EDITING ULYSSES: THE STRUGGLE FOR A DEFINITIVE TEXT. PART 1

ALANNA BROWN

In 1984, Hans Walter Gabler published *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition*, which was hailed by Joyceans and the press as finally the definitive text of Joyce's *Ulysses*. One year later an attack was launched against the new edition by John Kidd, challenging the definitive status which had so quickly been accorded, and claiming that in fact Gabler's *Ulysses* was a 'scandal'. A controversy, now famous as the 'Joyce Wars', was sparked, the overall feeling being — especially with Gabler's failure to officially respond — that Gabler had admitted defeat.

In 1993, eight years having passed, hostilities seemed over. In the intervening years, Kidd had gone ahead with plans for the publication of his own critical edition of *Ulysses*; and to everyone's surprise, Gabler suddenly released a long-overdue official response to Kidd's charges. Rendering events far from closed, the historical record needed updating and original conclusions needed to be reassessed.

This article is essentially then a renewed survey of the controversy, but includes also (in Part 2) a detailed study of Gabler's response, which has largely been left unanswered. Gabler reveals a defence supportive of his own original aims and intentions, in direct opposition to Kidd and unable to be dismissed. He underscores an approach to the editing of *Ulysses* which cannot be denied. The overall conclusion is one which emphasises that there is no single or correct way to edit *Ulysses* and that the notion of a definitive version of the work, in book form at least, is no longer tenable.

James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* has always been considered a difficult text in literary terms, but more especially a problem text on the basis of its inherent corruption. It has been suggested that one to six typographical errors exist on each page of the 1922 first edition alone. ¹ Joyce was aware that a problem did exist. He had a slip inserted in the first edition referring to the errors as 'unavoidable in the exceptional circumstances'. ² Allusion was being made to the whole text's method of production. Joyce, working from messy rough drafts and notes, produced a fair copy which, after dozens of notes had been added to each page,

---


* This article is extracted from the author's longer work on the text of *Ulysses*, which was awarded the Society's 1996 prize for an unpublished work by a young writer. Part 2 will appear in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

was passed on to 'a motley succession of amateur typists'. The working drafts produced were again transcribed by other typists, printers and friends of Joyce as each episode was developed, corrected or further revised. There are many examples of blatant errors at this transcriptional stage, such as omissions of individual words or whole lines of text, but also certain misdirections by typists and even the deliberate manipulation of text without Joyce's authority. At the type-setting stage, a French-speaking printer who knew English to a degree attempted to bring Joyce's idiosyncratic language into line with what he understood to be standard English.

Joyce himself was known as a compulsive reviser, adding, it is said, at least thirty percent to both typescripts and proofs. In correcting an erroneous later typescript or proof Joyce often failed to look back to his earlier manuscripts, making corrections from memory. As a result passages which should have been restored were left out, or replacement passages were added and never checked against the original. While correcting and revising, initial drafts were still being created. Joyce was also struggling with severe eye problems - unintentional oversights and copy errors certainly occurred. In addition, printers were operating under the requirement of having *Ulysses* ready for publication on Joyce's fortieth birthday. The printer did not receive the last proof corrections until only two days before the publication date.

The same stigma of corruption has attached itself to all other editions published since 1922. Each has descended ultimately from the first edition. Errors have been repeated, and, in seeking to correct previous mistakes, further errors have been introduced and transmitted. Existing texts have always been known as unreliable.

In light of these understandings, talks towards a new edition of *Ulysses* were initiated in 1973 with the formation of a committee to review the situation and to make a recommendation concerning the appointment of an editor. Hans Walter Gabler was appointed with a $300,000 grant from the Deutsche
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Forschungsgemeinschaft (similar to the U.S. National Endowment for the Humanities) and with support from the trustees of the James Joyce Estate. Gabler had worked at the University of Virginia under Fredson Bowers, by this date the doyen of bibliographers in the field of textual scholarship. Having been an associate editor on The James Joyce Archive and principal editor of that project’s sixteen volumes of *Ulysses*, Gabler’s link with Joyce and the text of *Ulysses* had been established. Gabler came to the task in 1977 with the funding, the approval and the ideas necessary to edit and restore *Ulysses* to the state that James Joyce had intended and that previous editions had failed to achieve. By returning to ‘the extant documents of composition and pre-publication transmission: the holograph drafts, faircopies, and typescripts as well as proofs for the first edition and Joyce’s numerous autograph corrections, additions and revisions’, Gabler would restore the text of the novel and bring into existence the first version of *Ulysses* to appear as Joyce intended. Gabler and his team would, in a mammoth undertaking, trace the growth of the text by means of a synoptic apparatus and, through it, reconstruct the authoritative and definitive text of *Ulysses*.

Gabler saw his project as one which would offer a new and original text of *Ulysses* – one which had never before had a public existence, one which would replace all previously published versions. In effect, we would have a completely new text rather than just a corrected one. By means of a new methodology, Gabler would reveal the accumulation of textual corruption, and its removal would enable him to establish the text of *Ulysses* as Joyce had originally intended.

