce's pages were so illegible, and the typists so frustrated, that Sylvia Beach enlisted an amanuensis to copy select portions of Joyce's manuscript pages, and these copies were sent to typists. Even so, the Rosenbach version of the Circe episode still falls into the line of descent for publication, albeit through one degree of remove from the author's hand.

great to be contained in a fair copy alone.”<sup>139</sup> What does become clear, however, in light of textual analysis, is that portions of the Rosenbach are clearly not documents that Joyce inscribed for the purpose of passing text to his publishers and readers. How does this textual relationship make the analysis of censorship tricky? In the case of Proteus (or any episode of linear descent), one can point to an omission of Rosenbach text in the *Little Review* and reasonably infer that the variant is a corruption incurred in transmission, against the author’s wishes. Yet the same cannot be confidently said for episodes in which the Rosenbach bears collateral descent.

Whenever Joyce copied his drafts, he was prone to revise those texts, mostly by adding new material. Let us say, for instance, that in the act of copying the episode-6 document of the Rosenbach collection, Joyce added material. Then he returned to his final working draft for composition. But what if he forgot to enter the new material on his final working draft, which was submitted to his typist? In that situation, the Rosenbach would contain text that the *Little Review* does not contain—not because someone expurgated the text, but because the text was never entered on a document of transmission. Alternatively, Joyce could have entered new material while inscribing the Rosenbach documents, only to later decide against the inclusion of the material while revising the (lost) final working draft. In this instance, the variance between the Rosenbach text and the published texts would not indicate a corruption, but would have been as Joyce intended.

When I return to the discussion of censorship, keep in mind the qualification that the above scenarios are possible for episodes of collateral descent. However, when collating the Rosenbach manuscript, a text known to predate the typescripts Anderson

---

<sup>139</sup> U1986, p. 1879.

used as her setting copy, with the *Little Review* text, the overwhelming impression is that of censorship and expurgation. Generally speaking, this impression is based on the content of the variance: the variants between the two texts are, in all instances but two, self-evidently potentially offensive. Yet in most instances of variance, censorship is evinced by Anderson's lamented admission of such. Most importantly, in all book negotiations for *Ulysses*, Joyce's primary concern was the restoration of excisions made in the serial publications and the opportunity to review proofs. In each instance of variance between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review*, the excision in the *Little Review* is restored in the 1922 edition by Sylvia Beach, indicating that most omissions of Rosenbach material in the *Little Review* were acts of censorship without Joyce's consent.

### **Lotus Eaters, Hades, and Aeolus**

The text of Lotus Eaters, as published in the July 1918 issue of the *Little Review*, suffered omissions also, but like the text of Proteus, lost typescripts make responsibility of the omissions indeterminate. Three passages and two words present in the Rosenbach manuscript have been omitted in the *Little Review*. The first omitted passage refers to the gelded horses Bloom observes while strolling toward Brunswick Street. The horses, noses in their feedbags, spur Bloom's thought (text omitted from the *Little Review* is set in italics): "Still they get their feed all right and their doss. Gelded too: *a stump of black guttapercha wagging limp between their haunches*. Might be happy all the same that way."<sup>140</sup> The second omitted passage was Bloom's interior thought. When considering the tone of Martha Clifford's letter, Bloom speculates she is menstruating (omitted text is set in italics): "Such a bad headache. *Has her monthlies probably*. What perfume does

---

<sup>140</sup> RM 5.6 (P73–75 L93–95 N76–77); LR July 1918, p. 42.



your wife use.”<sup>141</sup> The final passage omitted in the *Little Review* is the final passage of the Lotus Eaters episode. In the *Little Review*, the following passage appears: “He saw his trunk and limbs riprippled over and sustained, buoyed lightly upward, lemonyellow.”<sup>142</sup> The Rosenbach manuscript, however, reveals a passage truncated by excision; the text continues, “. . . buoyed lightly upward, lemonyellow; saw the dark tangled curls of his bush floating, floating hair of the stream around a languid floating flower.”<sup>143</sup> In addition, the following two words (set in italics) were omitted from the text: “Griffith’s paper is on the same tack now: an army rotten with *venereal* disease: overseas or halfseaoover *empire*.”<sup>144</sup> As was the case with Proteus, the typescripts—the only documents that would conclusively explain the omission of these passages—are lost, and surviving correspondence does not offer explanation. The three passages omitted—the image of gelded horses, Martha’s monthlies, and imagination of Bloom’s member—as well as the two words omitted, *venereal* and *empire*, all indicate deliberate expurgation of Joyce’s text. The Hades episode was set in type without any instance of excision, and it passed through the U.S. Post Office mailing for the September 1918 issue of the *Little Review*. Aeolus passed through the mails uncensored for the October 1918 issue.

### **Lestrygonians**

The first revocation of mailing privileges by the U.S. Post Office for the *Little Review*’s publication of *Ulysses* was the opening portion of the Lestrygonians episode, the January 1919 issue. The official charge in the suppression of Lestrygonians is the

---

<sup>141</sup> *RM* 5.8 (P75–76 L96–97 N78–79); *LR* July 1918, p. 43.

<sup>142</sup> *LR* July 1918, p. 49.

<sup>143</sup> *RM* 5.15 (P82–83 L106–107 N86).

<sup>144</sup> *RM* 5.3 (P70 L88–89 N72–73); *LR* July 1918, p. 38.

classic moral one: obscenity. The installment included Bloom's recollections of his first sexual encounter with Molly, on Howth Head:

Ravished over her I lay full lips full open kissed her mouth. Yum.  
Softly she gave me in my mouth the seedcake warm and chewed.  
Mawkish pulp her mouth had mumbled sweet and sour with spittle.  
Joy: I ate it: joy. Young life, her lips that gave me pouting. Soft  
warm sticky gumjelly lips. Flowers her eyes were take me willing  
eyes. Pebbles fell. She lay still. A goat. No-one. High on Ben  
Howth rhododendrons a nannygoat walking surefooted, dropping  
currants. Screened under ferns she laughed warm folded. Wildly I  
lay on her, kissed her: eyes, her lips, her stretched neck beating,  
woman's breast full in her blouse of nun's veiling, fat nipples  
upright. Hot I tongued her. She kissed me. I was kissed. All  
yielding she tossed my hair. Kissed, she kissed me.<sup>145</sup>

The sexuality of the passage is irrefutable, and in the early years of the twentieth century, sexuality could be labeled obscenity by virtue of its appearing in print.<sup>146</sup> Many of the laws pertaining to printed obscenity were poorly written and widely interpreted by judiciaries when the *Little Review* serialized *Ulysses*, as is evident in Judge Hand's application of Section 211 of the Criminal Code to the suppression of Wyndham Lewis's story. Bloom's recollection of his first sexual encounter with Molly would have been "obscene" enough to incite post office officials to suppress the publication, but the highly charged political atmosphere of the time also played a significant role.

In the postwar era of 1919, American paranoia of Anarchist and Bolshevik activism peaked, reaching its greatest height in the summer, after the May Day Riots in Cleveland, Ohio, as well as the mailing of thirty-eight homemade bombs to prominent economic and political figures, including the mayor of Seattle. The summer of unrest

---

<sup>145</sup> *LR* January 1919, p. 47.

<sup>146</sup> Take, for example, the suppression of a pamphlet written by Mary Ware Dennett in 1930—a sex-education document written for the benefit of her sons, which was merely printed by request of her community, including ministers and the YMCA and YWCA. See Chapter 3, and Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 97.

across the nation is now referred to as the first Red Scare, but Seattle's unrest began earlier, in January 1919. Sixty-five-thousand union workers in the shipbuilding industry walked off the job, in protest of low wages. The American establishment made a quick, defensible association between the unions involved and anarchist activism. The ability of unions to shut down major American cities, especially shipping yards, sent the FBI and federal officials charged with administration of the Espionage Act and the Sedition Act into overdrive. The first installment of the Lestrygonians episode coincided with the Seattle strike—it was printed for the January 1919 issue, more than a year after Lewis's story was suppressed. However, zealotry in the suppression of subversive literature had only increased within that timeframe. By then, more than seventy newspapers were forbidden mailing privileges for their coverage of WWI, and many periodicals and magazines like the *Little Review* struggled to stay in print.<sup>147</sup>

Publication in the *Little Review* already associated Joyce with anarchist political campaigns. As regards Bolshevism, Joyce also suffered guilt by association. On the other side of the Atlantic, Ezra Pound exploited officials' fear of bolshevist revolution to protect Joyce. While sitting out the war in neutral Switzerland, Joyce and Claude Sykes undertook a histrionic venture. Joyce received anonymous patronage of considerable sum in February 1918 (from McCormick, discussed earlier), and Sykes proposed to Joyce that they double it by forming a troupe to produce English plays in Zurich. Joyce, eager to get *Exiles* on a stage, and generally interested in the venture, agreed. The first play produced, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, caused a disagreement of considerable proportions between Joyce and one of the amateur players, Henry Carr. The dispute was primarily

---

<sup>147</sup> See Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, pp. 54–57. See also Sidney Kobre, *Development of American Journalism*, p. 322.

over the amount of payment, but a verbal altercation between Joyce and Carr occurred at the British consulate in Zurich. Carr was an employee at the consulate, having been invalided from his regiment. The matters over payment went to court, but Joyce felt the publicity of the incident incited British officials to harass the writer, suggesting Joyce volunteer for service in the British army, and implying that if he did not, he would be penalized. Having expressed this frustration to Ezra Pound, Pound wrote to the British Minister in Berne, Sir Horace Rumbold:

Dear Sir, If it be not already too late, I should like to caution you that you can find no surer means of making a few converts to Bolshevism or to the more violent revolutionary factions than by continuing or permitting to continue the persecution of James Joyce by the Zurich officials within the sphere of your influence.

I don't want to write "scare heads" to you, and I don't imagine the converts would be numerous, but they would probably be extremely vocal and active; a number of young men are not far from the borderline of these opinions; and a case like Joyce's would considerably enflame their imaginations. I would therefore request that if possible some ambassadorial courtesy might be extended to this, without exception, the most distinguished of the younger English prose authors. ... If his present work is interrupted, i.e., his novel "Ulysses" which we are using as a serial, some brief explanation will have to be given to our readers.<sup>148</sup>

Pound's exploitation of revolutionary impulses is quite remarkable. The carefully phrased letter never states that Joyce was an activist in revolutionary causes. In fact, Joyce had to declare his political neutrality to move from Trieste to Zurich. He was, in thought, a socialist, but in action, an absolute pacifist. His war upon suffering at the hand of political institution, he reserved entirely for his cunning pen.

"So we find Joyce's political satire at work in the opening passage of the Lestrygonians episode," as published in the *Little Review*:

---

<sup>148</sup> P/J: 152–153.

Pineapple rock, lemon platt, butter-scotch. A sugarsticky girl  
shoveling scoopfuls of creams for a christian brother. ... Lozenge  
and comfit manufacturer to His Majesty the King. God. Save. Our.  
Sitting on his throne, sucking jujubes.<sup>149</sup>

Vanderham claims,

This satire of the British Monarch is mild enough, but it could  
easily have made the Post Office censors see Red in January 1919:  
the radicals that Burluson and Lamar were determined to silence  
had often based their opposition to the war on the grounds that it  
would benefit only the British imperialists.<sup>150</sup>

Vanderham's assessment is supported, at least generally, by the 1919 Annual Report of  
the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice. John Sumner, Secretary of the New  
York Society, is on record as saying, "Just as we have the parlor Anarchist and the parlor  
Bolshevist in political life, so we have the parlor Bolshevists in literary and art circles,  
and they are just as great a menace."<sup>151</sup>

In addition to the obscenity and political satire of *Lestrygonians*, the *Little Review*  
text contained some of the most explicit criticism of Irish subjugation by the Christian  
church. As the opening of the episode continues, Bloom is strolling along Bachelor's  
Walk, and from a distance, he recognizes "Dedalus' daughter there still outside Dillon's  
auction rooms." Bloom laments the disintegration of family after the loss of a mother:  
"Home always breaks up when the mother goes." The size of the Dedalus family Bloom  
attributes to Catholic teachings:

Fifteen children he had. Birth every year almost. That's in their  
theology or the priest won't give the poor woman the confession,  
the absolution. Increase and multiply. Did you ever hear such an  
idea? No families themselves to feed. Living on the fat of the  
land.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> *LR* January 1919, p. 27.

<sup>150</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 30.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, as quoted in Paul S. Boyer, *Purity in Print*, p. 67.

<sup>152</sup> *LR* January 1919, p. 28.

The implication is clear: ministers of Catholic doctrine instruct the congregation to reproduce, even if beyond the means of a family's resources, while the same ministers become beneficiaries of their burdened congregation. Bloom's judgment of Catholicism is the same as Stephen's criticism of British imperialism: both characters see exploitation.

Pound and Anderson were very reserved with Joyce's typescripts of this episode. Neither expurgated these passages. The only variant between this installment of *Ulysses* in the *Little Review* and the surviving Rosenbach manuscript was the smell of piss (omitted text appears in italics): "Smells of men. Spaton sawdust, sweetish warmish cigarette smoke, reek of plug, spilt beer, *men's beery piss*, the stale of ferment."<sup>153</sup> The second half of the Lestrygonians episode passed through the mails uncensored.

### **Scylla and Charybdis**

Ezra Pound expurgated Joyce's text, and the U.S. Post Office suppressed it. Margaret Anderson joined the unfortunate and lamented rank of being the third known censor of *Ulysses*. In the May 1919 number of the *Little Review*, Anderson recounted the January suppression of the Lestrygonians episode, along with a footnoted statement of her editorial decisions:

The Post Office authorities objected to certain passages in the January installment of "Ulysses," which prevents our mailing of any other copies of that issue. To avoid a similar interference this month I have ruined Mr. Joyce's story by cutting certain passages in which he mentions natural facts known to everyone.<sup>154</sup>

As with the previously expurgated episodes, the typescript Anderson used as her setting copy is lost. Having expressed her dissatisfaction with the prudence of excision, however, she attempted to make her editorial pen (and her defiant dissatisfaction with the Post

---

<sup>153</sup> *RM* 8.16 (P161–162 L214–216 N169–170); *LR* January 1919, p. 42.

<sup>154</sup> *LR* May 1919, p. 21.

Office censors) evident in text that remained. Rather than excising passages as Pound did, with an effort to leave continuous text in the censor's wake, Anderson often inserted a long string of ellipses points, omitting only a potentially offensive word or passage. For example, she substituted the word *pissed* with ellipses in the following dialogue: “—The tramper Synge is looking for you, he said, to murder you. He heard you . . . . . on his halldoor in Glasthule.”<sup>155</sup> In another instance, she substituted intervening letters with en dashes: “What the h—l are you driving at?”<sup>156</sup> The cuts made by Margaret Anderson were all made to remove potential obscenity.

When deleting passages of greater length, Anderson left an obviously truncated passage. Reference to Oscar Wilde's “Love that dare not speak its name” was subtle enough to let stand, but the dialogue following was truncated in an evident way, after a speaker tag: “It seems so, Stephen said, . . . . . Maybe, like Socrates, he had a midwife to mother as he had a shrew to wife.”<sup>157</sup> The omitted passage, in the Rosenbach, reads, “when he wants to do for him, and for all other and singular unneared wombs, the office an ostler does for the stallion.”<sup>158</sup> Another obviously truncated passage omitted Stephen's recollection of patronage at the brothel. When recollecting borrowed money, the *Little Review* text reads, “You spent most of it in . . . . .”<sup>159</sup> The Rosenbach text, however, continues, “in Georgina Johnson's bed, clergyman's daughter.”<sup>160</sup> Illicit sexual relationships were excised: “Son's with mothers, sires with daughters, nephews with

---

<sup>155</sup> *LR* May 1919, p 19.

<sup>156</sup> *LR* May 1919, p. 26.

<sup>157</sup> *LR* May 1919, p. 21.

<sup>158</sup> *RM* 9.20 (P193–194 L258–259 N201–202).

<sup>159</sup> *LR* April 1919, p. 35.

<sup>160</sup> *RM* 9.6 (P181–182 L241–243 N189–190).

grandmothers, queens with prize bulls,”<sup>161</sup> as well as the subtitle of a play *Everyone His Own Wife: A Honeymoon in the Hand*.<sup>162</sup> Anderson’s judgment cannot be faulted. She expurgated two “vulgar” words and references to homosexuality, incest, bestiality, and masturbation. Her preemptive efforts, however, may not have served their purpose. The May 1919 number of the *Little Review* was still was not allowed to pass through the mail. Whether the suppression of this issue was due to *Ulysses* or not is unclear, for the issue also contained four nude drawings by James Light.

### **Wandering Rocks and Sirens**

Wandering Rocks was published uncensored and passed through the mails in two installments, the June 1919 and July 1919 issues of the *Little Review*. Sirens, uncensored, was also allowed to pass through the mails in the August 1919 and September 1919 issues of the *Little Review*, but not without objections from Ezra Pound. On June 10, 1919, having received the Sirens episode, Pound wrote a long letter to Joyce.

O gloire et décor de la langue Irso-Anglais:

The peri-o-perip-o-periodico-parapatetico-periodopathetico—I don’t off-the markgetical structure of yr. first or peremier parapetitic graph—will cause all but your most pig-o-peripatec-headed readers to think you have gone marteau-dingo-maboule—

Even I cd. do with indication of whose jag—possibly Blooms (?) it is.

—A red headed jew Chicago reporter long since assured me that Ulysses had bitched the American market which had begun to take “Portrait” seriously.

In the interest of literature, I refrained from boring you with his unskilled & philistine tip.

—In the face of *mss* just arrived, I think however I may adjoin personal op. that you have once again gone “down where the asparagus grows” and gone down as far as the lector most bloody benevolens can be expected to respire.

---

<sup>161</sup> RM 9.25 (P198–199 L265–266 N207 – P199–200 L266–268 N207–208).

<sup>162</sup> RM 9.35 (P207–209 L277–279 N216–217).



I don't ask you to erase—But express opinion that a few sign posts. perhaps twenty words coherent in bunches of 3 to 5 wd. not only clarify but even improve the 1st. page.<sup>163</sup>

Pound clearly considered the opening overture of the Sirens episode a narrative experiment that came at too great a cost. He continued his letter, in the Joyce-inspired loose linguistic communications, to say that even Gertrude Stein does not demand a new style per chapter. After having expressed these initial reactions, Joyce's Sirens submission must have continued to worry Pound, for before sending the letter, he added to it. After a break in the page, demarcated by Pound's inscription "Later," he wrote,

Caro mio: Are you sending this chapter *because* you feel bound to send in copy on time?

Let the regularity of appearance be damned. If you want more time take it.

I shall send off mss. to Egoist & L. R. tomorrow. But you will have plenty of time to hold up publication if you want to, and to revise if you want to.

1. you have got some new effects.

2. It is too long

3. One *can* Fahrt with less pomp & circumstance

[3a. gallic preference for Phallus—purely personal—know mittel europa humour rums to other orifice.—But don't think you will strengthen your impact by that particular.

Mass effect of any work depends on conviction of author's sanity=

Abnormal keenness of insight O.K. But *obsessions* arseore-ial, cloacal, deist, aesthetic as opposed to arsethetic, any obsession or tic shd. be carefully considered before being turned loose.=

Besides. Bloom has been disproportionately on

???

or hasn't he. Where in the hell is Stephen Tellemachus?

all the bloody makintosh while.

4. Fahrt yes, but not as climax of chapter = not really the final resolution of fugue.<sup>164</sup>

Not unexpectedly, Pound worried about Joyce's frank depiction of bodily functions, and the aesthetic twist Joyce placed on them. These elements evidently threatened

---

<sup>163</sup> P/J: 157.

<sup>164</sup> P/J: 158.

suppression on the grounds that the material was “lascivious.” Though Pound did not exercise his blue pencil in response to Joyce’s submission, his objections to Joyce’s writing are an important insight into the reception of Joyce’s work. If these are the elements of Joyce’s work that worried Pound—radical narrative technique, “obsessions,” and an expulsion of gas to conclude the episode—his contemporaries were quite likely to react negatively to the same portions of Joyce’s text.

### **Cyclops**

*Cyclops* was printed in four installments, for publication in November 1919, December 1919, January 1920, and March 1920 issues. *Cyclops* is an episode that contains three kinds of potential offense: (1) long, frank discussions of the political climate of 1904, (2) recurring interpolations of parody, by an anonymous narrator whose subject matter includes militarism and politics, and (3) frank discussion of an obscene nature. Once again, Anderson, anticipating the reaction of the U.S. Post Office, dealt with the last of these by expurgating of *Ulysses* for the November 1919 installment. Anderson’s decision was prudent. The passage she deleted, in the Rosenbach manuscript, discusses the effect of death by hanging, in which Alf Bergnan details the consequent erection of the unfortunate invincible, Joe Brady:

—What’s that? says Joe  
—The poor bugger’s tool that’s being hanged, says Alf.  
—That so? says Joe.  
—God’s truth, says Alf. I heard that from the head warder that was in Kilmainham when they hanged Joe Brady, the invincible. He told me when they cut him down after the drop it was standing up in their faces like a poker.  
—Ruling passion strong in death, says Joe  
—That can be explained by science, says Bloom. It’s only a natural phenomenon, don’t you see, because on account of the ...  
And then he starts with his jawbreakers about phenomenon and science and this phenomenon and the other phenomenon.

The distinguished scientist Herr Professor Luitpold Blumenduft tendered medical evidence to the effect that the instantaneous fracture of the cervical vertebrae and consequent scission of the spinal cord would, according to the best approved tradition of medical science, be calculated to produce in the human subject a violent ganglionic stimulus of the nerve centres of the genital apparatus, thereby causing the elastic pores of the corpora cavernosa to rapidly dilate in such a way as to facilitate the flow of blood to that part of the human anatomy known as the penis or male organ resulting in the phenomenon which has been denominated by the faculty a morbid upwards and outwards philprogenitive erection *in articulo mortis per diminutionem capitis*.<sup>165</sup>

In substitution of Joyce's text, Anderson inserted ellipses points and, in an asterisked footnote, wrote, "A passage of some twenty lines has been omitted to avoid the censor's possible suppression."<sup>166</sup>

In addition, Anderson, like Pound before her, may have excised a reference to urination. The following words were also omitted from the *Little Review* text (*LR* text appears in roman font; omitted words in italic): "So I just went round to the back of the yard *to pumpship* and begob (hundred shillings to five) while I was letting off my (*Throwaway* twenty to) letting off my load gob says."<sup>167</sup> (Unlike Bergnan's narration, this omission may have been accidental, for it makes little sense to deliberately excise *to pumpship* while letting the *load* let off, stand.) Anderson's anticipation of censorship proved effective this time: the November 1919 number was allowed to pass through the mail. The second installment was also allowed to pass through the mail, but the third installment of the Cyclops episode brought a direct threat from the U.S. Post Office.

---

<sup>165</sup> *RM* 12.17–18 (P291–292 L393–394 N304–305 – P292–293 L394–395 N305).

<sup>166</sup> *LR* November 1919, p. 49.

<sup>167</sup> *RM* 12.48 (P320–321 L435–436 N335); *LR* November 1919, p. 52. *Throwaway* was italicized in the *Little Review*; only the italic typeface of *to pumpship* is mine.

In January of 1920, Anderson and Heap were told that if they did not stop printing *Ulysses*, the Post Office would put them out of business.<sup>168</sup> To make the threat felt, the third installment of *Cyclops* brought suspension of mailing privileges for the January 1920 issue. Jane Heap wrote a letter to Joyce. Joyce, having never been in direct contact with the editors, mistook Heap for a gentleman, but he shared her communications with him in a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, dated February 25, 1920:

A Mr Heaf or Heap of the *Little Review* wrote to me a very friendly letter and complimentary letter in which he said that the U.S.A. censor had burned the entire May issue and threatened to cancel their licence if they continue to publish *Ulysses*. This is the second time I have had the pleasure of being burned while on earth so that I hope I shall pass through the fires of purgatory as quickly as my patron S. Aloysius.<sup>169</sup>

The letter from Heap that Joyce refers to is unpublished, but it does survive at the Rare Books and Manuscript Collections of Cornell University. Paul Vanderham examined the letter and summarizes Heap's contention in her letter to Joyce—that the suppression was due to Joyce's “disrespect for Victoria and Edward’—not to mention their empire.”<sup>170</sup>

### **Nausicaa**

Nausicaa was published in three installments in the *Little Review*—in the April 1920, May–June 1920, and July–August 1920 issues. The first two installments were set in type and mailed unsuppressed. Two omissions occurred in this portion of the text, and lost typescripts make accountability for the omissions indeterminable. Like the potentially accidental omission in *Cyclops*, the first of these, based on its innocuousness alone, could have been a mistake on the part of Anderson's printer. Unlike *Cyclops*, in which the Rosenbach document was submitted to typists for eventual publication, this

---

<sup>168</sup> Margaret Anderson, *My Thirty Years' War*, p. 178.

<sup>169</sup> *L I*: 137.

<sup>170</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 34.

omission also may be explicable in terms of collateral descent. Italicized text represents this variance:

She often looked at them dreamily when she went there for a certain purpose and thought about those times because she had found out in Walker's pronouncing dictionary *that belonged to grandpapa Giltrap* about the halcyon days what they meant.<sup>171</sup>

It seems unreasonable to assume that this omission was deliberate, for the possessor of the dictionary could hardly have been offensive. Regarding the second omission, the same cannot be said with full confidence. Bloom is musing on the effect of pheromones, when his thought associatively leads to recollection of a nun in Tranquilla, who liked the smell of oil. The following italicized text, present in the Rosenbach manuscript, is missing in the *Little Review*: "Girl in Tranquilla convent that *nun* told me liked *paraffin* oil."<sup>172</sup> If this was a deliberate excision, it makes little sense why one would excise the word *nun* without excising the word *convent*. Omission of the word *paraffin* also could have been a mistake; if so, the corruption more likely occurred before setting up the type for the *Little Review*. The word *paraffin* is the last word on the manuscript page, so the typist (and subsequently, Joyce, during review) may have missed it.

Two more alterations, both in the final installment of *Nausicaa*, appear in comparison of the Rosenbach manuscript and the *Little Review* printing. The first, we know to be deliberate: "Mr. Bloom with careful hand recomposed his *wet* shirt."<sup>173</sup> The excision of the word *wet* was made by Ezra Pound. Writing to Quinn, Pound informed the attorney that he had tried to make some changes in the *Nausicaa* episode, but as a consequence received a "thoroughly insulting and abusive letter" from Joyce. In spite of

---

<sup>171</sup> *RM* 13.17 (P339–340 L462 N355); *LR* May–June 1920, p. 64.

<sup>172</sup> *RM* 13.38 (P350–351 L478–479 N367–368); *LR* July–Aug. 1920, p. 49.

<sup>173</sup> *RM* 13.41 (P353 L481–482 N369–370); *LR* July–Aug. 1920, p. 44.

the strength of Joyce's reaction, Pound informed Quinn, "I did myself dry Bloom's shirt."<sup>174</sup>

One remaining difference between the *Little Review* text and that of the Rosenbach manuscript is not accounted for in surviving correspondence. This final act of censorship, due to its content, indicates a deliberate excision. In the Rosenbach manuscript, the episode closes with "Oh sweetie All your little white up I saw. Dirty girl. Made me do love sticky."<sup>175</sup> Yet in the *Little Review*, this text reads, "Oh sweetie all your little white I made me do."<sup>176</sup> The most overt reference to masturbation, *Love sticky*, is now gone. But even more so, *dirty girl* has been excised. Bloom's attribute to Gerty is, in Bloom's psychic life, more a compliment than an insult, but to the censors keeping a watchful eye on the *Little Review*, *dirty girl* would strike as a most offensive attack upon the innocence of youth. Whether Pound or Anderson was responsible for this variance, the passage, as altered, appears deliberately altered.

Despite these excisions, to a careful reader, Bloom's masturbation was a discernible event in the *Little Review*'s text. Even so, the third installment of *Nausicaa* was allowed to pass through the mails. This final installment of *Nausicaa* brought a deluge of protesting letters from Anderson's subscribers. In her autobiography, Anderson recounts being particularly wounded by these complaints, for her own sake, but more so, for the sake of Joyce. One of these letters Anderson reprinted in her autobiography. This was a typical response:

I think this is the most damnable slush and filth that ever polluted paper in print. I have persisted in reading it to the end. I

---

<sup>174</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 441. The letter from Pound to Quinn is dated October 31, 1920. The letter from Joyce to Pound is unpublished, if it survives.

<sup>175</sup> *RM* 13.59 (P364 L497-498 N381-382).

<sup>176</sup> *LR* July-Aug. 1920, p. 58.

wanted to know why those responsible for printing what the authorities condemned should jeopardize their own reputations unless there was something intrinsically beautiful even though misunderstood by the censors. And so, as I say, I persisted in reading to the bitter end of Episode XIII. Damnable, hellish filth from the gutter of a human mind born and bred in contamination. There are no words I know to describe, even vaguely, how disgusted I am; not with the mire of his effusion but with all those whose minds are so putrid that they dare allow such muck and sewage of the human mind to besmirch the world by repeating it—and in print, through which medium it may reach young minds. Oh my God, the horror of it.

With all the force of my being I reject thinking of you as part of this hellish business. I loathe the possibility of your continuing to associate yourself with such degradation. It defies all that is moderate in speaking of it. No one connected in any measure, or having any such part or parcel with a person who could know such filth, think such . . . but what is the use? It pollutes one to speak of it, even to cry out against it. I hate, I loathe, I detest the whole thing and everything connected with it. It has done something tragic to my illusions about America. How could you?<sup>177</sup>

Aside from the vehement emotive nature of this letter, two other elements are noteworthy: one, the perception that young minds were particularly vulnerable to printed obscenity (much would be made of this in the eventual prosecution of *Ulysses*), and two, that purity was deeply associated with the current American culture. (It is striking that the ban upon *Ulysses* lasted the precise duration of Prohibition: 1920 to 1933.) The letter struck such a deep chord in Anderson that she replied to it. The editor explained that

only a person who has been ‘crucified on his sensibilities’ would write as Joyce writes of his experiences with mankind and with nature, . . . that only a very exceptional man could revenge himself on the banality, the aridity, the obscenity from which he had suffered by transcribing it so flawlessly into an epic criticism of mankind.<sup>178</sup>

Aside from defending Joyce, Anderson also defended herself. A portion of her rebuttal to this complaint was also reprinted in her autobiography:

---

<sup>177</sup> Margaret Anderson, *My Thirty Years' War*, pp. 212–213.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 214.

You received a copy of the *Little Review* at your own request. This was a tacit agreement to deal with it courteously. You received it from me. You have heard me speak of James Joyce with reverence. And yet you did not hesitate to speak of him to me with grossness. You know that I regard his work as the high water-mark of the literature of to-day; you know also that in five minutes an analyst of half my skill could unmask your profound ignorance of all branches of art, science, life. On what then is your temerity toward me based? It is not important that you dislike James Joyce. It is as it should be. He is not writing for you. He is writing for himself and for the people who care to find out how life has offended and hurt him.<sup>179</sup>

Anderson, like Pound, believed that artists should be free to work without regard for the patronage of audience: the binding and compromising effort of considering this patronage would only effect compromised artwork. Like Joyce, Anderson also believed that art transcends obscenity.<sup>180</sup> That art and morality could be discussed on the same platform was incomprehensible to Anderson. In her opinion, art could be judged only by the mastery of its own devices. Despite Anderson's competence in defending Joyce, her personal defense is a bit mitigated by yet unmentioned hypocrisy.

In the letter above, Anderson notes the contractual nature of subscription to her magazine—a contract that Anderson believed to be implicitly endowed with courteous treatment thereof. This defense was a fitting response to a subscriber to the *Little Review*. Yet in mailing the final installment of *Nausicaa*, Anderson made perhaps one of the greatest mistakes of her administration in publishing the magazine. In an effort to boost subscriptions, the editor sent unsolicited copies to prominent New York residents. One of these fell into the hands of an attorney's daughter who, aghast at Bloom's masturbation, gave the issue to her father and demanded the magazine be prosecuted. So accordingly,

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., pp. 213–214.

<sup>180</sup> See the discussion of Joyce's submission to *St. Stephen's*, an article entitled "Drama and Life," in which Joyce examines the implications of Aquinas's theory of beauty, in Chapter 3 of this thesis.



