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**A DISTANT VOICE**

It is especially useful that the first long critique of my *Inquiry into “Ulysses: The Corrected Text”* comes from a member of the editorial board of the work in question. Michael Groden’s dozen years as a collaborator on the edition, and his high visibility as a proselytizer for it, mean that while his views are already well known, his defense of the new *Ulysses* should be among the strongest that could be mounted. Short of a detailed response from the principal editor, Hans Walter Gabler, the fifty-page typescript before me might be considered the definitive inquiry into my *Inquiry*. Certainly it presents itself as a final, indeed overwhelming, rebuttal of my position.

Mr. Groden repeats some old charges against my approach to *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition* (1984) and its offspring *Ulysses: The Corrected Text* (1986), and, in his references to a “rule of the invariant context,” offers a somewhat new defense of Mr. Gabler’s procedures. I will deal with the old charges first, using the occasion to acquaint or reacquaint readers of the *James Joyce Quarterly* with the history of the debate. It is disappointing, however, that Mr. Groden chose not to submit his Response to the original publishers of my study, the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, whose editors worked so closely with me during the four years it took to prepare the *Inquiry*. The editors and referees of the *Papers*, being specialists in the issues at hand, could have helped the argument and avoided some errors of fact. If my own reply is found to have omitted some point requiring response or elaboration, I should be grateful to learn of it. The production schedule of the *JJQ* allowed me only two weeks to prepare this reply.

**ERROR, GREEN GEM OF THE SILVER SEA**

By nature, Joyce was obsessed with details and ironies. More than any other author before or since (with the possible exception of
Freud) his work is a long commentary on the inevitability of slips, misquotation, and talking at crosspurposes. Joyce's fascination with "error," or "wandering" from determinate facts, puts an extra strain on the scholarly editor. The dilemma is not unique to Joyce—Thomas Tanselle has written on the problem of "External Fact" in relation to Melville and others—but Joyce's intentions are often hard to penetrate. The definition of "error" is crucial for editing *Ulysses*, but it has been brought into the current debate for regrettably trivial reasons.

To start, Mr. Groden levels a very specific charge about my use of the word "error": "as I have already mentioned, the standard against which Kidd measures an 'error' or an inconsistency seems to change regularly to whatever is most convenient at the moment for Kidd's accusations" (97). The complaint is an old and tired one. In a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* of 7 October 1988, Mr. Groden asserts that "Kidd redefines words to suit his own purposes. Most crucially, he seems to have redefined 'error.'" Yet his 3,000 word letter does not once quote me using the word "error." This was my reply at the time:

**REFLECTIONS ON THE KIDD ERROR**

> On the definition of "error" [Mr. Groden] pretends that I have exaggerated Gabler's hundreds of errors into thousands. In all my writings on editing *Ulysses* I have carefully distinguished between factual error, editorial judgment, and the inevitability of differing textual versions. As witnessed in the *New York Review* postdated September 29, page 82, column 3, I am entirely in accord with the authorities cited against me by Mr. Groden. (*TLS* 21 October 1988, 1175)

While the hundreds of factual errors now documented in the *Inquiry* are no longer in dispute, in 1988 the editorial team implied that my lists were fabrications. Even before Mr. Groden sought relief by way of semantic games over "error," it was necessary to head off that escape route in the pages of the *New York Review of Books*:

> Mr. O'Hanlon [a team member writing in the *NYR*] envisions me a Senator Joe McCarthy "flourishing...lists of hundreds and thousands of errors in the critical edition." Unlike McCarthy I have named names—Captain Buller, Harry Thrift, Conolly Norman (and now Greene and Adderley). There are hundreds of errors of fact, but I never claimed there were "thousands of errors," only thousands of dubious judgments. (*NYR* 29 September 1988, 82)

My letter to the *TLS* concluded by pointing out that the *New York Review of Books* had refused to publish Mr. Groden's long letter because it contained just such spurious accusations as that about my use of "error."
MAGISTER ERRORUM

