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Ulysses, it has been said, is a difficult book to read. It was also, unsurprisingly, a difficult book to write and publish and the legacy of these difficulties remains to this day. There is no single edition of Ulysses that could honestly be called “definitive”. This situation is perhaps, as most scholars argue, an inherent condition of any literary work, but it is also a direct outcome of the various difficulties Joyce faced in getting Ulysses published. While most readers might like to think that such problems either should have been solved already or have no discernible impact on their own experiences with the novel, an awareness of the condition of the text of Ulysses can help increase one’s understanding and even enjoyment of Joyce’s novel.

Of course, there is no such thing as a perfect or definitive edition of any literary work. Any published edition is always an imperfect, or even flawed, incarnation of the text it carries. As Jorge Luis Borges wrote, “The concept of the ‘definitive text’ corresponds only to religion or exhaustion”. It is a historical fact that Ulysses exists in multiple forms, in different editions, with differences both great and small in the printed texts. Ulysses is plural. But then what is Ulysses when it is plural?

As an illustration of how a book becomes different when its text changes, I will take a small example from the “Ithaca” episode of Ulysses. At one point, the contents of Leopold Bloom’s library are enumerated with a seemingly scrupulous bibliographic exactitude. One of Bloom’s books is called In the Track of the Sun; this is an actual book by Frederick Diodati Thompson which describes his trip around the world. In the first edition of Ulysses, Bloom’s copy of this book is described as having “yellow cloth, titlepage missing recurrent title intestation” (U1922 662.01–2). In the second, and all subsequent editions, this passage
reads “yellow cloth, titlepage missing, recurrent title intestation” (*U1926 666.01–2; UG 17.1395–96).* Joyce uses the word “intestation” in a sense not usually found in English (the typical English sense of being deprived of the right to make a will clearly does not apply here). In Italian the word *intestazione* means “heading” or “inscription” and so a recurrent title intestation would be just a flowery way of saying running title. The comma added in the second edition makes a significant difference: without it, just the title-page of Bloom’s copy lacks a running title, but with the comma, Bloom’s copy lacks the title-page itself and elsewhere in this book the running title is present. Therefore, two different books are being described in these two editions of *Ulysses*, one with a title-page that lacks a “recurrent” inscription (something it wouldn’t be expected to have in any case) and one without a title page but with ordinary running heads. This one minor variable changes the book — at least the book by Thompson, if not *Ulysses*. (This, by the way, will be my only example involving punctuation.)

A more blatant example of how a seemingly small textual variation can yield entirely different meanings can be found in the first American edition of *Ulysses*, which, for reasons that will be discussed later on, contained many inaccuracies. On the first page we read that Buck Mulligan “pointed his finger in friendly jest and went over the parapet, laughing to himself” (*U1934 5.38–39), rather than the more sensible “over to the parapet, laughing to himself” (*U1922 4.07–8; UG 1.35–36; emphasis added), which is found, much to Mulligan’s relief, in other editions.

Of course, before going into this whole jumble of variants and multiple editions, the first question that needs to be explored is how *Ulysses* got to be this way. The short answer to this is that because of Joyce’s compositional practices and
because, out of fear of censorship, the first edition had to be published in France, by an amateur publisher using a French printer, the first edition of *Ulysses* was greatly flawed. Joyce was well aware of this. The first edition begins with the statement, initialled by its publisher Sylvia Beach but actually written by Joyce: “The publisher asks the reader’s indulgence for typographical errors unavoidable in the exceptional circumstances” (*U1922 [xi]). Every subsequent attempt to redress these errors in new editions wound up introducing new errors in the process; of course some editions come out better than others. The long answer to this question is, well, longer.

**From The Little Review to Shakespeare and Company**

The earliest known reference Joyce made to writing *Ulysses* was in a postcard (in German) to his brother Stanislaus on Bloomsday 1915: “I have written something. The first episode of my new novel *Ulysses* is written” (SL 209). (In 1906 Joyce briefly considered, then abandoned, writing a short story entitled “Ulysses” for *Dubliners* [LII 168, 190, 193, 209].) By 1915, Joyce had been working on *Ulysses* for less than a year and was struggling to get his earlier books published. In August, through Ezra Pound, he entered into an agreement that would allow for the serial publication of the episodes of *Ulysses* in *The Egoist* in England and *The Little Review* in the United States (SL 227; JJ 421). Previously, *The Egoist* had published *A Portrait* serially and in February 1917 they published the first English edition of *A Portrait* (although this was printed in America because no English printer would accept it). Up until his arrangement with these two journals, Joyce was working on *Ulysses* in bits and pieces. The agreement to publish *Ulysses* serially meant that Joyce would have to revise his working habits and work through each episode sequentially while maintaining a fairly consistent schedule.4
In the autumn of 1917, Joyce began to submit typescripts of the early episodes to both *The Egoist* and *The Little Review*. In order to do this, he needed to produce a handwritten manuscript that would be clear enough for his typist to read (*LII* 396) — this is called a fair copy manuscript. In general, for each episode three copies of the typescript were made (one for *The Egoist*, one for *The Little Review*, and one for Joyce). While the fair copy manuscripts for *Ulysses* are clearer and more legible than the working drafts that preceded them, they are still working drafts themselves as they contain numerous revisions and additions. Joyce’s fundamental process of writing was accretion and he seemed constitutionally incapable of leaving a document unsullied by further modifications and additions. Even as he checked the typescripts for errors before sending them off to *The Little Review*, he embellished his text further. Indeed, Joyce continued revising *Ulysses* well beyond the establishment of the typescript: as much as one third of the novel’s final text was written on the galley and page proofs from the early 1920s.

As Joyce was preparing the text for serial publication, he frequently wrote Claud Sykes (his first typist) to clarify certain features of the manuscripts and, in some cases, to introduce new revisions. In December 1917, he wrote: “I hope you will not find the MS difficult. I tried to write in a very legible hand but there are interlineations, very important. Hope you can make them out” (*LII* 413). Of course, Sykes, as well as subsequent typists, was not always able to make out Joyce’s writing. Joyce corrected many of the errors inflicted by typists but he did not catch them all. In some cases, he even went along with the changes made during the preparation of the typescript. For example, in “Eumaeus”, Joyce had the initials of Murphy the sailor-man be “D.B.” on the fair copy. The typist misread this as “W.B.”, which is an understandable mistake considering Joyce’s handwriting. On revisions made on subsequent proofs for this episode
Joyce retained these new initials. The suggestion of W.B. Yeats is appropriate to this episode’s thematics of misidentification and dissimulation — and the fact that this suggestion arose through a misidentification of Joyce’s writing heightens the irony.5

In June 1919, John Quinn, an Irish-American lawyer in New York and a patron of Pound and Eliot, offered to buy the manuscript of *Ulysses*. Previously, Quinn had purchased a manuscript for Joyce’s play *Exiles* as well as the corrected proof pages for *A Portrait*. Initially Joyce was reluctant, but eventually he agreed to sell Quinn the fair copy manuscript in instalments as it was being written.6

In 1923 Quinn sold the manuscript at auction to Dr Abraham Simon Wolf Rosenbach, a prominent Philadelphia manuscript and book dealer (*JJ* 559); it now resides at the Rosenbach Museum and Library and is thus known as the Rosenbach Manuscript.

Before buying the *Ulysses* manuscript, Quinn complained to Pound that the *Exiles* manuscript he had purchased was illegible. Pound agreed: “[Joyce] was quite cracked in suggesting that his unnutterable scrawl COULD possibly be deciphered at ANY price whatsoever. The thing is not humanly possible”.7 Because of this, Quinn repeatedly insisted to Joyce that the appearance of the *Ulysses* manuscript he was buying was important.