Edward Swann, District Attorney of New York, received a letter from this young woman's father:

If such indecencies don't come within the provisions of the Postal Laws then isn't there some way in which the circulation of such things can be confined among those people who buy or subscribe to a publication of this kind? Surely there must be some way of keeping such 'literature' out of the homes of people who don't want it even if, in the interests of morality, there is no means of suppressing it.<sup>181</sup>

Regardless of how strong one feels a champion of free speech, this complaint is an undeniably defensible one: freedom of speech generally involves the freedom to choose communities of discourse. Though the prosecutors of the *Little Review* violated freedoms of speech, Margaret Anderson treated her second-rate mailing privileges indelicately when she sent unsolicited copies of the *Little Review*.

Swann handed the complaint over to his assistant, Joseph Forrester, who sought the advice of John Sumner, successor to Anthony Comstock, secretary of the New York Society for the Prevention of Vice. Forrester's move toward Sumner was also, in context of the initiation of charges, a suitable one, for it was precisely the innocence of youth that John Sumner was sworn to protect. In response, Sumner initiated the process of sending *Ulysses* to court.

### **Oxen of the Sun**

Before *Ulysses* went to trial, Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap managed to publish the first half of *Oxen of the Sun* in the September 1920 issue of the *Little Review*. *Oxen of the Sun* was neither censored nor suppressed, but the fate of *Ulysses* was now on a much more threatened trajectory. If Anderson and Heap were incriminated for

---

<sup>181</sup> Paul Vanderham, as quoted in John Sumner, "The Truth about 'Literary Lynching,'" *The Dial* 71, no. 1 (July 1921), p. 67.

serializing Joyce's novel, neither American nor British printers would consider publishing the book unexpurgated when Joyce finished the second half of the novel. Provided the book was printed outside the English-speaking world, there still would be an embargo on its importation to English-speaking readers in the United States and the United Kingdom. Also, in the United States, copyright law did not protect literature legally deemed obscene.

### ***Serial Publication Comes to an End***

Bruce Arnold, in his narrative coverage of the history of *Ulysses*, states, "*Ulysses* is an obscene book." But Arnold is careful to clarify this statement. "It is obscene not today in the accepted legal sense of the term but in the much simpler form in which the word has a precise Latin meaning, that it deals frankly with behaviour, habits and actions which in life are generally private."<sup>182</sup> I think this is right. *Ulysses* is not a perverse work of literature; rather, Joyce made the psychic lives of his characters the forefront of dramatic action in his novel, and sexuality, political unrest, and institutional dissent are among the psychic events of a Dubliner in 1904. Joyce merely dealt with these frankly.

Oxen of the Sun was the last episode of *Ulysses* serialized. Obscenity was the official charge in the suppression of *Ulysses*, and the events that brought Anderson and Heap to trial were fairly judicious with regard to these charges. Sumner was, by virtue of his office, sworn to protect the innocence of youth. Furthermore, precedent in determining the obscenity of publications included the criteria of "into whose hands the publication may fall" (i.e., someone susceptible to corruption). In short, Joyce's novel was primarily banned for obscenity.

---

<sup>182</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991, p. 1.

Yet it should be remembered that *Ulysses*'s venue, as well as Joyce's depiction of political and institutional dissent, registered his work on the radar of U.S. Post Office officials charged with governance of the Espionage and Sedition Acts. The innovative narrative style of *Ulysses* bred further paranoia among these government officials and among *Ulysses*'s first readers. Vanderham offers the following evidence, worth quoting at length:

Fritz Senn has rightly remarked that 'Few works of literature ... can have appeared more chaotic and less patterned than *Ulysses* did to its first unprepared readers.'<sup>183</sup> Many early reviewers of the novel responded to its apparent chaos in terms which suggest why government authorities in the United States might have been expected to greet its publication with hostility. For example, in rejecting Valery Larbaud's idea that *Ulysses* marked the 're-entrance [of Ireland] into high European literature, John Middleton Murray wrote that Joyce

acknowledges no social morality, and he completely rejects the claim of social morality to determine what he shall, or shall not, write. He is the egocentric rebel *in excelsis*, the arch-esoteric. European! He is the man with the bomb who would blow what remains of Europe into the sky. ... His intention, so far as he has any social intention, is completely anarchic.<sup>184</sup>

S.P.S. Mais likened the anarchic quality of Joyce's novel to the Russian Revolution: 'Reading Mr. Joyce is like making an excursion in to Bolshevik Russia: all standards go by the board.'<sup>185</sup>

Mais most directly equates the style of *Ulysses* to a political agenda—as if toying with established literary conventions were equivocal to proposing anarchist thought. Murray accuses Joyce of a deep depravity of social morality, which strikes as an especially ironic

---

<sup>183</sup> Quoted from "Weaving, Unweaving" *A Star Chamber Quiry: A James Joyce Centennial Volume 1882–1982*, ed. E.L. Epstein (New York: Methuen, 1982), p. 45.

<sup>184</sup> Quoted from John Middleton Murray, untitled review of *Ulysses*, *Nation & Athenaeum*, xxxi (Apr. 22, 1922), p. 124.

<sup>185</sup> Quoted from "An Irish Revel: And Some Flappers," *Daily Express* (March 25, 1922), n.p.; reprinted in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, vol. 1, ed. Robert H. Deming (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 191. These passages are quoted in Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 29.

kind of ignorance; it is precisely a calling of social morality that cultivated Joyce's dissent, an objection to British exploitation of Irish subjects. And Fritz Senn does well to remind us of the connection between Joyce's stylistic innovations and the similitude of chaos, which is, among those who fear it, a hallmark of anarchism.

In short, the narrative experiments of *Ulysses* created a great deal of suspicion among a readership hyperalert to traces of political dissent. *Suspicion* may even be a generous term—correspondence between Pound and Joyce elevate *suspicion* to paranoia. In a letter dated July of 1920, Pound wrote, "News item or rather phrase of conversation from ex-govt. official: 'The censorship was very much troubled by it (*Ulysses*) during the war. Thought it was all code.'"<sup>186</sup> Joyce replied to this news item with clear irritation:

The typescript could not have seemed suspicious except for *Sirens* which was published long after the armistice. And as for said government official if he has no money to give let me never hear of him again in this life or the next.<sup>187</sup>

Joyce merely depicted psychic life as dramatic action, yet the resultant neologisms, lack of syntax, textual eccentricities, and linguistic experimentation appeared to government officials a much different kind of linguistic code: an enemy cipher. So while the official charges against *Ulysses* were obscenity, a formidable objection to its message and its means of message was registered in public opinion, and the publication was registered on the radar of authorities.

Serial publication in the United Kingdom was far more challenged, even, than in the United States. In the United States, distributors and publishers were held liable for licentious or obscene material, but in the United Kingdom, as stated earlier, printers held this liability. When possible, Weaver did publish portions of the *Ulysses* text. In London,

---

<sup>186</sup> *P/J*: 182.

<sup>187</sup> *L III*: 13.

five installments were published in serial form in 1919 by the *Egoist*. These episodes included Nestor (Jan.–Feb. 1919), Proteus (Mar.–Apr. 1919), excerpts from Hades (July 1919 and Sept. 1919), and Wandering Rocks (Dec. 1919). Because publication in the *Egoist* occurred almost a year later than publication in the *Little Review*, the *Little Review* publication was used as Weaver's setting copy for Nestor and Proteus; hence, the urination omission recurred in Proteus. Five single leaves of the typescript survive for Wandering Rocks, but it is unclear whether these documents were Weaver's setting copy or the setting copy for the 1922 first edition. (These surviving typescript pages may have been the *Egoist*'s printer's copy, returned to Joyce.) For the remaining episodes, typescripts used as setting copy for Weaver's publication are lost. (This includes one lost copy of typescripts for many of the episodes, for even though Weaver was not able to serialize much of *Ulysses*, Joyce and Pound continued to send the documents to Weaver.) After the December 1919 issue, Weaver's printer found Joyce's material too risky, and Weaver was unable to find another willing to print it. In addition to objections by her printer, Weaver also received complaints from subscribers about *Ulysses*, some going so far as to cancel subscriptions. Weaver, mindful of the keeping the *Egoist* in print and careful not to preempt copyright for the novel when it was finished, deemed it prudent to discontinue publication.

### CHAPTER 3: *ULYSSES*, THE BOOK

Habent sua fata libelli!

James Joyce, *Letters*

#### INTRODUCTION

The stories of *Ulysses*'s days in court are sensational, and any fan of Bloom's trial-by-Circe events would be equally fascinated by the proceedings and conduct of the nonfiction players. Several works have been written on the 1921 and 1933 trials. For a quick read, I recommend "Joyce, *Ulysses*, and the *Little Review*," by Jackson R. Bryer (in *South Atlantic Quarterly*). For book-length study, *Purity in Print: The Vice Society Movement and Book Censorship in America*, by Paul S. Boyer, is a rigorous work. *Girls Lean Back Everywhere: The Law of Obscenity and the Assault on Genius*, by Edward de Grazia, places *Ulysses* in the historical context of literary censorship and landmark trials in legal definitions of obscenity. B.L. Reid's biography of John Quinn, *The Man from New York*, offers an interesting and relevant perspective of the 1920 suppression and the 1921 trial. For an exceptional review of the 1933 trial, with commentary on the life of attorney Morris Ernst and his role in the history of obscenity law, see *Our Joyce*, by Joseph Kelly. The documents of the 1933 trial of *Ulysses* were edited by Michael Moscato and Leslie Le Blanc, and were published in 1984 in *The United States of America v. One Book Entitled Ulysses by James Joyce*. In this chapter, I briefly summarize coverage presented in much greater detail in these works. I do so to contextualize the effect the legal proceedings against *Ulysses* had upon the development and publication of the novel.

---

*Epigraph*: "Books have fates of their own." In a letter dated April 2, 1932, from Joyce to Bennet Cerf, publisher and writer, founder of Random House. See *L III*: 242.

## **ULYSSES GOES TO COURT**

When John Sumner was consulted by Forrester about the letter District Attorney Swann received, Sumner began the process of bringing legal charges against *Ulysses*. He did so by walking down to the Washington Square Bookshop, where the *Little Review* was currently being sold by Josephine Bell Arens. Arens was a well-supplied distributor of the *Little Review*, because Anderson and Heap were renting the apartment unit above the bookshop. On September 29, Sumner bought from Arens several copies of the July–August 1920 issue, containing the closing portion of *Nausicaa*. He submitted these, along with a written letter of complaint, to the Jefferson Market Police Court. The Magistrate who received Sumner’s package summoned Mrs. Arens to appear before him.<sup>188</sup>

When Arens told Anderson and Heap of this summons, the editors, in turn, notified John Quinn that the *Little Review* had been seized by authorities. Quinn, at first response, said he didn’t give a damn. Years earlier, when Quinn had first met Anderson and Heap, he regarded them with respect, for their tenacious promotion of the Arts and their courage.<sup>189</sup> Over the years, however, Quinn grew continually exasperated by the women. The attorney felt they were not business people. Quinn was able to forgive sloppy bookkeeping from time to time, and he often bailed the editors out financially, but his objections to their business practice were more philosophical, contending that they were too strong-willed and stubborn to heed

---

<sup>188</sup> Much of the coverage of historical events in the first trial of *Ulysses* comes from the research of Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, 1998, Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991 and 2004, Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 1982, and B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, 1968.

<sup>189</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 345.

practical advice.<sup>190</sup> This contempt escalated steadily over the years, so that by the time the *Little Review* was confiscated by Sumner, Quinn could not “think, speak, or write about them without foaming at the mouth,” and he had begun to refer to them in his correspondence with Pound as “those two rabbits.”<sup>191</sup> In spite of Quinn’s contempt for the editors of the *Little Review*, he recognized that if they were convicted, Joyce would not be able to obtain copyright for the finished novel, so Quinn agreed to act on the editors’ behalf without fee. In a letter to Ezra Pound, dated October 20, 1920, the attorney expressed his feelings about the matter quite clearly: “I am interested in Joyce, and in having ‘Ulysses’ published, and in nothing else.”<sup>192</sup>

Quinn’s strategy was simple enough. He had a realistic pessimism about the outcome of official charges of obscenity, so his main objective was to protect eventual book publication. The first step Quinn took was to call John Sumner, petitioning that Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap replace Josephine Arens as defendants in the case. This was agreed to by Sumner, and the editors were substituted for Arens at the Jefferson Market Police Court on October 4. Quinn also arranged a lunch meeting with Sumner for October 15, and Anderson and Heap went with Quinn. At their meeting, Sumner presented Quinn with the material of his complaint, and Quinn admitted that passages in the *Little Review* text risked charges of obscenity. But Quinn argued the point of Joyce’s genius. He presented Sumner with Evelyn Scott’s article on Joyce, published in the October 1919 issue of the *Dial*, entitled “Contemporary of the Future.”<sup>193</sup> Then Quinn emphasized that incriminating

---

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., p. 445.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., p. 442.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., p. 450.

<sup>193</sup> Evelyn Scott, “Contemporary of the Future,” *The Dial* 67 (October 1919).



the editors of the *Little Review* would complicate book publication for Joyce. Quinn also promised Sumner that *Ulysses* would no longer be serialized if the charges were dropped. (Sumner later attempted to negotiate this settlement for Quinn, but District Attorney Swann denied his petition.) Anderson, unsatisfied with Quinn's tactics, took a theoretical line of argument with Sumner, stating that the only relevant question in consideration of *Ulysses* was "Is it art?" Though the lunch meeting with Sumner was cordial enough, it was ineffectual. The magistrate at the Jefferson Market Police Court scheduled a preliminary hearing, to take place before Joseph E. Corrigan on October 21, 1920.

After his lunch meeting with Sumner, Quinn wrote two letters to Pound. The first was dated October 16 and the second, October 20. While *Ulysses* was being serialized, Quinn's cautions about suppression became more and more explicit. By the fall of 1918, the attorney no longer felt that expurgation was enough to protect Joyce's novel, and he advised Pound and Anderson to stop serializing *Ulysses* altogether. On October 16, 1920, Quinn's frustration had escalated to livid anger. He wrote a "powerful and unprintably gross letter of ten single-spaced pages"<sup>194</sup> to Ezra Pound, which included the following:

There are things in 'Ulysses' published in number after number of 'The Little Review' that never should have appeared in a magazine asking privileges of the mails. In a book, yes. In a magazine, emphatically no.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., p. 443.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid., p. 443.

Quinn was further exasperated by the demands of his time and the posture of Anderson and Heap, who seemed to Quinn to be pursuing martyrdom by means of Joyce's work.<sup>196</sup> In the same letter, Quinn wrote,

It can't even be pretended that such plain violations of the law are a good way to bring about its amendment. For such raw violations of the law, with subsequent convictions, are just the things that convince legislators that the law shouldn't be changed. ... Law is changed by public opinion, discreetly organized and not by flagrant violations leading to convictions.<sup>197</sup>

Quinn had clearly reached a breaking point with the editors, and he spoke with strong reason about tactics for publishing *Ulysses*. At the lunch meeting of October 15, Sumner had revealed to Quinn that the New York Society for the Prevention of Vice had not originated the complaint, and he told Quinn about the chain of events that initiated official confiscation. In the October 20 letter, Quinn wrote to Pound that this was not a case of entrenched philistinism, "not a case where Sumner, or Comstockery, or the Society can honestly be knocked," but that this was a case in which an offended citizen had spoken out.<sup>198</sup> Quinn refused to listen to the principles of American bigotry, and he warned Pound about taking that tack with him:

Don't for God's sake write to me any more about the illiberality of the United States, or its laws. The statute is identical with the British Act, copied from it. Not so strong as the French Act. Not so strong as the Belgian Act. ... So, don't blow off at your typewriter with the idea that this is a sign of provinciality, or anything peculiar to America.<sup>199</sup>

So it was that Quinn was put to the task of representing Anderson and Heap entirely on behalf of Joyce's interests, after having predicted the outcome of serialization. The

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., p. 446.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid., p. 447.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., p. 446.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., p. 447.

attorney believed that the practical future of the book *Ulysses* would be best served by a calculating, if disingenuous, defense, and he prepared for the preliminary hearing.

At the preliminary hearing, Sumner read the allegedly offensive passages of *Nausicaa*. Capitalizing on the conversation he had with Anderson on October 15, Sumner also stated that the editors of the *Little Review* admitted to publishing the work, and that they gloried in it. Corrigan retreated to his chambers to read the material of Sumner's complaint. When he returned, Quinn began his defense of Joyce. Arguing, as he did in his lunch meeting, that successful prosecution of the *Little Review* would deny copyright protection of a literary masterpiece to a serious writer, he then discussed obscenity according to its legal definitions. Relying on the Hicklin rule, Quinn took a pragmatic, rather than theoretical, line of argument, much to the chagrin of Anderson and Heap. Precedent in the Hicklin rule defined obscenity as the tendency "of the matter charged as obscenity to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."<sup>200</sup> As is clear from the letter that Anderson received from her subscriber, this was not merely legalese, but a common cultural sentiment of the time: American youth were a large part of the demographic considered "open to immoral influences." Quinn argued that if the *Nausicaa* passage fell into the hands of a young person, he or she would not understand it (this was a rather weak position, given the chain of events that brought *Ulysses* into the courtroom). Alternatively, Quinn argued, if it fell into the hands of an older person, those readers had already

---

<sup>200</sup> Regina v. Hicklin established this definition of printed obscenity in Great Britain in 1868 (English Common Law, LR 3 QB 36), and in 1896, presiding Supreme Court Justices confirmed the utility of the definition for the American legal system in *Rosen v. U.S.* and *Swearingen v. U.S.* This standard definition of obscenity was not revised to the definitions of being "depraved" according to "contemporary community standards" until 1957, in *Roth v. U.S.*

been educated and hence would not be susceptible to corruption. Rather, Joyce's work had an effect that would brace and deter, essentially, a beneficial moral effect. Unconvinced of Quinn's argument, Magistrate Corrigan declared the passage "where the man went off in his pants unmistakable in meaning, smutty and filthy within the meaning of the statute," and he ordered the case to go to trial.<sup>201</sup>

Quinn had few options left to him. One of those was to convince District Attorney Swann to drop the charges, by promising an end to serialization. Given Sumner's failed attempt to achieve this compromise, the success of such a tactic seemed unlikely to Quinn, so he decided to make every effort to postpone the trial until Joyce could complete the novel, hoping that copyright could be achieved before sentencing handed down. Quinn successfully arranged for three postponements. The last of these was a petition that the case be heard, not at the Court of Special Sessions, in front of three justices, but at the Court of General Sessions, where a jury would decide the effect of the allegedly obscene material. This was a reasonable request, given the precedent of the Hicklin rule—that obscenity in literature should be judged by its effects—but that is not why Quinn petitioned trial by jury. Quinn knew that a jury would be just as likely to incriminate the editors as justices would, but the motion promised the greatest temporal delay for Joyce's work.

In consequence of the pending motion, Quinn had to appear before Judge Crain at the Court of Special Sessions, where he argued again the great stakes of a ban. Quinn discussed the serious financial loss to both the editors of the *Little Review* and, more importantly, to James Joyce. Quinn's argument was successful, in the sense that Judge Crain was very impressed by it, yet it was unsuccessful in its outcome.

---

<sup>201</sup> Quoted in B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 449.

Quinn's argument backfired on him. Following Quinn's rationale, Judge Crain claimed that serious property rights were at stake, and that trial by jury would hold the case up in the Court of General Sessions for over a year. Quinn, Crain claimed, could have these issues resolved expediently in the Court of Special Sessions, and he rushed the case to trial.

The trial took place on February 14, 1921. Quinn held to the same line of argument, but he supplemented this with expert testimony of John Cowper Powys and Phillip Moeller of the Theater Guild. Powys declared that *Ulysses* was "too obscure and philosophical a work to be in any sense corrupting."<sup>202</sup> Moeller took the same line. Relying upon a Freudian analysis of Nausicaa, he claimed that *Ulysses* could not possibly have an aphrodisiac effect. Presiding Judge McInerney, unfamiliar with the novel Freudian theory, uttered an 'Oh rocks. Tell us in plain words' sentiment. Justice McInerney said, "Here, here, you might as well be talking Russian. Speak plain English if you want us to understand what you're saying." He then pressed Moeller for the effect of *Ulysses* on the average reader. Moeller replied, "I think it would mystify him." Evidently, *mystify* is not plain English either, for McInerney's colleague, unsatisfied, asked again, "Yes, but what would be the effect?"<sup>203</sup>

Just as Quinn began to call a third witness, Chief Justice Kernochan, irritated by what seemed to be a circus of testimony, declared that neither Joyce's reputation nor the expert testimony was of any significance in consideration of the offense. All that mattered were the passages so charged, and he ordered Forrester to read them aloud. One judge responded to this with paternal concern, insisting that Anderson be

---

<sup>202</sup> Quoted in Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 22.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

escorted from the courtroom. Quinn, smiling, and mystified himself, replied, “But she is the publisher.” “I am sure she didn’t know the significance of what she was publishing,” he replied. In the end, Anderson was allowed to remain in the courtroom.<sup>204</sup>

After the passages of *Nausicaa* were read aloud in court, two of the judges pronounced them incomprehensible, and an adjournment of a week was taken for study of the text.<sup>205</sup> When court reconvened on February 21, Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap were declared guilty of publishing obscenity and fined twenty-five dollars each. (Anderson and Heap could not afford the fine, so Quinn paid it for them.) The effects of this incrimination were felt immediately. Joyce had been negotiating publication with B.W. Huebsch for years; in the months just before the trial, this task had been taken up by Weaver and Quinn. Huebsch controlled acquisitions for Viking Press, which carried the American editions of *Dubliners* and *Portrait*. Early in April, Huebsch informed Weaver that in light of the outcome of Anderson and Heap’s trial, he was unwilling to publish the book unless changes were made to the text. Since Joyce refused to make them, Huebsch declined to publish an American edition of *Ulysses*.

## **THE EFFECT OF THE TRIAL**

### ***Self-Censorship***

One of the potential effects of censorship upon a work of literature is that the author will recoil from the negativity of the experience with self-censorship, in consideration of audience or at the behest of publishers, like Huebsch, who

---

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>205</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 454.

necessitate authorial revision for publication. In these situations, the author does revise the text, but he or she does so in consequence of pressure from publishers and audiences. Such is the case with Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, which scholarly editors only recently restored to the Ur-version text Margaret Anderson reviewed.<sup>206</sup> In recent years, some scholars have claimed that Joyce suffered self-censorship as well, after the ban on *Ulysses*, in the act of ongoing revisions to the first half the novel, and in the continued development of the second half. For example, in *Ulysses in Progress*, Groden notes that the 1921 revisions of *Ulysses* for book publication made obscenity more obscure; overtly obscene passages were altered to symbolism of epic parallels. Groden is careful only to note correlation—the correlation between the time period of the ban and the time period of such revisions. Paul Vanderham, in a chapter entitled “Making Obscenity Safe for Literature,” pushes Groden's observation of correlation to a causal chain of events, arguing that the ban upon *Ulysses* caused Joyce to make 1921 revisions of the character of self-censorship. Yet Vanderham offers evidence for the argument rather selectively, and he makes some slippery presentations of Groden's work as well. For example, in 1977, Groden wrote, “Joyce overhauled *Ulysses* through his revisions of the last six months of 1921. Such a complete reworking does not seem to have occurred to him before the summer of 1921.”<sup>207</sup> Vanderham appropriates Groden's passage as follows:

Although Joyce's late revision continues the transformation he had initiated in 'Circe,' it 'does not seem to have occurred to him before the summer of 1921,' some two months after he discovered

---

<sup>206</sup> See Theodore Dreiser, *Sister Carrie*, ed. James West, et. al (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).

<sup>207</sup> Michael Groden, *Ulysses in Progress* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 194.

that *Ulysses* had been definitively suppressed by the Court of Special Sessions in New York.<sup>208</sup>

Vanderham deeply embeds his appropriation of Groden's language in the argument, and both scholars are missing some important evidence in the evolution of *Ulysses*.<sup>209</sup>

Vanderham traces the development of Joyce's oeuvre, from his first essays to the completion of *Finnegans Wake*. In the early essay "Drama and Life," Joyce challenges the notion that Aquinas's theory of beauty defines the purpose of art as instruction, edification, and elevation. The essay was censored; it was rejected from the university publication that commissioned it, *St. Stephen's*. The theory takes its final form in the development of Joyce's fictional oeuvre. Working out the same rhetorical line of argument, in *Stephen Hero*, Stephen argues,

I am unable to find even a trace of this Puritanic conception of the esthetic purpose in the definition which Aquinas has given of beauty. . . . The qualifications he expects for beauty are in fact of so abstract and common a character that it is quite impossible for even the most violent partizan to use the Aquinas theory with the object of attacking any work of art that we possess from the hand of any artist whatsoever.<sup>210</sup>

As noted in *Stephen Hero*, when you follow Joyce's (or in this case, Stephen's) interpretation of Aquinas to its logical conclusions, it emancipates the poet from all moral laws. Vanderham claims that in *Portrait*, this rationale has been diffused by humor:

—You say that art must not excite desire, said Lynch. I told you that one day I wrote my name in pencil on the backside of the Venus of Praxiteles in the Museum. Was that not desire?

---

<sup>208</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 79.

<sup>209</sup> Because Vanderham makes the strongest case for self-censorship, I will primarily respond to his work.

<sup>210</sup> James Joyce, *Stephen Hero*, ed. Theodore Spencer (New York: New Directions, 1944), pp. 77, 79.



—I speak of normal natures, said Stephen. You also told me that when you were a boy in that charming carmelite school you ate pieces of dried cowdung.

Lynch broke again into a whinny of laughter and again rubbed both his hands over his groins but without taking them from his pockets.<sup>211</sup>

In this way, Vanderham argues, Joyce was a writer continually responsive to the effects of censorship—as his oeuvre moves increasingly away from claim to suggestion, from realism toward symbolism. In *Portrait*, Stephen also states that

The feelings excited by improper arts are kinetic, desire or loathing. Desire urges us to possess, to go to something; loathing urges us to abandon, to go from something. These are kinetic emotions. The arts which excite them, pornographic or didactic, are therefore improper arts. The esthetic emotion (I use the general term) is therefore static. The mind is arrested and raised above desire and loathing.<sup>212</sup>

But this is not a presentation of the same *Stephen Hero* theory diffused with humor, but simply the same theory presented in a more developed fashion in *Portrait*. It strikes as particularly ironic that Vanderham attempted to evince self-censorship with revisions to passages that, despite the varying forms they took, never deviated from Joyce's rhetorical position in "Drama and Life." Joyce's interpretation of the Aquination theory of beauty is the same position that Anderson argued with Sumner, that art transcends moral laws, and artists should be judged only by the mastery of their craft.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> P: 5.1114–1122.

<sup>212</sup> P: 5.1106–1113.

<sup>213</sup> John Yeats (in a letter to John Quinn dated October 14, 1920) quoted the above passage from *Portrait* and encouraged Quinn to capitalize on it as an illustration to the courts of Joyce's aesthetic purpose. Yeats wrote, "I can't but think that this quotation is most important[.] Joyce is, *as you know*, a very serious artist working out his problems with the most intense diligence—and in this paragraph he defines for us his purpose. That it is to lift the mind above both desire and loathing—it expresses his very strong disapproval of the art that incites desire—what he calls pornographic art—In all his art his object is to get rid of desire, loathing, bring about a perfect tranquility of the mind, soul—what he calls a *static* state as opposed to *kinetic*[.] If therefore anything he writes awakens bad or libidinous desire it is not his fault." As noted above, Quinn elected to take a pragmatic rather than theoretical line of

One of the most compelling features of this dissenting argument—that Joyce did suffer self-censorship in response to the reception of his work—is the rubric upon which Vanderham titled his chapter. This is an essay included in *Our Exagmination*, the first critical work of *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>214</sup> In *Exagmination*, a critic who goes by the name of G.V.L. Slingsby poses the question, “Is Joyce making obscenity safe for literature?” Scholarship has revealed that Slingsby was in fact Joyce, writing criticism of his own novel. Did Joyce engage in self-censorship in response to the official censorship of his work? This is an important question, but let us telescope the evidence to examine the evolution of *Ulysses*, in particular, and let us examine the whole of evidence available to do so.

Consider the following example. Though Vanderham does not cite this example in particular, the revision is the type of which Groden observes and Vanderham posits as evidence of self-censorship. This passage is particularly useful, because it falls into the category of expurgations of the serialized version of *Ulysses*, noted above. While Bloom is musing on Martha Clifford’s letter in the Lotus Eaters episode, his Rosenbach text reads, “Has her monthlies probably.”<sup>215</sup> The passage was excised from the *Little Review*. In 1921, Joyce revised the passage: “Has her roses probably.”<sup>216</sup> The overt reference to Martha’s menstruation was substituted with a symbol consistent with Homer’s *Odyssey*, the intoxicating sensations of the Lotus

---

argument in defense of Joyce. Despite Yeats’s acumen, the resistant response of the justices to theoretical defenses of Joyce’s work (such as those offered by Moeller and Powys) indicate that Quinn would not have had any more success had he taken Yeats’s advice. (The letter from John Yeats to John Quinn is archived at the New York Public Library, the John Quinn Memorial Collection. It is quoted here as it was in Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, who quotes from William T. Noon, *Joyce and Aquinas* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957], p. 34.)

<sup>214</sup> William Carlos Williams and Samuel Beckett, eds., *Our exagmination round his factification for incamination of work in progress* (Paris: Shakespeare and Company, 1929).

<sup>215</sup> *RM* 5.8 (P75–76 L96–97 N78–79).

<sup>216</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *Ulysses: The Critical and Synoptic Edition*, 1984, p. 156.

Eaters isle of languor. Yet when we examine the revisions entered on the second round of proofs of the Lotus Eaters episode, we find that Joyce was simultaneously embedding epic parallel structures (not necessarily to obscure obscenity) and composing additional material likely to be considered obscene. For example, Joyce added the following, rather innocuous, passage:

Test: turns blue litmus paper red. Chloroform. Overdose of laudanum. Sleeping draughts. Lovephiltres. Paragoric poppysyrup bad for cough. Clogs the pores or the phlegm. Poisons the only cures. Remedy where you least expect it. Clever of nature.<sup>217</sup>

This is certainly an instance of Joyce's concentration on epic structural parallels, but its placement in the text does nothing to obscure or alter potentially obscene passages. More importantly, some of the material added during the second round of proofs is as obscene as those struck from his *Little Review* text. Inside the church, Bloom muses on the power dynamics of sexuality:

Like that haughty creature at the polo match. Women all for caste till you touch the spot. Handsome is as handsome does. Reserved about to yield. The honourable Mrs and Brutus is an honourable man. Possess her once take the starch out of her.<sup>218</sup>

An author engaging in self-censorship would not continue to add material of the same offense.

The following correlation, also posited as evidence of self-censorship by Vanderham, is true. At the same time that Joyce was making his 1921 revisions, he was compiling and lending his schema (now commonly referred to as the Linati schema) to Carlo Linati, Joyce's Italian translator, and Valery Larbaud, French writer and critic who was preparing to present *Ulysses* at the December 1921 séance hosted

---

<sup>217</sup> U1922: 81.

<sup>218</sup> U1922: 71.

by Adrienne Monnier. Vanderham posits that Joyce compiled the Linati schema as a tool for self-censorship, and as a publicity stunt to emphasize the epic parallels over alleged obscenity. Vanderham even states, “Joyce first began to talk about the ‘schematic structurings’ of his novel in September 1920,” just after the confiscation of the *Little Review*.<sup>219</sup> But this is a misappropriation of Joyce’s correspondence. Joyce began to talk about the *graphic presentation* of the structure of his novel in September 1920, but he had been talking about the schematic structurings of his novel since its earliest inception. Conversations and correspondence with Frank Budgen in particular bear this point.<sup>220</sup> In addition to Budgen’s account of his conversations with Joyce, evidence is present in their correspondence: once Joyce left Zurich and corresponded, rather than conversed, with Budgen, all Joyce’s published letters inform Budgen of the schematic structurings Joyce intended while he worked on *Ulysses*. Budgen was not the only correspondent whom Joyce spoke with of structure. On July 20, 1919, two years prior to the compilation of the Linati schema, Joyce wrote to Weaver,

Mr. Brock also wrote me begging me to explain to him the method (or methods) of the madness but these methods are so manifold, varying as they do from one hour of the day to another, from one organ of the body to another, from episode to episode, that, much as I appreciate his critical patience I could not attempt to reply. . . . Moreover, it is impossible for me to write these episodes quickly. The elements needed will only fuse after a prolonged existence together.<sup>221</sup>

In this letter, written two years before the compilation of the Linati schema, we find the evidence of Joyce’s design, later presented in the schema: the variation of time of

---

<sup>219</sup> Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship*, p. 76.