The charge of redefining “error” was, I thought, answered in 1988, but Mr. Groden repeats it six times in 1990. He refers to “[Kidd’s] shifting standard of what constitutes an ‘error,’” again using quotation marks around the word as if alluding to something in the Inquiry (97). Five pages later a rebuttal of my views on Mr. Gabler’s choices in wording concludes: “Kidd has not exposed an error on Gabler’s part” (101). Those who have the Electronic Version of the Inquiry on a disk may search the file mentioning the crux and will confirm that Mr. Gabler is accused of an “error” nowhere in the surrounding thirty pages of text. I criticize his guiding theory, I criticize his apparatus as deficient, and I criticize his selections among the variants, but nowhere is the term “error” attached to these choices. Now, as his argument winds down, Mr. Groden makes the allegation three more times: “The last point to be made involves the one alteration that Kidd would make to the passage (and considers Gabler to be in error for not making)” (106). The word “error” appears nowhere on the page cited, Inquiry 508. Nor does the Response ever quote me using the word. Nor did I say that the 1984 Synoptic Edition or the 1986 Corrected Text was obliged to put here what Joyce actually wrote; instead I reveal six emendations Mr. Gabler did make. And from the penultimate paragraph of Mr. Groden’s essay: “Kidd’s discussion is a lot of sound and fury signifying very little... mistaking Gabler’s purpose so that arguable differences in editorial orientation are confused with errors” (107). The implication is that the Inquiry uses the term “error” to disagree with editorial decisions.

PEN IS CHAMP

Equally surprising as the attribution to me of words I did not use is Mr. Groden’s own frequent use of “error” when he actually means “poor judgment”: “The emendation seems erroneous to me.... Gabler erred in spelling “Saltgreen” as one word... but he corrected it.... Kidd acts as if the error was never corrected and is obviously not inquiring into Ulysses: The Corrected Text at this point” (103). (This is a real error because, in the table [page 532] for the passage he is criticizing, the compound separated in the 1986 Corrected Text is in fact reported. Further, I was Mr. Gabler’s source for the “correction”—the removal of an uncalled-for emendation—as pointed out in the New York Review of Books, August 18, 1988.)

Even as these comments on “error” go to press, a special issue of Studies in the Novel on the Ulysses controversy has providentially
provided an elaboration of my views. Patrick McGee’s “The Error of Theory” asks:

From what does the scandal originate? From the fact of error. Gabler’s edition is somehow in error. For this charge to have weight the error must concern the facts; and that has been the gist of Kidd’s whole argument: Gabler’s edition is not true to the facts. The facts are the details, the particulars, of the documents. Any textual interpretation will have to take into account the indeterminacies of the relations between the facts, but the facts themselves cannot be indeterminate. They simply exist. (Studies, Summer 1990, 149)

Mr. McGee ultimately differs with me on the theory of copytext, but his succinct presentation of my usage for “error” throughout this debate thoroughly discredits the claim that I have “redefined” error for pure sensationalism. I am happy to acknowledge the interest in determinate fact Mr. McGee attributes to me, which is appropriate in bibliography.

ENTER THE GENETIC TEXT

The applicability of the term “genetic text” to an apparatus purporting to record Joyce’s revisions is also challenged by the Response. “The presentation of the textual information in the synoptic text does not constitute a genetic text, despite Kidd’s persistent claims to the contrary” (90; Mr. Groden’s emphasis). The paragraph, having begun with this bold assertion, ends still more emphatically:

Kidd might have spared himself much effort had he analyzed this presentation rather than faulting the synopsis for not using a “more traditional genetic apparatus”...and referring to the Gabler edition incorrectly as “the entire project of a genetic record of Ulysses”...and a “‘genetic’ edition of Ulysses.” (90)

My misuse of the term “genetic” is sometimes willful, sometimes accidental:

the synopsis (as Kidd seems frequently to forget) is not a genetic transcription of what Joyce wrote.... The complaint about unrecorded Little Review readings continues the article-long confusion about what the synoptic text represents: it is not a “genetic” edition, as Kidd knows but then forgets. (101, 105)