In the early 1970s, Michael Groden, Hans Walter Gabler, Philip Gaskell, and A. Walton Litz all concluded that for certain episodes the Rosenbach Manuscript could not have been the copy from which the typescripts were prepared. For many of these episodes, typescripts do not exist or are incomplete, but their contents can be inferred from the serialisations in *The Little Review*, even when
taking into account errors that were introduced in the preparation of the serialised
texts. For certain episodes, the extant typescripts (or otherwise inferred manuscripts)
contained significant revisions not indicated on the Rosenbach. The conclusion
they drew was that for these episodes, Joyce sent Quinn a different manuscript
than the one sent to the typist. Presumably Joyce did this because the working
fair copy (that is, the copy that went to the typist) might not have met Quinn’s
standards for appearance. The affected episodes are “Calypso”, “Hades”, “Aeolus”,
“Lestrygonians”, “Scylla and Charybdis”, “Sirens”, “Nausicaa”, and “Oxen of
the Sun”. Unfortunately, for these episodes the actual working fair copies do
not exist and so the Rosenbach Manuscript remains the principle extant witness
to the text of *Ulysses* at the fair copy stage.

As soon as the process of the serial publication of *Ulysses* was underway, Joyce
was made painfully aware of the problems his novel would face. Pound, the
European editor for *The Little Review*, received the first episode by December
1917 and already began to fret about censorship: “I suppose we’ll be damn well
suppressed if we print the text as it stands, BUT it is damn wellworth it” (*LII*
414). The following March, Pound informed Joyce that the printers for *The
Egoist* refused to print the first episode (under British law at this time, both the
printer and the publisher are liable for any objectionable publication). Ultimately,
Weaver was only able to find a printer who agreed to print just a few episodes

Pound decided that some compromises would have to be made in order to
publish “Calypso” in *The Little Review*. He wrote Joyce: “I think certain things
simply bad writing, in this section. … The contrast between Blooms [sic] interior
poetry and his outward surroundings is excellent, but it will come up without
such detailed treatment of his dropping feces. … Perhaps an unexpurgated text of you can be printed in a greek or bulgarian translation later”.10 Pound deleted about twenty lines from “Calypso” for publication in The Little Review, all from the account of Bloom’s visit to the outhouse. While Pound disagreed with Joyce’s artistic choices, he was primarily acting in the best interests of the publishers of The Little Review, who faced the real prospect of prosecution (the November 1917 issue had been suppressed because of the alleged indecency of Wyndham Lewis’ story “Cantleman’s Spring Mate”). Uncompromising to the last, Joyce refused to tolerate any repeat of Pound’s excisions and he insisted that Ulysses only be published in the form he wrote it. In August 1918, Weaver wrote B.W. Huebsch, who had published A Portrait in the U.S., about a possible American edition of Ulysses: “As regards Ulysses he asks… that the excised paragraphs must be reinstated and the altered ones restored before publication by you” (LII 419).

Initially, Pound’s fears of legal action against The Little Review seemed exaggerated as the first numbers of The Little Review to serialise Ulysses appeared without incident, however the January 1919 issue, which contained the first half “Lestrygonians”, was confiscated by the U.S. Postal Authorities. This was followed by seizures of the May issue, which had the second half of “Scylla and Charybdis”, and then the January 1920 issue, the third part of “Cyclops”. All this prompted Joyce to remark to Pound: “No country outside of Africa will print [Ulysses]” (JJ 497). In September 1920, matters took a turn for the worse when John S. Sumner, the secretary for the New York Society for the Prevention of Vice, filed an official complaint against The Little Review on the basis of the July–August 1920 issue, which contained the third part of the “Nausicaa” episode. Legal action was taken against The Little Review and its editors, Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap; the trial was held in February 1921. Acting as their lawyer, Quinn was able to spare
Heap and Anderson a jail sentence but they were each fined $50 (JJ 502–4). Although the magazine itself survived the trial, it emerged much-weakened and finally ceased publication in 1929. The trial scared off Huebsch and other potential commercial publishers from issuing an unexpurgated Ulysses (JJ 504).

Publication of Ulysses in The Little Review ceased with the first portion of “Oxen of the Sun” in the September–December 1920 issue. This meant that Joyce was no longer writing on deadline and so from “Oxen of the Sun” onwards, the episodes became longer and stranger. Had publication in The Little Review continued, most likely Ulysses would have wound up being a very different and quite possibly far less revolutionary book.11

Joyce did not actually find out about The Little Review trial until March, a month after it had ended, when he read a press cutting from the New York Tribune in the Parisian bookstore Shakespeare and Company, which was owned and run by Sylvia Beach, an expatriate American. Beach’s published account of what happened next has become canonical, although it is not entirely accurate. She claims that upon hearing of Joyce’s exasperation in learning that Ulysses might never be published, she was inspired to suggest that she and her bookstore “have the honor of bringing out your Ulysses. He accepted my offer immediately and joyfully. I thought it rash of him to entrust his great Ulysses to such a funny little publisher. But he seemed delighted, and so was I. We parted, both of us, I think, very much moved”.12 Edward L. Bishop has demonstrated that although Beach’s memoir was published in 1957, she began writing it in 1937 and the earlier drafts of this fateful meeting lack the mawkishness of the published version. Indeed, Beach’s earlier versions detail how the idea for publication came from Joyce: “Joyce said to me: ‘I’m afraid you’ll have to do it, Miss Beach’. I was quite willing
to accept the honor, though I felt it was going to be rather a huge venture”.13 In fact, the idea of printing *Ulysses* in France — but published by Huebsch or John Rodker, an English poet and publisher — had been mooted by Weaver and others before the trial (*LIII* 17).

Adrienne Monnier, Beach’s companion, recommended that she hire Maurice Darantiere, an established printer in Dijon, to produce *Ulysses*. Darantiere made books for tony French publishers and bibliophiles but also worked with contemporary French writers and so was used to dealing with experimental works of fiction. He was very accommodating to Beach and her unusual circumstances.14 Joyce later described Darantiere as “scrupulous and understanding” (*LIII* 242); these qualities were important since Joyce’s writing habits were very taxing. Eugene Jolas — the editor for *transition*, which published *Finnegans Wake* serially — once remarked that the word “Joyce” had become a “verb of objurgation” amongst his typesetters.15

In the autumn of 1920, before a publisher was found, Joyce began revising one of the copies of the typescripts that had been made for serial publication. He told Quinn that the episodes that received the most revisions were “Lotus Eaters”, “Lestrygonians”, “Cyclops”, and “Nausicaa” (*LIII* 31). These revised typescripts were ultimately sent to Darantiere, starting in the spring of 1921. For the last four episodes, which did not appear in *The Little Review*, typescripts were prepared, and of course revised, specifically for Darantiere. Right from the beginning of his commission, Darantiere warned Beach that any authorial revision made on the proofs would incur a charge of 4.75 Fr. per hour.16 Of course, Joyce kept on revising. His habit of imposing substantial additions as the book was being printed was actually relatively common practice in nineteenth-century France.17 The proofs were pulled in two stages: galleys (referred to by their French name
placards), which typically consist of eight unnumbered pages on one side of a large sheet, and page proofs, which are printed on both sides of the sheet and are folded to form a gathering of sixteen pages. Because of Joyce’s constant additions to the text at every stage of preparation, many sections of text had to go through five or six sets of proofs (rather than the two Darantiere would have preferred), and some went through even more. As an example of Darantiere’s frustration, after the first five episodes went through one stage of placards and then two successive sets of page proofs because of Joyce’s continuing revisions, Darantiere reverted back to pulling a third set of placards rather than pull another set of page proofs (which are more expensive to produce).

Since Joyce was working on many different sections of Ulysses at the same time as he was preparing the proofs, many of the late additions deal with introducing patterns of cross-referencing and symbolic correspondences throughout the novel. Certain episodes changed dramatically during the proof stages. For example, “Aeolus” was, as Joyce wrote Weaver, “recast” (LI 172): on the first set of placards Joyce added in a series of headings to punctuate the text. This distinctive feature had been absent in previous versions, most obviously to readers of The Little Review’s serialisation of this episode. One particularly complex pattern of addition involves the proofs for “Circe”. Joyce signed one page proof, after making few revisions, with the coveted stamp of approval “Bon à tirer” (“Ready to print”), much to Darantiere’s relief. However, a few days later Joyce took up a duplicate of this page proof and introduced substantial new passages. He marked this page “Corrections supplémentaires si encore possible” (“Supplementary corrections if still possible”) (Buffalo V.C.I: 30b; JJA 26: 171). Apparently, by the time Darantiere received this copy of the proofs it was no longer possible to incorporate the new revisions. Therefore, Joyce instead
added these passages to a later section of “Circe” that was in an earlier stage of the proof process. He modified them to fit in the new context but they are clearly recognisable. This revision initially confounded Hans Gabler when he was editing *Ulysses*. Having access to this discarded proof, he inserted one of the aborted passages back to where Joyce had originally planned to use it (*UG1984* 15.1914–1917) even though the reworked version had been placed elsewhere (*UG* 15.4506–4509) and the original discarded. When Gabler revised his edition in 1986 he eliminated this insertion, which is why there is a skip between lines 15.1913–18.