Gabler defined his editorial task as one which would go ‘beyond correction’ of the public text by turning to the extant documents of composition and pre-publication transmission. *Ulysses* is well known for its abundance of pre-publication material. Joyce’s surviving notes are held at the British Library or at the Lockwood Memorial Library of the State University of New York at Buffalo. Early drafts (mostly in fragments) exist for a minority of the eighteen episodes, but for every one a fair copy, or else a final authorial draft, does exist. These, along with the typescripts, are held mainly at Buffalo, with some at Cornell University and others at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Most of the corrected galley proofs are held at Harvard and the page proofs at Buffalo or the University of Texas at Austin, but others are housed at Princeton, Yale and the Rosenbach Foundation, Philadelphia. Materials from such collections have been reproduced in photo reprint by the Rosenbach Foundation in sixty-three volumes entitled The James Joyce Archive.

Gabler's new critical edition would 'analyse and set forth the sequences of composition and revision as the documents reveal them' in order to trace and record the work's evolution towards publication. It would as a result re-establish or, as Gabler explained it, recover 'the text of Ulysses as Joyce wrote and successively revised it'. Gabler claimed that his edition was 'the first critical edition to be undertaken of Ulysses', a new and original text of Ulysses which would replace 'the text made public in the book's first printing and every subsequent printing since 1922'.

The resulting 1984 Critical and Synoptic edition is divided into two components, the main feature a synoptic or genetic display, appearing on the left-hand page. A complex system of diacritics is built into the text so that the various layers of its growth from pre-publication documents to reconstructed ideal text can be traced. This was really a gathering together of all the evidence and a display of the genetic relationships between particular words or phrases to show the extent of the revisions, replacements and additions and as a means of identifying the stage at which separate elements came into existence. Facing this synoptic text, on the right-hand page, is the critically constituted new reading text which Gabler had established. This text was later published separately as a plain-reading text by Penguin Books and Random House, in 1986.

Gabler's Ulysses was eventually delivered into the hands of grateful scholars and Joyce enthusiasts to a chorus of resounding applause. Having rescued or recovered the lost text of Ulysses, the American Random House hardback and Vintage paperback editions (last set in 1961) and the English Bodley Head hardback and Penguin paperback editions (last set in 1968) became obsolete and went out of print. The 1984 Garland Press Ulysses became, for a spell, the only trade version remaining in print world wide.

Gabler was aware, with the task of editing ahead of him, that 'the first edition comes closest to what Joyce aimed for as the public text of Ulysses', that the first edition 'represents the closest approximation to be found in one document of the work at its ultimate stage of compositional development', and that according to traditional Anglo-American editing practices the 1922 text appeared as the most obvious copy text upon which a critical edition could be based. Gabler was all too aware though of the numerous limitations of the 1922 text, and so he rejected the first edition - the most obvious choice - as copy text. He banished the first edition to the Historical Collation, where it joined the second Shakespeare and Company edition of 1926, the Odyssey Press of

1932, the Bodley Head of 1936 and the Random House of 1961.\textsuperscript{23} To Gabler the first edition was as much a part of the overall corruption of the text, as the other editions published in Joyce’s lifetime attest.

Gabler objected to what could be termed the intrinsic status assigned to a text once it is published as formal and complete – in other words the standing awarded to a text as a literary object upon publication. Referring to an earlier article of his entitled ‘The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce’s Ulysses’, Gabler pointed out that as readers we mistake the first edition (of any work) as a final product and the textually rounded product of the writer’s art.\textsuperscript{24} In fact, as the abundance of notes, typescripts and proofs attest, this is only one version of Joyce’s authorial intentions as they were on February 2, 1922 when the text was published.\textsuperscript{25} Each of Joyce’s revisions and augmentations (surviving or not) can be described as ‘discrete textual states, in temporal succession’ extending from the earliest draft to the final revision and providing a series of authorial decisions made by Joyce in the construction and development of his text over time to publication.\textsuperscript{26} The textual states can in fact be recognised as individual and complete versions of the work at the time when the change was incorporated and before another was formulated – individual synchronous structures of the overall text at that point in time. In such an argument the 1922 edition is in fact only one textual state, one individual version of the text existing within the overall development of Ulysses as a work. The total work then comprises all the authorial textual stages put together, existing as what Gabler describes as a diachronous whole.\textsuperscript{27} Gabler believed that it was not enough to base a new edition of Ulysses on the 1922 edition as end-product alone. The documents of composition and revision existing at the time of the book’s publication, as the totality of the developing work in progress, remained intrinsic components. Gabler challenged readers to view the text of Ulysses as a development or progress over time, as opposed to a product released on February 2, 1922. With the aim of recovering the text as Joyce wrote it, Gabler made a determined effort to edit Ulysses not as a product but as a process – as a work which was developed by Joyce the writer over a span of seven years.\textsuperscript{28}

According to Gabler, the text of highest overall authority on which to base a critical edition of Ulysses resides in ‘Joyce’s autograph notation [i.e. manuscripts].\textsuperscript{29} Unfortunately, such autograph notation was ‘not assembled in a unified holograph manuscript at a state of development corresponding to the