<sup>220</sup> See Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*.

<sup>221</sup> *L I*: 128.

day, of organs of the body, of variance from episode to episode. It is far more reasonable to infer that Joyce did not need a graphic presentation of his design in order to compose his book, and the composition pace prevented him from assembling it for others' use until that became absolutely necessary—when his translator began working on the novel, and when his friend, Larbaud, prepared a presentation. These necessities coincide with the book's impending publication. When Joyce compiled the schema in 1921, he was economizing the explanation that Mr. Brock begged for in 1919, but his letter to Weaver indicates that in 1919, Joyce had neither time nor sufficient cause to pause from his composition and supply this information. In addition, I find Joyce's statement that elements needed would only fuse after prolonged existence together, the writer's recognition that Homeric structural ties would be woven into the novel in its final stages of composition. The concinnity of Joyce's novel took full shape in the final revisions of 1921, but it seems that even if the book had never been banned, such would have been the nature of Joyce's artistic process.

The schema could not have been, as Vanderham suggests, a publicity stunt to emphasize epic credibility and obscure obscenity, for although Joyce lent his schema to Linati and Larbaud, he did not widely distribute it. He refused its inclusion in the printed book, and he did not substitute his roman-numeral episode divisions with the Odyssean titles of the schema.<sup>222</sup> Were the schema designed as an ambassador to legitimate his work and as a tool for self-censorship, it would have featured much

---

<sup>222</sup> Joyce adamantly refused that any explanatory materials be bound in an edition of *Ulysses*. See Edward L. Bishop, "Re-Covering *Ulysses*," *Joyce Studies Annual* 5 (1994): 35–36.

more prominently in the printed book, as a reproduction in the 1922 edition, or as episode titles incorporated into the text of the printed book.

At the same time that Joyce was providing his translator and his friend with the schema, he had also recently received a suitcase full of his earliest notes for the novel, notes that had been left behind in Trieste in 1918. On April 3, 1921, Joyce wrote to Weaver, “By dint of writing several letters and telegrams to Trieste I received safely a fortnight ago the bag full of notes for *Ulysses*. I regard this as one of the triumphs of my life.”<sup>223</sup> These notes held a wealth of material of his early creative ideas for *Ulysses*: ideas that were epic by their very nature and contributed to the finishing touches that Vanderham claims are self-censorship. The notes that Joyce received date to the same time period as the *Zurich Notebook* of 1918, “remarkable for its garnerings from Victor Bérard’s *Les Phéniciens et l’Odyssee*, W.H. Rosher’s *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, the plays of Thomas Otway and Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*.”<sup>224</sup> It is plausible that Joyce’s creative efforts in 1918 were devoted to harvesting the materials of these texts, and that in 1921, while making revisions for book publication, he direly wanted the notes he had compiled three years earlier, to fuse the elements together.

The most logical and forceful refutations of the claims that Joyce suffered self-censorship, I offer in three points. (1) Joyce refused to make alterations to his text that would have enabled book publication in the United States and the United Kingdom. Certainly, the financial incentives of achieving copyright would have been the most motivating factor for making revisions of self-censorship. But the majority

---

<sup>223</sup> *L I*: 161.

<sup>224</sup> *U1986*, p. 1861.

of passages in *Ulysses* that were expurgated in serialization, that caused the official ban, and that Huebsch necessitated revision for publishing, Joyce let stand as he had originally composed them for book publication. (2) *Ulysses* was officially called pornographic writing at the trial of 1921. Pornography, etymologically, derives from ‘graphic,’ or portrait, and ‘porno,’ meaning whore. If we are talking about the portrait of the whore, Joyce was merely getting started. He composed Circe between June and December of 1920, in the same time period of aggressive suppression and official confiscation. The typescripts for Circe required almost as much time as its composition: these were not completed until April of 1921, after the *Little Review* editors were incriminated. Circe had yet to be submitted to his Dijon printer when Joyce was made aware of the outcome of Anderson and Heap’s trial. Were Joyce suffering from self-censorship, he could have struck obscene passages from the Circe episode before submitting the typescript to his Dijon publisher. Along the same line, the most obscene portion of the entire novel is Penelope, and this episode was composed well after the ban.<sup>225</sup> And (3), despite the plethora of revisions that obscure obscenity with epic or structural parallels, there are just as numerous instances of additions to the novel that are overt offenses of obscenity and institutional dissent, of the same category as those that caused the ban. Additions to Lotus Eaters and Hades, in particular, offer such evidence.

Groden’s statement, that such a complete reworking does not seem to have occurred to [Joyce] before the summer of 1921, is simply false. Perhaps the assessment is symptomatic of working with limited amounts of prepublication material, all of which provide internal evidence, without due examination of the

---

<sup>225</sup> See also the letter Joyce wrote to Quinn, dated November 17, 1920, quoted below.

external evidence of Joyce's correspondence. Joyce's statement to Weaver, in the summer of 1919, that the elements would not fuse until a prolonged existence together, indicates Joyce's expectation that he would weave together the parts after the development of the whole, a weaving only possible once the novel neared completion. Furthermore, in all of the correspondence regarding negotiations for book publication, correspondence dating from 1918 through 1920, Joyce insists that he must have several sets of proofs, preferably with wide margins. When Joyce was still working with Huebsch, albeit through Weaver and Quinn, to negotiate American publication, he wrote the following letter to John Quinn (November 24, 1920):

Apart from what I wrote already concerning the publication by Huebsch, I have two other things to add. The first is: proofs. I began *Ulysses* in 1914 and shall finish it, I suppose, in 1921. This is, I think, the twentieth address at which I have written it—and the coldest. The complete notes fill a small valise, but in the course of continual changings very often it was not possible to sort them for the final time before the publication of certain instalments. The insertions (chiefly verbal or phrases, rarely passages) must be put in for the book publication. Before leaving Trieste I did this sorting for all episodes up to and including *Circe*. The episodes which have the heaviest burden of addenda are *Lotus-eaters*, *Lestrygonians*, *Nausikaa* and *Cyclops*. Therefore I must stipulate to have three sendings of proofs (preferably a widemargined one must be pulled), namely:

- (1) A galley-page proof of all the book up to and including *Circe*.
- (2) A similar proof of the three chapters of the *Nostos*
- (3) A complete proof of the book in page form.

The second point is: that if Huebsch decides to print it and the copies are subscribed, an advance (and a substantial advance) of royalties be paid over by him at once.<sup>226</sup>

In this letter, we find that Joyce was premeditating revisions to the novel during typesetting, and while he minimizes the extent to which he may revise (stating they are chiefly phrases, rather than passages), he also states that the notes fill a small

---

<sup>226</sup> L III: 30–31.



valise! The insistence that Joyce be given ample presswork on which to revise and add material, with preference for wide-margined proofs, is indication of Joyce's plans for revision well before the summer of 1921.

Vanderham's argument selectively and partially notes revisions without attention to the whole of them, and any thorough study of Joyce's 1921 revisions reveals characteristic Joycean defiance and mockery of the prosecution of his work. Joyce may have delighted in the idea that his *Wakean* linguistic play obscured obscenity, for obscenity is certainly present in the *Wake*. But the narrative obscurity of obscenity in the *Wake* is not a case of self-censorship, in which an author—in motivation of procuring copyright, in response to publishers, or in wounded response to social mores—revised his text or altered his artistic intentions. This is mere coincidence of aesthetic design, and the coincidence evidently delighted Slingsby (or James Joyce).

Joyce was momentarily discouraged by the ban upon *Ulysses*. When Sylvia Beach became his confidante in this, she quickly alleviated the discouragement when she offered alternative arrangements for publication. Joyce consoled himself over the ban, stating that serialization had already achieved its intended aim: the novel was brought to the forefront of public attention. Sylvia Beach took this estimation one step further. In her memoir, she stated that the ban upon *Ulysses* was fortunate, that it brought the novel to the attention of the public, and otherwise, the novel would have suffered a very small interest among readers due to its erudition and innovative style.

### ***French Printing***

Another common argument about the significance of the ban is that, as a consequence, Joyce had to have the text printed in France, by French typesetters who did not speak English. But great care must be taken in the way we state this: There is a correct form of this point, i.e., that the obscenity and the political dissent of *Ulysses* necessitated printing in a non-English-speaking part of the world. It is not true that the ban necessitated French printing. The situation of printing *Ulysses* in a non-English-speaking country was neither sudden nor surprising. In the earliest correspondence regarding publication of the novel, the 1917/1918 period, Joyce and his advocates were considering having the book printed in Africa or in Japan. Joyce, as noted earlier, even encouraged Weaver to have the *Egoist* printed in Paris. At the culmination of these considerations, just before the ban, John Rodker was negotiating for English publication by offering his English imprint if printers in Paris would set the book up in type and export the pages.<sup>227</sup> So French typesetting was not a news flash, nor a sudden event; most importantly, it was not a consequence of the ban, but an always-present consideration to overcome the obstacles of publication, which arose as soon as Joyce's publishers attempted to serialize the novel in progress.

### ***The Length of Circe***

Recently, scholars, including Groden and Gabler, have claimed that the ban upon *Ulysses* freed Joyce from the grueling schedule of serialization, and hence, the

---

<sup>227</sup> John Rodker (1894–1955), essayist, poet, novelist, editor, and publisher. In 1919, Rodker established the Ovid Press (though it was “nearly a one-man show”) and published limited editions of T.S. Eliot, Wyndham Lewis, and Ezra Pound. In 1919 he also took over Pound’s role as foreign editor for the *Little Review*. Ovid Press only lasted for a little over a year, but in 1922, Rodker continued to aid Joyce in publication, namely, by smuggling copies of *Ulysses* past the postal authorities. (For more on John Rodker and his involvement in the modernist movement, see <http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/research/fa/rodker.bio.html> [accessed August 21, 2007].)

length of *Circe* owes much to these events as well. The claim seems reasonable, given the coincidence of legal action and the composition of *Circe*.<sup>228</sup> But this claim gives the impression that Joyce became aware of the confiscation, took a deep breath, and in newfound luxury of time, got carried away with *Circe*. Published correspondence can neither confirm nor refute the claim, but we do have several variables to consider regarding the length of *Circe*.

Most surviving evidence suggests that Joyce was not fully aware of the confiscation and legal proceedings until he was almost done writing *Circe*.<sup>229</sup> The writer seems to have sat mostly in darkness about the events of confiscation and the legal proceedings that followed, removed by several degrees by the expansive network of advocates on both sides of the Atlantic. Joyce received letters from John Quinn regarding the prosecution of the *Little Review*, but he received these letters much later than they were sent, because the writer was transient and the postal services unreliable.

On September 29, 1920, Joyce wrote to Rodker, “Has no number of the *Little Review* appeared since May–June?”<sup>230</sup> This is the first mention that Joyce suspects some delay in publication of the American serialization. (Anderson and Heap already had his typescripts for *Oxen of the Sun*.) His suspicions of delayed publication were confirmed in November, but still only vaguely. After the confiscation, but before the trial, Joyce wrote to Pound, on November 5,

---

<sup>228</sup> As stated above, *Circe* was composed between June and December of 1920, and the typescripts were prepared between January and April, 1921; confiscation of the *Little Review* occurred on September 29 of 1920, and the legal proceedings ended in February 1921.

<sup>229</sup> Joyce was clearly aware of the suppression of the publication (see epigraph to Chapter 2), but the bulk of correspondence regarding the confiscation of *Nausicaa* was exchanged in November, when he was almost done writing *Circe*.

<sup>230</sup> *L III*: 23.

I knew nothing of the affair till yesterday when Mr Thayer of the *Dial* wrote to me ... saying that he was sorry about the *Little Review*. This explained nothing and I had heard nothing from Miss Anderson, Miss Heap or Mr Rodker. ... The last number of the L.R. I saw was the July–August number with the close of the *Nausikaa* episode. Has no number appeared since then or has *The Oxen of the Sun* episode been published wholly or in part? Is the *Little Review* closed?<sup>231</sup>

When Quinn wrote the two letters (quoted above) to Pound in October of 1920, he informed the poet of legal proceedings in the United States. The attorney also included copies of his letters to be sent to Joyce. Quinn was communicating with Joyce through Pound because the attorney did not have a reliable mailing address for Joyce. The writer was having trouble finding a flat in Paris that he could afford at the time (more on this anon). Despite that Quinn sent the letters on October 20, Joyce did not receive them until early November. On November 10, he wrote to Rodker, “I have received letters from New York concerning a prosecution. Have you received any letters from the New York editor? I should like to know before I reply.”<sup>232</sup> On November 20, he wrote to Weaver,

I have received two very long letters from Mr Quinn of New York concerning *Ulysses* and *The Little Review* but before I reply I should like to know whether you have had any communication from anybody in New York on the subject. It seems that the case is on its way now to a third hearing and I knew nothing about it till Mr Pound sent me on Mr Quinn’s letters.<sup>233</sup>

Early in November, Joyce was completing his sixth draft of the Circe episode; the bulk of Circe had already been composed.

In the letters Joyce received, Quinn wrote very clearly about the matter and also gave frank advice about the options left to the writer. Joyce could either (1)

---

<sup>231</sup> L III: 27–28.

<sup>232</sup> L III: 29.

<sup>233</sup> L I: 149.

forbid further publishing of episodes of the novel in the *Little Review*, (2) “emasculate” or “castrate” or at least “circumcise” any “parts” he still insisted on publishing there, or (3) expect certain suppression of the magazine and the probable death of any hope for printing the whole book in the United States.<sup>234</sup> With Quinn’s letters, Joyce also received a cover letter from Pound, in which Pound advised Joyce to give Quinn “a free hand” in the matter, even if it meant withdrawing *Ulysses* from the *Little Review*.

Joyce replied to Quinn, also via Pound, in a letter dated November 17. The letter was shrewd and wary. Quinn later accused Joyce of being evasive and of side-stepping the issue, which is indeed what Joyce did. But Joyce’s response was representative of his experience. After three pages of complaint about the difficulty of his life, Joyce proceeded to discuss *Ulysses*, the *Little Review*, and the possibility of a private edition published by Huebsch in America.<sup>235</sup> Joyce distrusted the Viking Press publisher, owing to poor communications between the two of them. After having expressed repeated interest in *Ulysses*, Huebsch and Weaver were sent a contract shortly after Joyce moved to Paris. Weaver signed, but Huebsch did not. In the summer of 1920, Huebsch made a trip to Paris and got in touch with Joyce. The publisher suggested that Joyce alter and delete passages for publication, which Joyce refused to discuss. Huebsch then asked Joyce if he believed anyone would publish, and Joyce informed the publisher that “there was a scheme for having it printed in Paris for European circulation, whereupon [Huebsch] said: ‘Oh, in that case I could

---

<sup>234</sup> B.L. Reid, *The Man from New York*, p. 450.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 450.

print it off in New York from that edition and pay you nothing.”<sup>236</sup> Joyce took Huebsch’s remark to be a threat of piracy for American circulation, but Huebsch was attempting to warn Joyce of the likelihood that other publishers would pirate the text if the writer did not procure a copyrighted American publication.<sup>237</sup> In his letter to Quinn, Joyce stated that if he withdrew *Ulysses* from the *Little Review*, Huebsch would interpret Joyce’s withdrawal as a sign of weakness, and the publisher would not be slow to take advantage of it. Joyce wrote,

If the book be withdrawn by the L.R., already, as seems the case, the matter is easier. If it be not, possibly the arrival of the Circe episode (a tasteful production on which I am now engaged) will decide the matter.<sup>238</sup>

Ultimately, he told Quinn, “My intervention is useless.”<sup>239</sup> It seems Joyce was as exasperated and irritated by the whole affair as Quinn was, though for different reasons. The Circe episode, already in its sixth draft, was not quite a “tasteful” production, and Joyce’s sarcasm can only be read as defiant resignation to the fate of the book, whatever that may be.

The composition timeline of Circe was considerably longer than that of the other episodes. Joyce originally thought the composition of Circe would take no longer than composition of other episodes, and Circe did grow by length in the process of composing. Joyce stated that he rewrote the episode as many as nine times (accounts vary). His correspondence reveals four main variables that delayed the

---

<sup>236</sup> Ibid., p. 451.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., p. 452. When the James Joyce Estate gave Reid permission to print parts of the letter from Joyce to Quinn, they requested that the nature of Huebsch’s comment be clarified.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., p. 452.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid., p. 452.

completion of the episode: unreliable postal service, transience, illness, and preparation of the typescripts.

During composition, a suitcase full of working notes and drafts Joyce needed, which were mailed from Trieste in late June, went astray in the mails and did not reach Joyce in Paris until the fall of 1920. Joyce desperately spent his summer and fall trying to track down the mailed suitcase. In addition, transience dogged the heels of the writer, as he was instructed to find new residence in the same time. The following letters make clear the duration of these struggles. On September 29, he wrote to Rodker,

The case of books papers etc which I sent on from Trieste to enable me to write seems to be lost. I sent it on 29 June last. Have you any spare copies of the *Little Review* containing my novel? I should be glad to have them even temporarily as my copies were in the case. To add to this, I have received notice to quit this flat (if one can call it so) within a few weeks.<sup>240</sup>

These obstacles were largely caused by the state of political unrest in Europe.

International mailing networks often broke down, and crowding in exile cities was common. On November 5, 1920, Joyce wrote to Pound,

I am exhausted. An entire month of flathunting, out every morning and back at night, in taxis, buses, trams, trains, lifts, agencies, newspaper offices. I spent about 500 francs I am sure and found nothing so we are here again. I used to carry different parts of the Circe episode about with me. Very pleasant indeed. Also the case of books I had sent on from Trieste went astray. I had to write and wire and interview numerous people. I feared it was lost. At last it arrived after four months of its odyssey.<sup>241</sup>

On November 10, 1920, Joyce wrote to Weaver,

Circe has been very much delayed by a number of causes—my journey here, all the unsatisfactory interviews I have had here with

---

<sup>240</sup> *L III*: 23.

<sup>241</sup> *L III*: 27.

people who seemingly do not know their own intentions and also the fact that the case of books and documents which I sent on to Paris from Trieste on 28 June to enable me to write the two episodes *Circe* and *Eumeus* here went astray. After a great deal of writing, wiring and interviewing it was at last discovered at a station on the Franco-German frontier. It arrived a few days ago after its odyssey and I am now writing out the final (the sixth or seventh) draft of the episode which is about twice as long as the longest episode hitherto, *The Cyclops*.<sup>242</sup>

Transience and postal services may be blamed for the duration of composition time, but these are not the only obstacles that can be gathered from Joyce's correspondence at the time.

*Circe* was also delayed by two consecutive attacks of iritis in the summer and fall of 1920. The latter necessitated surgery and took Joyce away from his work for five weeks. When yet another attack occurred just as Joyce was finishing *Circe*, he found some means of making light of his plight. On December 29, 1920, he wrote to Weaver,

I have been ill for the past few weeks with my eyes but luckily it did not reach the iris. It is better now and I can begin to read and write again though I am plagued by violent neuralgia. The nerves of my head are in such a bad way that I think *Circe* must be revenging herself for the unpleasant things I have written about her legend.<sup>243</sup>

Despite the completion of *Circe*, the evolution of the episode into print was further delayed by the difficulty Joyce and Beach had finding typists willing to take on the task. The fits of iritis made Joyce's manuscripts for this episode highly illegible. Eventually, Beach employed an amanuensis, a Greek girl (Joyce thought her ethnicity a good omen) who recopied his manuscripts before sending them to typists. Even with legible exemplars, the histrionic textual design required patience. And

---

<sup>242</sup> L I: 149.

<sup>243</sup> L I: 150.



there is also the notorious incident of some pages being cast into the fire by a typist's husband, who was mortified by the content.<sup>244</sup> On February 4, 1921, Joyce wrote to Weaver,

I finished that episode [Circe] some weeks ago and sent it to be typed. It was returned to me by four typists as impossible. Finally it was passed into the hands of a fifth who, however, has only an hour or two free in the day to work at it, so that it will not be ready for some weeks more.<sup>245</sup>

The timeline of Circe's evolution in print was indeed long, but we may oversimplify if we attribute the lengthened composition of Circe to the legal proceedings against the book. We have much stronger evidence that Joyce simply suffered a number of detractions from his work in the fall of 1920. The length of the episode is first and foremost an effect of aesthetics, owing to two factors. First, Circe is the climax of the entire novel and a synecdoche of the whole. Second, the length of Circe, i.e., the number of pages it constitutes in the book, is most obviously due to its textual feature: a great deal of white space for its format as a play.

As with the claim of self-censorship, we may discredit Joyce's artistic mastery to suggest that the composition of *Ulysses* was so affected by suppression and censorship. The writer had a long history of struggle in which to formulate his positions regarding the censorship of his work, and over the course of time, repeated resistance of publishers, printers, and public censors only strengthened his artistic will; it did not compromise it. This is most evident in light of Joyce's reference to the Circe episode as a tasteful production, and when one reads the expanse of Joyce's oeuvre.

---

<sup>244</sup> See Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 507.

<sup>245</sup> *L I*: 156.

## *The Piracy of Ulysses*

So, if the ban upon *Ulysses*, as I attest, did not have any effect upon the development of the novel, what is the relevance of the censorship of serialization? As stated previously, the ban upon *Ulysses* meant that it was not protected by copyright law in the United States, as protection under the Copyright Act of 1842 only prevailed for “innocent” publications. Also, the United States did not sign as a member of the Berne convention, which honored copyright law across national boundaries, until President Reagan’s administration, in 1984. These legal strictures meant more than financial loss; they left Joyce’s work vulnerable to piracy.

Once Joyce began writing *Finnegans Wake*, his interest in *Ulysses* waned.

This was the common backlash of Joyce’s composition efforts. Talking with Georges Borach after the completion of the Sirens episode, Joyce said,

Since exploring the resources and artifices of music and employing them in this chapter, I haven’t cared for music any more. I, the great friend of music, can no longer listen to it. I see through all the tricks and can’t enjoy it anymore.<sup>246</sup>

After completing Eumaeus, Joyce wrote to Weaver,

Since then I have been training for a Marathon race by walking 12 to 14 kilometers a day, looking carefully in the Seine to see if there is any place where I could throw Bloom in with a 50 lb weight tied to his feet.<sup>247</sup>

The effect of the part was true to the effect of the whole. As journalist and scholar

Bruce Arnold reports,

By mid-1924, the book had become remote. Joyce told Harriet Shaw Weaver that he had to convince himself that he actually wrote it and he felt that he could no longer talk intelligently about it. Joyce’s interest in the continuing critical analysis of the book

---

<sup>246</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 459.

<sup>247</sup> *L I*: 171.

was a mild one. He read and judged the various academic and scholarly autopsies, and joked about them. In the later summer of 1925, in the wake of several of these, he told Harriet Shaw Weaver that he was going to organise a piece of ‘lower criticism’ which would include textual analysis of the book, but that thereafter the book could look after itself.<sup>248</sup>

Prone as Joyce’s book was to take on a life of its own, it was not capable of looking after itself. The text was kidnapped in the late 1920s by a New York publisher named Samuel Roth.<sup>249</sup> Roth was illegally printing and disseminating *Ulysses* in America without the author’s consent, and he was disseminating corrupt versions. Roth’s publication, entitled *Two Worlds Monthly*, often featured writings deemed to be obscene, and the publisher spent a total of eight years of his life in prison for publishing “obscenity” (including sixty days in 1928 for *Ulysses*). Roth published *Ulysses* in an attempt to lend clout to his publication, but as Joseph Kelly notes, “Roth probably sullied *Ulysses* more than *Ulysses* ennobled him.”<sup>250</sup>

Joyce made two maneuvers: he sought the legal advice of Benjamin Conner, an American lawyer in Paris, and he enlisted the informal aid of Ludwig Lewisohn and Archibald MacLeish, the only lawyers in the expatriate circle, who drafted and mailed the following protest:

---

<sup>248</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991, p. 51.

<sup>249</sup> Samuel Roth (1894–1974), writer, editor, translator, and publisher. After the First World War, Roth was given an assignment as a correspondent in England, where he came into contact with Joyce’s work. He first pirated *Work in Progress* in 1925, and then pirated *Ulysses*. The *Ulysses* piracy in *Two Worlds* ran from July 1926 to October 1927. In 1928, the police raided Roth’s print shop, and the publisher spent 60 days in jail for his plates of *Ulysses*, owing to the novel’s obscenity. Roth was as much an advocate of free speech as Anderson was; he simply went about it, at times, without the author’s consent. The prosecution of Roth eventually led to the revision of legal statutes regarding printed obscenity, in *Roth v. U.S.* Perhaps direct defiance of the law does lead to its revision, contrary to Quinn’s claims. (“Samuel Roth.” *Dictionary of American Biography*, Supplement 9: 1971–1975. Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1994. Reproduced in *Biography Resource Center*. Farmington Hills, Mich.: Thomson Gale. 2007. <http://galenet.galegroup.com.proxy.ulib.iupui.edu/servlet/BioRC> [Accessed August 22, 2007].)

<sup>250</sup> Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 90. There is an important bibliographic distinction to make with regards to *Two Worlds Monthly*. The piracy occurred during 1927, but the issues that carried *Ulysses* were incorrectly dated 1929.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the *Ulysses* of Mr. James Joyce is being republished in the United States, in a magazine edited by Samuel Roth, and that this republication is being made without authorization by Mr. Joyce; without payment to Mr. Joyce and with alterations which seriously corrupt the text. This appropriation and mutilation of Mr. Joyce's property is made under colour of legal protection in that *Ulysses* which is published in France and which has been excluded from the mails in the United States is not protected by copyright in the United States. The question of justification of that exclusion is not now in issue; similar decisions have been made by government officials with reference to works of art before this. The question in issue is whether the public (including the editors and publishers to whom his advertisements are offered) will encourage Mr. Samuel Roth to take advantage of the resultant legal difficulty of the author to deprive him of his property and to mutilate his creation of his art. The undersigned protest against Mr. Roth's conduct in republishing *Ulysses* and appeal to the American public in the name of that security of works of the intellect and the imagination without which art cannot live, to oppose to Mr. Roth's enterprise the full power of honorable and fair opinion.<sup>251</sup>

This statement was sent to literary artists and enthusiasts all over the world, and published with 167 signatures, fittingly on Joyce's birthday, 1927. Supporters included Richard Aldington, Arnold Bennett, E.M. Forster, John Galsworthy, Wyndham Lewis, James Stephens, Rebecca West, Virginia Woolf, and Albert Einstein, among many notable others.

John Quinn passed away in 1924 from cirrhosis of the liver, but Joyce sought the council of Quinn's surviving legal partner, and he also sought the advice of Ezra Pound's father, Homer Pound, who was a practicing attorney in the United States.<sup>252</sup> Eventually, Quinn's legal firm took up the case, but the firm could not sue for copyright infringement; instead, they filed charges of libel in the use of James Joyce's

---

<sup>251</sup> Reprinted in Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 586.

<sup>252</sup> John Quinn's cirrhosis was not, as is often the case, caused by alcohol consumption.

name on the *Two Worlds Monthly* publication.<sup>253</sup> An injunction against Roth was obtained, but two years later, Roth pirated the text again, this time, publishing a book. The edition was published in 1929, but it was a forgery of the 1927 legitimate printing by Sylvia Beach and Darantiere. Roth's pirated edition was so well packaged that in 1953, Slocum and Cahoon reported that it "almost certainly never existed."<sup>254</sup> The physical differences between Roth's 1929 piratical edition and Beach's 1927 legitimate printing are so subtle that even today book dealers often confuse the two. But the texts therein are significantly different. Roth's 1929 pirated edition is littered with serious errors and corruptions.

As stated in Chapter 1, in the 1960s Jack Dalton, from the University of Austin at Texas, began the call for a critical edition of *Ulysses*. He was the first scholar sensitive to the corruption of Joyce's text, and Dalton demonstrated that the first American edition of *Ulysses* was set from Samuel Roth's 1929 pirated text. Bennet Cerf, of Random House, believed they were working with Beach's 1927 printing, when in fact, they had a copy of the piracy.

In short, claims that the censorship of *Ulysses* effected self-censorship in the final development of the novel, claims that French typesetting was a consequence of the ban, and claims that the length of Circe was an effect of the ban are misguided. The most significant effect of the ban upon *Ulysses* was the work's vulnerability in

---

<sup>253</sup> The piracy of Joyce's *Ulysses* was somewhat karmic: The English Players, founded by James Joyce and Claude Sykes in Zurich, had engaged in a bit of piracy themselves. In 1917, they produced George Bernard Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. They did so without the consent of Shaw. When the playwright wrote in protest to Joyce, Joyce's defense was that the play was not protected by copyright, for obvious reasons.

<sup>254</sup> Slocum and Cahoon, *A Bibliography of James Joyce, 1882–1941*, pp. 28–29.

the legal sector to piracy, and the piracy of Joyce's work led to a very corrupt American edition, when legal publication became possible.

### **THE FIRST EDITION, PARIS**

With the serial publication of his novel discontinued on both sides of the Atlantic, Joyce went in despair to see his friend Sylvia Beach. Beach was a young American woman who had come to Paris some years before. In November of 1919, she opened a small bookstore and lending library called Shakespeare and Company. Beach and Joyce met each other at a party of Andre Spire's in 1920. Beach found Joyce perusing a bookshelf, somewhat removed from the conversation. She approached him and said, "Is this the great James Joyce?" Her question set the tenor for their relationship.

Much of Beach's memoir revolves around the publication of *Ulysses*, but even more palpable, Beach venerated Joyce. A truly sweet woman, she rarely registered an opinion without comment of Joyce's on the same—everything from preference of truffle flavors to the color of the Pounds's furniture. Beach also had a rather skewed opinion of Joyce's relationship with his contemporaries: "Joyce was, of course, their god, but their manner toward him was one of friendliness rather than veneration."<sup>255</sup> Very few of Joyce's contemporaries thought of him as a god; some had a strong distaste for the man. D.H. Lawrence thought Joyce was the vilest mind of the century. George Bernard Shaw (if he can be called a contemporary) demonstrated controlled contempt for the writer and his writings. And Virginia Woolf thought *Ulysses* was the work of "a queasy undergraduate scratching his pimples."<sup>256</sup> Beach also reports, "As

---

<sup>255</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 40.

<sup>256</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 528.

for Joyce, he treated people invariably as his equals,” but this not quite true either.<sup>257</sup> Joyce did demonstrate a democratic respect for all individuals regardless of class. He would often invite his servers to join him in dining when they finished their work. He had long conversations with cab drivers and valets, always demonstrating a particular interest in humanity. However, he did not always treat his contemporaries engaged in artistic production with equal interest and respect. Upon dining for the first time with Wyndham Lewis and T.S. Eliot, Joyce did not take much notice of Eliot, and Eliot thought Joyce arrogant, his excessive politeness a brand of insincerity. The three became, “after their fashion, friends,” but Lewis and Eliot both felt Joyce was self-absorbed, and condescending toward the work of his contemporaries.<sup>258</sup> To read Beach’s memoir, it is not surprising that, when Joyce came to her after the ban in despair, she offered to publish *Ulysses*, despite having never published literature before.

Joyce and Beach quickly made plans for publication, in a first printing consisting of 1000 copies in a three-tier structure of quality and price. Beach solicited subscribers for the first printing while the book was in press, and Weaver was a great aid to Beach in enlisting them. As for a printer, Adrienne Monnier suggested hers, Maurice Darantiere of Dijon.<sup>259</sup> Though historians of *Ulysses* have often attributed a great deal of the corruption of Beach’s edition to the Dijon printer, this is generally overstated. Darantiere was a third generation Master Printer, and possession of the mere technical resources to bring out a book like *Ulysses* speaks to his experience in

---

<sup>257</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 50.

<sup>258</sup> See Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, pp. 494–95.