Despite his discomfort with the term “genetic,” Mr. Groden is even more forgetful than I: five years ago he explicitly compared the 1962 record of Melville’s drafts of Billy Budd to the 1984 “genetic text” of Ulysses. Moreover, he also attributed to Mr. Gabler a claim that the
Synoptic Edition is a "genetic text": "Gabler has spoken of the two
texts in Saussurian terms, calling the clear text [right hand pages]
synchronic and the genetic text [left hand pages] diachronic, and the
edition attempts to present both texts as fully as is typographically
possible" (157). This explanation of the 1984 "genetic text" was
published in the James Joyce Quarterly in 1985. Now I am censured by
Mr. Groden in the same journal for sharing his terms. Where did he
first learn of these "genetic" features? The word is Mr. Gabler's own.
The 1984 Synoptic Edition which engendered this dispute states on its
copyright page:


THEIR WELLPRAISED PROTOTYPES

The terms "genesis," "genetic text," and "genetically" are used by
Mr. Gabler to describe his record of revisions in his prototype
edition of the Lestrygonians episode (1979, i); in his "And Now:
Ulysses as James Joyce Wrote It" (1979, 26); in his announcement of
the edition in Computers and the Humanities (1979, 351); in his first
scholarly article on the subject, published in the Bulletin of the
Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing (1981, 237); in his
paper on "Synchrony and Diachrony" (1981, 320); in the copyright
notice and the Afterword of Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition
(1984, [iv], 1898); in the introduction to the oddly named Handlist, or
index, to Ulysses (1985, ix); in "The Editor Reviews the Reviews"
(1988, TS, 3 and 5), a paper read in Venice on a panel Mr. Gabler
joined on the condition that I be removed as a speaker (which was
done); in his first letter of protest against my "Scandal of Ulysses"
(TLS 1 July 1988, 733); in his Miami "Position Statement" (1989, 4);
and in his contribution to the Studies in the Novel special issue on the
Ulysses controversy, the first appearance in print of his "Response" to
my 1985 paper at the Society for Textual Scholarship (1990, 252).

EXIT THE GENETIC TEXT

Given the number of times that Mr. Gabler referred to the "ge-
netic" function of his apparatus, it is not surprising that some
believed that the Synoptic Edition would try to present "a genetic
text... as fully as is typographically possible." Throughout the In-
quiry I presumed that, given the importance of Joyce's drafts and the
complexity of his revisions in proof, a "traditional genetic appa-
ratus" would have been preferable to the selectively "synoptic" pre-
sentation designed by Mr. Gabler. The Inquiry certainly does not
fault Mr. Gabler for innovating per se, but for implying that his edition was "genetic" and engaged the "totality of the Work in Progress" ("Synchrony," 325) while omitting the range of data normally found in genetic or synoptic texts. Mr. Gabler should have prepared a genetic text, but did not.

**HIS NATIVE GAELIC**

In the same year as Mr. Groden's assertion that the *Synoptic Edition* contained a "genetic text," I wrote in the *Irish Literary Supplement*: "The exclusion of crucial variants from the synopsis... deprives this edition of its potential usefulness as a reference work...[the] long-awaited scholarship on Joyce's revisions [has] yet to be undertaken" (*ILS* 42). In "Gaelic in the New *Ulysses*" I argued that, in addition to numerous transcription errors, the synoptic text omitted information needed to follow Joyce's composition of some extremely muddled Irish Gaelic. Not knowing what Joyce had written at each stage, no one could judge whether the errors were carried from one draft to another; whether he had once gotten the Gaelic right and then misread his own handwriting; or whether Joyce's earliest spellings revealed his printed sources. This neglect of early variants leaves it unclear whether Mr. Gabler had ever consulted the Gaelic of the working drafts. Both these drafts and the *Little Review* carried correct Irish accents on some phrases, but these accents are registered nowhere in the *Synoptic Edition*. Whether or not to adopt the accents Joyce drafted or may have added to the *Little Review* typescript is an editorial decision. In other words, the case of Gaelic provides an example of my consistent concern with relevant contexts for decision-making.