\textsuperscript{25} Gabler, ‘Synchrony’, p. 306.
\textsuperscript{26} Gabler, ‘Synchrony’, p. 309.
\textsuperscript{27} Gabler, ‘Synchrony’, p. 309.
\textsuperscript{28} Gabler, ‘Afterword’, p. 1891.
\textsuperscript{29} Gabler, ‘Afterword’, p. 1895.
first-edition text'. Gabler determined then to assemble a 'continuous manuscript text' which would act as his copy text for the reading text. The elements he turned to in tracing the development and growth of the work were the extant documents of composition and pre-publication transmission, which he identified as the Rosenbach Manuscript (the earliest complete surviving notation in autograph for all but two episodes), the typescripts, serialisations in the Little Review and Egoist, the proofs for the first edition and the first edition itself, all of which have been authorially revised. The continuous manuscript text then, as an editorial construct, represented Ulysses at its ultimate stage of compositional development and also served as the edition's copy text, which was emended eclectically. As an ideal, the continuous manuscript text brought together the documents of composition, Gabler having recognised a diachronic structure which did not privilege one version of Joyce's text over another. As he argued, the continuous manuscript text could be 'perceived as a many-layered and highly complex text that carries the dynamics of an extended textual development within it'. Essentially though, it existed only within the realms of the computer program that Gabler was working with. Gabler viewed his editorial methodology, in assembling a continuous manuscript text, as an extension of current editorial theory. He still relied on the Anglo-American notion of basing a critical edition on a single identified copy text, but he challenged the traditional notion of copy text by establishing a continuous manuscript text from multiple sources as copy text to be eclectically emended.

In physically constructing his new edition, the assembled continuous manuscript text was emended to become the text on the left pages of Gabler's resultant edition. A complex system of diacritics - such as raised opening and closing half-brackets indexed alphabetically and numerically for each chapter, indices in parentheses, empty parentheses, asterisked indices and square brackets - was built into the text. An apparatus integrated into the very text flagged the various points where revisions or augmentations entered or left it. As a result, the individual layers of the text, as successive levels of composition, were brought together and the overall growth of the text was traced. This synopsis was seen by Gabler as the innovative feature of the edition, which allowed the reader to trace in reverse the compositional process from the text at its ultimate stage of revision 'via the antecedent states of the overlay in proofs and typescripts to the substratum of the Rosenbach Manuscript holograph or the final working draft text' without disrupting the continuum of the critically edited text. The production of such a synoptic text emphasised Gabler's belief that Ulysses was a work which Joyce developed over time. Concern should be expressed though over the complex system of diacritics which the

The reader must become familiar with to fully benefit from the edition. Gabler regarded it as sufficient to supply in each volume of the edition a chart of the symbols and their corresponding representations as an aid.

The Reading Text facing the Synopsis on the right pages of the new edition was 'submitted as the new, critically established text of Ulysses'. Gabler had 'extrapolated' the Reading Text from the Synopsis, rendering 'the emended continuous manuscript text at its ultimate level of compositional development'. The Reading Text is a clear text with a system of line numbering by episodes which Gabler introduced as a referencing system to his edition.

Footnotes to the Synoptic Text record individual emendations or departures in the first and subsequent printings from the newly established text. They are supplemented by an Historical Collation documenting the overall emendations, and also by Textual Notes when further explanations are needed.

The project had been a task of mammoth proportions, taking Gabler and his associates - Wohlard Steppe and Claus Melchoir - seven years to complete, the same length of time that it had taken Joyce to write his novel. On June 16, 1984 Gabler’s Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition, a three-volume work priced at $200 U.S., was released. As already mentioned, Gabler's efforts were applauded by leading Joyce scholars, and he was lionized by the press. Richard Ellman, Joyce's biographer, termed the new edition 'an absolutely stunning scholarly achievement'. The new edition was understood to be, finally, the definitive text of Ulysses.

* * * *

The first to publicly challenge and direct serious criticism at the 1984 edition of Ulysses was John Kidd, a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies at the University of Virginia. In 1985, at the height of the edition's success, Kidd rocked the literary establishment with his bold claims against the new edition. Raising doubts about Gabler's methodologies and the theoretical underpinning, Kidd challenged scholars to reconsider their acceptance of the new Ulysses as the long-awaited definitive edition. An expert at manipulating the mass media - summoning immediate attention and causing sensation - Kidd unleashed his grievances into the public arena, provoking a dispute, now famous as the 'Joyce Wars', in which scholars were forced into siding with either Kidd or Gabler. Kidd's article 'The Scandal of Ulysses', journalistic in approach and with immediate shock appeal, piled accusations against the new edition on top of one another - bold assumptions leading to huge inferences, such as the claim that 'in more than two thousand places, or three times a page, the new version is

demonstrably not what Joyce wrote in any manuscript.\textsuperscript{40} This new version, according to Kidd, was 'a radical version forged of shoddy scholarship and puffed out with grandiose claims', which forced him to call for its immediate withdrawal.\textsuperscript{41} The dispute now in the public arena, impassioned responses filled the pages of The Times Literary Supplement and The New York Review of Books as all parties involved marshalled words of defence or attack. It emerged that the James Joyce Estate had rushed the Gabler edition into print in order to secure a new copyright for the text of Ulysses, thereby obtaining lucrative royalty payments for the next seventy-five years and control of Joyce's words for that time and driving all competition from the market. Kidd had provoked controversy. He had also insulted the establishment.\textsuperscript{42} Having hailed the new Ulysses so ardentally prior to and immediately after its release, academics felt personally affronted by Kidd's charges. In reality, they had been duped by Gabler. The reaction was disdainful, that one so young and with such little editing experience could cause such a stir and question the approval which Joyceans and others had accorded the new edition.