<sup>259</sup> Adrienne Monnier befriended Beach and had a bookstore opposite Beach’s, on the street of rue de le Odeon, which featured contemporary French writers’ works.

printing. Leonard and Virginia Woolf were first approached as possible printers, but they didn't even possess enough type to set up an episode of *Ulysses*. Furthermore, Darantiere was a very erudite man and a bibliophile, and he spoke English fluently. Darantiere's foreman, Hirschweld, also spoke English, and Jack Dalton, in his research, noted Hirschweld's process of "correcting" Joyce's work, though this was often the act of "correcting" intentional "errors." Dalton's research has been, I believe, misunderstood in subsequent literature. It is reasonable to assume that the situation of "correcting" intentional "errors" would have been equally bad, if not worse, had the novel been set in type in an English or American printshop. In fact, of all of those who acted on behalf of bringing *Ulysses* into print, save Beach and Weaver, none demonstrated more patience than Maurice Darantiere.

The pace of typesetting was grueling. As noted above, Joyce anticipated revisions in the final stages of composition. Joyce never reviewed his presswork without making additions: every stage of reviewing galleys and page proofs added new creative material to the text. Sylvia Beach described the proofs as "adorned with Joycean rockets and myriads of stars guiding the printers to words and phrases all around the margins."<sup>260</sup> Beach also reported that Joyce, by his account, wrote one third of *Ulysses* on the proofs.<sup>261</sup> Darantiere developed a mock gesture of despair, throwing his hands into the air when proofs were returned by Joyce. Examination of the surviving documents confirms the extensiveness of these revisions; they threw off Darantiere's pagination, and were at times illegible, owing to the crowded margins of the page. Neither the French printer nor French typesetters were as responsible for the

---

<sup>260</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare & Company*, 1991, p. 58.

<sup>261</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.



high incidence of textual corruption in the 1922 edition as was Joyce himself. But Beach was a staunch advocate of Joyce's, and she respected his skill and artistry. She instructed Darantiere to provide the writer with as many proofs as he wanted.

Not only was Joyce actively and creatively involved in reviewing presswork in 1921, he also had yet to finish writing episodes 16 through 18. At the time Beach offered to publish *Ulysses*, Joyce had strong outlines for these episodes' content, but drafting had yet to begin. In the final stages of writing, Joyce was composing Ithaca and Penelope at the same time. His blue manuscript book of these compositions contains text for the former on rectos, for the latter, upside-down on versos. Joyce told his friend Robert McAlmon that he was "working like a lunatic, trying to revise and improve and connect and continue and create all at the one time."<sup>262</sup>

The prospectus for subscription to the first printing of the novel indicates that the book's publication was scheduled for October of 1921.<sup>263</sup> October came and went, and the book was not ready. Joyce had only finished composing Penelope at the time. Ithaca was not completed until Christmas of the same year. In December 1921 and January 1922, subscribers began to contact Beach, asking, where was *Ulysses*? Joyce became as fevered for its publication as his expectant readers—in part, because he was exhausted by this final effort of creation, but mostly because he was superstitious. He direly wanted to see *Ulysses* published on his fortieth birthday, February 2, 1922. Darantiere sent a telegraph to Joyce, saying that three copies would be deposited on the train from Dijon to Paris on his birthday, and that they would surely arrive the following day. But Joyce insisted otherwise, enlisting Sylvia Beach

---

<sup>262</sup> L I: 173. See also Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*.

<sup>263</sup> See L I: 121, and the annotated catalogue of holdings at the University of New York, Buffalo.

to push the printer for delivery on his birthday. Beach succeeded, and Darantiere placed the parcel on the overnight express from Dijon to Paris. At 7:00 A.M., Sylvia Beach went to the train station, met the conductor, and received the parcel, the first bound copies of *Ulysses*. Arnold notes, “To say that *Ulysses* was published on Joyce’s fortieth birthday is to stretch a point. Legally, to denote publication, the availability of more than three copies of a book would be required.”<sup>264</sup> The parcel Beach received contained only two copies. Nonetheless, Beach delivered one to Joyce at his flat, and took the second to display in the window of Shakespeare and Company. By 9:00 A.M., a crowd had already gathered on the sidewalk outside the little bookstore to catch a glimpse of this scandalous novel. This attention continued all day long.<sup>265</sup> Despite this widespread interest, a challenge delivering copies of the novel to Joyce’s subscribers still remained.

The first printing of *Ulysses* consisted of 1000 copies on February 22, 1922. Weaver commissioned the second printing of the novel. Using Darantiere’s standing type, Weaver gave the Egoist imprint to the second printing of the first edition, intending to distribute these copies in the United States and the United Kingdom. The second printing ran to 2000 copies, published on October 12, 1922. Of these, 500 were impounded by the U.S. Postal Service and destroyed. Five-hundred copies were printed as a replacement of these (the third printing, in January of 1923), and after one was sent to Harriet Shaw Weaver, the remaining 499 were shipped through Folkestone, where they too were seized and, presumably, destroyed, though there is no record of their destruction. As copies of the book continued to be shipped, customs

---

<sup>264</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991, p. 26.

<sup>265</sup> See Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*.

officers became familiar with the size and look of the package. Hundreds of uncounted copies were not reaching Joyce's subscribers. The situation became so desperate that Harriet Shaw Weaver began hand-delivering copies to Joyce's readers in Western Europe. American subscribers owe the deliverance of their copy to Ernest Hemingway. When U.S. Post Office officials began seizing the parcels at customs, Beach, in her turn of despair, told Hemingway about this state of affairs. Hemingway responded, "Give me twenty-four hours."<sup>266</sup> Within days, Hemingway's friend set up temporary residence at the border of Canada, and the copies were shipped to him. Every day, Hemingway's friend took the ferry across the border where he mailed one copy at a time. In March, Joyce wrote to Robert McAlmon,

Only 4 copies of *Ulysses* were sent for the 1<sup>st</sup> week after publication owing to a mistake about the cover. You can imagine the scenes at the shop! A nerveracking conclusion, indeed. At last some 80 or 100 copies come but I am still in a turmoil helping Miss Beach to get them off and packing parcels in a way they were never packed before. The British Museum ordered a copy and so did the *Times* so that I advise you to go to confession for the last day cannot be far off.<sup>267</sup>

In March, copies from Darantiere began to come steadily, and Joyce wrote to Weaver, "I have not been able to rest yet as I help in (or interfere with?) the packing and checking and sometimes address envelopes in a child's handwriting and carry volumes to the post."<sup>268</sup> Sales of *Ulysses* in bookstores were a covert operation as well. Even if booksellers outside France received their copies, they could not be displayed, but had to be hidden unless requested by a customer.

---

<sup>266</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare & Company*, 1991, p. 87.

<sup>267</sup> *L II*: 181.

<sup>268</sup> *L II*: 183.

Joyce was exhausted from the final efforts of writing (he didn't write for a year following the completion of *Ulysses*). He aided Beach in smuggling *Ulysses* past Post Office authorities, he waited for the earliest reviews to appear, and in his correspondence, he expressed deep concerns over the number of errors in the 1922 edition. He questioned Sylvia Beach as to whether they would be continued in future editions. He wrote to Harriet Shaw Weaver, complaining of the defects, especially in the Ithaca and Penelope episodes.<sup>269</sup> He wrote to Frank Budgen as well, saying that the errors disfigured his book. Perhaps the most striking evidence of Joyce's discontent with the textual state of the 1922 edition is the alteration, in page proofs, to the publisher's notes. Written in Joyce's hand is the following apology for the textual corruption of the novel: "The publisher asks the reader's indulgence for typographical errors unavoidable in the exceptional circumstances." This apology was signed, also in Joyce's hand, "Sylvia Beach."<sup>270</sup> Joyce did make an effort to rectify these corruptions, as early as possible, in the form of errata slips. Joyce reviewed the first edition through Cyclops and compiled errata,<sup>271</sup> and Weaver and Rodker aided in compilation of the errata, by reviewing the whole book and suggesting corrections. However, Joyce did not include some of Rodker's suggestions, stating, "These are not misprints but beauties of my style hitherto undreamt of."<sup>272</sup> Between the three of them, they compiled an eight-page errata slip, which was tipped into the second printing of the novel. Darantiere incorporated most of these into the third printing, but

---

<sup>269</sup> L I: 176.

<sup>270</sup> For a reproduction of Joyce's hand revising the publisher's original statement, see James Joyce, *Ulysses: A Facsimile of Page Proofs for Episodes 16–18*, JJA 17, p. 305.

<sup>271</sup> The original errata slip in Joyce's hand is archived at Buffalo as V.F.4, item 102, case XIII.

<sup>272</sup> L I: 187.

he was not able to incorporate all of them, so a second, four-page errata slip was prepared from the first, and tipped into the third and fourth printings.

After the seizures of the second and third printing, Weaver realized she could not give her English imprint to the novel yet, so Beach resumed publication. For the fourth printing, Beach began the tradition of including the historical account of the prosecution of *Ulysses*, citing the seizure of the second and third printings. The fourth printing carried forward the corrections of the third, but because the exemplar of the third printing is singularly rare (only Weaver's copy is extant), the fourth printing is often cited as the first printing to incorporate these. The fifth through seventh printings carried forward the corrections, at 2000 copies per printing each.

What is commonly referred to as the eighth printing (it was advertised as such) was actually the second edition of *Ulysses*.<sup>273</sup> In May of 1925, Darantiere proposed to Beach that the type be reset, and Beach employed a proofreader from the *Daily Mail* to proofread corrections to the novel. In May of 1926, the second edition was printed in 2000 copies. When Joyce reviewed this text, "with the aid of two pairs of reading glasses and a magnifying glass," Beach recounts that, within moments, he exclaimed, "Three errors already!"<sup>274</sup> The second edition was printed in four runs through 1930, at 4000 copies per run. As is evident from Beach's account, Joyce's eyesight had taken several turns for the worse. His success in correction, we cannot measure.

---

<sup>273</sup> Bibliographers define a new edition as any text in which at least 50 percent of the type is reset.

<sup>274</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 98.

## THE FIRST AMERICAN AND ENGLISH EDITIONS

When the ban upon *Ulysses* was issued in the United States, B.W. Huebsch was deep in negotiations with Joyce for the publication of *Ulysses*. As noted above, Huebsch declined to print an unexpurgated version after Anderson and Heap were incriminated, so Joyce withdrew *Ulysses* from the table. Yet in the 1930s, *Ulysses* engendered advocates in Morris Ernst and Alexander Lindey, two upcoming attorneys in New York who did more than any other legal professionals to challenge censorship, clarify legal definitions of obscenity, and promote freedom of speech.<sup>275</sup> The son of Bohemian immigrants who were the only Jews in Uniontown, Alabama (where Ernst was born in 1888), Ernst was a bit of a Bloom character himself: aside from being Jewish, he demonstrated parallax of perspective, he always aided the underdog, and he was a pure pragmatist. Having been rejected from Harvard, Ernst attended Williams College, where in a fraternity he found some sense of belonging. In his later life, he despised the Greek organizations, for he slowly recognized that his own membership only came at the exclusion of others: just after Ernst left Williams, his fraternity drafted rules against admitting Jews, unless they were the sons of members.

Ernst's passion for free speech came about when he lost a trial. He was defending the book *What Happens*, and he noticed that when the jurors took breaks, they would relax by reading tabloids, which contained material far more offensive than the book Ernst was defending. The attorney thought this an indication that he would win the case and was stunned when the jury found the book obscene. In

---

<sup>275</sup> The information presented here concerning Ernst, obscenity law, and the 1933 trial is the work of Joseph Kelly, in *Our Joyce* (see References), who examined unpublished archives of Ernst's, including autobiographical material hitherto unexamined.

conversation with a juror after the judgment, the juror said that the members had been offended by the word *masturbate*; if the publisher had substituted *masturbate* with *self-abuse*, the jury would have acquitted. Ernst later recalled, “This so offended what little I have of rationale thought that I immediately started to write articles on the subject of obscenity.”<sup>276</sup>

Ernst despised what he recognized as an embedded class prejudice in the statutes of printed obscenity. Text written in Latin could legally and freely print obscene material, the classics that were canonized could legally print obscenity, and censorship of a contemporary work rarely came about until it was printed in an affordable edition. The demographic that the Hicklin rule referred to, those susceptible to corruption and into whose hands a publication may fall, was not only a demographic of age, but also of class. This was the most groundbreaking assertion in Ernst’s writings. His work on obscenity law and his advocacy for free speech still populate the standard legal textbooks of today.

A series of successful cases encouraged Ernst in his work for freedom of speech. In 1929, he successfully defended Radclyffe Hall’s *The Well of Loneliness* by arguing the social value of the book, as portraiture of the psychology of homosexuality. Ernst manipulated the language of his briefs to the presiding judges, who interpreted the “social perplexity” Ernst referred to as lesbianism, when Ernst believed the social problem to be intolerance of lesbianism. This was an attorney who, in Kelly’s words, knew how to use the “wedge at hand.”<sup>277</sup> In 1930, Ernst took the same tactic with *Pay Day*, by Nathan Asch, and won based on the scientific value

---

<sup>276</sup> Quoted in Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, 1998, p. 94.

<sup>277</sup> Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 94.

of the book, as a work of psychology. He also successfully defended Mary Ware Dennet, a woman who had written a sex education pamphlet for her sons, based on two new criteria of acquittal: the truth of the material and the sincerity of the motives. In 1931, he won two more trials, with the same logic, for Dr. Marie Stopes, who published *Married Love* and *Contraception*, sex education books for women. These successes encouraged Ernst, and his strategy for legalizing literature changed.

Reports of bringing *Ulysses* back into court differ. Sylvia Beach, in her memoir, stated that “In the summer of 1931, in desperation over the pirating, Joyce asked James Pinker, his agent in London, to get offers of *Ulysses* from publishers in the United States.”<sup>278</sup> The writer heard rumors indicating that Roth had continued to publish *Ulysses*, despite the injunction that Quinn’s legal firm achieved four years earlier. Joyce wrote to Weaver on October 1, 1931,

I saw Miss Beach. ... She had had confirmation that Roth had brought out and sold off to someone else an edition of 10,000 and suggested to me that Hemingway’s lawyer would take up the case over there. I declined to have anything more to do with lawyers. I said Pinker’s opinion was that the only way to stop Roth was to get a U.S. publisher to take the book. She asked did I want that. I said if Roth went on for 3 years more that the American market, already crippled, would be killed outright. She said a U.S. edition meant shutting her shop and rearing chickens but that she would do it if it was my wish.<sup>279</sup>

The fate of his book was, unbeknownst to Joyce, already aligning efforts to legalize *Ulysses* and achieve copyright in the United States.

---

<sup>278</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 201. James Brand Pinker (1863–1922) was the founder of James Pinker and Sons, a firm of literary agents in London. From 1917 until Pinker’s death in 1922, Pinker would occasionally help Joyce in his publication efforts, though Joyce enlisted Pinker’s services far less often than he relied on help from Pound and Weaver. When James Brand Pinker passed away, his sons, Eric, James, and Ralph succeeded him in business. Here, Beach refers to James Pinker, II.

<sup>279</sup> *L* III: 230.



Just three weeks after successful defense in the Stopes trials, Ernst, and his assistant Alexander Lindey, began plotting to bring *Ulysses* back into court. Lindey wrote to Ernst on August 6, 1931, “I still feel very keenly that this would be the grandest obscenity case in the history of law and literature, and I am ready to do anything in the world to get it started.”<sup>280</sup> The first step taken was to line up an American publisher. The natural choice was Huebsch. After a meeting between the attorneys and Huebsch, in which Ernst and Lindey laid out their strategy, Huebsch made an offer to Joyce to publish the work. Beach’s consent was not required by copyright laws in the United States, for as stated previously, the United States did not sign as members of the Berne convention, which honored copyright law across national boundaries, until 1984. But a contract between Joyce and Beach did stipulate her possession of copyright “worldwide.”

Joyce had not signed a contract with Beach until 1930, and the contract they devised had unusual stipulations. The author agreed “To assign to the Publisher the exclusive right of printing and selling throughout the world, the work entitled ULYSSES.” The publisher agreed “To print and publish at her own risk and expense the said Work”; “To pay the Author on all copies sold a royalty on the published price of twenty-five per cent”; and

To abandon the right to said Work if, after due consideration such a step should be deemed advisable by the Author and the Publisher in the interests of the AUTHOR, in which case, the right to publish said Work shall be purchased from the Publisher at the price set by herself, to be paid by the publishers acquiring the right to publish said Work.<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>280</sup> Quoted in Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 103.

<sup>281</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 203. Beach’s memoir includes a facsimile of this contract.

In other words, Beach was, legally, a very integral part of any negotiation of the rights to publish *Ulysses* throughout the world, and Joyce and Beach experienced a bit of fallout over this when Huebsch offered to bring out an American edition.

Evidently, correspondence with Beach, from Pinker, representing Joyce's instruction, was indelicately written. Beach was offended by references to herself as Joyce's "*representative* in Paris, not as his publisher." She stated in her memoir,

It was exactly as if they were proposing to publish a manuscript, not to take over a book that had been published by somebody else for almost ten years. This didn't seem to me the correct way to do things, and I waited for Joyce to speak up, but he never did. . . . It didn't occur to me that I might receive something when a suitable arrangement was made for the publication of *Ulysses* in my country—until I realized that it hadn't occurred to anyone else. Then I began to be exasperated at being ignored.<sup>282</sup>

When Huebsch did inquire about the sum Beach required for the rights to *Ulysses*, she declared, in this state of exasperation, twenty-five-thousand dollars. With such a high price, Huebsch withdrew from negotiations. He then wrote a letter to Bennet A. Cerf at Random House, cordially telling Cerf that it might be "hopeless to try to wrench *Ulysses* away from Miss Beach." All the same, Huebsch thanks Cerf for standing aside for Viking while they attempted negotiations, and assures him that Viking will do the same for Random House should Cerf determine to acquire rights for the book.<sup>283</sup> After Huebsch's withdrawal, a spokesperson of Joyce's appeared in Beach's doorway, one Beach does not name in her memoir, but only refers to as a poet she had admired since her youth. The poet urged Beach to cede the rights of *Ulysses*, and when she argued the point of her contract, he simply replied, "You're

---

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., p. 202.

<sup>283</sup> *M*: 100.

standing in the way of Joyce's interests."<sup>284</sup> Stunned, Beach surrendered to any of Joyce's wishes from that point on.

Perhaps the withdrawal of Huebsch was fated. Ernst and Lindey were pleased by it, owing to a history of tension, unrelated to the *Ulysses* case, between Ernst and Huebsch. Before Huebsch had resigned his efforts, the attorneys were already in contact with Cerf about the possibility. Kelly, in *Our Joyce*, corrects some hitherto circulated impressions about the anecdotes of these events. In Cerf's memoir, *At Random*, and in Ellmann's biography, *James Joyce*, the story implies that Cerf initiated the services of Ernst and Lindey, but the events were different than this. Pinker had solicited offers for *Ulysses* in the summer of 1931; perhaps this solicitation is what galvanized Ernst and Lindey to plan for the legal battle. In December of 1931, Robert Kastor, the brother of Joyce's daughter-in-law, went to Cerf and asked him if he would like help getting *Ulysses*; Kastor was headed to Europe soon and promised to put in a good word for Random House. "According to Cerf, 'I tore uptown, talked the matter over with Donald Klopfer, my partner, and before five that evening we were closeted with Morris Ernst, the lawyer, outlining a contract to offer Mr. Joyce, and laying the plans for the legal battle before us'."<sup>285</sup> According to Kelly, "If Cerf tore uptown to plot strategy with Ernst in December, Ernst, who had had the plans drawn up since August, must have done all the talking."<sup>286</sup> Kelly's research is a significant correction of our inherited coverage of

---

<sup>284</sup> Sylvia Beach, *Shakespeare and Company*, p. 204.

<sup>285</sup> Quoted in Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 105.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

these events, for as he points out, “This point is not trivial. For the first time in their fight against Sumner and obscenity laws, Ernst and Lindey went on the offensive.”<sup>287</sup>

So in the spring of 1932, Cerf flew to Paris and, without the contention of Beach, returned with Joyce’s blessing to proceed. The primary correspondents in initiating trial were Bennet Cerf and Paul Léon, Joyce’s friend and literary agent. Cerf wrote Léon, instructing him to paste several favorable reviews into a copy of the novel, to clearly package it and write *Ulysses* on the package face, and to alert American customs that the book was en route. The pasting of favorable reviews was Ernst’s instruction, as it achieved a legal point—their inclusion in the confiscated book enabled the reviews to be admitted into court as evidence.<sup>288</sup> With a bit of insistence from its carrier (customs had relaxed in seizure of *Ulysses*), the package was seized. Though it took some time for the book to make it through all the channels of initiating trial, the plan worked, and *Ulysses* went back to court in 1933. One of the interesting outcomes of this procedure was a rare contract between Cerf (or Random House), Joyce, and Ernst; rather than Ernst taking a fee outright for his services, his fees would be paid if the trial was successful, in the form of royalties of 4 percent of sales of the Random House edition.

Ernst and Lindey had little hope that they would be able to use the same strategy employed in the defense of the works discussed above. Though it would not be difficult today to argue the social utility of *Ulysses* (for example, in the psychology of colonialism presented in the previous chapter), the lawyers did not have the benefit

---

<sup>287</sup> Ibid., p. 105.

<sup>288</sup> I viewed the letter from Cerf to Léon in the National Library of Ireland in January of 2004; however, the institution prohibited taking notes of the document, so I am remiss in stating the catalogue number. This letter was part of the deposit of Paul Léon to Count O’Kelly in 1941.

of decades of research and available correspondence. In an interesting move, they went in the opposite direction of social scientific value. They demonstrated the literary merit of the work, in a defense of art that would have vindicated as much as pleased Anderson and Heap a decade earlier. Despite that Ernst despised the class prejudice evident in obscenity law, he exploited this ‘wedge at hand’ to bring *Ulysses* to the public and to set precedent for the protection of free speech in literature.

In 1931 a provision was written into the Tariff Act that allowed the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt imported books from seizure, at his own discretion. This was primarily to protect upper-class bibliophiles, who imported expensive and limited editions of literary classics, from losing their investment upon arrival in the United States. Using this provision with the Customs Bureau, Ernst successfully defended Frances Steloff, from Gotham Book Mart, who was prosecuted for importing one copy each of *Hsi Men Ching* and *From a Turkish Bath*, both classic Eastern works. But the strategy for such a case had never been applied to a contemporary work, and the provision was not meant to include commercial importations, only private ones. Still, Ernst and Lindey believed that if they could procure the Treasury Department’s declaration of the work’s literary merit, i.e., by declaring it a “modern classic,” this declaration would prove an effective tool in the court battles to come. Ernst decided to test the wheels of this new legal loophole on George Moore’s *The Story-Teller’s Holiday*, before he applied the strategy to the *Ulysses* case. Ernst petitioned the Secretary of the Treasury to allow importation of Moore’s work to a private collector, arguing that the work should not have to age before its literary merit is recognized, and he included expert testimony of George Moore’s mastery and the novel’s value.

The petition was granted, yet even though the Moore case was meant to pave the way for *Ulysses*, it was not finally settled until after the *Ulysses* decision: Mr. Ennis in the U.S. Attorney's office suspended action on Moore's work until the *Ulysses* decision could direct their policy.<sup>289</sup> Evidently, Lindey was not the only one who perceived the *Ulysses* case as a landmark trial of obscenity.

A second copy of *Ulysses* was mailed while the book made its way through prosecution channels, and a similar petition was filed for *Ulysses* with the Secretary of the Treasury. On Bloomsday, 1933, the petition was granted for *Ulysses* as well, on the grounds that it was a modern classic. This declaration gave confidence to the strategy of defending *Ulysses* based upon its literary merit and outlined the entire case. Ernst and Lindey hoped the case would be heard before a judge with literary interests, i.e., Judge John Woolsey, who had acquitted in the Stopes trials and had a broad background in literature. Not only did the attorneys want Woolsey, but Woolsey wanted the case, and good fortune granted wishes: he was the presiding justice for the trial's schedule. As soon as Woolsey's court was determined, Ernst and Lindey began to send him extensive memorandums and briefs in preparation for the proceedings. Included was a bibliography of international criticism of *Ulysses*. Several of the listed reviews were highly critical of the work, but the attorneys were aiming for the overwhelming impression of impact on the international literary scene, and they were relying on the assumption that none of the reviews would actually be consulted.<sup>290</sup> They also included a six-page biography of Joyce, culled from Gorman's *James Joyce: The First Forty Years*, and in a rather melodramatic fashion,

---

<sup>289</sup> Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, p. 113.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

they likened Joyce to Homer: “Nearly as blind as the Greek master from whose epic he borrowed the name of his novel, [Joyce] has lived apart, an austere Olympian.”<sup>291</sup>

The briefs also included the studies of *Ulysses* written by Smith and Gilbert.<sup>292</sup>

Lindey got an unexpected break when a graduate student from Harvard, Peter Pertzoff, expressed interest in the case, and the attorney seized upon the high reputation of the institution. Lindey asked Pertzoff if *Ulysses* had been included in any of his graduate coursework, and Pertzoff confirmed that it was on the reading list of English 26, a course taught the previous year by Poet in Residence T.S. Eliot. The reading list that Pertzoff referred to was a bibliography that consisted of many works, but none were obligatory reading. Still, Lindey wrote the following statement in a memorandum to Woolsey:

It would be absurd to assume that an obscene work would appear as assigned reading in our leading institutions of learning. Yet no course dealing with twentieth century English letters, given at any of our colleges and universities, fails to include Joyce and ULYSSES. For instance, the book has been on the reading list at Harvard in connection with English 26, given last year by T.S. Eliot, the distinguished poet (then occupying the Charles Eliot Norton Chair of Poetry), and three years ago by I.A. Richards, Professor at Cambridge and Peking.<sup>293</sup>

Ernst and Lindey’s memorandums and briefs were a work of spin that would have made the most tenacious political campaigners kneel. Perhaps the most astounding inclusion in the material was a map, prepared from data of a questionnaire mailed by Cerf to eight hundred librarians throughout the country.<sup>294</sup> The questionnaire was mailed in an attempt to balance out the strategy: Ernst and Lindey were cautious not

---

<sup>291</sup> *M*: 239.

<sup>292</sup> See footnote 3 in Chapter 1.

<sup>293</sup> *M*: 262–263.

<sup>294</sup> *M*: 253.

to push the elitism of literary interest too far. Many of the quotations they included in the brief argued the innocuousness of *Ulysses* according to the same line that Moeller and Powys had argued in 1921. But if the attorneys went too far in the argument that obscenity was obscure because the work was nearly incomprehensible, they would have backed themselves into a corner, for what is the loss if an incomprehensible book is not in print? To obviate this, they instructed Cerf to send this questionnaire to eight hundred librarians. The cover letter that introduced the questionnaire made great claims about the literary merit of *Ulysses*, and in the only question that left space for substantive response, the librarians' responses were culled from the cover letter's language. The sixth question on the questionnaire read "Do you believe that an American publication at a reasonable price will be of value?"<sup>295</sup> From this data, Lindey prepared a map of the United States, and for every librarian who responded with "yes" to question 6—144 in total—a dot was entered on the map, giving an overwhelming iconic impression of interest in *Ulysses* across the United States. In the brief, Lindey did not reproduce the question from which the data was compiled, but rather, he represented those dots as "libraries that have expressed a desire to secure and circulate *Ulysses*."<sup>296</sup>

Armed with a sympathetic judge and a wealth of testimony of interest in *Ulysses*, the genius of James Joyce, and the literary merit of the work, Ernst and Lindey took *Ulysses* to trial. Woolsey was able to consider the novel in its entirety, in a way that previous justices (assuming they would have wanted to) were not able to do. Woolsey declared that the book was not pornographic, but a serious experiment

---

<sup>295</sup> *M*: 124.

<sup>296</sup> *M*: 227.



and artistic achievement. Woolsey's decision was written with the double vision of literary appreciation and public interest.

In December of 1933, Woolsey's ruling reversed the ban on *Ulysses* and allowed legal publication in the United States for the first time since 1920. The first American edition from Random House appeared in 1934, albeit set from Roth's piratical edition. Woolsey's decision had legal domain only in the United States, but it did make the threat of prosecution of an English edition less likely. Anticipating Ernst's success, Joyce wrote to Weaver, "So let them take off the ban and I suppose England will follow suit as usual a few years later. And Ireland 1000 years hence."<sup>297</sup> Joyce was correct, at least, with regard to England. He began to negotiate for English publication as soon as the Woolsey decision was handed down, and finally settled on Bodley Head in 1934. Printers in London were still a bit fearful of prosecution, so the Bodley Head edition was not published until 1936. As a preemptive defense against any possible charges, the 1936 Bodley Head edition also contained the ruling of Judge John Woolsey, and a narrative of the history of prosecution of the work. When Joyce received his copy of the Bodley Head edition, he told a friend, Tom Kristensen, he had been fighting for this for twenty years—that the war between himself and England was over, and that "he had been the conqueror."<sup>298</sup>

Quinn's assessments of the vulnerability of *Ulysses*, with regards to serialization, were right on the mark. Though Quinn's defense of *Ulysses* was weak, though he pursued a pragmatic rather than theoretical line of argument, he did not have the same advantages that Ernst had. When Quinn defended *Ulysses*, he had to

---

<sup>297</sup> *L III*: 233.

<sup>298</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 1982, p. 692.

defend passages from portions of text, based upon the serialized venue. Claiming Joyce's artistry, as he had initially attempted with Sumner and Crain, was barely feasible until the completion of the novel. So while Quinn's strategy was obviously weaker than Ernst and Lindey's, the scope of material available to Quinn was substantially less: he did not have a completed novel to contextualize a justification for the material, and he did not have a large body of criticism to argue Joyce's genius. Quinn also did not have the same legal advantages Ernst and Lindey had: he did not have sympathetic judges, he did not have recent successes of precedent from which to outline a stronger case, and he did not have the legal loophole involving the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury.

In retrospect, Joyce gifted Anglo-American aesthetes with much more than just his novel. His refusal to print the book in an expurgated version and the mastery of his craft determined a trajectory that enabled advocates of free speech to challenge the practice of literary censorship in the United States. The achievements of those who took up Joyce's cause, in turn, enabled the dissemination of numerous works of art that otherwise would have suffered suppression and censorship for years to come.

## CHAPTER 4: THE SECOND SCANDAL OF *ULYSSES*

Write me your essayes, my vocational scholars, but cursorily,  
dipping your nose in it.

James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*

### PRE-GABLER EDITION

*Ulysses* comes in several salient versions, each with varying degrees of corruption. The Rosenbach manuscript is the most developed portion of the novel written in the author's hand, but the Rosenbach is a collection of documents written out over a period of four years. Its utility as an indicator of Joyce's intentions for publication is compromised by episodes in the collection that were inscribed for sale to art patrons. Though inscribed as a fair copy, the Rosenbach is also far short of completion; there is a four-page lacuna in the Circe episode of the document; significant portions of the novel were composed on lost final working drafts and the presswork for the 1922 edition; and the second half of the Wandering Rocks episode was dictated to Frank Budgen. (It has plausibly been suggested that inconsistencies of orthography, largely of proper nouns, between the second half of Wandering Rocks and the rest of the work are symptomatic of the oral dictation.)

The text of the *Little Review*, owing to its expurgation, censorship, and ban, offers the greatest portraiture of the relationship between the work and its first readers, but Joyce expressed his discontent with the typescripts prepared as setting copy for the serialization. Moreover, these typescripts are lost, which leaves a gap in the evidence of textual transmission. Even in the case of linear descent, we cannot, with any degree of certitude, ascertain which variants between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* represent Joyce's corrections to the typescripts and which variants are

---

*Epigraph*: James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (New York: Penguin, 1999), p. 447.

corruptions from typists' or compositors' error. The *Little Review* is a very unreliable source for determining Joyce's orthography and punctuation. In a letter to John Quinn, dated March 11, 1920, Joyce stated that the "version in *The Little Review* is, of course, mutilated."<sup>299</sup> And Ezra Pound frequently expressed his dissatisfaction with the number of printing errors in Anderson's publication.

The 1922 edition of *Ulysses*, published by Sylvia Beach and printed by Darantiere, was "disfigured" and unreliable, a testimony of the author's review. The second through seventh printings by Darantiere carried forward many of the corruptions. Joyce prepared errata slips for these subsequent printings, but Joyce reviewed the novel only through the Cyclops episode. Harriet Shaw Weaver and John Rodker made errata suggestions for Joyce's consideration for the whole novel, but this is a very different kind of correction process than had Joyce reviewed (or been able to review) the work in its entirety. As is evident, Joyce's competence in reviewing the 1922 edition was compromised by significant decline of his eyesight in the early 1920s. Even though Darantiere had the type reset for the May 1926 printing, many of the corruptions were carried forward and new corruptions crept into the text.