Darantiere faced additional problems beyond Joyce’s seemingly limitless potential to revise and expand his text. Since Darantiere did not normally print English texts, he had to specially order extra quantities of the most commonly used letters in English. He complained that the typescript Joyce submitted was not always clear and this created many mistakes (and missed lines or passages). Joyce’s handwriting also created more than a few obstacles for the typesetters (as it had done for his typists earlier), only one of whom, Maurice Hirchwald, actually knew English. A further wrinkle was that Hirchwald decided to proofread *Ulysses* and thus he introduced further distortions into the text. Joyce was able to correct many of these errors perpetrated by Darantiere and his team, however some did creep into the first edition. For example, the Gabler edition correctly reproduces this passage from “Nestor”: “Their full slow eyes belied the words” (*UG* 2.367–68). However, someone at Darantiere’s atelier, presumably Hirchwald, not knowing the English word belied, changed this passage on a late page proof to read “Their full slow eyes bellied the words” (**JJA** 22: 150; *U1922* 34.09–10). The error made its way into the first edition and was eventually corrected for the third printing (*U1923* 34.09). Other attempts by Hirchwald to proofread
Joyce’s text endured for much longer. I should point out that Darantiere and his team, working under tremendous constraints, performed yeoman service in terms of printing *Ulysses* and for every thing they got wrong they got thousands of things right.

Many of the “corrections” made in subsequent editions are of a similar proofreading character: attempts to expunge apparent “hides and hints and misses in prints”. Of course these later “corrections” were made by people more proficient in English than Hirchwald yet many of them remove effects deliberately chosen by Joyce.

By November, Joyce reported to Weaver that he was exhausted by the task of revising and correcting: “I am extremely irritated by all those printer’s errors. … Are these to be perpetuated in future editions? I hope not” (*LI* 176).

The whole process of preparing and revising and further preparing and further revising the proofs delayed publication of *Ulysses* until Joyce’s fortieth birthday, 2 February, in 1922 (originally Joyce and Beach had hoped for publication in October 1921 [*LI* 162]). Even then it was a race to the last minute for Darantiere to get the first two finished copies from his atelier in Dijon to Beach’s store in Paris (*JJ* 524).

From an early point, Beach and Joyce decided that they would produce *Ulysses* as a deluxe limited edition available only through subscription (*LI* 162). The first edition was limited to one thousand numbered copies, with three separate limitations: copies 1–100 were on fine Dutch handmade paper and were signed by Joyce; 101–250 were on vergé d’Arches paper; and 251–1,000 on vergé à barbes (about twenty unnumbered copies were also produced). Because the vergé d’Arches limitation was substantially larger (earning it the sobriquet “Giant
Joyce”), the type had to be recast, which allowed Darantiere to introduce some last-minute corrections he was unable to work into the other two limitations. So, even the first edition carries within itself a “corrected edition”.

If the text of Ulysses had sparked some controversy, the very form of the first edition also aroused debate. George Slocombe called it “as large as a telephone directory or a family bible, and with many of the literary and social characteristics of each!” The cover simply read “ULYSSES | by | James Joyce” in white letters over a blue field — the blue of the Greek flag. Arriving at the exact shade of blue Joyce desired proved to be a lengthy and cumbersome process. As was typical for some deluxe French volumes, the “cover” was actually a wrapper which could be used as a kind of dust-jacket once the buyer had the book bound at their own expense. This arrangement proved to be confusing for English and American reviewers unfamiliar with this Gallic practice and many simply assumed that the binding was shoddy.

The Egoist Press

Even as the first edition was being sold, plans were underway for a second printing, this time in England. At this point Beach had no intention to continue publishing Ulysses beyond the first edition. Harriet Shaw Weaver agreed to publish the second printing for the Egoist Press and John Rodker acted as her agent in France (JJ 505–6 n.). Darantiere’s plates for the first edition were used and the Egoist Press edition came out in October. Two thousand numbered copies (and one hundred unnumbered) were printed and, with the exception of the publisher’s statement — “Published for the Egoist Press, London by John Rodker, Paris” — this edition is almost identical to the 750 series limitation of the first printing (it is slightly smaller).
Weaver expressed a desire that corrections would be made to the text, but Joyce told her that Darantiere could not correct the plates to *Ulysses* in time for the second printing and so these would have to wait for the third (*LI* 187–88). Initially, Rodker compiled a list of corrections but Joyce vetoed many of them since, as he explained to Weaver, “These are not misprints but beauties of my style hitherto undreamt of” (*LI* 187). While in Nice in November, Joyce sent Weaver a list of his own corrections through “Cyclops” (*LI* 192). Beyond that point in the text, most of the additional list of corrections was compiled by Weaver and Rodker without Joyce’s input. As work on compiling the errata list was not finished in October, the eight page list of corrections (listing over two hundred errors) was not available for the first copies produced and sold.

Darantiere had warned Beach that since the type he used was movable, a few new errors might creep into a second printing. One of these is somewhat ironic. In “Wandering Rocks”, while perusing an illustrated copy of *Aristotle’s Masterpiece* — a purportedly clinical and somewhat pornographic 17th Century treatise on gynaecological maladies — at a bookstall, Bloom thinks “Crooked botched print. Plates: infants cuddled in a ball in bloodred womb” (*U1922* 226.02–3; *UG* 10.585–86). The Egoist Press printing botches the print here and reads “Pates: infants cuddled…” (*U1922b* 226.02–3).

While no legal action against *Ulysses* had yet been taken in England, the danger was still present. In the U.S., *Ulysses* was a black-market commodity, often smuggled in through Canada with copies sometimes rebound with dust-jackets bearing innocuous titles like *Merry Tales for Little Folks*. In the autumn of 1922, as copies were being shipped to the U.S., a large quantity was seized and
eventually destroyed. While the number of destroyed copies has been taken to be 500, Weaver herself was uncertain as to the exact figure and thought it be anywhere between four and five hundred.35

Plans were then quickly made to produce a new printing of 500 copies to replace the one lost to the U.S. custom authorities. Many of the mistakes listed in the errata list were corrected in the replacement printing. For example, the very first listed erratum, “Genera” (U1922 6.23), is restored to “General” (U1923 6.23). This printing also remarks the circumstances of its issuance with the notice “This edition of 500 copies is specially printed to replace those destroyed in transit to the U.S.A.” (U1923 [ix]). Ironically, by this time the British authorities had decided that Ulysses was an obscene book and thus could be seized.36 Therefore, when a consignment of the third, replacement printing arrived in Folkestone it was duly confiscated.37 There is some doubt as to the exact number seized at Folkestone; the claim is that 499 copies were destroyed, out of 500 printed. However, at least three copies are known to survive — one at Buffalo and two at Yale — and occasionally others surface in the rare books market.

Back to Shakespeare

Weaver’s experience with the two Egoist Press editions made her realise that Ulysses could not yet be published in the United Kingdom. Beach thus decided, “at her own risk, suggestion and expense”, as Joyce put it (LI 210), to produce an inexpensive edition of Ulysses. Priced at 60 francs, the fourth printing appeared in January 1924. To Joyce’s dismay, the fourth, fifth, and sixth printings had white covers with blue letters instead of the blue covers of the earlier printings.
(these returned with the seventh printing). The fourth printing used the same plates as the third and thus carried forward the corrections Darantiere had implemented for that printing (because the third printing is so rare, it is usually assumed that the corrections first appeared in the fourth printing). A new errata list, of four pages, was also included. This list contained additional corrections by Joyce and Weaver, some of which address errors that were introduced after the first edition, such as the “Pate” that reared its ugly head at \textit{U1922b} 226.02.