On the other hand though, Kidd was reported as having 'garnered varying degrees of support from some prominent Joyceans and bibliographers including G. Thomas Tanselle, president of the Bibliographical Society of America, Jerome McGann, a bibliographer at the California Institute of Technology, Dercherd Turner, director of the Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas, and Bernard Benstock, past president of the International James Joyce Foundation', support which alone added weight to his claims against the new edition and suggested that he had made an impact after all.\textsuperscript{43} As a result of Kidd's initial accusations, a committee headed by Tanselle was set up to advise Random House whether or not Gabler's Ulysses should remain in print or be withdrawn. Kidd was invited by Tanselle to produce a report which would act as the official documentation of charges against the Gabler edition.\textsuperscript{44} After a delay of three years, his 'Inquiry' into Ulysses was finally released and also published in The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America.\textsuperscript{45} As it turned out, the Random House Committee headed by Tanselle was disbanded as a result of unrelated events: a dispute had erupted between Tanselle and Random House's Jason Epstein over matters related to The Library of America.\textsuperscript{46} Not having even met, the Committee was promptly disbanded and Gabler's edition was given a reprieve. Random House announced that Gabler's edition would remain in print, but now alongside the 1961 edition.

\textsuperscript{40} Kidd, 'The Scandal of Ulysses', p. 34.
\textsuperscript{41} Kidd, 'The Scandal of Ulysses', p. 39.
\textsuperscript{44} Rossman, 'Critical Reception ... Part One', p. 167.
\textsuperscript{46} Rossman, 'Critical Reception ... Part Two', p. 348.
As the much delayed document of official charges against Gabler and the report originally intended to be presented to the Random House Committee, Kidd’s *PBSA* article stirred great interest amongst academics. Running to mammoth proportions— in fact, nearly two hundred pages—the article was basically a reiteration of arguments which he had presented previously, but detailed this time with hundreds of examples to support his claims. Thirty-seven tables, listing hundreds of variants (encompassing such minute details as spacing and punctuation), were presented as evidence of the edition’s inconsistency and error, leading Rossman to comment that Kidd’s *Inquiry* certainly was ‘one of the most detailed scholarly assessments ever given a critical edition.’ As the culmination of Kidd’s work, it stands also as convincing testimony that his attention all along had been focused on the edition and its theoretical and practical implications as a definitive critical edition rather than on a self-seeking desire to topple Gabler. Such exhaustive evidence demanded scholarly attention. Kidd could not be easily passed over, much less dismissed, as had been the case when he first set out his claims against the new edition in 1985. Now that they were presented in a more scholarly fashion, Kidd’s criticisms were contested or endorsed in the same manner and judged on the basis of the evidence that he had presented. Initial opposition or support by scholars was reached on the basis of their individual interpretation of these arguments. Accepting Kidd’s case, there were those who argued against the validity of the Gabler edition. Yet set against them were defenders such as Michael Groden and Wolfhard Steppe, who displayed unqualified support of Gabler, defending the edition’s integrity.

As time progressed, support for Kidd was bolstered by the extrinsic fact that Gabler had remained silent, failing to formally respond to the specific claims that Kidd had made in his *PBSA* article. Whether the silence was due to a reluctance or a refusal to respond on Gabler’s part, the effect was one which legitimized Kidd’s arguments. Onlookers were led by his silence to believe that Gabler’s critical edition of *Ulysses* had been successfully deposed— that Gabler had admitted defeat.

In 1993, three years after the publication of Kidd’s *Inquiry*, and in the same journal, Gabler released his long-awaited response in a paper entitled ‘What *Ulysses* Requires’. The act of publication alone suggests that, contrary to conclusions drawn, Gabler had not accepted defeat. A considered reply now exists which forces not only an overall updating but also a re-opening of the debate. For the first time it is now possible to set Kidd’s and Gabler’s arguments against each other for assessment, to draw a final conclusion about Kidd’s impact, to determine whether Gabler’s edition has been deposed, and to
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consider what the debate has revealed. This paper continues with a detailing of Kidd’s individual charges and then (in Part 2) of Gabler’s defence.

* * * * *

In June 1988 John Kidd, in his ‘Scandal’ article, had drawn two conclusions. In his opinion Gabler’s new edition of Ulysses was ‘a radical version forged of shoddy scholarship and puffed out with grandiose claims’ and also ‘a different version from what Joyce conceived, authorised and saw into print’. Before publication of Kidd’s later PBSA article many interpreted such sweeping claims as a product of Kidd’s desire to bring down Gabler on a personal level. It was not until publication of this PBSA article, outside the public arena, that more serious and scholarly attention was paid to Kidd. As the formal documentation of his charges, extensively illustrated with hundreds of examples of what many accepted as convincing evidence, the PBSA article makes it clear that Kidd was not motivated by a desire to ruin Gabler. His criticisms were instead those made against an edition which had been wrongly hailed as the definitive text of Ulysses and which had displaced a potential edition based on the 1922 text, which Kidd saw as the best basis for editing Ulysses. The PBSA article forces a reassessment not only of the Gabler edition but also of the labels which had been attached to Kidd.