With Joyce's consent, Stuart Gilbert undertook proofreading a new edition for the Albatross Press in the early 1930s. Gilbert had just finished his French translation of the novel, and in the process of the translation, Gilbert felt he had uncovered some potential corruptions. The edition published by Albatross Press was printed with the imprint the Odyssey Press, and has since been referred to as The Odyssey Press edition. This edition was printed in four runs between 1932 and 1939. But the edition

---

<sup>299</sup> L II: 459.

could hardly own up to its claim as definitive: Jack Dalton contacted Stuart Gilbert to investigate Gilbert's process of correction, and Gilbert informed,

I consulted Joyce re some of the doubtful points—including punctuation—when I was correcting proofs of the Odyssey Press *Ulysses*. . . . As far as I remember, I used what was then the latest Shakespeare & Co edition and also my copy of the First, when correcting the Odyssey Press text of *Ulysses*.<sup>300</sup>

Hence, Gilbert's work was in no way exhaustive. He did not consult holograph versions, and he relied upon corrupt texts for gauging potential errors. Each successive printing of the Odyssey Press edition corrected errors of the first, but despite Gilbert's effort, many of the corruptions remained, and a host of new ones were introduced.<sup>301</sup>

The first American edition was set from Samuel Roth's pirated, corrupt text. When Bennet Cerf of Random House realized the mistake, he attempted to correct the text, and he utilized the Odyssey Press edition as a means of correcting the most egregious errors. This "corrected" text was first published as the 1940 Modern Library imprint, but it still carried forward many of the errors of Roth's piratical edition, and it had a short lifespan. Random House mistakenly reverted to the 1934 corrupt text in 1949.

The 1936 edition by Bodley Head was set from the corrupt 1932 Odyssey Press edition and was the first of numerous impressions until 1959. Joyce reviewed the presswork for the 1936 Bodley Head edition, but by the time he did so, his eyesight was even worse than the previous decade, and his interest in *Ulysses* had

---

<sup>300</sup> Quoted in Jack Dalton, "The Text of *Ulysses*," *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium* (Bloomington and London, Indiana University Press, 1972).

<sup>301</sup> See James F. Spoorri, "The Odyssey Press Edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 50, no. 2 (April–June 1956): 195–198.

waned significantly. In 1960, Bodley Head reset the type, using the last, most reliable printing of the Odyssey Press edition as setting copy, but the newly set text introduced new errors. This 1960 “corrected” text by Bodley Head served as setting copy for Random House, when type was reset in 1961.

At the time that the critical edition appeared, these two, the 1960 Bodley Head and 1961 Random House editions, were the most widely read editions in the United Kingdom and the United States. Both claimed to be “scrupulously corrected.” When Jack Dalton collated the “corrected” 1961 Random House edition, he reported corruptions as numerous as 4,000, including “well over 2,000 corruptions which went back to the manuscripts, things which had *never* been printed correctly.”<sup>302</sup>

## **THE EDITORIAL PROJECT**

In 1977, Hans Walter Gabler petitioned the James Joyce Estate to spearhead the critical edition of *Ulysses*.<sup>303</sup> Gabler, now semi-retired, was then a professor of English at Munich University, with experience both in scholarly editing and in Joyce scholarship. Gabler was trained in the Anglo-American methods of eclectic editing at the University of Virginia, and was also active in the discourse of textual criticism in the Franco-German tradition. Though the estate had formerly declined Gabler’s petition to re-edit *Portrait*, Gabler’s offer was accepted for *Ulysses*. With the endorsement of the James Joyce Estate and unprecedented funding of an English-language work from Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, a cultural agency of the German government, work commenced immediately. Gabler enlisted the help of Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, both students of English at Munich University.

---

<sup>302</sup> Dalton, “The Text of *Ulysses*,” p. 102.

<sup>303</sup> This coverage of the editorial project is borrowed from *The Scandal of Ulysses*, by Bruce Arnold (see References).

These students performed much of the computer-aided groundwork for the editing project, and Melchior was responsible for building the textual stemmatology. The Joyce Estate appointed an advisory committee also. This committee included Richard Ellmann, the doyen of Joyce scholarship, whose imprimatur was his work on Joyce's biography, the editing of the *Letters* volumes, authorship of introductions to several seminal publications in Joyce scholarship, and numerous critical writings on *Ulysses*. Clive Hart, a prominent Joyce scholar, and Philip Gaskell, a prominent textual scholar, were also enlisted. Of the three members, Gaskell was the only scholar who offered expertise in textual scholarship. The estate's sole trustee at the time, Peter du Sautoy, though unversed in textual scholarship, had a great deal of experience in the business of publishing. When the project commenced, he was also director of a well-respected publisher, Faber and Faber, was active in publishing associations in Britain and abroad, and traveled widely to conferences to discuss publishing issues. This project ran for seven years, at the end of which a three-volume critical edition was published by Garland Press.

Peter du Sautoy devised three different contracts for the publication of the scholarly edition: one with Garland, who would publish the 1984 three-volume scholarly edition; the other two with Random House and Bodley Head, who would publish the trade edition of the established reading text for widespread commercial sale, but not until 1986. This two-year period was intended, as Brenda Maddox noted in her review, to allow scholars to review Gabler's methods and register any criticisms of the new edition.

Criticism was registered, and in rather formal venues, in 1985. As noted in Chapter 1, ten months after Gabler's edition appeared, John Kidd presented doubts in the reliability of the critical edition on April 26, at a conference in New York for the Society of Textual Scholarship (STS). At this conference, he challenged Gabler's collation, stating that Gabler had failed to collate all editions. Kidd also questioned the project's reliance upon TUSTEP, a computer program that, he felt, introduced new errors into the text. The most daring of Kidd's criticisms included a suspicion, gauged from Gabler's editorial essay, that established methods of textual scholarship had been abandoned in the designation of copy-text. (The designation of copy-text is a procedure in the Anglo-American method of eclectic editing, which is discussed at more length in Chapter 5 of this thesis. The current narrative serves primarily to outline the highly politicized reception of the critical edition.) Kidd did not anticipate the response that followed. Gabler, also present, rose from the audience. Gabler began by stating that he'd been asked to deliver a response, though no defense of his project was necessary. Repeating Kidd's name with "machinegun-like repetition," Gabler accused Kidd of polemic, and of "not grasping the editorial principles of the project."<sup>304</sup> The scholar also responded with a quote from Dryden:

But I have already swept the stakes; and with the common good fortune of prosperous gamesters, can be content to sit quietly; to hear my fortune curst by some, and my faults arraigned by others, and to suffer both without reply.<sup>305</sup>

Michael Groden, in "Perplex in the Pen," discussed his experience as an intimate spectator at the STS conference. Groden personally reviewed both papers before they were delivered, and he made only minor suggestions. Neither of the

---

<sup>304</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991, p. 160.

<sup>305</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, quoted in Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 2004, p. 213.



papers, in print at least, seemed to violate the decorum of scholarly debate, but Groden did not anticipate the David-and-Goliath scene that ensued, by virtue of the mannerism of deliverance. Kidd appeared innocent; Gabler appeared obstinate, unyielding, and overly defensive. If ineffectual in engendering fruitful dialectic, Kidd's paper at STS stirred the waters, and in a sense, rallied Joyceans and the journalists present to pay more attention to this new text.

George Sandulescu was among those scholars. In collaboration with Clive Hart, Sandulescu organized the Monaco conference for the summer of 1985. As stated in Chapter 1, a conversation with John Kidd strengthened Sandulescu's "deep-seated conviction that the 1984 *Ulysses* was very urgently in need of collective assessment."<sup>306</sup> John Kidd was not physically present for the Monaco conference in 1985, but his presence was certainly felt. Informal conversation among the participants frequently recalled the STS conference. Unfortunately, two other conspicuous absences also marked the conference: Philip Gaskell was not in attendance, and neither was Hans Walter Gabler. Gabler wrote to Sandulescu after receiving his invitation, saying that "to a considerable degree [Sandulescu was] falling victim to the strange operations of Dr. John Kidd."<sup>307</sup> Something had clearly gone awry. Du Sautoy had arranged a two-year delay in the trade printing for the sake of Joyceans' feedback, yet a prominent member of the advisory board and the lead editor did not attend this conference, designed specifically for the purpose of providing that feedback.

---

<sup>306</sup> George Sandulescu, in *Assessing the 1984 Ulysses*, 1986, p. xxi.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxii.

Even though Gabler and Gaskell were not in attendance, Clive Hart informed Peter du Sautoy of the nature of criticisms at the conference. In his letter to du Sautoy, Hart spoke of two kinds of criticisms. The first kind was detailed judgments of editorial decisions, a piecemeal delivery from all sides of disagreement. These, Hart said, Gabler expected and was ready to consider. The second kind of criticism, however, was of the principles that formulated the edition, principles that were “so deeply rooted” that “to meet them would require a complete rethinking of the edition, which is of course out of the question.”<sup>308</sup>

Gabler did entertain these piecemeal deliveries of disagreements, which led to a Note on the Second Impression of the critical edition (1986) and forty changes to the text, also incorporated into the trade edition. Du Sautoy decided to proceed as planned with the trade edition, and two years later, this decision, and the text printed, received a broadside attack, from a daunted-but-not-defeated John Kidd.

### **THE JOYCE WARS**

In 1988, John Kidd assailed the James Joyce Estate, Hans Walter Gabler, Gabler’s editorial team, and the new critical edition, this time in venues uncommon to scholarly debate. Kidd published an article in the *New York Review of Books* in June. Kidd was very gifted at bringing textual details to the magnitude of their potential meaning. He spoke with confidence in bibliographic and editorial terms, and he always embedded this specialized language within the significance of literary meaning in resonant, convincing ways. For example, Kidd opened his article with the story of Harry Thrift. Harry Thrift was a professor of drama at Trinity College and a public icon in Dublin, not only for his work in the arts, but also because on June 16,

---

<sup>308</sup> Clive Hart to Peter du Sautoy, quoted in Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 2004, p. 194.

1904, the young Thrift participated in a bike race in Dublin. He is listed in the Wandering Rocks episode, leading the pack of cyclists in the Bloomsday race. Yet Gabler's editorial team (accidentally) expunged Thrift from the text in the 1984 edition; instead, a Harry *Shrift* leads the pack of cyclists. Kidd listed two other fictional characters drawn from nonfiction sources in Joyce's book who suffered a similar fate in Gabler's 1984 edition. Then Kidd detailed how these mistakes were made: Gabler relied too heavily on facsimiles that obscured text which, in original holograph documents, was quite clear. (For example, in the facsimile edition of the Rosenbach manuscript, the *T* of *Thrift* appears to be an *S*. In the original Rosenbach manuscript, Joyce's inscriptions are clear.)

Kidd further claimed that the edition did not execute its own stated policies, as "an unstandardised and unmodernised text."<sup>309</sup> Quantifying departures from this policy, Kidd argued, "Setting aside cases where Joyce may have revised now-lost drafts, and looking only at uncontested final manuscript readings, the newly edited texts overrule what Joyce actually wrote two thousand times."<sup>310</sup> He then argued that a general perspective turned up entire classes of emendations that were not given sufficient explanation in the critical edition: changes in Joyce's correct contemporary spelling, compounding into one word what Joyce wrote in two words, creation and removal of italics, addition of unneeded punctuation, changes of values in numbers, changes of proper nouns, changes to typographical features ordered by Joyce, changes of capitalization, literary allusions, and idiosyncratic abbreviations, as well

---

<sup>309</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *Ulysses: The Critical and Synoptic Edition*, 1984, p. 1898.

<sup>310</sup> John Kidd, "The Scandal of 'Ulysses'," *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 11, p. 7.

as “illusory improvements when a character misspeaks or makes a Freudian slip, where Joyce wrote and clearly intended the slip.”<sup>311</sup>

Kidd concluded his opening Thrift argument with, “Did it occur to anyone to check whether Thrift was a real person before changing him to Shrift? Apparently not.”<sup>312</sup> His language gives the impression that Gabler or a member of his editorial team attended specifically to the spelling of Thrift as an isolated textual feature, and made a deliberate decision to change the hitherto received text. If, as Kidd argued, the error in the establishment of the new text, *Shrift*, occurred in the process of transcription, then no one on the editorial team made a decision to change *Thrift* to *Shrift*. This was an error of execution. These are bound to occur in any project of this magnitude. Kidd could have posited the following: the process of transcription generated the error, but it should have been noticed and investigated when compiling the historical collation. Put this way, the criticism casts reasonable doubt on the editorial team’s thoroughness and/or haste, which may have ramifications for other, yet uncorrected, executions of editorial process. But Kidd does not take this critical tack.

Kidd’s most frequent and damning accusation in his writings of the time was that the project was compromised by the estate’s motivation for renewed copyright of *Ulysses*. Once the newly established text was available in a trade edition, Random House and Bodley Head no longer printed the 1961 and 1960 editions. This is true, but this is also a reasonable decision on the part of a publisher. Given the high incidence of textual error in those editions, and given the publishers’ necessity to take

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., p. 1.

in faith that the scholarly endeavor served its purpose and stabilized the text, Random House and Bodley Head could have gone so far as to quarantine their remaining stock of the 1960 and 1961 editions. In response to the publishers' and estate's decision, Kidd appears to conflate the notion of authorial intention and *textus receptus*. He states,

At best such a new text (were it accurate) could stand beside the version published during Joyce's lifetime only as an alternative—not as a replacement. But commercial and not scholarly considerations are behind the disappearance of the version known to the author and his audience of sixty years.<sup>313</sup>

From the start, Kidd had criticized Gabler for not collating all the editions of *Ulysses*. One cannot profess knowledge of the various editions discussed above, each with various printings, and then make statements about “the version known to the author and his audience of sixty years.” The version known to the author is not the same version known to any audience of sixty years: too many editions have appeared to say we share one version across these generations. By the version known to the author, Kidd is referring to the 1922 edition, but the manner of his reference suggests the text of that edition was the one the author intended. This is where the conflation of authorial intention and *textus receptus* occurs. We already know that Joyce considered the 1922 edition to fall far short of his intentions for his work.

More importantly, there is a big difference between the *financial* considerations of Joyce's heirs and *commercial* considerations of profit-sharing publishers. Joyce's family paid dearly for the writer's artistic profession, and financial benefits to Joyce's only surviving heir, Stephen James Joyce, are due him, and any heirs of Stephen's, should he ever have them. The James Joyce Estate

---

<sup>313</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

seeking the renewal of copyright is not an offensive crime, but rather, a due process of equity. It is well known that James Joyce dissented vehemently from the practice of marriage; this is not surprising given that the institution of marriage is substantiated by two other institutions Joyce dissented from, church and state. In spite of his feelings about marriage, Joyce married Nora Barnacle to legitimate his children and secure their inheritance of royalties from his work. But John Kidd still invoked the injustice of financial interest, and he cast the language of it in ways that do not fully represent the situation.<sup>314</sup>

Kidd's 1988 attack was measurably more successful than his paper at the 1985 conference because it brought the criticism of what seem minor details to the level of the publicly personal. The new text of *Ulysses* became the topic of conversation in Dublin pubs and public spheres around the globe. Much media attention was directed to the controversy. Two additional things happened in December of 1988. Kidd

---

<sup>314</sup> Kidd's statement simply does not apply to *Ulysses*. To cognize the misapplication, consider the following situation, in which Kidd's statement would be applicable to a different author, his publishers, and his work of art. In 1953, Ballantine Books first published Ray Bradbury's classic work that details the eternal struggle between censorship and freedom of thought, *Fahrenheit 451*. In 1967, the editors at Ballantine, in an effort to generate additional sales, first published *Fahrenheit 451* in the Bal-Hi series. This series consisted of classic works that were expurgated, in an effort to make them amenable to the approval of school boards. The editors at Ballantine censored *Fahrenheit 451*, expurgating every "vulgar" word, every reference to mind-altering substance, and every depiction of insanity. They did so without Bradbury's knowledge. The situation became even worse when, in 1973, a member of Ballantine's production crew pulled the Bal-Hi text template from the shelf for reprinting the Ballantine, unexpurgated, trade version. Hence for several years, the only published version of Bradbury's classic work on censorship was a censored text, albeit bound in two different covers. The situation was not corrected until 1979. Two high school classes independently discovered the censorship and contacted the author. In this way, Bradbury discovered both the misconduct and the mishap, and, infuriated, corrected the situation with his publisher. Ever since, *Fahrenheit 451* contains a cautionary Afterword by Bradbury, alerting his readers to be wary of the versions of the texts they purchase. This is an example of a situation in which *commercial*, rather than scholarly, considerations caused the disappearance of the version known to (and approved by) the author and his audience of many years. But the James Joyce Estate's interest in renewing copyright does not qualify as the same category of *commercial* interests. (This history is largely recounted from a lecture by textual editor and scholar Jonathan Eller, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, January 12, 2004. For more on the censorship of Bradbury's works, see George R. Guffey, "Fahrenheit 451 and the 'Cubby-Hole Editors' of Ballantine Books," *Coordinates: Placing Science Fiction and Fantasy* [Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983]).

published his 173-page article in *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America*, an article that included several pages of charts and appendices to delineate his claims that the critical text was unreliable. On a more general level, Kidd's 1988 paper included the following criticisms:

1. Gabler's editorial essay used nebulous jargon that made it difficult for others to assess exactly what his fundamental methods were for establishing copy-text.
2. Gabler's apparatus was faulty: Too many variants were omitted—Kidd numbered them in the thousands.
3. The transcription of the Rosenbach manuscript was seriously flawed from reliance upon facsimiles.
4. Gabler invented levels of text, even when those layers of text were lost and had to be reconstructed from extant presswork, and Gabler used complicated symbols to represent them.
5. Gabler's examination of the printing history of *Ulysses* was incomplete and inaccurate; he failed to collate the 1935 Matisse-illustrated edition, a very authoritative text, as well as distinguish between the 1932 and 1933 Hamburg editions.
6. Because of the use of TUSTEP, the text had been corrupted by a new series of computer-generated errors.

The second occurrence in December of 1988 was the emergence of a new voice in the debates surrounding the edition. The *NYRB* carried an article published by Charles Rossman. In 1987, Richard Ellmann passed away after a long struggle

with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. His estate granted permissions to Charles Rossman, of the University of Texas at Austin, to study Ellmann's private papers. Erwin B. Ellmann, Richard's brother, is now the executor of the scholar's estate. When Rossman sought permission to study Ellmann's papers, Erwin responded, "Since [my brother] built a career on reading other people's mail, it would be captious and ungenerous for me as his representative to deny scholars' access to his own."<sup>315</sup> Among Ellmann's papers, Rossman found extensive correspondence between the editorial team, the advisory committee, and du Sautoy regarding the project of critically editing *Ulysses*. This correspondence revealed deep and strong misgivings among the advisory committee about Gabler's methods, as well as the push for establishment of new copyright as the organizing motive behind the estate's decisions to publish in 1984 and 1986. Rossman's research lent credibility to all of Kidd's criticisms, since Kidd had been claiming all along that commercial, rather than scholarly, interests lie at the heart of decisions for the new text.

Much of the reservations on the part of the Academic Advisory Committee are represented in correspondence with du Sautoy, Gabler, and Ellmann, dated 1981. These reservations began to surface in a letter from Gaskell to Gabler, in which he writes, "Only six Textual Notes for the whole of 'Cyclops'?" Aside from this reservation, however, Gaskell remarked that the work on Cyclops, as well as Eumaeus, Ithaca, and Penelope, was "very impressive indeed."<sup>316</sup> In September of that year, the advisory committee met with Gabler. Though this meeting was meant to

---

<sup>315</sup> Quoted in Robin Bates, "Reflections on the Kidd Era," *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1990): p. 133. The original document is cited by Robin Bates as "Erwin B. Ellmann letter to Charles Rossman (August 18, 1988)."

<sup>316</sup> Quoted in Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 2004, p. 149.



discuss technical details, Gaskell had written du Sautoy, saying that “he and Hart had to thrash out several important points about general editorial principles” before the meeting.<sup>317</sup> Ellmann also expressed his concerns with Gabler’s copy-text designation to du Sautoy. (Ellmann’s concerns were prompted by a conversation with Fredson Bowers, one of the founding theorists in the Anglo-American methods of scholarly editing.)

The year 1982 came and went with little correspondence between the editor, his advisors, and the trustee of the Joyce Estate, while Gabler worked away. This was a busy year for Joyce scholars, as they celebrated the centenary of the artist’s birth. While correspondence waned, Peter du Sautoy made a decision that Ellmann called a masterstroke in the resolution of the advisory committee’s misgivings. In March, du Sautoy signed the contracts with Garland, Random House, and Bodley Head for the publication of the new edition, including the stipulated two-year review period discussed above. In 1983, just one year before printing the scholarly edition, disagreement once again came to a head.

The two most significant letters of the time are dated May 5, from du Sautoy to the editorial team, and June 6, from Gaskell to du Sautoy. In the first, du Sautoy expressed his unhappiness that fundamental questions of editorial principle were still being debated. In essence, du Sautoy took his position as protecting the interests of the James Joyce Estate. He stated two important points. “The first was the presence in the edition of significant fresh creativity. . . . The second, which seems to be the first point put in a different way, was simply that there should be sufficient textual change to justify new copyright and that this change should rely on material that could be

---

<sup>317</sup> Bruce Arnold, *The Scandal of Ulysses*, 1991, p. 115.

traced back to Joyce.”<sup>318</sup> In essence, du Sautoy’s letter called for an abandonment of unresolved issues of editorial principle and confirmed that the edition would go to press despite these. This was a position du Sautoy could now more confidently take, with the provision of lapse in the publication of the trade edition.

On June 4, a meeting was held in Cambridge between the trustees and the advisers. Clive Hart and Philip Gaskell were extremely dissatisfied with copy-text designation. Subsequent correspondence indicates that an ultimatum from Gaskell and Hart was either intimated or clearly expressed. If Gabler would not adjust his principles and decisions considerably, Hart and Gaskell felt they had no choice but to resign. On the following Monday, Gaskell wrote to du Sautoy. “What Gabler was doing, in Gaskell’s view, would have an important but undesirable effect on the final text of *Ulysses* and he felt he had to withdraw entirely. He added: ‘I do not want my name to be used, or my advice to be acknowledged in any way, either in or with reference to Hans’s edition of *Ulysses*’.”<sup>319</sup>

When Rossman uncovered these conflicts, he published an article in the *New York Review of Books*, citing what he was able to quote by permission of the Ellmann Estate and generalizing where necessary. This article took the Joyce community by storm, and these issues were debated in *TLS* in London and *NYRB* in the United States for a year. The Joyce Estate also made statements, including a lamentation by Stephen James Joyce, a wish for return to the simple pleasure of enjoying his grandfather’s work. After extended coverage of this controversy, the estate eventually closed discussion. A committee was appointed to investigate the reliability of the

---

<sup>318</sup> Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., p. 121.

edition. This committee included G. Thomas Tanselle, Dennis Donoghue, Herbert Cahoon, and Jo Ann Boydston. Their ultimate task was to make a recommendation to Random House and Bodley Head of whether or not the 1986 trade edition should stay in print. The James Joyce Estate closed discussion in the *NYRB* and *TLS* by stating that until the committee met, they would not say another word, and they even threatened scholars with their prerogative of withholding documents of research and permissions for reproduction of Joyce's work.<sup>320</sup>

The Tanselle committee never met, due to the same kind of conflicts of personality that the *Ulysses* project suffered from. Jason Epstein, an executive at Random House, and Tanselle had an irreconcilably estranged relationship (unrelated to the *Ulysses* project). In consequence, the Tanselle committee was formally disbanded in March of 1990. Yet Kidd's criticisms left their mark.

Many of Kidd's particular points of contention presented in his 1985 paper at STS were incorporated into the 1986 trade edition. Gabler's thirty-thousand-word editorial essay in the scholarly edition has not only been reduced to thirty-five hundred words in the trade edition, but moved to the back of the book, replaced instead with a preface by Richard Ellmann. The reduction of an essay on editorial method for a trade edition is not uncommon, but granting authorship of the preface to someone other than the editor who established the text is uncommon. Even more uncommon is the disagreement Ellmann stated with the established text, which to a keen reader is a clear disclaimer: the scholar used the space of his preface to state, in diplomatic fashion, his disagreement with the inclusion of the "love" passage. The

---

<sup>320</sup> See "The New 'Ulysses': Unanswered Questions," by Clive Hart, Peter du Sautoy, and Roma Woodnut, *The New York Review of Books* 35, nos. 21 and 22 (January 19, 1989).

1986 edition initially marketed as *Ulysses: The Corrected Text* is now marketed as *Ulysses: The Gabler Edition*. Finally, and most importantly, Random House now prints the 1961 edition of *Ulysses* for sale alongside the Gabler edition, and several authorized versions of the 1922 edition, in facsimile, have emerged on the marketplace bookshelves as well.<sup>321</sup>

The academic community endorsed Kidd's position. In 1988, Boston University invited Kidd to a faculty position, helped him establish the James Joyce Research Center, and promised five hundred thousand dollars in funding for work on a CD-ROM edition of the text. Norton publishers also invested in Kidd, contracting a six-figure remuneration for his critical edition of the text.

In 1999 John Kidd left academia, and the James Joyce Research Center at Boston University was closed. In an article called "Troubled Chapter," written by David Abel for the *Boston Globe*, Kidd was reported to be "broke, jobless, and in such poor health he has trouble writing more than a few sentences." Kidd promised a comeback in Abel's article. "I'm not a basket case," he said. He described himself as feeling like "a brain in a jar." In the eleven years that Kidd was at Boston University, he was never able to complete the CD-ROM version of *Ulysses*. The Norton project met with a similar fate. After several failures by Kidd to deliver his manuscript, and amid a host of copyright problems, Norton indefinitely delayed publication of this edition.<sup>322</sup> Joyce's novel not only scandalized his earliest readers and publishers, in *fait accompli*, it also scandalized the editors, publishers, critics, and benefactors of the

---

<sup>321</sup> For those interested in further coverage of the Joyce Wars, Charles Rossman prepared a bibliography, published in *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 2 (1990), pp. 257–269, titled "The 'Gabler *Ulysses*': A Selectively Annotated Bibliography."

<sup>322</sup> David Abel, "Troubled Chapter," *The Boston Globe* (April 9, 2002), p. B1.

critical edition. *Ulysses* is such an unstable text, it is possible that the critical edition would have received criticism regardless of the methods and procedures used to establish a reading text.

## **THE DIFFICULTY OF EDITING *ULYSSES***

### ***Joyce's Methods of Composition***

The primary reason that *Ulysses* is difficult to edit is Joyce's methods of composition. The writer continually composed additional material for the novel, even when the book was in its most final stages of typesetting. It has often been remarked that Joyce never completed *Ulysses*; the publishers took it out of his hands. Perhaps the writer resigned himself to the impending book publication, for the novel never reached the length and scope of his originally conceived ideas. (Joyce originally planned for twenty-two episodes in the novel.)<sup>323</sup> The same may not be said of *Finnegans Wake*, which took twenty-two years to compose. Joyce's methods of composition have several effects upon the reliability of the text:

- (1) For the 1922 edition, a fair amount of textual error is a statistical verity: the more often a printer has to intervene in the type that is already set up, the more often mistakes will occur.
- (2) Joyce's creative efforts were generative, rather than critical, when reviewing presswork for the 1922 edition, decreasing the likelihood that he did a sufficient job proofreading the presswork.
- (3) The composition of *Ulysses* spans several developmental document layers, burdening the process of editorial execution.

---

<sup>323</sup> It may be plausibly argued, given that the novel was originally intended to extend to twenty-two episodes, that what we currently possess of *Ulysses*, as a cultural artifact, is a highly sophisticated foul copy of Joyce's work in progress.

### ***The Wealth of Materials***

Editing a modernist text, with its subjective narrative and often nonlinear flow of observed events, represents a formidable challenge; *Ulysses*, with its proliferation of editions and competing sources of emendation, offers even greater challenges. First, an overwhelming wealth of material bogs down the editor in establishing variants through the process of collation. For *Ulysses*, this material spans from 1913 to 1935, ending with the 1935 Matisse-illustrated edition, the last edition Joyce authorized. The material includes notesheets, drafts and draft fragments, the Rosenbach manuscript, what few typescripts survive, serialized versions, the first and second galleys produced by Darantiere, *at least* three stages of proofs for every episode of the novel, the 1922 edition, and eleven subsequently published, authorized editions (in English). The process of collation to determine the level and degree of variance, treated with integrity, requires an army of graduate students, and requires several years to come to completion. Second, while many scholarly editing projects rely upon facsimiles for the purpose of transcription, these transcriptions must always be verified against the extant original materials to insure accuracy. But the wealth and dispersal of primary Joyce documents at several institutions across the globe makes this task not impossible, but certainly financially burdensome and extremely time-consuming.

### ***The Absence of Materials***

Nonetheless, extensive as surviving material is, significant and crucial gaps in the record of textual transmission make determining authorial intention at these stages very tenuous, if not downright impossible. The most lamented gap in the textual

transmission involves the episodes of collateral descent in the Rosenbach manuscript. For these episodes, the loss of the final working draft that Joyce submitted to his typists means that we do not have any holograph version that can confidently be called Joyce's settled intention for publication. Furthermore, where the final working draft is lost, numerous passages in the novel do not have holograph versions at all, and many of the typescripts that Joyce sent to his publishers are lost, leaving an additional gap in the evidence of textual transmission.

### ***Passive Authorization***

Any critical edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses* needs to establish quite readily its posture toward passive authorization. *Passive authorization* is an editorial tool: a document prepared by an amanuensis, typist, or publishers' production crew achieves authorial status if there is holograph evidence that the author reviewed the document carefully. The temptation to credit Joyce with passive authorization is overwhelming, because of notorious documented incidents in which Joyce let mistakes stand. The most famous example applies to *Finnegans Wake*. While dictating the work to Samuel Beckett, someone knocked on the door. Joyce heard the knock, but Beckett did not, so when Joyce said, "Come in," Beckett transcribed the phrase into the text. Later, when reviewing the work, Joyce realized how the invitation crept into his text, and rather than expunging it, he instructed Beckett to let it stand. Robert McAlmon also has taken some credit for features in the Penelope episode of *Ulysses*. He made several mistakes while typing the Penelope episode, attempting to aid Joyce in his final efforts of rushed composition during late 1921. McAlmon feared that Joyce would be upset over these mistakes, but Joyce liked the changes and kept them. The

final word of *Ulysses*, “yes,” is attributed to one of Joyce’s French translators, Valery Larbaud, who prepared the *séance* in late 1921. Larbaud thought the French translation of “Yes, I will” sounded weak, so he tacked on “Oui.” As a consequence, Joyce decided to end his English version with “yes.” And, when Rodker pointed out several corruptions in the 1922 edition, Joyce responded, “These are not misprints but beauties of my style hitherto undreamt of.”<sup>324</sup> Through all the development of the novel, one may point to instances in which Joyce noticed a typist’s or compositor’s mistake, and rather than correcting it, incorporated it into the text, with further revision and expansion of the passage.

The propensity that Joyce had to incorporate an amanuensis’s, typist’s, or compositor’s error is complicated by the writer’s failure to proofread his typeset text well. Aside from his efforts being directed at continual composition, he suffered from eyesight failure throughout the composition and printing of *Ulysses*. In my estimation, Joyce’s condition precludes the possibility of passive authorization as an editorial tool. While reviewing proofs, Joyce wrote to Weaver on November 6, 1921,

I feel more and more tired but I have to hold on till all the proofs are revised I am extremely irritated by all those printer’s errors. Working as I do amid piles of notes at a table in a hotel I cannot possibly do this mechanical part with my wretched eye and a half. Are these to be perpetuated in future editions? I hope not.<sup>325</sup>

One may indeed make a stronger case for passive authorization if the passage or textual feature in question went through several rounds of proofs, raising the number of times Joyce would have, presumably, reviewed it. But these cases must be considered with the utmost care and logical criteria. Those who have invoked the

---

<sup>324</sup> *L II*: 187.