From now on, new printings of \textit{Ulysses} try to correct errors that were made after the first printing as well as errors from before. The 1924 printing also inaugurated the tradition of listing previous printings and noting confiscations, thereby including the narrative of the prosecution of \textit{Ulysses} into \textit{Ulysses} itself.

Several further printings were issued and in May 1925 Darantiere proposed to Beach that the type be entirely reset. At this point Joyce’s interest in \textit{Ulysses} had waned as he was now working on \textit{Finnegans Wake} and so Beach hired a professional proofreader who worked for the \textit{Daily Mail}. The second edition is (incorrectly) designated as the eighth printing but it is a new edition as the type was entirely reset. It was published in May 1926. Beach recounts that when Joyce first looked at this edition, he “eagerly scrutinized the first pages with the help of his two pairs of glasses plus a magnifying glass—and I heard an exclamation. Three errors already!” One example of a proofreading “correction” actually corrupting the text comes at the end of “Proteus” when Stephen thinks of “his my sandal shoon” (\textit{U1922} 50.05; \textit{UG} 4.487–88) — the compound word neatly expresses the fact that Stephen’s shoes are borrowed from Mulligan. The second edition eliminates this compound: “his my sandal shoon” (\textit{U1926} 49.34–35). (Some of the changes made to \textit{Ulysses} over the years will be familiar to anyone who has ever used a spell-checker.)
This edition, and all subsequent Shakespeare and Company printings, eliminates one of more peculiar features of the “Ithaca” episode. This episode ends with a large dot or point, which comes in answer to the question “Where?” (UG 17.2331). Joyce left instructions on two sets of proofs that this point should be “bien visible” (JJA 21: 140; also JJA 27: 212). Because of printing limitations, the point appears somewhat square in the first edition. However, the second edition removes the point altogether so that “the point was the least conspicuous point about it” (UG 16.819–20). In this way, this episode ends with an unanswered question. The elimination of this point can be found in quite a few subsequent printings of Ulysses over the years and can be attributed to “the printers who saw the blot and believed they were doing the right thing in retouching it out”.42

Beach published three more printings of the second edition through May 1930. John Kidd claims that the second printing of the second edition (from 1927), and to a lesser extent the third printing (1928), contain new corrections, “some of which restore manuscript readings for the first time”.43 One example of such a correction comes in “Scylla and Charybdis”, where the first edition, somewhat bizarrely, reads “Eve. Naked wheatbellied sin. A shake coils her, fang in’s kiss” (U1922 191.03). In 1927, this was restored to what Joyce originally wrote on the Rosenbach manuscript: “A snake coils her, fang in’s kiss” (U1927 191.03; UG 9.541).44 Unsurprisingly, some corrections introduced in these later Shakespeare printings turn out to be erroneous instances of well-intentioned, but misguided, proofreading (Hirchwald could still be to blame). For example, in “Lotus Eaters” there is the description of Bloom “Drawing back his head and gazing far from beneath his vailed eyelids” (U1922 71.08–9; UG 5.110–11). In a note to this word “vailed”, Gabler refers to its OED definition, “To lower or cast down (the eyes)” (CSE 146). He also indicates its use in Hamlet, “Do not for ever with thy
vailed lids / Seek for thy noble father in the dust” (I.ii.70–71) — certainly an apposite allusion to make within *Ulysses*. In the 1927 printing, this word winds up being the more familiar “veiled” (*U1927 71.09*), thereby veiling the allusion to Shakespeare.

**Ulysses at the Odyssey Press**

While Beach was publishing *Ulysses*, some American publishers expressed an interest in Joyce’s novel, however stores which (discretely) sold copies of the Shakespeare edition in the U.S. were still being prosecuted. Before any formal arrangements could be made with an American publisher, the German firm the Albatross Press offered to take over publication of *Ulysses* in continental Europe from Beach (*JJ 652–53; LIII 259–60*). Their edition was published under the imprint “The Odyssey Press”. Between 1932 and 1939 there were four printings, usually as two small volumes. Complicating matters from a bibliographic perspective, the so-called first printing of 1932 came in three limitations: one on thin India paper in one volume, one in two volumes (each one about the same size of the one volume limitation), and one a special deluxe two volume edition of only thirty-five copies. The one volume limitation must have come first as it has errors that are corrected in the other two and the deluxe limitation must have been last as it corrects some errors from the previous two. Thus the first printing contains three distinct textual states. Each of the three printings after 1932 corrects further errors.

As a reflection of the legal difficulties still confronting *Ulysses*, a note on the back cover page reads “Not to be introduced into the British Empire or the
U.S.A.” A note on the title-page verso reads “The present edition may be regarded as the definitive standard edition as it has been specially revised, at the author’s request, by Stuart Gilbert”. By this time Gilbert had effectively become “the official Joycean” largely on the strength of his 1930 book-length study of *Ulysses* (he had also assisted in the French translation of *Ulysses*). In two 1965 letters to Jack Dalton, Gilbert describes his role in preparing the Odyssey Press edition: “I consulted Joyce re some doubtful points” and “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*. I certainly asked for, and received, revise proofs”.\(^47\)

Citing a 1956 study by James F. Spoerri, Ellmann calls the final printing of this edition (1939) “the most accurate text of the book” (*JJ 653*) — this is still a commonly-held assumption within the Joyce world. Spoerri however is a bit more circumspect. He notes that Gilbert himself wrote in blue pencil in a copy of a 1932 printing of this edition: "Despite the ‘perfection’ | of this version (I should | say “Edition”), five | misprints somehow | slipped their way | in! Hélas! | Stuart Gilbert”.\(^48\) Spoerri uncovers more than five misprints, the most dramatic being the “Aeolus” heading “LINKS WITH BYGONE DAYS OF YORE” (*UG 7.737*), which appears as “LINKS TH BYGONE DAYS OF YOREW1” (*U1932a–b 143.15*) in the first two limitations of the first printing but is corrected in the third (the deluxe) and in subsequent printings. Despite numerous proofreading emendations made in all printings of the Odyssey Press edition, it created new errors. For example, “Smell of grilled beefsteaks to the starving” (*U1922 104.16–17; *UG 6.760–61*) became the somewhat less appetising “frilled beefsteaks” (*U1932a 112.32*), a reading that remained until Gabler’s edition.
Ulysses Comes to America

In early 1932, Bennett Cerf of Random House secured the American rights to Ulysses from Beach and, sensing that the moral landscape of the United States had changed, began planning how he could publish it. The following autumn, Ulysses was again put on trial but this time the results were favourable. Judge John M. Woolsey’s decision, announced on 6 December 1933, has become famous for its sensitivity to matters both literary and legal and for finally allowing Ulysses into the United States, more than ten years after it was first published (JJ 666–67). Cerf boasted that he had printers working on setting Ulysses within ten minutes of hearing the verdict. The edition, published in January 1934, included a copy of Woolsey’s decision and a letter by Joyce to Cerf explaining the troubles his Ulysses had faced in its long voyage towards legitimate publication in the U.S.