Attention is here focused on Kidd’s PBSA article, dividing his arguments into those against the practicalities and technical aspects of the edition’s production and those against the theoretical assumptions behind the new edition. These are the fundamental bases on which scholars would reassess the Gabler edition, and they also constitute the charges that Gabler would have to confront in any effort to justify his Critical and Synopsis Edition. Kidd’s allegations also provide a useful insight into his own plans for the editing of Ulysses: essentially Kidd intends to replace one definitive edition with another. Having reassessed Kidd’s overall intentions, the remainder of this section discusses the impact of the PBSA article and Kidd’s claims. The success of Kidd’s case was assured, it seems, by the fact that Gabler failed to offer an immediate response, apparently admitting defeat.

Kidd’s main objections against the practicalities and technical aspects of the edition’s production result from Gabler’s overlooking of various archival sources, his failure to collate all relevant printings of Ulysses, errors in transcription, his complete dependence on photo-reproductions of the manuscripts, inconsistency and unexplained emendation.

As a convenient starting point, we begin with Kidd’s assertion that if an editor is to gather together all the evidence about an author’s intentions for his critical edition, as is ‘the bibliographical way’, ‘all extant documents bearing on

the text' must be located. Gabler had gone no further than the already published and catalogued manuscripts and correspondence. If he had, for instance, looked at Joyce's unpublished correspondence, he would have located a postcard (now famous) from Joyce to Claude Sykes, his first typist. housed at Buffalo, the postcard, dated 19.XII.1917, reveals Joyce's request for a revision to the Nestor (or second) episode which Sykes never carried out - direct evidence of Joyce's authorial intentions. Similarly, Gabler had ignored: the unpublished papers of Stuart Gilbert, who had revised, at Joyce's request, the fourth edition; the further changes suggested by Joyce to the sixth (1935) edition; the papers of the French and German translators; Joyce's correspondence with Ezra Pound, in which changes in the first episode are discussed; letters to the typist of the Circe (or fifteenth) episode; and correspondence dealing with the Bodley Head 1937 text. All contain evidence which might have altered editorial decisions.

As the ultimate example of Gabler's failure to locate all the extant documents bearing on the text, there is his ignorance of typescripts complete with revisions made by Joyce which were exhibited in 1975 at the Joyce Symposium in Paris and which Gabler had even gone so far as to claim were lost. Indeed they are not lost, as Kidd demonstrates.

Kidd also suggests that Gabler ignored relevant printings or forms of the text produced during the author's lifetime, such as the 1927 second impression of the second edition and the 1935 sixth edition - in the face, that is, of Bowers's assertion that 'accuracy to fact demands that a trustworthy record should be printed of all [italics supplied] variant forms of the text during the author's lifetime.' Kidd notes that in 1927 extensive plate corrections were made to the second impression or ninth printing of the 1926 edition. This 1927 'genuine impression' (so described in order to distinguish it from the Samuel Roth piracy of the same year) should have been collated against the 1926 edition, according to Kidd, in order to identify the corrections (numbering 150) which had been made - but it was ignored. Instead Gabler took a 'short cut', considering only the first impression of the 1926 edition when in fact the second impression's corrections were transmitted through following impressions to the next setting of the text, in 1932. Gabler's 'short cut' had bypassed important corrections in the 1926 text - most notably, variants from the second and later impressions.

As Kidd reveals, it was a procedure which led Gabler to miss later variants which had been introduced into the second, fourth and fifth editions.\(^\text{58}\)

According to Kidd, Gabler should also have paid more attention to the sixth edition, supervised by Joyce's friend Stuart Gilbert, which was set from the fourth edition in 1935 and which Kidd describes as an 'important textual witness'.\(^\text{59}\) In fact, this sixth edition was totally ignored by Gabler. If he had investigated this edition, Gabler would have found, as Kidd had, changes in names which had not been mentioned in the correspondence between Joyce, Gilbert and the publishers. Gilbert is obviously a crucial figure in terms of the unauthorized alteration of Joyce's text, a fact which was not picked up by Gabler. Gabler placed complete faith instead in the 1932 Odyssey Press Hamburg edition, which, supervised by Gilbert at Joyce's request, had been considered the 'definitive standard edition' and had later been chosen as copy for the first authorised British edition, the Bodley Head setting of 1936.\(^\text{60}\) In fact, Kidd demonstrates that the 1934 edition had overruled Joyce's manuscripts one hundred times in order to follow the 1932 edition.\(^\text{61}\) If Gilbert had taken the liberty of making unauthorized alterations in 1935, such may also have been the case in 1932. In relying on the 1932 text, without investigating Gilbert's role in the 1935 edition, Gabler violates conventional Anglo-American editorial guidelines, which stipulate that all lifetime editions or printings of a work must be collated.\(^\text{62}\)

Kidd's next area of discontent, in terms of the practicalities of the 1984 edition's production, lies with Gabler's errors in transcribing the Rosenbach Facsimile, the few examples identified in evidence merely suggesting the extent of further errors of this type still to be located. One example comes from Circe (the fifteenth episode), with Gabler's removal of the letter 'S' at the end of 'THE CALLS!' which, although in the Rosenbach Manuscript appearing to be the letter 's' written in a hurred manner, is distinctly different from the clearly singular 'whistle call and answer' in the line directly above.\(^\text{63}\) According to Kidd, the plural 'calls' is supported by Joyce's Homeric scheme for Ulysses, and Circe's island is called 'Aiaia', which is translated as 'the cries' or 'the wails'.\(^\text{64}\)

Other examples come from Eumaeus (the sixteenth episode), within lines 1242-1244: Gabler introduces two full stops not present in the Rosenbach manuscript - one after 'Gold Cup,' and one after 'disaster.' - and also mistranscribes 'Sir Hugo' as 'Sir Hugo'.\(^\text{65}\) The problem, according to Kidd, was
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Gabler's failure to make a list of the differences between his transcription of the Rosenbach facsimile and Clive Driver's collation of the original. Gabler consequently had no points to check with the original to test whether his differences from Driver were 'real or manufactured by the facsimile'.