<sup>325</sup> *L I*: 176.



notion of passive authorization in the critical conversation surrounding the new text unwittingly demonstrate their reluctance to see some of their favorite readings corrected out of existence.<sup>326</sup>

### ***Joyce's Experimental Literary Techniques***

Yet another difficulty in editing *Ulysses* stems from Joyce's highly experimental literary techniques. Often a scholarly editor is alert to necessary emendation based on the conventions of language and text during the lifetime of the author. All such reliance upon standard conventions will go by the board when editing a work like *Ulysses*. The stream-of-consciousness technique of the initial style of the novel (namely, episodes 1 through 11, Aeolus excepted) generated phrases and passages that barely conform to sentence structure. Joyce's neologisms, taken to their greatest degree in the *Wake*, have already begun to emerge in *Ulysses*. And for the remainder of the novel, the narrative style varies from episode to episode. An editor of *Ulysses* will never be able to treat a departure from the norm of textual convention in this work as a suspect mishap, against the author's wishes. Joyce's experimental literary techniques in Sirens, Cyclops, Nausicaa, Oxen of the Sun, Circe, and Penelope complicate the editors' reliance upon departures from the norm as red flags of potential textual corruptions. The Eumaeus episode epitomizes this difficulty, as the literary technique at the close of the novel reinforces the exhaustion of characters through the exhaustion of our narrator.

---

<sup>326</sup> See the papers delivered at the Monaco conference, published in *Assessing the 1984 Ulysses*, ed. George Sandulescu and Clive Hart (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Nobles Books, Buckinghamshire: Gerrards Cross, 1986). In particular, the argument presented by Richard Ellmann invokes the concept of passive authorization to argue that Joyce did not intend to include the love passage in his published text. Ellmann claims that the theme of love was central to the book; hence, Joyce would have carefully reviewed any passage that referred to love, but there is not any holograph evidence to indicate that Joyce did so. Fritz Senn served as a good counterpoint to Ellmann's argument, warning Joyce scholars against the temptation to invoke passive authorization in their criticism of Gabler's edition.

### *Variance from Episode to Episode*

Not only do Joyce's literary techniques morph as the novel goes into its later stages of development, but the textual situation, in terms of surviving and relevant materials, varies significantly from episode to episode. The Telemachia are the easiest episodes to edit. Because these episodes were the first Joyce composed, without the demand of a serialization schedule, they have the fewest revisions and additions in the presswork for the 1922 edition. The Telemachia also have a straightforward linear descent: the Rosenbach manuscripts of these episodes served as Sykes's exemplar when preparing typescripts, and the third copy of those typescripts was submitted to Darantiere for 1922 publication. While these episodes are the easiest to edit, they are by no means easy to edit. Even though the text was transmitted linearly, from the Rosenbach to the typescript to the first *placards* by Darantiere, we suffer a gap in the evidence of transmission. The typescripts Sykes produced are lost.<sup>327</sup> Since Joyce expressed his dissatisfaction with the reliability of these typescripts, it becomes rather important to know where he made changes to them and where he did not. We do have a form of evidence, from which we can infer what existed in the lost typescripts. That evidence includes the descending texts of the *Little Review*, the *Egoist*, and the first *placards* produced by Darantiere. But the utility of these documents, as witnesses of what existed in the lost typescripts, breaks down for Nestor and Proteus, because Harriet Shaw Weaver used the *Little Review* publication as setting copy for these two episodes (more on this anon).

---

<sup>327</sup> Only one page of Sykes's typescripts survives, and it belongs to the printer's copy submitted to Darantiere for the Proteus episode.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the textual stemmatology of *Calypso* and *Lotus Eaters* is much more complicated than that of the *Telemachia*. Groden and Gabler have difference of opinion regarding linear or collateral descent for the Rosenbach manuscripts. For the *Calypso* episode, Joyce evidently shuffled the pages of his triplicate typescripts, and the fragmentary surviving pages of the typescripts generate confusion, rather than clarity, about the author's process of correction. The typescript copy submitted to Margaret Anderson is lost; only two pages of the typescript submitted to Darantiere survive, and the third copy, though bearing in some instances Joyce's correcting hand, was typed by at least two different typists. For this surviving typescript fragment, a continuous eight-page run, pages 3 through 7 were retyped to include authorial revision, but these eight pages were never submitted to Joyce's publishers. So an editorial crux again presents itself. The surviving fragment carries evidence of Joyce's corrections and revisions, but he didn't submit it to Darantiere.

For *Lotus Eaters*, we most likely suffer collateral descent, so we do not have a manuscript that can be confidently called Joyce's intentions for publication. In addition, the variance between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* indicates that this episode contains the heaviest addenda and revision to the lost final working draft, meaning that several passages in the episode do not have a holograph version.

Hades, Aelous, Lestrygonians, Scylla and Charybdis, and Sirens all have a surviving typescript exemplar submitted to Darantiere, but these episodes do not have a holograph version for the purpose of publication. This means that we can neither consider the holograph version Joyce's intentions for publication, nor can we treat the typescripts as an authoritative text, for the typists were very prone to stylize Joyce's

text. Joyce reviewed and made corrections to the typescripts, but the authority of the typescripts is compromised by the writer's failing eyesight. As with *Lotus Eaters*, the number of additions to the text, which appear for the first time in the *Little Review*, leave many passages without any holograph version.

Wandering Rocks is an episode with linear descent, but the second half of it was dictated to Frank Budgen during the previously mentioned attack of iritis. Several proper nouns are spelled differently in this portion of the novel than they are in the rest of the novel.

Cyclops does have linear descent with relationship to the Rosenbach manuscript, but the surviving typescript submitted to Darantiere has inscribed corrections that are *not* in Joyce's hand. Gabler posits that they are Budgen's, but this cannot be substantiated, so again, a breakdown in the evidence of authorial intention occurs. In addition, Darantiere had to intervene in already set type to include the narrative portion of the Police, which Joyce composed between the production of the first *placards* and the second *placards*. Because of Joyce's continual composition of this episode, the presswork went through four sets of *placards* and five sets of proofs.

Nausicaa has been grouped with episodes of collateral descent, but in some instances, the Rosenbach manuscript seems to have been the setting copy for the typist. It is possible that leaves of the Rosenbach were pulled from the final working draft to fulfill obligations to John Quinn. Oxen of the Sun suffers from collateral descent at the Rosenbach level, but surviving draft fragments introduce new considerations into the development of the episode. The drafts are not only fragmentary, but they divide into two different developmental levels.

For Circe, the Rosenbach manuscript is the direct linear ancestor for most of the episode, but the Rosenbach has a four-page lacuna. Despite the relief of linear descent, the Circe episode has one of the most complicated textual stemmatologies of the entire novel, in part because the writer continued to compose new sections for the episode while completed portions were being set in type: the episode was never set in type continuously, but in several sections at a time, beginning with the Messianic narrative portion. Many of the pages in the Rosenbach were not the typist's setting copy, and for most of the episode, the manuscript was re-inscribed by the Greek amanuensis Beach employed. (A graphic presentation of Circe's textual stemmatology is readily viewable on the University of Buffalo Rare Books and Manuscripts Web site.)<sup>328</sup>

For Eumaeus, we have linear descent and surviving typescripts, but the typescript that Joyce submitted to Darantiere only partially survives. Copies of the surviving typescript were used to supplement this lacuna as a source of inference, but they were uncorrected by Joyce, and the typist who prepared them restyled all of the punctuation and quotations in the episode. The typescripts prepared for Ithaca, though they were prepared from the Rosenbach, went through three rounds of revision and three partial retypings, and the surviving printer's copy submitted to Darantiere is incomplete. Penelope was typed by several different typists, including Robert McAlmon, but for both Penelope and Ithaca, the episodes suffer from Joyce's haste.

In short, the textual situation of *Ulysses* is a veritable case study of all of the most difficult challenges when conducting a critical editing project. The wealth of

---

<sup>328</sup> See <http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/pl/exhibits/joycebloom/day/caseIII/index.html>, item no. 28.

material is strewn with gaps and parallel lines of revision. The transmission of the episodes from Joyce's hand into print present several editorial cruxes throughout, because there are so many stages of authorial development. While Joyce's creative methods left us a cherished literary artifact, epic in its details, and immensely enriching at every read, it also left us with a very unstable text.

## CHAPTER 5: THE CRITICAL EDITION OF *ULYSSES*

Thus the unfacts, did we possess them, are too imprecisely few to warrant our certitude.

James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*

### INTRODUCTION

In 1973, textual scholars from Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Belgium gathered for a symposium in Bellagio, on Lake Como, Italy, with the purpose of exchanging ideas about editorial practice in the treatment of modern literatures. Hans Walter Gabler attended this symposium, which pivoted on the exchange of the Anglo-American and German schools and, according to Gabler, the symposium became “in terms both of methodology and of procedure . . . the birthplace of the critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*.”<sup>329</sup> Gabler’s method for *Ulysses* draws upon both Anglo-American and continental traditions for editing modern literature. The Joyce Wars were largely due to the fact that Anglo-American scholars were evaluating the critical edition as if it had been produced purely by the Anglo-American method. In 1997, David Greetham stated this rather succinctly:

I have long contended that much of the unease felt by Anglo-American scholars over Hans Walter Gabler’s ‘synoptic’ edition of Joyce’s *Ulysses* was the result of Gabler’s attempt to effect a marriage between Greg-Bowers intentionalist clear text (on the recto pages) and Franco-German genetic presentation (on the verso

---

*Epigraph*: James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (New York: Penguin, 1999), p. 57.

<sup>329</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *Contemporary German Editorial Theory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), p. 1. The symposium in Bellagio also resulted in two papers representative of divergence between the Anglo-American and German schools: Fredson Bowers’s “Remarks on Eclectic Texts,” which was commissioned for the occasion to summarize Anglo-American copy-text editing (later published in *Proof 4* [1974]: 13–58 and reprinted in *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing* [Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975]: 488–528) and Hans Zeller’s “A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts” *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–64.

pages), an attempted alliance that caused only mutual incomprehension rather than a pooling of spousal resources.<sup>330</sup>

Despite the publicity of the debates surrounding the Garland edition, no one has conducted a comparative study of the two schools of thought, as they have been applied to Joyce's texts.<sup>331</sup> This is a significant absence for Joyce studies, because many of the precepts of the German school of editing are particularly useful for the *Ulysses* editorial situation. This is also an embarrassing oversight in our scholarship. Twenty years after its publication, the reputation of the Gabler edition still suffers from the confusion generated by the Joyce Wars.

## TEXTUAL SCHOLARSHIP

Textual scholarship may be defined as “the general term for all the activities associated with the discovery, description, transcription, editing, glossing, annotating, and commenting upon texts.”<sup>332</sup> The discipline dates back to the Hellenistic period and is the most ancient of scholarly activities in the West. Before the theoretical criticism of Aristotle and Plato, Greek scholars had, by the end of the sixth century B.C.E., established texts of the Homeric epics, with an admittedly subjective method that removed errors resulting from oral transmission.<sup>333</sup> But the third Chief Librarian at Alexandria, Aristarchus of Samothrace, brought a more objective method to the

---

<sup>330</sup> David Greetham, Book Review of *Contemporary German Editorial Theory in Modern Philology* 95, no. 2 (November 1997): 285–289.

<sup>331</sup> In a letter from Hans Walter Gabler to myself, dated April 24, 2005, Gabler stated the following: “The only discussion I can think of, of the *Ulysses* edition and its perspectives from a sound comparative knowledge of both Anglo-American and German editorial premises, is that of J.C.C. Mays in *Text*.” (See *Text* 8 [1998]: 217–237.) Mays is the textual editor of *Poetical Works* in the chronological edition *Collected Coleridge*. Mays does not discuss the Gabler edition of *Ulysses* at length, but refers to it as “the only other attempt to harness the German and French advances in editorial theory to an English (Irish) author” (p. 231).

<sup>332</sup> D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1994), p. 2. The following historical surveys are cultivated largely from Greetham's valuable work.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 297.



activity of archiving, transmitting, and establishing texts, by combining the largely aesthetic methods of his predecessors with a new awareness of technical evidence. The latter was applied as a bibliographic method. Aristarchus produced critical recensions, trying as far as possible to isolate “good” manuscripts from corrupted ones, in an effort to remove the layers of conjecture of his predecessors. The scholar brought a wide knowledge of grammar, etymology, orthography, and literature to the editorial task, and applied a critical evaluation of documentary evidence to recognize the “Homeric” reading from the merely scribal. This method could, in the hands of an able critic like Aristarchus, produce a “sensitive and discriminating text responsive to authorial intention.”<sup>334</sup> And the concepts as well as the practice became the major characteristic of the Alexandrian school of analogy.

At the other end of the critical spectrum, the Pergamian linguistic and scholarly rivals invoked a principle of anomaly. Dependent upon a Stoic acceptance of the inevitable corruption of all temporal, earthly phenomena as a result of man’s fallen condition, the Pergamian anomalists felt it was impossible to create or recreate an ideal form. The method of textual criticism held that the only honest recourse was to select a specific utterance or extant document which, on philological grounds or on the grounds of provenance, seemed to best represent authorial intention. Having made this selection, the readings of the document were followed as closely as possible. In this way, critical judgment was suspended once the first leap of faith had been made.<sup>335</sup> But in both enterprises, critical activity is at work to preserve, establish, transmit, and comment upon text.

---

<sup>334</sup> Ibid., p. 299.

<sup>335</sup> Ibid., p. 300.

Textual criticism is the more precise term for this discipline, which acknowledges the critical faculties of scholars applied to the process of “interrogating” the text and preparing it for public consumption.<sup>336</sup> The activity is critical in that it involves a speculative, personal, and individual confrontation with the material to be edited, despite attempts by some textual critics to turn the process into a science, and despite the frequent misunderstanding by nontextuists, who often think of textual criticism as a mechanical imposition of technical procedures in order to produce “definitive editions” of works.<sup>337</sup> Textual criticism has gone through two millennia of adaptation, not only to changing theoretical premises, dispositions, and discourse, but also to the changing cultural, political, and institutional forces of textual production and transmission. Despite the long history, the trace elements of rival scholarly positions of our earliest critical forefathers still characterize the scholarly disagreement in the treatment of modern literatures.

#### **ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION: INTENTIONALIST ECLECTIC EDITING**

Discourse in Anglo-American textual scholarship is guided by the central concern of recovering an author’s intentions for his or her work; discussion among practitioners of text concerns how best to do this, especially when faced with an editorial crux. The three scholars to whom most editors are indebted for the development of guiding principles and methodology are W.W. Greg and his principal successors, Fredson Bowers and G. Thomas Tanselle. Greg published “The Rationale of Copy-Text” in 1950, a paper intended to give practical advice. His paper initiated the most germinal theoretical movement in the tradition of modern Anglo-American

---

<sup>336</sup> Ibid., p. 295.

<sup>337</sup> Ibid., p. 295.

textual scholarship.<sup>338</sup> Greg was an editor of Elizabethan texts, of which we often have inherited a multitude of printed versions without any manuscripts to indicate authorial intention. In this paper, Greg drew a methodological distinction between *accidental variants*, differences in marks of punctuation and orthography, and *substantive variants*, differences in text that carry meaning. Based upon the rationale that accidental variants are far more likely to be the work of a publisher and substantive variants are far more likely to be the work of an author, an editor may develop a textual stemmatology, follow the lineage up the family tree to the first extant progenitor, and declare that document the *copy-text*, the text to be critically edited. Designating the copy-text this way will minimize the number of publishing-house corruptions in the text, and the editor maintains fidelity to the copy-text in all instances of accidental variance. Then, the editor may consider the substantive variants in the textual descendents and, when critically deemed to be authorial revisions, incorporate them into the copy-text to produce the text that most approximates authorial intention. (This method is called eclectic editing, for its use of multiple documents to establish a new text.)

Greg's successors, Fredson Bowers and G. Thomas Tanselle, adapted these principles for editing modern works, for which large amounts of prepublication material, in the form of manuscripts and presswork, survive. The ideal editorial situation for a modern work is the survival of the author's *printer's copy*, a term used to refer to the document that the author submits to his or her publisher for setting a work in print. The printer's copy carries important status, because it most faithfully

---

<sup>338</sup> See "The Rationale of Copy-Text" (1950–51), in W.W. Greg's *Collected Papers*, ed. J.C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).

represents the author's intentions for publication. Ideally, the printer's copy is a manuscript, rather than a copy produced by an amanuensis or a typist. The fewer the degrees of remove from the author's hand, the better the indication of authorial intent. In addition, presswork, which carries documentary evidence of revisions made (or approved) by the author and those made by editors and publishers, facilitates critical editing. The editor may then designate the printer's copy as copy-text, and incorporate substantive variants, evinced to be authorial (or approved by the author) from any presswork document or authorized printed version. Bowers and Tanselle's adaptation of Greg's rationale to the treatment of modern texts developed the following guiding principle: as an author's intentions change over the course of composition and publication, revisions to certain passages or readings supercede earlier text, so that the result of eclectic editing represents the author's *final and settled* intentions for publication. This methodology is now referred to as the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle tradition of scholarly editing, and it was adopted in 1963 by the Modern Language Association, which developed a permanent committee to evaluate and endorse critical editions: the Committee for Editions of American Authors (CEAA), later renamed the Committee on Scholarly Editions (CSE). The CSE has continued to adapt its requirements for endorsement to encompass any edition in which certain criteria are met, including documentary or genetic editions.

In the early 1960s, Anglo-American scholars began to challenge the intentionalist premise in scholarly editing. The first was issued by James Thorpe, whose corpus of writing seeks to legitimize the role that publishers play in bringing out a text. Thorpe considered the work of the author merely "potential" until the

production crew of a publishing house brought the work to readers.<sup>339</sup> The second critic to take on intentionalist premises was Donald Pizer, who issued a series of objections to newly established texts in scholarly editions, in which the new text departed so drastically from the hitherto received text that it confused the very notion of what the cultural artifact was.<sup>340</sup> Philip Gaskell then generated some good press for consideration of the role of publishers in the production of texts in *From Writer to Reader*.<sup>341</sup> Hershel Parker also issued a challenge to the Bowers-Tanselle notion of *final* authorial intentions.<sup>342</sup> In *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons*, Parker privileges initial intentions above final in some case studies, as by the time a text is in its final stages of production, an author may have switched from creative mode to editorial. Parker also engages the psychology of creation, and the economic and political factors of publication, to situate an author in a social continuum. In each of these discussions, the social aspects of textual production are at the forefront of consideration; however, these discussions are not large departures from author-centric approaches to text, for at the core, they issue the challenge to consider the publisher's work upon a text as a functional extension of authorial intention. The biggest contribution these discussions made to textual criticism was the acknowledgement

---

<sup>339</sup> See James Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1972).

<sup>340</sup> Pizer's primary criticisms were of Stephen Crane's *Red Badge of Courage* and the Pennsylvania Edition of Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*. Both works underwent heavy revision by their authors, and the critical editions of these works restored the texts to Ur versions. Dreiser's work on *Sister Carrie* is a prime example of editorial crux in the case of self-censorship. The first release of *Sister Carrie* was widely criticized as being an immoral work, and under great pressure from his publishers, Dreiser revised the novel. Pizer's position was one of *textus receptus* (the notion that a canonized version of a work holds a privileged status as a cultural artifact). It should be noted, however, that when scholarly editors restored these works to their Ur versions, they simultaneously created a market competitor for editions Pizer had prepared in previous decades. See *Sister Carrie: an authoritative text*, ed. Donald Pizer (New York: Norton, 1970) and in *The Red Badge of Courage: an authoritative text*, ed. Donald Pizer (New York: Norton, 1976).

<sup>341</sup> Philip Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

<sup>342</sup> Hershel Parker, *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1984).

that scholarly editions cannot always claim to be *definitive*. Often an editor is confronted with indeterminate or inconclusive evidence, and in those situations, each editor may exercise critical judgment differently.

The biggest challenge to author-centric theory was issued in the 1980s. The primary proponents of this new thinking in the social constitution of texts were Jack Stillinger, D.F. McKenzie, and Jerome McGann. Stillinger's work *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* follows case studies of multiple authorship from Homer to Anne Beattie.<sup>343</sup> Capitalizing on evidence of social influence in the development of a literary work, Stillinger asserts that reverence for the solitary author is fallacious. McKenzie delivered a series of lectures in 1985, now referred to as the Pazinni lectures, in which he offered bibliographic method as a means of accessing multiple media venues. But in all of his lectures, he underscored the point that meaning is reconstituted as text is reproduced, reread, and reprinted; in other words, meaning is (re)generated in the social aspects of its currency.<sup>344</sup>

Jerome McGann has become the most noted and prominent spokesperson in Anglo-American scholarship for the social paradigm of text. In 1983, McGann, from the University of Virginia, published *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*.<sup>345</sup> In this book, McGann calls into question our reverence for authorial intention, purporting that our implicit ideas about the nature of literary production and textual authority so emphasize the autonomy of the isolated author that they distort our

---

<sup>343</sup> Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). Stillinger includes, for our modernist interests, Ezra Pound's influence on the final development of T.S. Eliot's "The Waste Land."

<sup>344</sup> McKenzie's lectures were revised and published in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>345</sup> Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1983). McGann followed this publication with *Social Values and Poetic Acts* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

theoretical grasp of the mode of existence of a work of literary art. That mode of existence is, in McGann's view, social rather than individual. The collaboration of an author with his editors and publishers is a social enterprise, not entirely unwelcome by the author. The transmission of a text through time is also inherently social. McGann argues that our ideas about an isolated author are "so widespread in our literary culture, and since they continue to go unexamined in fundamental ways that ... seem necessary, they continue to operate at the level of ideology."<sup>346</sup>

G. Thomas Tanselle has offered the most rigorous and logical corrections of the claims made by the proponents of social theories of text.<sup>347</sup> Tanselle corrects the notion that scholarly editors have idealized an isolated consciousness, or operate under a myth of solitary genius. Scholarly editors who work according to intentionalist premises do not disregard the social aspects of textual production. In fact, the extensive research that goes into a critical edition of a modernist work is not dismissive of any aspect of social production; presswork, publications, and correspondence, when extant, are always part of the larger body of materials that intentionalist editors excavate to determine authorial intention. Both internal evidence (such as an author's mark of acceptance of a publishing-house editor's alteration of text) and external evidence (such as an author's correspondence with his or her production crew, family, friends, or associates) govern the establishment of text. Few scholarly editors who operate according to this mode would argue the cogency of social influence on the development of text. In short, intentionalist editors are enmeshed in the social aspects of textual production. Nonetheless, the challenge to

---

<sup>346</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>347</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology," *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 85–144.

the intentionalist premise in textual scholarship has generated a combative tone among textuists, in part because it is difficult to propose “new” theory without directly challenging the “old.” Though it cannot properly be called a Kuhnian paradigm shift (none of the proponents of the social paradigm have developed an editorial procedure as of yet), the social paradigm for the conception of text has certainly redirected Anglo-American discourse back to its premises.

Contrary to the strong impression Anglo-American scholars gave in the press during the Joyce Wars, there is no singular correct method for scholarly editing, not even in the Anglo-American tradition itself.<sup>348</sup> The method chosen usually does, and should, depend upon the author, the extant materials, the conditions of publication, and the needs of readers. For example, the intentionalist method of eclectic editing, established by Greg, Bowers, and Tanselle, applies beautifully to an author like Willa Cather, who was also an editor, carefully reviewed the presswork for her publications, and gave specific orders for her books, down to the details of the cover and binding. Still, her publications suffered corruptions, and scholarly editors excavated the available evidence to determine which variants were corruptions and which were approved by the author. Likewise, *All the King's Men*, by Robert Penn Warren, has been liberated from impositions of 1946 standards of punctuation, orthography, and “good taste.” The editors at Harcourt Brace styled Warren’s punctuation and orthography, even though the departures from the convention of his day were consistent and deliberate (Warren had edited *The Southern Review* for a number of years). Passages were also struck by the Harcourt editors, passages that didn’t fall

---

<sup>348</sup> There are correct procedures and practices for transmitting text, for example, the highly technical executions of transcription and data control, and these apply to any critical edition, but there is not a singular correct method for critical editing.



into the decorum of good taste at the time. In 2001, Harcourt published the novel in a restored edition, critically established by editor Noel Polk, which used Warren's typescript printer's copy as a basis for eclectic editing.

Eclectic editing is also particularly useful for scholarly editions whose primary task is to provide a reliable version of the text to be canonized. For example, American polymath and philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce suffered the misfortune of writing for editors who often were not qualified to edit his work.<sup>349</sup> As a result, Peirce's publications suffered a fairly high degree of corruption. But for several of his important publications, manuscripts and presswork survive. Also, a wealth of unpublished material survives that traces the evolution of Peirce's thought (the far majority of his work was never published during his lifetime). Many of these papers were left as foul copies, but the philosopher always wrote with publication in mind and left strong evidence of his preferences for how his works should be printed. For example, Peirce was closely associated with the *Century Dictionary*, for which he authored no less than sixteen-thousand definitions, and in a manuscript written in 1900 entitled "An Apology for Modern English," he makes a beautiful argument against phonetic spelling, articulating his preference for Greek- and Latin-root orthography. With this kind of evidence, evidence collected from the corpus of Peirce's writings and correspondence, the editors at the Peirce Project are able to bring Peirce's foul copies to a publishable level in accord with his preferences. The Peirce Edition Project excavates Peirce's papers, orders them according to sound bibliographic method, and provides a critically established, stable text for

---

<sup>349</sup> Jonathan Eller, "Essay on Editorial Theory and Method," *Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce* 6 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

canonization. The Greg-Bowers-Tanselle method of eclectic editing is very well suited to the task. By producing a reliable, critically edited text, the new chronological edition of Peirce's work is filling a serious void in the body of literature for American philosophy.

A social paradigm of critical editing would work well for an author like Nathaniel Hawthorne, who submitted printer's copies that were quite untidy. Hawthorne expected, and even relied upon, publishers' editors and production crews to bring his texts to a degree of legibility consistent with the standard conventions of punctuation and orthography of the time. Lending authority to a printed version of Hawthorne's works, for example, would be a justified editorial decision, on the grounds that the publisher's role in the development of the work was, as Herschel Parker suggests, a functional extension of authorial intention.

J.C.C. Mays, however, is a scholarly editor for whom the principles of eclectic editing had to be abandoned in the development of a critical edition of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's poetry. Some of the poems in the Poetical Works of *Collected Coleridge* were edited according to the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle tradition of eclectic editing. For example, *Christabel* was edited with intentionalist methods to establish a reading text. For *Christabel*, the first publication of the poem (1816) was set in type from a very tidy manuscript, and the last in Coleridge's lifetime (1834) incorporated revisions but also accumulated errors. Hence, eclectic editing was particularly useful to establishing the text Coleridge intended for *Christabel*. The methods of eclectic editing, however, were slowly abandoned by Mays in the establishment of other poems. As Mays worked over the texts,

It became apparent that old ideas about substantives and accidentals which Alice Walker had passed on to me at Oxford simply did not apply to the post-Renaissance author. Differences of spelling and punctuation affect meaning as much as differences of wording.<sup>350</sup>

Furthermore, authorial intention for several works in Coleridge's collection of poetry was largely indeterminate. As Mays states,

The choice of reading text is determined by particular circumstances, again and again. The determining point of balance is not Coleridge's intention; his intentions are always interesting, but I would be hard-put to say always what they are; frequently they are contradictory and frequently they changed.<sup>351</sup>

Coleridge's poetry often became a variant version in the context of different political situations and/or in Coleridge's expectation of how his work would be received (which led Coleridge to pride himself in being "the amenable author").<sup>352</sup> In these instances, Mays allows "separate versions autonomy," and displays "alternatives with the least suggestion of subordination."<sup>353</sup> Also in these instances, analyzing and providing the cultural context of composition and the history of production become primary enterprises of the critical activity. Mays's methods and critical procedures for these works are distinctly continental.

## **THE GERMAN TRADITION: HISTORICAL-CRITICAL EDITION**

The continental approach to editing modern works varies significantly from the Anglo-American approach.<sup>354</sup> The two traditions of textual scholarship share

---

<sup>350</sup> J.C.C. Mays, "Editing Coleridge in the Historicized Present" *Text* 8 (1998): 217–237.

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226.

<sup>352</sup> Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Collected Letters*, ed. E.L. Griggs, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956–1971) vol. 3: p. 428.

<sup>353</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225.

<sup>354</sup> The following discussion is generated largely from Gabler's essay in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), entitled "Textual Criticism," as well as *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, ed. George Bornstein, et. al (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995).

common roots. This is evident in the labels applied to the fruits of textual scholarship: Anglo-American editors produce a critical edition; German editors produce a *historisch-kritische Ausgabe*. For classical and medieval texts, the enterprise of textual scholarship involves the analysis of the transmission of text. This is common ground between Anglo-American and German schools of thought. The two traditions diverge, however, in the treatment of modern works, in which the author appears on the scene in a very material way, in the form of prepublication manuscripts and extant presswork.

The most useful starting place for understanding the difference in these traditions is the purpose served by the scholarly endeavor. In the Anglo-American tradition, the purpose of this endeavor is the production of a stable and reliable reading text, one which may be canonized. This is the primary reason that critical editions in this tradition often elect for a clean reading text, with an itemized apparatus in the back matter of the book. Reliability is defined by the author's final and settled intentions for publication of his or her work, and the beneficiaries of an established, reliable text are all readers, both casual and academic. The crowning achievement of critical editions in the Anglo-American enterprise is a reliable text, not only for the canon, but also on the marketplace of our beloved books. In the Franco-German tradition, the practice of textual criticism generates a history and record of the text primarily for the sake of scholarship. Some critical editions produced by German methods are apparatus-only editions. The primary beneficiaries of the work of these textual critics are colleagues engaged in literary and cultural studies within the academy. This does not mean that the Franco-German tradition

denies the authority of the author. In fact, much of the development of the editorial enterprise in the German tradition is due to the large demand and interest in the author's processes of composition. But whereas in the Anglo-American tradition, the critical activity has largely been applied to the establishment of text, in the German tradition, the critical activity is largely applied to analysis of the genesis and history of the work's life in print. The *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* is "aimed less at the reader than at the user of the edition."<sup>355</sup> When we articulate this difference of purpose, we see quite readily that the two are not competing paradigms of method, but largely different enterprises. Where the Anglo-American tradition focuses on the culmination of the author's writing, usually centering on the act of publication, the German tradition focuses on the evolution of text. In other words, the former aims for text as a unified and complete product; the latter aims for the depiction of process, both in the history of composition and in the history of transmission.

When Hans Gabler returned from Bellagio, he carried with him the idea for an edition of *Ulysses* formulated as a hybrid of both approaches, wherein each may offer solutions to the complexity of the *Ulysses* editorial situation. When his colleague Hans Zeller returned from Bellagio, Zeller delivered a paper to a German audience, a paper which outlined the precepts of author-centered eclectic editing.<sup>356</sup> Zeller praised the Anglo-American tradition as "the most influential and successful undertaking in the history of modern language scholarly editing."<sup>357</sup> Zeller was impressed by the

---

<sup>355</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, p. 7.

<sup>356</sup> Hans Zeller, "Structure and Genesis in Editing: On German and Anglo-American Textual Criticism," *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, pp. 95–123.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95.

organizational support of a unified program for editing, under the auspices of the Modern Language Association. Zeller stated,

For twenty-five years now more than a hundred editors have worked consistently to develop, apply, and implement a textual-critical program based on a uniform theory with formulated principles. The significance of this research for related disciplines lies in its rationality, discursivity, and coherence.<sup>358</sup>

Zeller was also impressed by the sound methods of descriptive and analytical bibliography, which form a science of knowledge regarding textual transmission, and which form the basis of textual analysis in the Anglo-American tradition. The scholar saw this science as a body of knowledge far beyond the development of German analysis of the same. But Zeller's encounter with the Anglo-American method for editing modern works reaffirmed and strengthened the scholar's opposition to authorial intention as a guiding principle for editing, as well as his opposition to eclectic editing.