In retrospect, such haste proved to be a bad idea. Cerf and his typesetters assumed they were working from a copy of the 1927 Shakespeare and Company printing when instead they had a piratical edition that had been “published” in New York in 1929 by an enterprising publisher named Samuel Roth. This piratical edition was a forgery of the legitimate 1927 printing. Even today, some book dealers confuse Roth’s edition with the Shakespeare 1927 printing, although there are a few subtle physical differences between them: in Roth’s the paper is heavier and of different stock, the font is smaller, the jacket lacks the spine text, the wrappers lack folding flaps, and the book is slightly thicker (although the pagination is identical). More importantly, the text is highly corrupt and contains numerous errors, some of which are quite serious. Although Roth tried to make his piratical edition resemble the 1927 printing, he showed little regard...
for presenting Joyce’s text accurately. The error I mentioned at the beginning, where Mulligan “went over the parapet, laughing to himself” (U1934 5.38–39), is inherited directly from Roth’s edition (U-Roth 4.09–10). Both Roth’s and the 1934 Random House are filled with such mistakes.52

In addition to the piratical Ulysses, Roth had serialised Ulysses and parts of Finnegans Wake in his magazines Two Worlds Monthly and Two Worlds. In 1928 Joyce obtained a legal injunction forcing Roth to suspend publication of his works in his magazines. On the one hand, the piratical edition, despite its many flaws, did help make Ulysses somewhat available in the U.S. at a time when it was officially banned. Indeed, Roth was persecuted on several occasions for distributing Ulysses.53 On the other hand, the piratical edition seriously misrepresented Joyce’s text and Joyce, upon learning of its existence, mounted an International Protest against Roth which collected 167 signatures (JJ 585–87).54

Once it became apparent that he had based his edition on a faulty text, Cerf decided to redress matters.55 For the 1940 Modern Library imprint, he had the 1934 edition rigorously proof-checked against one of the Odyssey Press printings in order to remove the most egregious errors. This solved the more immediate problems (much to the laughing Mulligan’s relief), but this new edition was still far from perfect as some mistakes from Roth’s edition remained. Complicating matters further, the 1949 Random House reprint reverted back to the uncorrected 1934 text56 and so for many years American trade editions of Ulysses remained unreliable.

Sensing that there might be a compelling need in American homes for a deluxe edition of Ulysses, George Macy (as in the New York department store Macy’s)
acquired the rights to publish a limited edition of *Ulysses* with illustrations by Henri Matisse for the Limited Editions Club. Matisse confessed that he never read Joyce’s work and his illustrations are strictly Homeric (*JJ* 675). The edition is in a large format and is essentially a coffee-table book for collectors.\(^{57}\) The text is set in two columns. Notably, the headings in “Aeolus” are each set in different fonts in an attempt to mimic newspaper headlines in a manner that Joyce never conceived of (different fonts are used elsewhere as well). These choices have aroused the opprobrium of various graphic artists, such as John Ryder — a book designer for The Bodley Head from 1957–1986 — who called this edition “a typographic travesty”.\(^{58}\)

This edition features an introduction by Gilbert. The text is clearly based on the first Odyssey Press printing since it retains that printing’s stunningly incorrect “Aeolus” heading “LINKS TH BYGONE DAYS OF YOREWI” (*U1932a–b* 143.15; *U-Matisse* 65b.1). The text in the Limited Editions Club *Ulysses* is not absolutely consistent with the Odyssey Press first printing. The Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas-Austin has correspondence between Gilbert and Macy that lists suggested new corrections.\(^{59}\) Therefore this edition presents a unique iteration of the text of *Ulysses*. Oddly enough, at least one of Gilbert’s corrections made specifically for this edition is identical to one of the errors perpetrated in Roth’s piratical edition (and thus repeated in the 1934 Random House). At one point in “Scylla and Charybdis”, Stephen thinks about the Buddha: “Filled with his god, he thrones, Buddh under plantain” (*UG* 9.284). Buddha achieved enlightenment under the Bodhi tree, which is not of the genus plantain. The abbreviated “Buddh”, which is clearly intentional on Joyce’s manuscripts, is perhaps an allusion to the correct tree. In any case, Roth’s edition, the Random House 1934, and the Gilbert-
revised Matisse edition all read “Buddha” (U-Roth 184.16; U1934 189.34; U-Matisse 90b.16). Since Gilbert over-emphasised the association between *Ulysses* and eastern religions in his 1930 study, such an emendation on his part is not that surprising. It also further illustrates how the line between correction and corruption is eminently blurred.

**Ulysses in Britain and, Finally, Somewhat Corrected in America**

In October 1931, Joyce wrote Weaver that it seemed like the ban on *Ulysses* in the U.S. would not last much longer, “I suppose England will follow suit as usual a few years later. And Ireland 1000 years hence” (*LIII* 233). Joyce was at least correct in terms of England (while *Ulysses* was never officially banned in Ireland, it remained a difficult commodity to purchase for many years). Although Woolsey’s decision only had legal effect in the U.S., it made the threat of prosecution for an English edition of *Ulysses* somewhat less likely. After negotiating with various publishers, Joyce finally settled with The Bodley Head. In 1934 English printers were still too fearful of prosecution and so the Bodley Head edition did not appear until 1936 (*JJ* 653). Bodley Head initially published a hefty deluxe edition, limited to 1,000 copies. This volume also included Woolsey’s decision and other documents relating to the American trial as a pre-emptive defence against any possible charges.60

In a promotional flyer, Bodley Head described their edition as “Final and definitive”. While such claims were, unsurprisingly, hyperbolic, their edition was at least based on one of the Odyssey Press printings (possibly the 1933) and so it avoided some of the more blatant misprints that had infected *Ulysses* by this time.
Of course, new ones were introduced, such as “enchanced” (*U1936 302.07*) instead of “enhanced” (*UG 12.922*) — this “enchanced” emendation survived through several more editions. This particular misprint is all the more intriguing since it seems like a “Joycean” effect even though it was the result of some typesetter’s or proofreader’s error: a word enhanced by a chance mistake. A converse example of error appears in Martha Clifford’s letter when she flirtatiously chides Bloom/Henry Flower: “I called you naughty boy because I do not like that other world” (*UG 5.244–45*). Her evocative mistake in typing “world” for “word” is all the more charming since she met Bloom in response to his advertisement for a typist. In any case, the Bodley Head proofreaders corrected her error and concomitantly introduced one of their own by having her letter read “word” (*U1936 70.05*).61

In 1937 Bodley Head published a trade version of the 1936 edition, reduced in size and incorporating corrections made by Joyce (*CSE 1856*), thereby putting paid to the assertion that the earlier edition was “Final and definitive”. The 1937 printing went through several reprints. For the 1955 reprint, the printers inadvertently used the 1936 plates (which lacked Joyce’s additional revisions) and so an errata list was hastily assembled to correct this problem. However, this errata list did not comprehensively account for all of Joyce’s revisions. In turn, the 1958 printing, the final printing of this edition, was made from the corrected plates of the 1955 and also incorporates some new changes.62

In 1960 Bodley Head published an entirely-revised, new edition of *Ulysses*, designed by John Ryder. This was the most thorough revision of Joyce’s text until the Gabler edition came out in 1984. The text was based on their 1958 printing and thus it lacks some of the revisions Joyce made for the 1937 printing.63 For “Circe”, Ryder chose to revise Joyce’s preferred format. Instead of placing the speaker name
centre-justified, above the dialogue, he places it in the left margin (a more modern format for representing a theatrical piece). Some prefer this format, I do not. In 1968 Penguin issued a paperback edition of the 1960 Bodley Head with a few of their own corrections tossed in for good measure, such as emending “enchanced” back to “enhanced” (U1968 315.34).

The revised Bodley Head edition finally gave Cerf and Random House the means to redress their mistake of having relied on Roth’s edition. In 1961, they issued a new edition of *Ulysses* that was based on the 1960 Bodley Head but set on entirely new plates. One advantage of this was that they rejected the revised format for “Circe” and retained Joyce’s original layout. One disadvantage was that some of Joyce’s compound words which had to be hyphenated because they fell at a line-break in the 1960 edition incorrectly retained the hyphen even if they wound up in the centre of a line in the 1961. Also, the point at the close of “Ithaca” grew to disquieting proportions in this edition. A few additional revisions were also made by Random House’s proofreaders. Since they could now be unashamed of their edition, Random House labelled it “scrupulously corrected” on the dust jacket. In comparison, the only indication that changes were made in the Bodley Head 1960 is on the title page which just states that the edition is “completely redesigned” (but not corrected). Subsequent printings carry a blurb from *The Times* on the front flap: “The work has been reset and a handy volume produced. It is a great improvement”.