The most serious of Kidd's accusations, and the one most widely accepted as damaging, concerns the fact that Gabler based his new edition of *Ulysses* on facsimiles, his work not being compared against the originals housed in various locations across the United States. This failure, according to Kidd, rendered Gabler's work 'worthless' and ushered in a further set of errors which would presumably not have arisen if Gabler had spent more time with the originals.

One apt instance of errors in this category is Gabler's transcription of 'Captain Culler' in Lotus-eaters (the fifth episode): 'Still Captain Culler broke a window in the Kildare street club with a sleg to square leg' (5.560). As the original at Harvard clearly reveals, it is 'Captain Buller'. Printers' pencil markings are situated close to the name, which Kidd suggests came up 'so dark and unruly in the facsimile that a careless transcriber might for a moment think that there was a capital C on the page'. If Gabler had checked his transcriptions against the originals at Harvard he would have avoided the inexcusable error: 'Captain Buller' would have remained.

Kidd goes on to explain that, failing to thoroughly examine the original manuscripts, Gabler had missed many deletions that Joyce had made in the originals which simply cannot be identified by means of facsimile or microfilm. If Gabler had held a lamp under the manuscript leaves of Nestor (the second episode), as Kidd had, he would have discovered 'ten erasures not detectable in the facsimile'. As a result, these ten erasures made by Joyce are not included in the 1984 edition, thereby rendering, Kidd concludes, the edition not only incomplete but also misleading. Contributing to the record of the text's evolution towards first publication - a growth which Gabler sought to trace - these deletions should have been recorded. In view of Gabler's heavy reliance on facsimiles, Kidd then questions his apparent detection of erasures allegedly made by Joyce in the originals. When the claims for these erasures are checked against Joyce's manuscripts they are found to be unsubstantiated. One example is taken from Proteus (the third episode), where Stephen recalls the 'fading prophecies of Joachim Abbas' in Marsh's library. (3.108) Gabler notes at this point that Joyce made a deletion beneath Abbas. Joyce may well have been toying with Joachim's name. As Kidd notes, he was also known as 'Joachim Flora, Floris, Flore, or Fiore'. The fact of the matter is that when compared against the original 'there is no erasure beneath, beside, behind or before
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Abbas'. Kidd is at a loss to understand how Gabler came to his conclusion. Just as facsimiles cannot be utilised to decipher blurred handwriting, Kidd reports, they cannot 'spot erasures', which may in reality not exist. Neither do facsimiles allow for distinguishing different colours of ink, which are obvious when checked in the originals. For example, in the manuscript the correct grave accents are pencilled in above Joyce's circumflexes in 'crème de la crème'. (8.878) Appearing black in the facsimile, the accents take precedence in Gabler's edition – someone else's hand is taken, not Joyce's.

Another serious accusation brought against Gabler is inconsistency. Having stressed that his new edition was the text as Joyce wrote it (as opposed to what Joyce may have passed or overlooked), Gabler undermines his own assertions by including, as only one example, punctuation which should rightly be recognised as interference instead from the typist. An example comes with a couplet sung by Stephen in Eumaeus (the sixteenth episode). (6.1815-1816) A typist's colon preceding the couplet is adopted by Gabler, but the same mark by the same typist in the same circumstance two pages later is not included. (6.1883) There is no explanation for the contradictory decisions. Similarly, an ellipsis added by Joyce in a second proof is removed by Gabler. (6.1799)

The existence of such examples had led Kidd to the earlier conclusion that 'in more than two thousand places, or three times a page, the new version is demonstrably not what Joyce wrote in any manuscript.' Gabler's own policies, Kidd reveals, have not been followed; his final conclusion being that Gabler's alterations 'can depart from the final version in Joyce's hand as many as seven times per page – the frequency with which the first edition was corrupt'. To add weight to this assertion, Kidd followed up with his class of 'unacknowledged emendation' pervading the 1984 edition: thirteen categories, into which hundreds of individual alterations to Joyce's final revisions made by Gabler could be grouped. These, as later exemplified in his PBSA article: changes to Joyce's correct, contemporary spelling; changes in Joyce's use of compounds; changed dates, money and other numbers; personal names; place names; the removal or creation of italics; addition of unneeded punctuation; the rejection of specific typographical features ordered by Joyce; changes to Joyce's idiosyncratic use of abbreviations; independent correction of Joyce's spelling in English, French or other foreign languages; changed capitalization; literary allusions; and, in certain instances, failure to distinguish between Joyce's slips and revisions. As Kidd reveals, none of these thirteen categories of emendation are discussed or even mentioned by Gabler anywhere, not even in the
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Editing Ulysses

'Procedures in Emendation' attached to the new edition. Two hundred examples of emendations falling into Kidd's thirteen categories, combined with three hundred examples of inconsistencies in the application of Gabler's stated policies, are evidence of changes from what Joyce had actually written - testimony of Gabler's failure to stick to his original aim of capturing the text of Ulysses as Joyce had written it.