The position that Zeller had taken in years previous toward eclectic editing may be found in his earlier paper "Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing," delivered in 1971.<sup>359</sup> The German words *Befund* (record) and *Deutung* (interpretation) have become as common a currency in the discourse of German theory as Greg's accidentals and substantives in Anglo-American theory. Zeller uses the term *record*, *Befund*, to refer to the historical version of the text, and he uses the term *interpretation*, *Deutung*, to refer to the editorial activity. Zeller argues for separation of record and interpretation, and his

---

<sup>358</sup> Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>359</sup> Hans Zeller, "Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing," *Contemporary German Editorial Theory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995). The paper was first published in *Texte und Varianten: Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Gunter Martens and Hans Zeller (Munich: Beck, 1971).

position is best understood through the example he offers: Aristarchus's treatment of the *Iliad* (200 B.C.). Aristarchus did not intervene in the text of the *Iliad*, except to mark it with references guiding the reader to the editorial commentary. The "discussion of recension, the reference to other readings, and especially the conjectures—the interventions into the transmitted text resulting from the criticism to remove inconsistencies (*emendatio*)—are not found in the text, but rather in the commentary."<sup>360</sup> As a result of Aristarchus's editorial separation of the record (the text) from the interpretation (the editorial apparatus), we have inherited a well-preserved historical text of the epic. Had Aristarchus "healed" the linguistic anomalies (in accord with Alexandrian philologists' metrical notions) and unified the text, emending the interpolations, the editor would have obliterated the evidence of Homeric language, the basis for song theories (F.A. Wolff), the theories of compilation, and the new unitary understanding of epic composition technique.<sup>361</sup>

Zeller states,

Thanks to Aristarchus' division, recent philology is independent of Aristarchus' time-bound bias, or, as I would prefer to express it, thanks to that division, the inevitable shadow of the editor remains recognizable for us. It falls in Aristarchus (if we leave out recension) not on the text but rather on the commentary.<sup>362</sup>

In sum, thanks to Aristarchus's procedural choices, we have inherited three things: a well-preserved historical version of the work, the evidence of the Hellenistic epoch of literary production, and the evidence of Alexandrian philologists' editorial activities.

From this position of hindsight, Zeller concludes that eclectic editing corrupts the integrity of historical versions of texts. Zeller's position toward eclectic editing was

---

<sup>360</sup> Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>361</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>362</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

as germinal for German theory and practice as Greg's development of copy-text editing. This movement in Germany, for the separation of record and interpretation, led to a strong emphasis on the history of textual production and transmission, which explains why the German critical edition is designated a "historical-critical edition."

At the Bellagio symposium, Zeller's opposition to eclectic editing was reaffirmed, strengthened, and furthermore recast as opposition to the concepts of authorial intention as a guiding principle for editing. Zeller finds a twofold flaw in the objectives of intentionalist editing. The first flaw is the underlying textual concept and the theoretical stance that the concept implies. Anglo-American editors seek to establish an ideal text, such as the author would have produced in ideal circumstances. Hence, in editing Joyce, for example, this editorial activity would seek to amend all of the corruptions incurred in the text due to censorship and expurgation, as well as misprints in the act of publication. As examples, the same enterprise has been carried out by the editors of the Pennsylvania edition of Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, Warren's *All the King's Men*, Stephen Crane's *Maggie*, *A Girl of the Streets*, and Hawthorne's *House of Seven Gables* (which Hawthorne's wife, Sophia, prudishly expurgated). But in Zeller's estimation, imposing a context of "free conditions," in which an author would have produced an "ideal" work, imposes a false reality upon the process of artistic creation. The author's artistic intention cannot be isolated. Free conditions simply do not exist. He states,

It does not need to be explained today in Germany, where the study of communications is in the process of becoming a leading discipline, that a literary text, produced as a message within a communicative process under changing conditions, will be



distorted if reconstructed as though essentially founded only on an authorial will which could be isolated.<sup>363</sup>

From the standpoint of a textual concept then, Zeller believes that the author's intentions, such as they would have been exercised without the compromising effect of social pressures and social processes, are impossible to isolate, and if one seeks to edit in accord with them, such editing will distort the integrity of a work of art, which has a very specific place in the fabric of communication, history, and society.

The second flaw Zeller sees in intentionalist editing is the practical applicability of the concept toward the material to be edited.<sup>364</sup> Zeller studied Bowers's editions of Stephen Crane and Nathaniel Hawthorne to gauge the success of intentionalist editing. In these editions, Zeller states,

One constantly encounters differentiations of the concept of intention in the individual discussions of typical or special cases based on whether the author made changes 'for literary motives' or 'for nonliterary reasons.' These distinctions in my opinion demonstrate the unsuitability of the concept as a regulatory one.<sup>365</sup>

To Zeller, this kind of rationale, when applied in specific instances, "comes down to a question of the aesthetic quality of the variant,"<sup>366</sup> and such focus on aesthetic aspects of the work deny what a work of art is and how it comes about. Zeller argues that authors must often make decisions for nonliterary reasons. He points to Klopstock as an example, who made changes to *Messias* for theological reasons, and to avoid a response that would have been injurious to him. Zeller argues that to undo Klopstock's socially pressured changes would destroy the artistic structure of the work, which is based partly on nonaesthetic considerations.

---

<sup>363</sup> Ibid., p. 105.

<sup>364</sup> Hans Zeller, "Structure and Genesis in Editing," *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, p. 101.

<sup>365</sup> Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>366</sup> Ibid., p. 103.

As stated earlier, Zeller's stance toward intentionalist eclectic editing led to an emphasis on the historical analysis and depiction of text in process. But the author has remained on the scene in German theory and practice, albeit in a very material way. This is largely in the depiction of the author's processes of composition. Whereas the Anglo-American approach aims for an established reading text and culminates in the acts of publication, the German approach gives much greater attention to process of composition, found in the surviving materials of prepublication manuscripts, presswork, and in some instances, postpublication revision to the text. The editor's task is to depict the process of composition and transmission. The large interest in the author's writing processes developed the German form of an apparatus, the "integral" apparatus. The integral apparatus depicts variance in the context of invariance. Whereas an Anglo-American editor will choose as a copy-text (in the simplest terms, the text to be edited) the most developed version that is closest to the author's hand, a German editor will choose a text as a basis for editing that offers the greatest context of invariance. It is better thought of as an orientation text. This is not necessarily the most authoritative text, nor the most developed form of the work. It is the text that offers the greatest context of invariance through which to depict the development of the work. From this context of invariance, a German editor then works backwards and forwards, incorporating variance into the invariant context, and developing an integral apparatus with a system of symbols to signal the variants' place in the evolution of the text. With its focus on process, the German approach also recognizes the discards and deletions of the author as a valuable part of the record of composition, rather than subordinating superceded readings in preference for final authorial intention.

The author's presence on the German editorial scene is also in the concept of authorization. The collection of documents that a German editor considers relevant for the critical edition is largely determined by the documents and publications that the author composed, dictated, or authorized for printing. (This is common ground for the Anglo-American approach.) The author's intention is also a consideration in German discourse, but this is largely applied to the definition of a "textual fault," or *Textfehler*. German editors do at times emend the text. License to modify the text is restricted to an absolute minimum, and emendation is justified only to remove a textual error, or textual fault.<sup>367</sup> With its very strong emphasis on the integrity of historical versions, much of the debate in German discourse has centered on the justification for emendation, or, how a textual fault is defined. Zeller has laid the foundations for defining a textual fault, which have reached their fullest articulation in the writings of Siegfried Schiebe, who offers the following:

Editorial intervention is permissible only for unambiguous printing errors (with manuscripts, "slips of the pen") amenable to correspondingly unambiguous correction. An unambiguous error in this sense is anything that makes no sense in itself, or that within the immediate context the author could not have intended.<sup>368</sup>

A textual fault, then, is defined largely by the context in which it appears. And the criterion of an author's intention is quickly qualified by Schiebe. He no sooner defines a textual fault this way than he says, "The editor can only rely on that which has materialized from the intention of the author." By 'materialized,' Schiebe means that which has been written. He continues,

---

<sup>367</sup> Hans Gabler, *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, p. 3.

<sup>368</sup> Siegfried Schiebe, "On the Editorial Problem of the Text," *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, p. 205.

It is impossible to reconstruct what the author only thought. The author can also be mistaken without it altering the meaning or the significance of the text. The editor has to take that as given and must respect it, for the editor is not an “over-author” who knows better than the author, or who improves the text of the author’s work; the editor is “only” a scholar who understands, describes, and represents the development process of a work and who reproduces the “Text” of historically determined versions of the text in their own form—even in such doubtful cases.<sup>369</sup>

Hence, authorial intention, in the German tradition, is not a basis from which to eclectically edit a text, but serves as a process of emendation of textual errors; that is, authorial intention is much more limited in its application, and is still treated with a great deal of qualification.

The discussion of a *historisch-kritische Ausgabe*, from the standpoint of its comparative analog to a critical edition, is presented here at the level of introduction and overview, but this should by no means suggest that the *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* is simply a genetic edition, a variorum edition, or a selective variorum. The *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* has a very stringent methodology, as complicated in its theory and its application as its eclectically edited analog of the Anglo-American tradition. (In fact, German editorial *theory* is much more complicated, drawing upon multiple disciplines—philology, communication systems, Russian formalism, structuralism, and semiotics—than is the rather pragmatic analog of Anglo-American theory.) Many decades ago, the German approach to editing modern works abandoned the author’s final redaction, and with it, the concepts of authorial intention as a guiding principle for editing. But the *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* has developed far beyond the diplomatic editions in the Anglo-American tradition. The subtlety of its representation of a manuscript’s layering and topography of its writing establishes

---

<sup>369</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

and indicates temporality, in absolute and relative chronology, sequence, logic, and correlation of corrections and revisions.<sup>370</sup> The critical investment in the history of production and transmission provides a basis of scholarship. The greatest difference between the critical edition and the *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* is that the former will privilege a final text, one that is largely ahistorical, one that is established from the evidence of the author's intentions freed from the compromising effects of social pressures and social processes of publication, but the *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* does not privilege the *result* of textual changes over the *process* of such change. "Without denying the legitimacy of editing what the author intended, one may still recognize the wider option of editing what the author *did*—and this, broadly speaking, is the German editorial approach."<sup>371</sup> The *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* provides the temporal and social context of literary production and transmission for scholarship, without subordinating any version, the most nascent or the most developed, to the final redaction of the author's intention for publication. Rather, the *historisch-kritische Ausgabe* situates the author and the author's work in the complex historical and social system of communication.

### **GABLER'S METHOD: A HYBRID APPROACH**

Gabler's approach for editing *Ulysses* is influenced by the Anglo-American tradition, in that it privileges holograph inscription above any printed or non-authorial transmission. Gabler attempts not to preserve historical versions in the composition or publication history of the work, but to reconstruct a text that best approximates Joyce's intentions. Gabler also relies upon W.W. Greg's distinction of accidental and

---

<sup>370</sup> Hans Walter Gabler, *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, p. 4.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

substantive variants for determining authorial intent, when that is tenuous. Authorial intention is a justified guiding principle when working with the documents of James Joyce. Joyce was a writer who had specific intentions for his works, he often expressed his wishes explicitly, and he often remarked upon when those wishes failed to be realized. We have a wealth of available evidence for determining what Joyce intended, and the hitherto received texts have all failed to achieve those intentions. But Gabler also takes his influence from the German tradition for editing. First and foremost, the process of composition is given as great of a status in the critical activity as the aims of a publication text. For Gabler, the development of the novel in its nascent forms is a process to be depicted and provided to the audience of scholarly interest. This is achieved in the synoptic apparatus of the scholarly edition. Furthermore, Gabler does not subordinate the early development of the novel in order to privilege the author's final redaction for publication, and this has been the most controversial aspect of the edition.

### ***The Continuous Manuscript Text***

With equal critical emphasis on Joyce's processes of composition, Gabler does not choose one document for copy-text that most closely approximates Joyce's intentions for publication, as would an Anglo-American editor; instead, he reconstructs a base text from several documents that contain Joyce's holograph inscriptions. As Gabler stated in his editorial essay,

By common consent, an editor chooses as the copytext for a critical edition a document text of highest overall authority. This eliminates the first edition of 1922 as a copytext for a critical edition of *Ulysses*. The first edition admittedly represents the closest approximation to be found in one document of the work at its ultimate stage of compositional development. Yet the analysis

of the manuscripts, typescripts, and proofs reveals just how extensively it presents a non-authoritative text. According to the precepts of copytext editing, by which editorial decisions gravitate towards the copytext, upholding its readings where possible, an edition of *Ulysses* based on the first edition would not in a full sense attain the quality or scope of a critical edition, but would remain essentially a corrected edition of the work's hitherto received text.<sup>372</sup>

Rather than adhere to the precepts of copy-text editing in the Anglo-American tradition, Gabler conceives of a holograph text that may be excavated and reconstituted from several documents of composition and transmission. The German method for depicting process gives Gabler the conceptual and procedural tools with which to accomplish this. Gabler chooses the Rosenbach manuscript as his orientation text for two reasons. One reason is that the holograph inscription privileges authorial intention, and the other, distinctly continental in its conception, is that it provides the most useful context of invariance with which to depict the writer's processes of composition. The editor then works backward through the surviving drafts and draft fragments, incorporating variance into the Rosenbach orientation text, and he works forward, incorporating the variance of composition contained within the presswork for the 1922 edition. The presswork for the 1922 edition, given the prolific addition and expansion of the novel, carries the status of both documents of transmission and documents of composition. Where the text has been set in type and printed by Darantiere, in the *placards* and page proofs, the text of the presswork carries the status of documents of transmission. But in those Joyce-requested wide margins, in which the author continued to compose the novel, the presswork carries the status of documents of composition. The holograph inscriptions in the margins of presswork

---

<sup>372</sup> U1986, pp. 1894–5.

are the variance set within the Rosenbach context of invariance. This is presented linearly, but it also gives a depiction of the multi-layered evolution of the work. The result is a highly complex text reconstituted from the various stages of holograph development of the novel. Gabler states,

As a comprehensive text in the author's own hand, the continuous manuscript text corresponds at its ultimate level to the text of the first edition. If thought of as projected onto a single imaginary document, it will be perceived as a many-layered and highly complex text that carries the dynamics of an extended textual development within it.<sup>373</sup>

This Gabler calls the continuous manuscript text, and it serves as his basis for editing.

Setting aside for a moment the Rosenbach's episodes that do not fall in the line of descent for publication, there is only one problem with the application of Gabler's continuous manuscript text. As Joyce continued to compose and expand the novel on the presswork, the writer never worked with a previous copy at his side. His memory was impeccable, but the additions and revisions still sprung from the well of text that had been printed by Darantiere. Hence, a revision or addition was sometimes prompted by the printed text, a text that varied from the holograph version from which the print was set. The further one gets from the holograph inscription, the greater the variance of the text Joyce was working from when he made additions and revisions. This variance becomes especially problematic when Joyce accepted or incorporated a corruption in the printed text. If a typesetter's corrupt text served as the basis for an addition or revision, the incorporation of this addition or revision into an earlier holograph text loses its sensibility. The fabric, then, of the novel cannot be seamlessly reconstituted when we privilege holograph inscription, because the

---

<sup>373</sup> U1986, p. 1895.



transmitted text was an integral part of the author's process of composition. The application of the continuous manuscript text will sometimes yield a fabric of holograph inscription with snags. In such instances, Gabler restores the much earlier text for the final reading. Privileging the holograph inscription is a method to restore Joyce's intentions; however, it does not always produce that result, as, in some instances, Joyce's intentions may have changed as the novel was set in type.

### ***The Status of the Rosenbach Manuscript***

The development of a continuous manuscript text as a basis for editing and the synoptic apparatus might have been praised as a brilliant execution of editing if the extant textual materials for *Ulysses* were complete and followed linear descent. In the case of collateral descent, Gabler gives a great deal of status to the Rosenbach manuscripts: he considers these documents to have had, in Joyce's acts of copying, a status equal to that of a document of composition that was sent to be typed for publication. With regards to collateral descent, the editor states,

Where it occurs, the transmission of the text into the typescript from the final working draft does not alter, but rather emphasizes, Joyce's conception of a fundamental linearity in the compositional evolution. That the modified pattern of textual notation and transmission through the documents in his hand and under his control does not imply a change of attitude to that dominant mode of composition is also suggested by the ease with which the fair copies again re-enter the direct line of descent of the text for episodes 12, 15 and 16 ("Cyclops", "Circe" and "Eumaeus"). Moreover, the instances where illness (as for episode 10, "Wandering Rocks") or extreme pressure of time (as for episodes 17 and 18, "Ithaca" and "Penelope") forestalled altogether the separate inscription of a fair copy point to a basic interchangeability of [the lost] final working draft and [the Rosenbach].<sup>374</sup>

---

<sup>374</sup> U1986, p. 1880.

In most cases, the revisions initiated in copying the Rosenbach, presumably, for sale were transferred into the final working draft (this is evinced by their presence in the descending documents, such as the typescripts, where they survive, or the first *placards*, where the typescripts are lost). However, some readings are entirely unique to the Rosenbach documents that bear the collateral relationship. Because Gabler considers these documents to have the status of composition documents (rather than fair copies for the sake of sale), he includes the unique readings in his continuous manuscript text. He states,

The fair copy's unique readings, consequently—if as unique readings they are judged to be revisions and not earlier text superseded by revision in the final working draft that the typescript makes evident—must be admitted as integral to an edition text established critically in accordance with Joyce's conception of the evolution of the text of *Ulysses* as always directed towards the publication text.<sup>375</sup>

The status that Gabler gives to the documents of collateral descent in the Rosenbach manuscript is, as is already clear, the most controversial aspect of his edition. Did Joyce want the question of what is “the word known to all man” answered in the published version of his work? Clearly the word was love, but we cannot confidently know that Joyce wanted this printed in the published version of his work. The newly established text of *Ulysses*, then, is not a text that disregards authorial intention, when we utilize holograph inscriptions as indicators of this; however, it is a text that may not represent Joyce's *final* intentions for his published text. Gabler numbers the inclusions of readings unique to the collateral Rosenbach manuscripts at “some one hundred substantive readings.”<sup>376</sup>

---

<sup>375</sup> *U*1986, p. 1881.

<sup>376</sup> *U*1986, p. 1881.

### *Joyce the Scribe*

Gaskell and Hart objected to Gabler's inclusion of material that is unique to the Rosenbach manuscripts, but these scholars also objected to the inclusion of material in compositional documents that fall within the line of descent, for example, material from early drafts of the Proteus and Eumaeus episodes. Gabler draws a critical distinction between Joyce the writer and Joyce the scribe, positing that at times, Joyce is acting as an author, composing and revising his work, and at times, Joyce is acting as a scribe, copying his own text and transferring material from earlier drafts to new documents. In the latter instance, Gabler posits that Joyce was just as prone to mistakes as a medieval scribe. The most common "mistake" is the seemingly unintentional omission of material in the act of copying. Gabler states,

Joyce's routines of draft composition entailed repeated acts of copying chapter texts in whole or in part. In copying, he was both author and scribe. As author, he composed and revised unceasingly, but as scribe, he was simultaneously prone to inattention and oversight. Indeed, it may be assumed that the chance of inattention to the business of copying—as, later, to the chores of proofreading—rose in proportion to the degree of involvement in continued composition and revision.<sup>377</sup>

This is not an uncommon discovery in scholarly editing, especially for an author whose work develops through multiple drafts. But Gabler's treatment of these instances of omission is uncommon for the Anglo-American tradition of editing modern works. Critical judgment must be applied to these instances, to determine if the omission was a "mistake" on the part of the "Joyce the scribe" or a deliberate omission of "Joyce the author." The editor distinguishes the features of these omissions as thus:

---

<sup>377</sup> U1986, p. 1864.

Such features are bibliographical and compositional. Neither are common to all, and some cases are unaffected by either. Nevertheless, it is a recurrent bibliographical feature ... that the omitted words or phrases were interlinear or marginal insertions ... liable to have been missed in the copying, and it is a recurrent compositional feature that the textual lacunae were sensed or identified by Joyce at subsequent stages of the textual development.<sup>378</sup>

In these instances, Gabler restores the passage omitted in the act of copying a new draft. At times, this has serious interpretive consequences for the new text. For example, in the Proteus episode, Gabler included the italicized text, found in the early draft of that episode: “Wilde’s love that dare not speak its name. *His arm: Cranly’s arm.* He now will leave me.”<sup>379</sup> The juxtaposition of Stephen’s memory of Cranly with Oscar Wilde’s unspoken love suggests a homoerotic relationship between Cranly and Stephen, and this is an aspect of the characters that has never been present in the hitherto received texts. It cannot be said with confidence that Joyce wanted this passage in his final published text.

### ***A Process of Inference for Lost Documents***

We suffer the gap in transmission at the level of fair copy for episodes in the Rosenbach that do not fall into the line of descent, but we also suffer a gap in transmission for episodes in which the typescripts prepared do not survive. Gabler developed a method of inference to determine what existed in lost final working drafts and in the lost typescripts. He states,

If, on the other hand, a fair copy and a typescript stem collaterally from a lost final working draft or if documents or part-documents in the line of descent are lost to whose autograph notation only the adjoining extant documents bear witness, the assembly from the extant witnesses is mediate, that is, the elements of the continuous

---

<sup>378</sup> U1986, p. 1867.

<sup>379</sup> U1986: 3.451–52.

manuscript text pertaining to the missing documents must be established by inference, and thus critically, from the extant ones.<sup>380</sup>

So, for example, in the case of lost typescripts for the Telemachus episode, the Rosenbach text has been compared with the printings of the *Little Review*, the surviving galleys produced for the *Egoist*, and the first *placards* produced by Darantiere. Gabler infers the source of variance between the Rosenbach and these documents as thus:

Agreement of two printed texts against the third (and/or the fair copy) reveals an authorial correction or revision of the typescript, while a triple LR-Eg-Pl agreement against R represents an uncorrected typing error.<sup>381</sup>

As stated earlier, however, this system of inference breaks down for Nestor and Proteus, because Weaver used the *Little Review* as setting copy. Hence,

Agreement of LR and Eg, which for “Telemachus” points to an authorial marking-up of two copies of the typescript, here simply means that a LR reading, whether originating in the single typescript exemplar serving as LR’s copy or in LR itself, went unchanged into Eg. Hence, no stemmatic corroboration is available for the critical selection of a few likely authorial revisions from the group of LR-Eg concurrences that, taken together, predominantly represent corruptions in print of the text. . . . Editorially, the high potential of transmissional corruption in both LR-Eg and LR-Eg-Pl concurrences leads to the rejection of the variants from LR, Eg and Pl in all but a few critically compelling instances. The acceptance of a transmissional variant often receives support from external evidence, such as Joyce’s notes to Claud Sykes or his confirmation of the departures from R by changes made in the advanced proofs or even by some post-publication corrections requested for the book itself.<sup>382</sup>

---

<sup>380</sup> U1986, p. 1896.

<sup>381</sup> U1986, p. 1873.

<sup>382</sup> U1986, p. 1874.

Hence, Gabler is able to use these critical processes of inference, owing to the witness documents that derive from lost ones, to recover some evidence of what existed in lost documents.

### ***Other Procedural Aspects of the Edition***

#### **The Use of Facsimiles**

Some of the criticisms of the edition, despite having assumed a premise of procedure for Anglo-American critical editions, have lasting validity. Most importantly, Gabler's editorial team did not collate the entirety of their transcriptions against the original documents. In the process of transcription, the editorial team heavily circled illegible aspects of the facsimile texts and compared them with original documents, but they did not completely collate the transcription against original documents. The reason that critical editions are held to this standard (for endorsement of the CSE), laborious and tedious a process as it requires, is simple enough: facsimiles, including those of the Rosenbach manuscript and the *James Joyce Archive*, are produced with high-contrast resolution. High-contrast resolution is used because it makes faint marks very clear, but the clarity of those faint marks comes at a cost. The high-resolution contrast makes it impossible to distinguish between Joyce's ink and the typists' or the typesetters' pencil. For a methodological purist (or, for many who have seen the great disparity between an original document and a facsimile of it), this failure of execution renders the entire edition unreliable.

## **Collation**

Gabler, in his editorial essay, refers to eleven editions of *Ulysses* printed in Joyce's lifetime, and John Kidd criticized Gabler for this, stating that there were eighteen editions of *Ulysses* printed in Joyce's lifetime. Kidd is right: there were eighteen distinct editions of *Ulysses* printed (in English) in Joyce's lifetime, but only eleven of them were authorized by Joyce. All the same, Gabler did fail to collate the 1935 Matisse-illustrated edition, and he did fail to distinguish between the 1932 and 1933 Hamburg editions, which are distinct. These editions were authorized by Joyce. This failure is problematic when we expect a critically edited text to follow its own stated policies with consistency and thoroughness. For the Gabler edition, the continuous manuscript text was in a few critically compelling instances emended from the sources of variance in editions subsequent to the 1922 edition by Sylvia Beach, such as the Odyssey Press edition, and the 1936 Bodley Head edition. This means that the process of emendation from subsequent authoritative texts was incomplete; the editorial team should have, according to its own stated policies, collated all subsequent editions authorized by Joyce, for the possibility of critically compelling variants in those texts as well.

## **Gabler's Editorial Essay**

Gabler's editorial essay is difficult to follow. Most editorial essays are. As Fritz Senn remarked at the Monaco conference,

Textual critics seem to experience a real, intrinsic difficulty in addressing the uninitiated outside the temple. If you work long and microscopically with all those multiple drafts, notebooks, fair copies, typescripts, *placards*, galleys and all the rest—to say nothing of the lost final working drafts—all this will mean something to you once you give it a name; it is something

individual, concrete, identifiable, memorable. But when all of this is put into words for those without, the result may well be an erudite blur. What textual scholars deal with are documents, not too far removed from factual things, and they write on the whole with step-by-step lucidity. It is all the more ironic that the accumulation of such short range lucidity is experienced as the utmost turgidity, even obscurity—the rightful domain of those operating at the other extreme of the spectrum, the theorists.<sup>383</sup>

This ironic phenomenon is, for the most part, a necessary evil. Textual scholars must develop a language to distinguish between documents and the processes of textual production and transmission, as well as editorial theory and practice. All specialized disciplines require this, or to use Stanley Fish's phrase, this is the "immanent intelligibility" that is the mark of a profession. The only thing distinctly "nebulous" about Gabler's editorial essay is that his method was a hybrid of approaches from two distinct traditions. Hence, the language of Gabler's essay contained elements from each that were unknown to many.

### **Lack of Textual Notes**

Lastly, far too often, the edition departs from the stated principles for emendation without providing a textual note to explain that departure. Critical editors consider variants on a case-by-case basis, applying as best as they can the predetermined editorial rationale of the edition. But invariably, the predetermined rules for the general editorial process will break down, and the editor must, on an exceptional basis, depart from the generally stated guidelines. In these instances, the editor supplies a textual note that offers the rationale for the isolated instance of departure from the edition's procedures. Way too often, Gabler departs from his own stated policies without providing a textual note to explain the departure.

---

<sup>383</sup> Fritz Senn, in *Assessing the 1984 Ulysses*, ed. George Sandulescu and Clive Hart, p. 190.



## Use of the Synoptic Apparatus

The apparatus of the Garland *Ulysses* has been criticized for being too complex, but it is merely the textual situation of *Ulysses* that is complex. The synoptic apparatus is remarkably sleek and refined. It cannot be simplified, and in my estimation, it is the greatest contribution of Gabler's edition to the body of knowledge. When using the apparatus of the critical edition of *Ulysses*, a reader should keep this in mind: *The most important symbol in the apparatus is parentheses.* In Gabler's apparatus, parentheses enclose an alpha or numeric document level to indicate that the document is lost. The textual variance between these symbols was inferred based upon evidence of descending text. These are the most tenuous portions of the critically established text. Take, for example, the following in the apparatus for the Proteus episode:

<sup>(B)</sup>[*nimum*] *amplius* <sup>o(B)</sup>

The text is offset by its enclosure in parenthetical Bs, which indicates a revision at the document level symbolized by the letter B. The square brackets represent the text that was deleted, and the unmarked text of *amplius* is an addition. The degree symbol signifies an emendation to the continuous manuscript text. But the letters B, which, in the Proteus episode, represent the typescripts of 1918, are enclosed in parentheses, indicating that Margaret Anderson's typescripts are lost. The representation of revision, which falls between, is inferred based upon the variance between the Rosenbach manuscript and the *Little Review*. Gabler inferred, based on the rationale of Greg's substantive variance, that the variance between the Rosenbach and the *Little Review* was an authorial revision, so he emended the word *nimum* to *amplius* in

the critically established text. No matter how confusing the symbols in the synoptic apparatus appear, if one keeps in mind that superscript sigla *in parentheses* indicate lost documents, hence, an inference of Joyce's hand or Joyce's authority, he or she will have access to the most important criteria in evaluating the reliability of the text.

### **Use of the Trade Edition of *Ulysses***

As should now be clear, the most unstable portions of text Gabler established in the critical edition of *Ulysses* are the episodes that (are known or suspected to) suffer the relationship of collateral descent in the textual stemmatology of the Rosenbach manuscripts. These include episodes 4 through 9, 11, and 13. In addition, Joyce expressed dissatisfaction with the Ithaca and Penelope episodes. Despite the lack of textual notes, Gabler does a judicious job of recording both the constitution of the continuous manuscript text and emendations in the scholarly edition, so if one believes a reading in the 1986 trade edition is suspicious, he or she may consult the scholarly edition (or the Rosenbach manuscript, the *James Joyce Archive*, or the holdings of original documents) to formulate a position. The common system of line numbers for episodes, developed by Gabler, is in the three-volume scholarly edition, so checking the apparatus is an easy task. Also, we should always be careful with the language we use when we write literary interpretations of *Ulysses*. The text in the Gabler edition, though established with critical judgment, may not always be the text that Joyce intended for publication, and the text therein may suffer at points from mishaps of editorial execution or printing.<sup>384</sup> A fair degree of bibliographic confidence must precede statements about Joyce's intentions for his texts, and it is

---

<sup>384</sup> This is not a critique of Gabler's editorial competence. This is the nature of using critical judgment to establish a text in the face of indeterminate evidence. And, as should be clear by now, there is always the possibility of an error in the act of printing and publication.

never appropriate to speak of James Joyce's motivations in the acts of composition and revision as if one were sitting right next to the writer's elbow while he wrote.

Such privilege departed the earth with Samuel Becket.

### **JOYCE SCHOLARSHIP NOW**

I would be remiss in this thesis if I did not devote some pages to one of the monuments of Joyce scholarship and its state of reliability as well, Richard Ellmann's literary biography. Recently, Joseph Kelly conducted a brand of textual research in the investigation of Ellmann's papers, an investigation that highlights the fallibility of Ellmann's method. The privilege that Richard Ellmann earned in Joyce scholarship was in part the good fortune of his acquaintance with Ellsworth Mason. Mason and Ellmann were students together at Yale, they served part of their terms in World War II together, they corresponded when separated, and they remained friends after the war. When Ellmann completed his biography of Yeats, Mason had already gained the trust of Joyce's brother Stanislaus; Mason helped Stanislaus recover credibility in the critical terrain. Stanislaus's earliest works were immediately discredited when presented. The first made available in English was *Recollections*, which was translated from Italian in 1950 by Felix Giovanelli and published in the *Hudson Review*, but the editors at the *Hudson Review* expressed disagreement with Stanislaus's opinions. The James Joyce Society called the piece a controversial portrait that was only a provisional source of material for the early part of Joyce's life. Such disclaimers by editors and the estate were common for Stanislaus's work. Mason made a number of moves to reestablish the brother's currency in the conversation, earning Stanislaus's trust. When Ellmann considered a biography of

Joyce, Mason facilitated Ellmann's prerogative, by telling Stanislaus that Ellmann was the only biographer worth his time. But when Mason reviewed Ellmann's progress, he objected strongly to the approach. In 1958, he wrote to Ellmann,

If I intuit rightly, and if you are weaving both the works and the non-works [i.e., Joyce's real life] into a single, supposedly factual, fabric, it is a serious flaw in the work. We simply must have a biography that will tell us what can and what cannot be determined as actually having existed outside Joyce's works.<sup>385</sup>

Yet 1958 was not the first time that Mason objected to such a biographical method. He had encouraged Stanislaus to treat Joyce's life with the integrity of nonfiction reportage also, and he challenged points in Ellmann's work all along the way. As early as 1955, Mason wrote,

The trouble with your performances is that they have a kind of self-contained beauty of their own, and even in deepest error you have an intelligence of expression that is rare in Joyce criticism. I hereby predict that your errors about Joyce will be the last to depart from this earth.<sup>386</sup>

We still do not have what we simply must: a biography from which we can determine what actually did and did not exist in the writer's life.