Of course, errors still remained and new ones were introduced (by both the Bodley Head 1960 and the Random House 1961). For example, in the 1961 edition, the phrase “the paper the bread was wrapped in” (*UG* 7.1003) appears as “the paper the beard was wrapped in” (U1961 147.24–25). The loudest critic...
of these editions was Jack P. Dalton.\textsuperscript{64} Citing Fredson Bowers’ line about “the remorseless corrupting influence that eats away at a text during the course of its transmission”,\textsuperscript{65} Dalton states that rather than rely upon existing printings, an entirely new edition should be produced, one that starts with an examination of Joyce’s pre-publication manuscripts. Up until this time, all editions of \textit{Ulysses} (except for Roth’s piratical and the 1934 Random House editions) descended linearly from the Shakespeare and Company first edition. Starting from scratch would be the only way to expunge the 2,000 errors that Dalton claims appeared in the first edition and the 1,700 he claims that followed in subsequent editions.\textsuperscript{66} Dalton had a contract with Random House to produce such an edition, but ultimately this never appeared. In 1975, Michael Groden also argued that any newly-edited text of \textit{Ulysses} should be based on the manuscripts in order to restore passages that had gotten lost in the preparation of the first edition, some of which had appeared in the \textit{Little Review} serialisations.\textsuperscript{67}

\textbf{Gabler and the “Corrected Text”}

Much has been said, perhaps too much, about what happened next, so I will limit myself to the more essential points. In 1977, with Dalton’s proposed edition relegated to mythology, Hans Walter Gabler began work on an entirely new edition of \textit{Ulysses}. This was first published in 1984 in a three volume set as \textit{The Critical and Synoptic Edition}, which was intended only for the specialist. Gabler’s editorial methodology was an innovative mixture of Anglo-American and Continental editorial principles. Rather than use a single stage of the text of \textit{Ulysses} as copy-text for editing, Gabler assembled what he called the “continuous manuscript text”, which represents the sum-total of \textit{Ulysses} as it existed from
the fair copy up to the final page proofs. This continuous manuscript text is a virtual construct, that is, it does not exist except as an editorial conflation of the many layers of Joyce’s drafts. Some important qualifications need to be made here. Many Joyceans assume that Gabler’s continuous manuscript text represents all the extant *Ulysses* manuscripts. This is not quite the case, Gabler deliberately excludes the drafts that precede the Rosenbach Manuscript (as well as any non-authorial markings on the manuscripts) from the continuous manuscript text — although he does refer to them occasionally to make emendations. Since the Rosenbach Manuscript is not the actual fair copy for eight episodes, as discussed above, Gabler extrapolates what that fair copy would have been on the basis of the extant documents. This means that Gabler’s continuous manuscript text is not an objective representation of the composition of *Ulysses*, but rather a theoretical construct (see *CSE* 1891-1903). A different editor would likely produce a different continuous manuscript text.

Once the continuous manuscript text was assembled, Gabler edited it to produce the reading text. In the three volume edition, the left-hand page represents the continuous manuscript text, with the different draft layers distinguished through a complex system of diacritical marks (this is called the synoptic text, a representation of the virtual continuous manuscript text), and the right-hand page shows the resultant edited-down reading text (see *CSE* 1903-4). In 1986 the three volume set was reissued with some corrections (most notably the deletion of the passage from “Circe” discussed above) along with a one volume trade edition of just the reading text for the general audience. The lag of two years before the publication of the reading text was intended precisely to allow Gabler to make additional alterations from suggestions by the scholarly community (*CSE* vii-ix). The trade edition of Gabler was heavily promoted as
the definitive edition to end all other definitive editions: both the British and American editions were labelled on the cover “The Corrected Text”. Again, such claims proved to be more hyperbolic than legitimate.

By starting with the manuscripts, Gabler is able to correct all sorts of things that had gone wrong before the first edition was ever published. For example, in “Calypso”, Bloom reads in the advertisement for the Agendath Netaim planter’s company that “You pay eighty marks” (UG 4.194–95) for a share of land and “Can pay ten down and the balance in yearly instalments” (UG 4.198–99). However, the typist for this episode missed the “y” in “eighty”, thereby making the mortgage seem somewhat unusual (a total of eight marks or ten down plus a further balance paid annually). On one typescript, Joyce caught the error and supplied the missing “y” (Buffalo V.B.3a: 5; JJA 12: 265), but this was not the typescript he sent to Darantiere and so the error entered into the first edition (U1922 58.14) and stood until Gabler caught it.

Other emendations are more problematic. At the beginning of “Proteus”, Stephen thinks of a few lines from a song “Won’t you come to Sandymount, / Madeline the mare?” (UG 3.21–22). He characterises these lines as “Acatalectic tetrameter of iambs marching” (UG 3.23–24). Prior to Gabler, this passage read “A catalectic tetrameter of iambs marching” (U1922 37.22). Stephen’s dissection of the lines he has just quoted shows his pedantic streak, although his mastery of poetic terminology is less impressive than he imagines. The metre is not iambic, but trochaic (an iamb consists of an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed, a trochee is a stressed followed by an unstressed). Catalectic means that a line in a poem lacks the expected syllable at the end and acatalectic means that the line has the regular number of syllables. The first line is catalectic trochaic tetrameter
and the second is catalectic trochaic trimeter. The reason why there is a variation between Gabler and the previous editions involves a bit of see-saw variation across various manuscripts. Joyce consistently wrote out the one-word form on the early manuscripts (the pre-Rosenbach draft [V.A.3: 1; JJA 12: 239] and the Rosenbach [R 1]), however this was set as the two-word form on the first placard, which Joyce then revised back to one word (JJA 17: 45). On the final page proof there is a scribal mark to divide the word back to its two-word form (JJA 22: 153) and so the two-word form appeared in the first edition. Joyce included a correction back to the one-word form in his handwritten list of errata (BL 57356-7; JJA 12: 177) but this was not included in the published list of errata and so the correction was never made. Gabler explains in a note “Joyce was either consistently in error himself or he imputes a shaky knowledge of the technical terms of prosody to Stephen” (CSE 1731). However, David Hayman has found an unpublished letter from Joyce to Weaver, dated 3 November 1922, where he endorses the change to the two word form: “divide better A catalectic”. However, this letter does not necessarily mandate that the two-word form should be chosen. Under the parameters Gabler established for his edition, it is entirely appropriate to have “Acatalectic” since it is the final authorially-sanctioned form within the manuscript dossier (see CSE 1898–1900). Of course, the two-word form is also a legitimate editorial decision. Both forms imply Stephen’s (or Joyce’s) error in applying technical poetic terminology.

Gabler made more significant alterations than these two examples, such as the restoration of many passages that had dropped out during the composition of *Ulysses*, including a contentious sentence in “Scylla and Charybdis”. One of Gabler’s editorial principles has drawn some criticism. Gabler rejects what is called “passive authorisation”, the idea that an author accepts a non-authorial
change simply by not correcting it (CSE 1894). Gabler formalises this into what he calls “the rule of the invariant context” (CSE 1882). If a unit of text was omitted and the passage in which it would have appeared remains unmodified in successive drafts (that is, its context has not changed), the omitted unit is restored. But if the context receives changes, then the original unit cannot be readmitted (CSE 1902–3). In practice this means that Gabler’s edition favours readings from earlier drafts at the expense of later revisions. In total, Gabler made some 5,000 emendations — at least ten times more than any other previous edition. Even the smaller changes, such as ones involving punctuation, have an effect as they influence the pace in which one reads Ulysses.

Even before the Gabler edition appeared, John Kidd began assailing its legitimacy and methodology. His attacks became so persistent (and vitriolic) that for better or worse his name is enmeshed within Gabler’s edition. Kidd attacked Gabler on every front. For example, he lambastes Gabler for not properly following the traditions of Anglo-American editing, when in fact that was never Gabler’s stated methodology as he blends Anglo-American and Continental practices. Some of Kidd’s charges were far less legitimate than others, but in the wealth of data he ultimately assembled he created the impression that Gabler’s edition was deeply and fundamentally flawed. Two examples of unquestionable errors that Kidd uncovered were manuscript misreadings that Gabler ultimately corrected for the 1993 printing of his edition (UG ix) — which bore the new caption “The Gabler Edition”.