In the face of such numerous and seemingly convincing objections to the practicalities of the new edition's production, Kidd dismisses any claims that the Gabler edition may have had to being regarded as a definitive text. In his rooted objection too to the basic theories underlying the Gabler edition, Kidd strengthens his argument against the assumed status on a theoretical level. In Kidd's concern with the definition of a critical edition and with the very nature of copy text we are given an insight into his own theoretical standpoint and his ideas for producing a new edition of Ulysses which would displace Gabler's and stand instead as the definitive text.

To begin with, Kidd accuses Gabler of silently 'redefining' the meaning of critical edition and failing to articulate this meaning in print - criticism raised as a result of Gabler's mistaken assertion that his new edition is 'the first critical edition to be undertaken of Ulysses or of any of Joyce's works'. As Kidd is quick to point out, Gabler had totally ignored three decades of textual research and Joycean publication. There is Dalton's published work towards a critical edition of Ulysses, for which a cash advance had been paid by Random House but which, owing to Dalton's death in 1981, had never been completed, and other well known critical editions such as Tindall's Chamber Music, Anderson's Portrait, Scholes's Dubliners and MacNicholas's Exiles. In ignoring such past work, Gabler had inverted, or at least disregarded, all previous understandings of what constituted a critical edition.

Gabler's edition fails as a critical edition in that it is not 'a text resulting from the editor's informed judgement at points where questionable readings occur' and that it does not include 'all necessary information about the text and the circumstances of its composition and transmission' - requirements which Fredson Bowers and G. Thomas Tanselle had set down in 1975 and 1981 respectively as characterising a critical edition. As Kidd reveals: Gabler had failed to fully collate Joyce's working drafts; differences in the Little Review serialization are unmentioned; two authorized lifetime editions are not accounted for; various corrected impressions go unreported; and there is no discussion of Gabler's numerous emendations of Joyce's spellings. The decisions that Gabler had made in producing his edition had not been of a textually informed nature. Kidd's conclusion was that 'Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition is decidedly

not a critical edition. With such a realization, Gabler's edition cannot be termed definitive.

Quoting again from Bowers, Kidd qualifies his perception of what constitutes an ideal critical edition with the statement: 'if an editor is able to recover the author's intentions "more faithfully than any preserved transmitted document" – by emending one of those preserved forms – the resulting text is "critical"'. In relation to *Ulysses*, a critical edition can be established by emending an already preserved transmitted document – for example, the 1922 edition, as Joyce first published it, or the 1936 Bodley Head edition, the form of the book as Joyce last saw it and the form of the work from which the eighth and ninth editions were derived. A single text produced in such a way would recover Joyce's intentions 'more faithfully' than the 1922 or 1936 editions themselves – after all, the first edition contains errors, and subsequent editions have perpetuated these errors, so that neither edition is in itself completely authoritative. Kidd's aim is to produce a text representing Joyce's final intentions, based on the form of the work of *Ulysses* that Joyce wanted his public to have. The 1922 and even the 1961 texts are the closest to that form, and it is this understanding which gives rise to Kidd's subsequent objection to Gabler's construction of a copy text for the synoptic version which is not a preserved transmitted text but one assembled from multiple unrelated parts.

It is Kidd's opinion that Gabler misunderstood 'the nature and role of copy text' – a reaction against Gabler's outright rejection of the 1922 edition as copy text and his assertion that 'an edition of *Ulysses* based on the first edition would not in a full sense attain the quality or scope of a critical edition'. As Kidd has just spent time defining it, an edition based on a candidate such as the emended 1922 text would produce an edition deemed critical. And as Kidd goes on to demonstrate, an edition based on the first publication of the complete text is the preferred document from which to edit *Ulysses* critically. In fact, he maintains, it is the best option, as 'other responsible students of the text of *Ulysses* have concluded'.

Philip Gaskell had earlier admitted that 'a newly edited plain text of *Ulysses* would [italics supplied] be based on the first edition', and Jerome McGann had concurred that 'a scrupulous critical editor could – and probably should – produce a fully corrected edition of [the] 1922', that 'the appropriate Modernist *Ulysses* is the 1922 first edition ... Its "perfect" form would be a corrected [italics supplied] text of this edition'. Kidd fails to mention that Gaskell had also admitted that an approach such as Gabler's could equally lead to a critical text, and he fails to bring to the reader's attention that McGann also saw other viable alternatives, such as the production of a critical edition based

---

on the printed documents of transmission. Kidd’s intention though is to convince scholars and the general reader alike of his own conviction that the 1922 text is the best choice of copy text when producing a critical edition of *Ulysses*—indeed, an edition based on the 1922 text becomes the only option in Kidd’s eyes.