**RETURN OF THE GENETIC TEXT**

No evaluation of Mr. Gabler's performance as an editor can proceed without the missing data on Joyce's use of "foreign" languages. Nothing in the *Synoptic Edition* suggests that Mr. Gabler was aware of the accents or that there were solecisms in the Gaelic. Any scholar interested in Joyce's languages is left utterly in the dark. In addition to Gaelic, Mr. Gabler overrules Joyce's spellings of French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Latin. For these languages, too, the drafts are incompletely cited, and no rationale for the emendations is offered. Five years ago I asked Mr. Gabler to explain his policies on foreign languages; he has yet to say even "no comment." My article, in fact, was the first to mention that Joyce had *ever* written an accent on *any* word of Gaelic. Brendan O Hehir's 427-page *Gaelic Lexicon* says
nothing of Joyce's accents in the drafts, as nothing was known of them in 1967. Even in 1984, after the appearance of a "genetic synopsis" of *Ulysses*, Joyce's Irish accents remained unknown.

The seriousness of the omission of Joyce's drafts should be clear from the example of Gaelic. In 1986 *Ulysses: The Corrected Text* included without acknowledgment several corrections taken from my article on Gaelic. Mr. Gabler's continued denial of "Gaelic in the New *Ulysses*" as a source appears in his interview with Robin Bates in the Summer 1990 *Studies in the Novel* (122).

**MEMORABLE BATTLES RECALLED**

That the 1986 *Ulysses: The Corrected Text* would "correct" the 1984 *Synoptic Edition* at the places recommended in "Gaelic in the New *Ulysses*" was, under the circumstances, surprising. A member of the editorial team had, in the issue of the *Irish Literary Supplement* after my piece, dismissed my suggestions out of hand. Portraying me as "straining at every passing gnat" to find an error, Mr. Danis Rose said that [Kidd was] "at a loss to find one." The absence of "errors," he wrote, is "indicative of the extraordinary comprehensiveness and accuracy of the new text" (*ILS*, Spring 1986, 31).

Mr. Rose's 1986 "resounding rebuttal," as Mr. Gabler later called it (*TLS*, 12 August 1988, 883), foreshadowed Mr. Groden's tactics towards my *Inquiry*. First, Mr. Rose concludes that all the criticisms are quibbles, mere "gnats." Second, he defends the decision to cite selectively drafts and the *Little Review*. Third, Mr. Rose insists that flaws in the apparatus, were there any, would be forgivable, implying oddly that a reference text need be less accurate than a "reading" text. Fourth, his opponent is "dramatic and exaggerated, indeed sensational...slightly dishonest...deliberately obtuse...crazy...[and a] self-appointed prolocutor." [Kidd's work is] "absurd...a vestige of a case...a farce...[an] unsound, and unscholarly, campaign." However "absurd," my corrections to the *Synoptic Edition* were adopted in *The Corrected Text*.

**SPARTANS GNASH MOLARS**

If these reproaches ring a bell for some readers, it may be because Mr. Rose's personally dismissive remarks convey overtones similar to those in Mr. Gabler's 1985 "Response" to my paper at the Society for Textual Scholarship, "Errors of Execution in the 1984 *Ulysses*." (The paper and the response were solicited by Charles Rossman as guest editor of the *Studies in the Novel* special issue.) Among the
passages by Mr. Groden that revive Mr. Gabler’s and Mr. Rose’s past strategy are:

Kidd has badly misunderstood and misinterpreted... Kidd ignores... Kidd evades... Kidd's confusion... Despite the scorn Kidd heaps... Kidd is wrong... Kidd seems throughout to have confused... Kidd might have spared himself... Kidd chides... Kidd's persistent complaints... Kidd erroneously thinks... When Kidd notes, with a derisive tone that is typical of his rhetoric... he seems bewildered or scornful... when Kidd complains... Kidd confuses... [the Inquiry contains]... a lot more smoke than fire... recklessness and irresponsibility... sound and fury... dangerous implications...

O, HARP EOLIAN!