One immediate result of Kidd’s attacks was that the 1961 Random House edition was reissued in the U.S. Confusing matters, Random House’s publicity materials described this as a reprint of the 1934 edition. In the U.K. Penguin
reissued the Bodley Head 1960 edition (however, it might have been preferable to reprint the Penguin 1968 instead). The idea was that the pre-Gabler editions would compete with Gabler in the marketplace in a kind of “Darwinian struggle”. The 1922 first edition was also reprinted by Oxford University Press. There were numerous other reprints of the Bodley Head 1960 since *Ulysses* was temporarily out of copyright in the U.K. from 1992–1995; one of these, published by Flamingo, bears the subtitle “The uncorrected text” on its cover as a sly reference to the Gabler-Kidd polemic (such a label is inaccurate since, as discussed above, the Bodley Head 1960 is itself a corrected text). In 1989, Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart published a “repair kit” for the 1922, 1961, and Gabler editions: a list of suggested emendations to each of these editions, which, they stress, does not amount to a new edition. Through all the media attention for the Gabler-Kidd polemic (which for a while was considerable for a scholarly dispute), the public at large was made aware of the problems of the various editions of *Ulysses* but no clear resolution was in sight. Kidd’s own much-promised edition of *Ulysses* has still not appeared and with every passing year its publication (or even existence in a finished form) seems much less likely.

For my own part, I would say that there is more wrong with Gabler than what was corrected for the 1993 edition, but it still remains, despite its flaws, the best iteration of the text of *Ulysses* currently available. It is usually a fairly easy, albeit tedious, exercise to identify errors in editions or pre-publication manuscripts. The problem an editor must confront is how to deal with such errors. To some extent, editing is like translating. One can make a demonstrable mistake but also, and usually more frequently, one can make a choice that is contentious (like the catalectic case discussed above). Another editor (or translator) can disagree with it and propose an alternative but neither alternative
is unequivocally correct. I would say that the problems in Gabler’s text are the most interesting out of all the editions of *Ulysses* since many of them, *pace* Kidd, cannot be adjudicated so easily.

**Rose and *The Reader’s Edition***

In 1997 a new edition of *Ulysses* was published. Edited by Danis Rose, the self-designated *Reader’s Edition* departed from the then-current debates about the text of *Ulysses* in unusual ways. Rose began by assembling something like Gabler’s continuous manuscript text (but with more attention paid to the pre-Rosenbach drafts), which he called the isotext (*RE* xi–xiv). He then edited this to redress what he calls “textual faults”, which he defines as something that “can be suspected when one realizes that there is ‘something wrong’ with a particular sentence in the isotext, not simply when a word is misspelled but more subtly where the sentence is saying something that it should not, where the logic of the narrative is inexplicably broken” (*RE* xvii). Taking Gabler’s emendation of “eight” (*U1922* 58.14) to “eighty” (*UG* 4.195) as an example, if the typescript Gabler had relied upon for the correction were missing, Rose would have still made the change because the logic of the sentence is faulty. However, the concept of the “textual fault” grants Rose a tremendous amount of licence to alter the text in hitherto unimagined ways. For example, without any instances of manuscript precedence, he corrects many of the factual errors that fill *Ulysses* (especially in the “Ithaca” episode), he hyphenates many of Joyce’s distinctive compound words, and, most famously, he supplies the apostrophes that Joyce removed from “Penelope”, thereby eliminating a distinctive feature from that episode (he provides an alternate version of “Penelope” with the
apostrophes gone but his other emendations intact). On top of all this, Rose modernises Joyce’s spelling (in some cases eclipsing certain literary allusions Joyce may have been making), standardises other orthographical matters in ways never used by Joyce, and clears up punctuation, all in order to, as he puts it, “maximize the pleasure of the reader” (RE vi). In all, John Kidd estimated that Rose made approximately 10,000 changes to the text, about half of which lack any precedence in any manuscript or previous edition.

To illustrate Rose’s style of emendation, I turn to a passage from “Lestrygonians” that he discusses in his introduction. In Gabler (and other editions) this passage reads: “Lady this. Powdered bosom pearls” (UG 8.877). Rose writes of this sentence “We have no manuscripts to appeal to. But ‘Powdered bosom pearls’ is manifestly wrong. What is a ‘bosom pearl’ and why should bosom pearls be powdered? The logical explanation is that Joyce mistakenly dropped a comma after ‘bosom’ in copying out the protodraft [the now-missing pre-fair copy draft]” (RE xviii). Rose thus emends to “Powdered bosom, pearls” (RE 167.07). However, there was nothing “manifestly wrong” with how this sentence appeared and Rose’s version belies the metaphoric effect of describing a breast as being as round as a pearl. Rose’s objection aside, a powdered bosom pearl is no more illogical than a powdered bosom. (By the way, I humbly apologise for having a second example involving punctuation.)

Some of Rose’s changes distort the echoes that reverberate throughout Ulysses. In “Calypso”, Bloom visits a butcher and sees an advertisement for “Agendath Netaim: planters’ company” (UG 4.191–92). Agendath Netaim is a mistaken transliteration of Agudath Netaim, a Hebrew phrase meaning “a society of planters”. Charles Parish pointed out a likely explanation for this mistake: the
Hebrew letters which make up “Agudath” and the nonexistent “Agendath” are virtually indistinguishable to the untrained eye.84 Rose provides the correct Hebrew transliteration (*RE* 58.06; *et passim*). Even though Joyce seems to have made an unintentional mistake here, correcting it upsets the balance of *Ulysses*. Throughout the day Bloom remembers this advertisement and the name “Agendath Netaim” recurs frequently as a kind of reminder of how he has strayed from the Jewish faith. In this way it provides an associative link with Stephen Dedalus. In “Telemachus”, Stephen remembers the title of a Medieval moral tract, “Agenbite of Inwit” (*UG* 1.481), which means “remorse of conscience”. He thinks of this title several times during the day in association with his own guilt at not having prayed for his mother at her deathbed, despite her entreaties. Thus “Agenbite of inwit” functions as the sign of Stephen’s lapsed faith just as “Agendath Netaim” is the sign of Bloom’s own remorse of conscience. “Agendath Netaim” is Bloom’s own “Agenbite of inwit”. Rose’s use of the Hebraically correct “Agudath Netaim” eliminates the possibility of the reader making this association between Bloom and Stephen.85

Many more examples can be made, which would, in aggregate, suggest that Rose trusts the competence of neither the reader nor the writer. The *Reader’s Edition* was not met with favourable reviews. Fritz Senn wrote: “Rose’s aim seems to be to eliminate Joyce’s disruptive elements, the shifts of perspective, of register, of syntactic glides, and so forth, and to iron out flaws and mistakes according to some, often external, norm…. The *Ulysses* that I have come to like is one that displays a flawed world, characterized by fallibility, where characters misremember, misquote, where Bloom flounders — in other words, a funnier book. It is one whose author does not take me by the hand but allows me to try my own wits, such as they are, with all the risk involved of going too far in questionable directions”.86
The reaction of the James Joyce Estate was somewhat more intense. They brought legal action against Rose and his publishers and in October 2001 a trial was held in London. The Reader’s Edition was charged with two counts: copyright infringement and “passing off” (which meant that the Reader’s Edition was charged with having so altered the text of Ulysses that it could not justifiably be called an edition of Joyce’s novel). One could invoke the various censorship trials Ulysses endured in the 1920s and 30s but perhaps the more pertinent precedent would be the legal actions Joyce took against Roth. I served as the expert witness on behalf of the Estate and testified how, on the one hand, Rose systematically relied upon the manuscripts of Ulysses to prepare his edition (in violation of the Estate’s copyright over these documents) and how, on the other hand, he disregarded these manuscripts in order to introduce changes that he thought appropriate and how in turn these changes distort Joyce’s novel.87 Ulysses may be multiple but is it multiple enough to include the Reader’s Edition? I would (and did, under oath) say that it is not. The Reader’s Edition changes so many things in the text that many of the novel’s distinctive traits are lost. The Estate won the copyright side of the case, with the result that the publishers had to desist from producing and distributing the Reader’s Edition. However they lost on the “passing off” side because the judge ruled that the relevant articles of the law on this subject cannot be applied to a literary work.88 In this way, the arguments I prepared for this matter, and those of the defendants’ own expert witness, David C. Greetham, were deemed largely irrelevant for the purposes of the trial.