The monumental work also does not offer us tools for research in the rigor of proper documentation, so we may sort the fact from the fiction in the wake of Ellmann's elegance. Anyone who has attempted to use Ellmann's literary biography as a tool for research may have suffered the same frustration I have with the absence and vagueness of documentary reference. At the time that Ellmann wrote *James Joyce*, many of the documents the scholar reviewed were still privately held by

---

<sup>385</sup> Ellsworth Mason, quoted in Joseph Kelly, *Our Joyce*, 1998, p. 153.

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 153. Ellmann's prose IS that beautiful; I knew the weakness of Ellmann's biographical method while working on this thesis, but I still had difficulty relying upon my own expression of events and material substantiated elsewhere while composing.

Joyce's associates, collectors, or the estate. This may have made documentation difficult in 1959, but many of these materials were made available in the subsequent decades. The original 1959 publication was revised in 1982, yet no one took the care in revision to incorporate the massive efforts of our bibliographers and librarians, who catalogued acquisitions of Joyce materials in the decades between these publications. This is especially problematic, because Ellmann often supplements a thin line of real evidence with the events of Joyce's fiction, treating the writer's life as a working draft of his writings. Literary critics and Joyce scholars may generate a great deal of meaning in the parallels of fact and fiction (Joyce invites us to), but a biography is not the proper venue in which to conduct this project. If a biographer alternatively wants to publish the kind of criticism that develops the meaning of our fiction from the fact of the writer's life, such criticism is really valuable and interesting, but the publication venues of the fact and the meaning generated by its analog to fiction should be separate.

Unfortunately, if a scholar sets about correcting the legacy of Ellmann's literary biography, he or she will, at some point, be met with considerable resistance of the James Joyce Estate, which is now directed solely by Giorgio's son, Stephen James Joyce. Though I cannot substantiate it, it seems that the scandalous proceedings of the Joyce Wars have left a bitter taste in Stephen's mouth, because few representatives of a writer's estate have been more aggressive about policing the use of copyrighted material than Joyce's grandson. In 2000, David Fennessey, a young Irish composer studying in Scotland, requested permission to use eighteen words from *Finnegans Wake* in a three-minute choral piece, and Stephen Joyce

denied permissions, responding, “My wife and I don’t like your music.”<sup>387</sup> Stephen’s most shocking hostility was threats made before the centenary celebration of Bloomsday in Dublin. He denied permission for the Abbey Theatre to produce *Exiles*, and he threatened to sue the Irish government for breach of copyright if any recitations or public readings from *Ulysses* were sponsored. This threat was extended to the National Library of Ireland, Irish national television, the RTÉ, and the James Joyce Center in Dublin.<sup>388</sup> In 2002, J.C.C. Mays published *Fredson Bowers and the Irish Wolfhound*. Mays sought permission to include a diagram Joyce drew while composing *Oxen of the Sun*, which elucidates the biological and evolutionary themes of the episode. Stephen Joyce denied it. Instead of the diagram, page 71 reads,

The copyright-holder has refused permission to reproduce the chosen illustration and the reader must therefore consult either the original in London or a facsimile-transcription. ... Meanwhile, visualize a sheet of paper ...<sup>389</sup>

Most recently, Carol Schloss, Stanford University Professor of English and author of the recent biography *Lucia Joyce: To Dance in the Wake*, suffered Stephen’s control of Joyce materials. Stephen required the scholar to cut several passages from her manuscript of Lucia’s biography for publication. Schloss included these struck passages on a privately controlled Web site, but under continual threat from the estate, Schloss enlisted the legal aid of Stanford University’s Fair Use Project and Cyber Clinic. A lawsuit on Schloss’s behalf was filed in federal court against the James Joyce Estate in June of 2006, and in March of 2007, the estate entered into

---

<sup>387</sup> Reported by Madh Ruane, *The Irish Times* (June 10, 2000). The article is available on the Internet archives of the *Irish Times* at [www.ireland.com/newspaper/newsfeatures/2000/0610/newsfea10.htm](http://www.ireland.com/newspaper/newsfeatures/2000/0610/newsfea10.htm) (accessed May 6, 2007).

<sup>388</sup> See N. Byrne, “Joyce Grandson Threatens to Ban Readings at Festival,” *The Scotsman* 15 February 2004.

<sup>389</sup> J.C.C. Mays, *Fredson Bowers and the Irish Wolfhound* (Balleybeg, Ireland: Coracle, 2002), p. 71.

negotiations of a settlement with Schloss.<sup>390</sup> Stephen James Joyce has denied scholars access to Joyce papers, denied permission for reproduction of manuscript materials, denied derivative works, like Fennesey's, to use Joyce's words, and has denied Joyce enthusiasts venues of celebration. If one is a textual purist for authorial intention, however, he or she will be glad about the estate's renewed copyright on *Ulysses* in the following instance. When freelance editor Danis Rose and Macmillan Publishing Company put a reader-friendly edition of *Ulysses* on the market, an edition in which Joyce's text was heavily styled, the James Joyce Estate achieved an injunction against Rose and Macmillan. The edition was taken off the market, and Rose and Macmillan had to compensate the estate for legal fees.<sup>391</sup>

The text of *Ulysses* will not enter public domain until 2034. The lengthy copyright achieved by the publication of the critical edition is equitable enough, in terms of financial recompense to Joyce's heir. But it is particularly ironic that this work, which harvests everything from the classical canon to the phone directory, is being fiercely defended against cultural celebration and allusion to its artistry. And it is unfortunate that scholars and their attorneys will now have to fight fiercely for access to documents and the privileges to share them in order to correct errors about the artist's life.

## **CONCLUSION**

This thesis may generate a considerable degree of despair among some readers, but it should not. Current readers of *Ulysses* are the beneficiaries of decades of progress. Joyce's readers have gone from eschewing the author to clamoring for

---

<sup>390</sup> See Stanford University Law School's online News Center publication: <http://www.law.stanford.edu/news/pr/55/Stanford> (accessed April 3, 2007).

<sup>391</sup> Thomas Jones, "Short Cuts," *London Review of Books* 23, no. 24 (13 December 2001), p. 16.

access to his documents; from banning his book to investing considerable cultural resources in excavating his intentions; from a plethora of corrupt editions to a critically established text, one much more reliable than any that preceded it. We also are beneficiaries of substantial successes in acquisition, preservation, cataloguing, and distribution of material for critical investigation, and materials continue to emerge.

In a perfect world, the institutions that hold primary Joyce documents would allow them to be borrowed by a cultural project invested in a chronological edition of Joyce's oeuvre. This may seem like a feat of diplomacy beyond imagination, but the editors that Gavin Borden, enterpriser of Garland publishing, enlisted to produce the *James Joyce Archive* doubted that he would successfully procure the participation of these institutions, and he succeeded. Even if such an effort were unsuccessful or incomplete, digital scanning now offers a much more reliable reproduction of original documents for the purposes of transcription than facsimiles do, and digital scanning has great possibilities in the enlargement of features of documents. Assuming that either the participation of institutions or evolving technology could consolidate the Joyce collections that are now scattered across the globe, a chronological critical edition of Joyce's oeuvre is possible.

The wish for a chronological edition of Joyce's oeuvre is not prompted by the state of reliability of Joyce's works. Joyce's nonfiction and critical writings, *Dubliners*, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Finnegans Wake* all have fairly stable reading texts on the market. These have been critically established by the precepts of intentionalist eclectic editing, and these have neither the kind nor degree of textual cruxes from which *Ulysses* suffers. The wish for a chronological edition of



the oeuvre is prompted by two things. First, the writer's process of composition, discussed in Chapter 2—material overlaps the precise divisions of publication, and these overlaps cannot be properly accommodated in critical editions of separate publications. Second, the continued emergence of relevant Joyce materials suggests that there is much more to be found. The first enterprise of a critical edition is generally a rigorous search for surviving materials, and the emergence of the eighth draft of the Circe episode from the Quinn family, which was so well documented in the surviving correspondence, suggests that a thorough search has not been conducted. We need the cultural resources to support the pursuit and collection of surviving documents hitherto unexamined in our establishment of text. It is possible that Joyce's oeuvre will have to await the compliance of his estate to achieve these things, but we can expect that over the course of the next century, Joyce scholarship will be continuously revived by the emergence of currently protected or privately held materials.

In 2034, *Ulysses* will no longer be protected by the estate's copyright on Gabler's critical edition. We can expect several versions to appear, including such editions as Rose's reader-friendly text. Some of those editions will dismiss the scholarship Gabler conducted, especially if the reputation of the edition is not set right in the time between. What I would like to see is not disregard for Gabler's editorial work, but a trade edition that extends the hybrid editorial approach in a way that satisfies more fully the aims of each tradition of textual criticism. Such a trade edition should open with a historical survey of the salient versions of *Ulysses*, in a way that makes the material used to establish the text clear to a general audience,

rather than a diplomatic statement of disagreement with Gabler's editorial process. Then, we need to abandon the commonly held notion that numeric glosses, or footnotes, disrupt the reading text. They do not. Readers who take interest in such things notice them. Readers who do not take interest in them don't. Almost all trade editions of Shakespeare use this textual tool. Admitting this as an editorial tool for the text of *Ulysses*, one may then harvest from Gabler's synoptic apparatus the readings and passages that have been established through processes of inference, and those that cannot confidently be said to represent Joyce's intentions for publication, and then include these passage in close proximity to the text proper, at the foot of the page. This will capitalize on Gabler's successes in establishing a text closer to Joyce's intentions than any text that has preceded his edition; it will satisfy readers who consider Joyce's final redaction for aesthetic structure paramount; and it will provide insights into the history and design of *Ulysses* that have been accomplished by the large influence of the German method on the editorial enterprise. One wishes that Peter du Sautoy would have elected for this compromise in the publication of the trade edition, rather than a two-year lapse in the printings.

James Joyce's *Ulysses* is a work of art that engendered scandal in every stage of its production, dissemination, and reception. The work is now hailed as the prose monument of modernism, a twentieth-century masterpiece, and revolutionary in its stylistic technique, its foregrounding of language and psychological drama, and its ambiguity. *Ulysses* is, in truth, a simple tale, about a lifetime of one day, in a world of one place, in the lives of one people, played out on a stage of pages. The telling of such a simple tale is far from simple—it is among the greatest literary artifacts of our

cultural heritage. But the text of *Ulysses* continues to be entangled in the tension of its status as both a literary artifact, created by an artist, and a cultural artifact, influenced by the aspects of its currency. Among the many questions the novel begs is the question of who controls the meaning of a work of literary art. In the case of *Ulysses*, no one does. But everyone influences it: the author, his advocates and friends, his editors and associates, his typists, compositors, printers, and publishers, the attorneys who declared *Ulysses* a modern classic, the pirates of the text, the author's heirs, representatives of his estate, scholars, critical editors and editors' critics, and literary critics, who explicate meaning and design. But this historical verity does not necessitate a resignation to the instability of *Ulysses*. For me, appreciation for this Irish writer's craftsmanship creates a rather simple humility toward his intentions, as well as a great desire to understand his artistic process. Evidence of both will continue to emerge. In the meantime, we must simply exercise the competence of knowing and understanding the gentle pressures of influence on the constitution of our various versions of our *Ulysseses*.

## REFERENCES

- Abel, David. "Troubled Chapter." *The Boston Globe* (April 9, 2002): B1.
- Anderson, Margaret. *My Thirty Years' War*. New York: Covici, Friede, 1930.
- Arnold, Bruce. *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Life of a Twentieth Century Masterpiece*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- . *The Scandal of Ulysses: The Life and Afterlife of a Twentieth Century Masterpiece*. Dublin: The Liffey Press, 2004.
- Ashworth, Roscoe. *When Doctors Disagree: James Joyce and his book, "Ulysses," which has become an international literary sensation*. Jamaica, New York: Brewster Publications, 1922.
- Bates, Robin. "Reflections on the Kidd Era." *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 119–141.
- Beach, Sylvia. *Shakespeare and Company*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956; Reprinted Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.
- Bishop, Edward L. "Re-Covering *Ulysses*." *Joyce Studies Annual* 5 (1994): 35–36.
- Boyer, Paul S. *Purity in Print: The Vice Society Movement and Book Censorship in America*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.
- Bowers, Fredson. "Remarks on Eclectic Texts." *Proof* 4 (1974): 13–58; Reprinted in *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975, pp. 488–528.
- Brockman, William S. "Learning to be Joyce's Contemporary: Richard Ellmann's Discovery and Transformation of Joyce's Manuscripts and Letters." *Journal of Modern Literature* 22, no. 2: 253–263.

- Bryer, Jackson R. "A Trial Track for Racers: Margaret Anderson and the Little Review." *Ann Arbor Michigan*, 1965.
- . "Joyce, *Ulysses*, and the *Little Review*." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 66 (1967): 148–164.
- Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. New York: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1934; London: Greyson and Greyson, 1934; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1972, reprinted in 1989.
- Byrne, N. "Joyce Grandson Threatens to Ban Readings at Festival." *The Scotsman* 15 (February 2004).
- Card, James V.D. *An Anatomy of "Penelope"*. Rutherford: Farleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1984.
- Cohen, Philip. "Is there a Text in this Discipline?: Textual Scholarship and the American Literary Tradition." *American Literary History* 8, no. 4 (Winter 1996): 728–744.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Collected Letters*, ed. E.L. Griggs, 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956–1971.
- Conley, Tim. *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage: an authoritative text*, ed. Donald Pizer. New York: Norton, 1976.

- Dalton, Jack P. "The Text of *Ulysses*." *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium*, ed. Fritz Senn. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1972.
- Damon, S. Foster. *The Odyssey in Dublin*. Portland, Maine: Hound and Horn, 1929.
- de Grazia, Edward. *Censorship Landmarks*. New York: Bowker, 1969.
- . *Girls Lean Back Everywhere: The Law of Obscenity and the Assault on Genius*. New York: Random House, 1992.
- Deming, Robert H., ed. "An Irish Revel: And Some Flappers." *Daily Express* (25 Mar. 1922): n.p. Reprinted in *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, vol. 1. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Deppman, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, eds. *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Dreiser, Theodore. *Sister Carrie: an authoritative text*, ed. Donald Pizer. New York: Norton, 1970.
- . *Sister Carrie*, ed. James West, et. al. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.
- Eller, Jonathan. "Essay on Editorial Theory and Method." *Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce*, vol. 6. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, revised and reprinted, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Epstein, E.L., ed. Quoted from 'Weaving, Unweaving,' in *A Star Chamber Quiry: A James Joyce Centennial Volume 1882–1982*. New York: Methuen, 1982.

Fahy, Catherine, comp. *The James Joyce – Paul Léon Papers in The National Library of Ireland*. Dublin: The National Library of Ireland, 1992.

Fields, Beverly, Hans Walter Gabler, John Updike, Jon N. Elzey, Robert Craft, Robert M. Adams, with Reply by John Kidd. “The Scandal of Ulysses: An Exchange.” *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 13 (August 18, 1988): 63–65.

Gabler, Hans Walter, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Peirce, eds. *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Gabler, Hans Walter, John O’Hanlon, Thomas F. Staley, with Reply by John Kidd. “The Continuing Scandal of Ulysses: An Exchange.” *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 14 (Sept. 29, 1988): 80–83.

Gabler, Hans Walter. “Computer-Aided Critical Edition of *Ulysses*.” *ALLC Bulletin* 8 (1981): 232–48.

———. “Textual Criticism.” *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

———. “The *James Joyce Archive*: A Publisher’s Gift to Joyce Studies.” *Genetic Joyce Studies*, by the Antwerp James Joyce Center:  
<http://www.antwerpjamesjoycecenter.com/GJS/JJAGabler.htm> (accessed May 29, 2005).

———. “What *Ulysses* Requires.” *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 87, no. 2 (June 1993): 187–248.

- Gaskell, Philip. *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Gaskell, Philip, and Clive Hart. *Ulysses: A Review of Three Texts*. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Nobles Books, 1989.
- Gilbert, Stuart. *James Joyce's Ulysses: A study*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930.
- Goldman, Arnold. "Notes on the New Joyce Manuscripts." *Joyce Studies Annual* 14 (Summer 2003): [3]–4.
- . "Two New *Ulysses* Working Drafts." *Joyce Studies Annual* 12 (Summer 2001): [3]–9.
- Gorman, Herbert Sherman. *James Joyce: His First Forty Years*. London: G. Bles, 1926.
- Gottfried, Roy K. *Joyce's Iritis and the Irritated Text*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida: 1995.
- Greetham, D.C. "Contemporary German Editorial Theory." *Modern Philology* 95, no. 2 (Nov. 1997): 285–89.
- . "Textual Forensics." *PMLA* 111, no. 1: 32–51.
- . *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1994.
- . "The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing," *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Cohen. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991.
- Greg, W.W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." *W.W. Greg's Collected Papers*, ed. J.C. Maxwell. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.



- Groden, Michael, A. Walton Litz, David Hayman, Danis Rose, and Hans Walter Gabler, eds. *James Joyce Archive*, in 63 vols. New York: Garland, 1977–79.
- Groden, Michael, with Reply by John Kidd. “Ulysses’ Update.” *The New York Review of Books* 36, no. 1 (February 2, 1989): 1–2.
- Groden, Michael. “Editing Joyce’s *Ulysses*: An International Effort.” *Scholarly Publishing* 12 (1980–81): 37–54.
- . “Foostering Over Those Changes: The New *Ulysses*,” *James Joyce Quarterly* 22 (1984–85): 137–59.
- . “Perplex in the Pen—and in the Pixels: Reflections on the *James Joyce Archive*, Hans Walter Gabler’s *Ulysses*, and James Joyce’s *Ulysses* in Hypermedia.” *Journal of Modern Literature* 22, no. 2 (Winter 1998/1999): 225–244.
- . “Post-Genetic Joyce.” *Romantic Review* 86 (1995).
- . “The National Library of Ireland’s New Joyce Manuscripts: An Outline and Archive Comparisons.” *Joyce Studies Annual* 14 (Summer 2003): [5]–16.
- . *Ulysses in Progress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Guffey, George R. “*Fahrenheit 451* and the ‘Cubby-Hole Editors’ of Ballantine Books.” *Coordinates: Placing Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
- Hart, Clive, Peter du Sautoy, Philip Gaskell, Roma Woodnutt, Reply by Charles Rossman. “The New ‘Ulysses’: Unanswered Questions.” *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 21 and 22 (January 19, 1989): 58–59.
- Hay, Louis. “Does Text Exist?” *Studies in Bibliography* 41 (1988): 66–77.

- Herring, Phillip, ed. *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from the Buffalo Collection*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.
- . *Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972.
- Jones, Thomas. "Short Cuts." *London Review of Books* 23, no. 24 (13 December 2001).
- Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. New York: Penguin, 1999.
- . *James Joyce Archive*, ed. Groden, Michael, A. Walton Litz, David Hayman, Danis Rose, and Hans Walter Gabler, in 63 vols. New York: Garland, 1977–79.
- . *James Joyce's Letters to Sylvia Beach*, ed. Oscar Silverman and Melissa Banta. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- . *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses: Selections from the Buffalo Collection*, ed. Phillip Herring. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.
- . *Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum*, ed. Phillip Herring. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972.
- . *Letters of James Joyce*, vol. I, ed. Stuart Gilbert. New York: Viking Press, 1957; reissued with corrections 1966; vols. II and III, ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking Press, 1964.
- . *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hetteche. New York: Vintage International, 1993.
- . *Stephen Hero*, ed. Theodore Spencer. New York: New Directions, 1944.

- . *Ulysses: A Facsimile of the Manuscript*, ed. Harry Levin and Clive Driver. New York: Octagon Books, 1975.
- . *Ulysses: The Manuscript and First Printings Compared*, ed. Clive Driver. New York: Octagon Books, 1975.
- . *Ulysses* [Telemachus]. *Little Review* 4, no. 11 (March 1918): 3–22 [incorrectly numbered volume V].
- . *Ulysses* [Nestor]. *Little Review* 4, no. 12 (April 1918): 32–45 [incorrectly numbered vol. V].
- . *Ulysses* [Proteus]. *Little Review* 5, no. 1 (May 1918): 31–45.
- . *Ulysses* [Calypso]. *Little Review* 5, no. 2 (June 1918): 39–52 [incorrectly numbered vol. VI].
- . *Ulysses* [Lotus Eaters]. *Little Review* 5, no. 3 (July 1918): 37–49.
- . *Ulysses* [Hades]. *Little Review* 5, no. 6 (September 1918): 15–37.
- . *Ulysses* [Aeolus]. *Little Review* 5, no. 9 (January 1919): 27–50.
- . *Ulysses* [Scylla and Charybdis]. *Little Review* 5, no. 12 (April 1919): 30–43 [incorrectly numbered issue 11] and *Little Review* 6, no. 1 (May 1919): 17–35.
- . *Ulysses* [Wandering Rocks]. *Little Review* 6, no. 2 (June 1919): 34–45; and *Little Review* 6, no. 3 (July 1919): 28–47.
- . *Ulysses* [Sirens]. *Little Review* 6, no. 4 (August 1919): 41–64; and *Little Review* 6, no. 5 (Sept. 1919): 46–55.
- . *Ulysses* [Cyclops]. *Little Review* 6, no. 7 (Nov. 1919) 38–54; *Little Review* 6, no. 8 (Dec. 1919): 50–60; *Little Review* 6, no. 9 (Jan. 1920): 53–61; and *Little Review* 6, no. 10 (March 1920): 54–60.

- . *Ulysses* [Nausicaa]. *Little Review* 6, no. 11 (April 1920): 43–50; *Little Review* 7, no. 1 (May–June 1920): 61–72; and *Little Review* 7, no. 2 (July–Aug. 1920): 42–58.
- . *Ulysses* [Oxen of the Sun]. *Little Review* 7, no. 3 (Sept.–Dec. 1920): 81–92.
- . *Ulysses* [Nestor]. *Egoist* 6, no. 1 (Jan.–Feb. 1919): 11–14.
- . *Ulysses* [Proteus]. *Egoist* 6, no. 2 (Mar.–Apr. 1919): 26–30.
- . *Ulysses* [Hades]. *Egoist* 6, no. 3 (July 1919): 42–6; and *Egoist* 6, no. 4 (Sept. 1919): 56–60.
- . *Ulysses* [Wandering Rocks]. *Egoist* 6, no. 5 (Dec. 1919): 74–78.
- . *Ulysses*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. Harmondsworth: Penguin in association with Bodley Head, 1986.
- . *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. New York: Random House, 1986.
- . *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.
- . *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. London: Bodley Head, 1986.
- . *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*, in 3 volumes, ed. Hans Walter Gabler, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984. Reprinted with corrections, 1986.
- Joyce, Stanislaus. *My Brother's Keeper: James Joyce's Early Years*, ed. Richard Ellmann with preface by T.S. Eliot. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1958.

- Kelly, Joseph. *Our Joyce: From Outcast to Icon*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.
- Kenner, Hugh. "The Computerized *Ulysses*: Establishing the Text Joyce Intended." *Harper's* 260, no. 1559: 89–95.
- Kidd, John. "An Inquiry into *Ulysses*: The Corrected Text." *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 82, no. 4: [411]–584.
- . "The Scandal of 'Ulysses'." *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 11 (June 30, 1988): 1–18.
- Kobre, Sidney. *Development of American Journalism*. Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown, Co., 1969.
- Lidderdale, Jane, and Mary Nicholson. *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver 1876–1961*. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.
- Litz, A. Walton, Hugh Kenner, Reply by Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchior. "The Scandal of *Ulysses*." *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 16 (October 27, 1988): 100–101.
- Litz, A. Walton. *The Art of James Joyce: Method and Design in Ulysses and Finnegans Wake*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Maddox, Brenda. "The New *Ulysses*," *The Economist* 85 (June 23, 1984).
- Mahaffey, Vickey. "Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce's *Ulysses*," *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, ed. George Bornstein. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Mays, J.C.C. "Editing Coleridge in the Historicized Present." *Text* 8 (1998): 217–237.
- . *Fredson Bowers and the Irish Wolfhound*. Balleybeg, Ireland: Coracle, 2002.

- McCleery, Alistair, Hans Walter Gabler, Replies by Charles Rossman, John Kidd.  
 “The New ‘Ulysses’: Grave Matters.” *The New York Review of Books* 36, no. 5 (March 30, 1989): 43–45.
- McCleery, Alistair, Reply by John Kidd. “‘The Scandal of Ulysses’: Yet Another Exchange.” *The New York Review of Books* 36, no. 9 (June 1, 1989): 40–41.
- McGann, Jerome. “*Ulysses* as a Postmodern Work,” *Criticism* 27 (1985): 283–306.  
 ———. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1983.  
 ———. *Social Values and Poetic Acts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- McKenzie, D.F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Moritz, Theresa. *The World’s Most Dangerous Woman: A New Biography of Emma Goldman*. Vancouver: Subway Books, 2001.
- Moscato, Michael, and Leslie LeBlanc, eds. *The United States v. One Book Entitled Ulysses: Documents and Commentary—A 50-Year Retrospective*. University Publications of America, Inc., 1984.
- Murray, John Middleton. *Ulysses*, *Nation & Athenaeum*, xxxi (Apr. 22, 1922).
- Nadel, Ira. “Textual Criticism, Literary Theory, and the New *Ulysses*.” *Contemporary Literature* 28, no.1 (Spring 1987): 111–120.
- Noel, Lucie. *James Joyce and Paul L. Léon: The Story of a Friendship*. New York: Gotham Book Mart, 1950.
- Noon, William T. *Joyce and Aquinas*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

- Parker, Hershel. *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1984.
- Pound, Ezra, ed. *Des Imagistes: An Anthology*. London: Poetry Bookshop and New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1914.
- . *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*, ed. Forrest Read. New York: New Directions, 1965.
- Prescott, Joseph. *Exploring James Joyce*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1964.
- Reid, B.L. *The Man from New York: John Quinn and His Friends*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Roberts, R. F. "Bibliographical Notes on James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Colophon* 1, no. 4 (Spring 1936): 565–579.
- Rossman, Charles, ed. *A Special Issue on Editing Ulysses*. Denton, TX: North Texas State University, 1990.
- . "The New 'Ulysses': The Hidden Controversy." *The New York Review of Books* 35, no. 19 (December 8, 1988): 53–58.
- , comp. "The 'Gabler *Ulysses*': A Selectively Annotated Bibliography." *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 2 (1990): 257–269.
- Sandulescu, George, and Clive Hart, eds. *Assessing the 1984 Ulysses*. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Nobles Books, Buckinghamshire: Gerrards Cross, 1986.
- Schiebe, Siegfried. "On the Editorial Problem of the Text." *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

- Schillingsburg, Peter. "A Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism." *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 58–79.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime, Jane Ford, Jean Kimball, and Fritz Senn, eds. "The New Edition of *Ulysses*: An Assessment of its Usefulness One Year Later." *New Alliances in Joyce Studies*, ed. Bonnie Kime Scott (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 218–237.
- Scott, Evelyn. "Contemporary of the Future." *The Dial* 67 (October 1919).
- Slocum, John J, and Herbert Cahoon. *A Bibliography of James Joyce, 1882–1941*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Smith, Paul Jordan. *A Key to the Ulysses of James Joyce*. New York: Covici, Friede, 1927, 1934.
- Spoerri, James F. "The Odyssey Press edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*," *Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 50, no. 2 (April–June 1956): 195–198.
- Spoo, Robert. "Copyright Protectionism and its Discontents: The Case of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in America." *The Yale Law Journal* 108, no. 3 (December 1998).
- . "Injuries, Remedies, Moral Rights, and the Public Domain," *James Joyce Quarterly* 37, no. 3–4 (Spring–Summer 2000).
- . "*Ulysses* and the Ten Years War: A Survey of Missed Opportunities." *Text* 10 (1991).
- . *Three Myths for Aging Copyrights: Tithonus, Dorian Gray, Ulysses*. Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 2004.



- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Sumner, John. "The Truth About 'Literary Lynching,'" *The Dial*, 71, no. 1 (July 1921): 67.
- Sutherland, John. "Publishing History: A Hole at the Center of Literary Sociology." *Critical Inquiry* 14, no. 3: 574–589.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. "Critical Editions, Hypertext, and Genetic Criticism." *Romantic Review* 86 (1995).
- . "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 85–144.
- Thomas, Donald. "A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England." *English Journal* 59, no. 3 (March 1970): 429–431.
- Thorpe, James. *Principles of Textual Criticism*. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1972.
- Vanderham, Paul. *James Joyce and Censorship*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Williams, Carlos William, and Samuel Beckett, eds. *Our exagmination round his factification for incamination of work in progress*. Paris: Shakespeare and Company, 1929.
- Younger, Irving. "Ulysses in Court: The Litigation Surrounding the First Publication of James Joyce's Novel in the United States." *Classics of the Classroom* 16. Minnetonka, Minnesota: The Professional Education Group, 1988.

- Zeller, Hans. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts."  
*Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975), pp. 231–64.
- . "Structure and Genesis in Editing: On German and Anglo-American Textual Criticism." *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995: pp. 95–123.
- . "Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing." *Texte und Varianten: Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Gunter Martens and Hans Zeller. Munich: Beck, 1971.  
Reprinted in *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Kelly Lynn Tully-Needler**

### ***Education and Professional Training***

*Master of Arts, English Literature*, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN 2007

*Graduate Certificate in Professional Editing*, IUPUI, 2004

*Theories and Practices of Editing*, IUPUI, 2001

*Effective Business Writing Certificate*, IUPUI, 2001

*Bachelor of Arts, English and Psychology*, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1999

### ***Work Experience***

*Instructor, Technical Writing for the Workplace*, Ivy Tech Community College

### **Instruction Skills and Experience**

- Taught trade apprentices technical writing for the workplace
- Conducted course with a problem-based learning model
- Taught students' skills for all technologies related to business communication, including word processing, e-mail, and Web-site evaluation

*Assistant Textual Editor*, Peirce Edition Project, IUPUI, June 2003–January 2006  
(promoted November 2004)

### **Editorial Skills and Experience**

- Edited the writings of Charles Peirce according to scholarly editing principles
- Demonstrated strong competence editing specialized language
- Compiled and electronically created editors' front- and back-matter for publication
- Collated variant texts and established manuscript stemmatology
- Researched Peirce's publications and extant correspondence
- Researched Peirce's publishers and editors, to rectify corruptions in the transmission of his texts
- Drafted essays on editorial theory and practice of the Edition
- Copyedited writings of Associate Editors for front- and back-matter of scholarly edition, in compliance with *The Chicago Manual of Style*
- Updated Editorial Manual of the project for in-house use and evaluation by the Modern Language Association's Committee on Scholarly Editions
- Diplomatically contributed to discussions on editorial policy
- Adapted previous work experience in commercial publishing house to the specialized needs and goals of a scholarly edition

*Senior Editor*, The College Network, Inc., December 1999–August 2001 (promoted July 2000)

#### Editorial Skills and Experience

- Performed all aspects of editing process, i.e., recruited authors and evaluated authors' submissions, edited authors' submissions, and prepared books in final layout for printing
- Content-edited books according to specified coverage
- Reviewed and edited all outgoing correspondence of the company
- Edited collegiate textbooks in diverse areas of the curriculum
- Grew copyediting skills in application of *The Chicago Manual of Style*

#### Communication Skills and Experience

- Worked closely with authors to meet deadlines, insure coverage, and clarify text
- Developed sensitivity when reviewing and revising others' work
- Used active listening skills to draw people out and help them express thoughts and ideas
- Clearly communicated moods, information, and ideas in writing, demonstrating a strong command of language and grammar usage
- Mediated interdepartmental communication through diplomatic conversation, recognizing the need for both quality products and efficient production

#### Management/Training Skills and Experience

- Interviewed and assessed job applicants
- Authored training manuals, editorial tests, and job-performance evaluations
- Trained new editors in copyediting and company policies, procedures, and expectations
- Reviewed performance of editors
- Managed work of freelance editors
- Organized and delegated tasks and managed work flow and publishing deadlines

#### Computer Skills and Experience

- Utilized multiple software programs to accommodate texts in diverse disciplines
- Proficient in Word, Quark, and Adobe Framemaker 7.0 + SGML

*Founder/Director, ICAN Day Camp and Care, Inc., Elkhart, IN, December  
1994–May 1997*

Entrepreneurial Skills and Experience

- Designed, developed, and implemented not-for-profit organization for at-risk youth
- Generated all funding to support program expenses
- Worked closely with school systems to select and monitor participants

Social Skills and Experience

- Counseled at-risk youth to grow social competence
- Received reports of growth and wellness of participants in following school year
- Respected confidentiality of all participants, particularly with regard to publicizing the program