Kidd next considers Gabler’s ‘continuous manuscript text’ as further evidence that Gabler had misunderstood the nature and role of copy text. Describing it as a ‘novelty’, a ‘chimera’ and ‘imagined’, Kidd finds the notion of such a copy text impossible to come to terms with. The problem he finds is that nowhere does Gabler identify a source for the term. Kidd unsuccessfully attempts to find one, relating the idea of continuous manuscript text— with which he is unfamiliar—to what he knows and recognises in the field of text editing. At first the continuous manuscript text of *Ulysses* is taken to be ‘an offspring of the fabled continuous copy of Shakespeare’s lost manuscripts’, a phrase which had been coined by E.K. Chambers, and next a ‘new conflation of continuous copy with W.W. Greg’s “The Rationale of Copy-Text”’. For the second time, Kidd has brought to the fore what he takes to be Gabler’s descent from Greg. Assuming that Gabler is linked to Greg, Kidd can underscore how Gabler has in fact failed to uphold the general principles enunciated by Greg. Earlier Kidd had isolated a comment made by Gabler defining a general notion of copy text which stated that ‘By common consent, an editor chooses as the copy text for a critical edition a document text of highest overall authority’. A link was immediately drawn with Greg, because Gabler had used the term ‘highest overall authority’, which Kidd was able to trace to Greg’s seminal essay, ‘The Rationale of Copy-Text’. In terms of Kidd’s own interpretation of Greg’s essay—that in fact Greg had dismissed the notion that there is no single document of highest overall authority—Kidd concludes that ‘Gabler has done poorly by Greg’. Since it had failed to adopt Greg’s principles, the Gabler edition had wrongly been termed definitive. Converting Gabler’s assumed descent from Greg into a failure, and being himself so well versed in the finer points of Greg’s ‘Rationale’, Kidd may well be regarded as belonging in the camp of Greg—a possible explanation for his further theoretical objections to the Gabler edition.

In terms of the continuous manuscript text, Kidd finds it problematic that Gabler ‘wants to find in the *Ulysses* documents (but does not) an unbroken thread along which he can trace a comprehensive text in the author's own hand’. On one level, the continuous manuscript text, which Gabler assumes will facilitate the tracing of a comprehensive text, extends the received meaning of ‘manuscript’, to include typescripts, serialisations, proofs of the first edition and the first edition itself. In many instances Kidd points to the fact that Joyce’s
hand (at the manuscript level) is overlooked in favour of printed or typed elements which differ from the manuscript. As the weakest of his arguments against the Gabler edition, Kidd, it appears, has failed to recognise that Joyce may have added passages at various stages beyond those initial manuscripts as signals of his intent as the text moved towards publication. Although not undermining any of Kidd's overall claims, such a failure on Kidd's part has tended to be accepted as authoritative amidst the other allegations so overwhelming.

On another level Kidd's concern echoes his earlier dissatisfaction with the assembly of a copy text for the synoptic display from multiple authorities, an incongruous assortment of fragments which, as he states in his 'Inquiry', 'never selects a fair copy or a typescript to announce "Document XYZ is the copy text for this episode"'. In the 'Inquiry' Kidd further pinpoints his unhappiness by underlining the fact that such a patching together of sources, and a conflating of versions, is to a large extent based on conjecture. Forty percent of the Rosenbach Manuscript is not the final draft that Joyce gave his typists, and the final working draft is lost - so where a typescript or a typeset document differs from the Rosenbach Manuscript Gabler is forced to assign a chronology (which he terms 'levels' of revision) and make decisions about the choice of a base text reliant only on inference. When Kidd categorises the continuous manuscript text as a 'conjectural synthesis of texts from every level' he goes beyond his early dissatisfaction with Gabler's collection of fragments 'assembled like mosaic chips'. His objection this time is against a continuous manuscript text viewed as a compilation of discontinuous documents descending from heavily revised lost drafts. Kidd's ultimate conclusion is that 'the term continuous manuscript text serves no useful purpose in the study of Ulysses except to deflect attention from the very real difficulties of establishing what Joyce did write and intend to publish'.

Against a copy text assembled from multiple authorities, which he regards as an incongruous assortment of fragments, based on conjecture and derived from lost documents, Kidd sets his own understanding of the choice of an appropriate copy text. In contrast with Gabler's idea, only one document, which must be preserved, is chosen as the basis upon which Kidd's critical edition will be established - the 1922 text. It is possible to trace the origins of Kidd's principles if not immediately to the Greg-Bowers school of thought then to a more general Anglo-American conservative approach which dictates the direction that Kidd will take when he tackles 'the work that lies ahead - to edit Ulysses anew'. By singling out the 1922 text, Kidd has accepted, just as Gabler pointed out in his 'Afterword', that the first edition does represent the 'closest approximation to

be found in one document of the work at its ultimate stage of compositional development' and that it does come 'closest to what Joyce aimed for as the public text of Ulysses'. Kidd's new edition will recover Joyce's final intention in the form of a single stable critical text, as opposed to Gabler's, which, recognising authorial revision, is a text which is in principle unstable. The result will be an edition which, in Kidd's eyes, will replace Gabler's Critical and Synoptic Edition as the closest that can be got to a definitive form of the work.

In terms of its presentation in table form and general conclusions on both practical and theoretical aspects, Kidd's salvo against the Gabler edition is indeed convincing. Kidd's intentions were not to pull down Gabler, as had first been thought, but instead to expose an edition which had been wrongly accepted as definitive. The PBSA article is also convincing when we add to Kidd's arguments the fact that, three years after the publication of Kidd's PBSA article, Gabler had failed to make a response to the charges - so seeming to admit defeat. With Gabler's long-overdue response now available, the question re-arses whether in fact the evidence contained in Kidd's salvo has been successful in deposing Gabler's Critical and Synoptic Edition of Ulysses after all. It is now possible to set Gabler's arguments in defence against Kidd's criticisms and reach a final judgement regarding Kidd's overall impact and hence success.

Churchill, Vic.