I must admit that I would not have agreed to be the witness for the Estate if the matter had only involved copyright. The Estate was troubled enough by the character of Rose’s emendations to make it a focal point of the trial instead of just focusing on the copyright aspect of the case. To be fair to Rose, I would
have no objection to his edition being reprinted if it were prominently labelled with something other than the hopelessly vague and woolly epithet “Reader’s Edition”. Something like “Ulysses, edited and modified by Danis Rose” might be appropriate since this would signal that Rose has both edited the text (in the preparation of the isotext) and also altered it in such a way that, as Robert Spoo put it, “the wary reader no less than the wrangling scholar may well wonder whether the pleasure of the text in a given instance is given authorially or editorially generated”.89

_Ulysses Great and Small_

In 1988, the Arion Press issued a mammoth, deluxe edition of _Ulysses_ with 40 etchings by Robert Motherwell. The edition was limited to just 175 copies and each one is about the size of two volumes of the _OED_ and weighs almost six kilos. Unlike Matisse, Motherwell was very familiar with Joyce and many of his etchings are quite striking.90 Unremarked within either the edition or any of its attendant publicity materials, the text it presents is newly-edited specifically for the Arion Press. John Kidd, working in consultation with David Hayman, supplied Arion with a list of about 900 corrections to be applied to the Random House 1961 edition “which eliminated corruptions introduced from 1926–1961”.91 In effect, the Arion edition is a cleaned-up version of the Random House 1961, with virtually all emendations deriving from previously-published editions. It is a shame that this edition is not more widely available.

At the other end of at least one spectrum comes a queer, trade-size paperback edition of _Ulysses_ that carries on the cover the statement “Complete &
Unexpurgated | First American Printing”. This is actually another piratical edition, published in California. Although undated (and, like one version of Bloom’s copy of Thompson’s book, lacking a title page), it seems to have been published between 1968–1971. The forty-three pages of backmatter provide some clue as to the nature of the publisher responsible for this edition. The back-page advertises a book called All Male Nudes! Other pages contain ads for various sexual aids and other books, such as Yes, My Darling Daughter!; The She-Devils; Jean Genet’s Our Lady of the Flowers; The Amorous Adventures of a Gentleman of Quality; and what may well be the sequel to Ulysses, It’s Fun to Be Irish! Evidently, Ulysses’ reputation as a dirty book had aroused the interest of a prurient publisher. Beach writes that after she first published Ulysses, she received many enquiries from prospective purchasers who had seen Ulysses listed in catalogues of erotica. Joyce’s reaction to this was to plaintively say “There is less than ten per cent of that in my book”. For those who may be interested in this sort of thing, the text is based on the Bodley Head 1960, although new errors were introduced.

Conclusion

The fact that all the various editions of Ulysses contain errors of some kind or another can be met with a wide range of responses. One could assume a posture of indignation (like Dalton, or Kidd, or myself during the trial of Rose’s Reader’s Edition) and bemoan the imperfections of so-called “definitive” or “corrected” texts. Or, one could simply ignore all these textual imperfections and hope for the best. After all, many of the first generation of American Joyceans were reared on the eminently flawed 1934 Random House edition.
and some of them seem to have done rather well by it. Indeed, Sebastian Knowles, a contemporary Joycean, favours the 1934 for all its errors because, even though they are unintentional, they “reinforce the fact that errors are inevitable, that in a book so concerned with the human such errors are not only forgivable but necessary”. Knowles likes his *Ulysses* “enchanced”. Such openness to contingency and error suggests a third possible response to the plethora of editions of *Ulysses*. One could construe *Ulysses* as not just one book but many: many different, ever-errant *Ulysses* that can never be bound in a single book, but ever in one’s mind, variable and affecting.

I would like to thank Luca Crispi, Robert J. Bertholf, William Brockman, Michael Groden, John Gordon, David Hayman, Geert Lernout, Alena Nahabedian, and Dirk Van Hulle.
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ABBREVIATIONS

As I cite from various editions of *Ulysses*, I employ the following convention to differentiate editions and printings: \( U + year + page \cdot line \). Therefore, \( U1922 \ 662.01-2 \) designates lines 1–2 on page 662 of the 1922 edition (the first edition). The Gabler edition is cited as \( UG \), which, unless otherwise specified, refers to the 1993 printing of that edition (earlier printings are referred to as \( UG1984 \) or \( UG1986 \)). Following Gabler’s convention, his edition is cited by episode and line number (therefore \( UG \ 17.1395-96 \) designates lines 1395–96 in episode 17). Because of its ubiquity in scholarly reference, citations are also keyed to Gabler’s edition. Full details of the various editions and printings of *Ulysses* are in the Appendix.

References to the Forward, Critical Apparatus, Textual Notes, Historical Collation, or Afterward to Gabler’s *Critical and Synoptic Edition* are cited as \( CSE + page \) number (these references are to the 1986, revised printing).

Manuscripts are cited by their appearance in the *James Joyce Archive* and by their manuscript name (when appropriate). The *Ulysses* materials appear in volumes 12–27 of the *JJA* which were edited by Michael Groden.


The Rosenbach manuscript is published separately; page references are given to the manuscript page (which starts new for each episode):


Other standard works:
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Shakespeare and Company and Egoist Press

U1922: James Joyce, *Ulysses*, Paris: Shakespeare and Company, February 1922. (First edition. 1,000 numbered copies in three limitations: 1–100 on fine Dutch handmade paper, signed by Joyce; 101–250 on vergé d’Arches paper; 151–1,000 on vergé à barbes. About twenty unnumbered copies were also produced. The vergé d’Arches limitation includes corrections not present on the other two limitations.)

U1922b: James Joyce, *Ulysses*, London: The Egoist Press, October 1922. (2,000 numbered copies. One hundred unnumbered copies were also produced. Uses the same plates as U1922 and includes an eight page listing of errata.)

U1923: James Joyce, *Ulysses*, London: The Egoist Press, March 1923. (500 numbered copies. Made from the same plates as U1922 and U1922b but incorporates corrections from the first listing of errata.)
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Piratical


Odyssey Press

_U1932a_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna: The Odyssey Press, 1932. (One volume, India paper. Labelled as the first printing. Text of _U1930_ revised by Stuart Gilbert. The first printing of this edition came in three limitations which contain textual differences.)

_U1932b_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna: The Odyssey Press, 1932. (Two volumes, regular paper. Labelled as the first printing. Some corrections to _U1932a_.)
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_U1935_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna: The Odyssey Press, 1935. (Issued in both two volumes and one volume form, both on regular paper. Labelled as the third printing. Some corrections to _U1933_.)

_U1939_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna: The Odyssey Press, 1939. (Two volumes, regular paper. Labelled as the fourth printing. Some corrections to _U1935_.)
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_U1940_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, New York: Modern Library, 1940. (The text of _U1934_ proofread against a copy of the Odyssey Press edition [specific printing unknown]. Numerous additional printings through 1960, some of which use the uncorrected state of _U1934_ instead.)
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_U1936_: James Joyce, _Ulysses_, London: The Bodley Head, October 1936. (1,000 numbered copies in two limitations: 1–100 signed on mould-made paper, bound in calf vellum, 101–1,000 on Japon vellum, bound in linen buckram. Some unnumbered copies were also produced. Text based on _U1933_ with additional corrections.)
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Rose

RE: James Joyce, “Ulysses”, A Reader’s Edition, ed. Danis Rose, Dublin: Lilliput; London: Picador, 1997. (The Lilliput edition is limited to 1,000 numbered copies and includes a Foreword by John Banville. The first 100 copies are signed and bound in quarter leather, a further 26 copies are bound in full leather.)
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James Joyce, Ulysses, San Francisco: Arion Press, 1988. (With 40 etchings by Robert Motherwell. Printed on mould-made Johannot. Limited to 175 copies, of which 25 are hors commerce, signed by the artist. The text is edited by John Kidd with David Hayman and is based on U1961 but with emendations deriving from previous editions.)
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