Mr. Groden links his old argument about “error” to a new complaint about my use of “consistency.” As with “error,” my use of “consistency” has been both clear and, well, consistent. Any editorial project will be judged not only on its theoretical model, but also on how consistently the rules are carried out. Both editorial and authorial consistency are at issue. Did the author spell the names of his characters the same way each time they appear? If not, is the inconsistency intentional or inadvertent? An editor certainly is free to decide whether he will impose consistency on the author—whether or not the author intended it. Some editors eschew such attempts at uniformity. Still others pose the question: What would the author have done if the inconsistencies were pointed out? If an editor states that he will, as a rule, perform one way, we realize there will be exceptions. If these exceptions do not prove the rule but flout it, the editor might be charged with inconsistency. Such criticism might be countered by a statement that the editor does not intend to be consistent. If an editor announces that he does not intend to be consistent, but will perform arbitrarily, randomly, or playfully, his project becomes more creative than scholarly. In turn, a debate about what is “scholarly” might ensue.

RICHER, MORE CONSISTENT

For four years I have tried to show that Ulysses: The Corrected Text is inconsistently edited. I have not said that Joyce's peccadillos must be set straight, but that Mr. Gabler's attempt to impose consistency on Joyce has been incompletely, i.e. inconsistently, carried out. The rough edges of the 1922 Ulysses from the hands of French printers are notorious, but the glaring flaws of The Corrected Text are Mr.
Gabler's responsibility. As with the accusations about my use of “error” and “genetic,” my use of “consistency” conforms to the editors' own past claims. Only now when the edition is under attack have the editors shifted ground. According to Mr. Groden in 1980, four years before publication, consistency was a goal of the editors: “several thousand richer, more consistent, and more comprehensible words and phrases await discovery through editorial efforts” (39). In 1985 he praised the Synoptic Edition for “several thousand richer, more consistent, and more comprehensible passages [that] await discovery by readers” (148). The consistency, this says, is dormant in the work, waiting for an editor or reader to awaken it. Yet when I show that the new edition imposes standard spellings, a system for italics, and money sums that add up, Mr. Groden demurs.

Despite the attempt to downplay the hundreds of factual errors in the Synoptic Edition as amenable to “minor revision,” one must ask if the very way in which the 1984 edition was constructed did not contribute to what we might call “procedural” inconsistency. As with his statement supporting my position on error, Patrick McGee has also followed my lead on inconsistency:

the tables, and the more detailed analysis in the main body of Kidd's essay, reveal disturbing inconsistencies in Gabler's editorial practice. . . . Once Gabler decided to include all hyphenated words in the synopsis, he should have been able to do it consistently. (156)

DIMINISHED DIGITS

Mr. McGee is not referring here to a handful of factual errors in the synopsis, but to more than one hundred examples of misreported hyphens listed in Table 36 of the Inquiry. Those hundred errors were culled from the Synoptic Edition during a single day's work in 1985. Other lists, with more examples, often took as long as two months to compile. Mr. Groden admits that in the year he had to prepare his Response he troubled to check fully only one page of one table, in an appendix of 37 tables spread over 67 pages, and checked none against original manuscripts (97, 103). When an advisory editor of the Synoptic Edition prepares a written rebuttal, considers 2% of the evidence of the Inquiry, and declines to check any of the original manuscripts being cited, his dismissal of the whole as “nonsense” and “rubble” is by no means conclusive. The point of these tables was not that every entry demonstrated an error of fact or inconsistency in judgment. On the contrary, they were meant to offer a basis for others to judge the policies of the edition.

119
IN THEORY, YES

Let me now turn to Mr. Groden’s new theoretical defense of the Synoptic Edition. To defend the edition on theoretical grounds, however, is itself not new. To answer virtually all criticism of the 1984 Ulysses, from whatever quarter, the editors, in timbres ranging from the patronizing to the hostile, have appealed to theory. Specific mechanical procedures like the gathering of evidence and questions about editorial policy of emendation have not been answered; instead, “theory” surfaces when historical facts such as the spelling of a citizen’s name are called for. At the same time, when any element of the theory behind the Synoptic Edition is questioned, the response has been that the questioner (A) is ignorant of the principles of textual criticism; (B) adheres to an “irreconcilable...orientation”; (C) has not studied the edition closely enough to understand its principles and symbols; or, (D) does not realize that editing Ulysses is unlike other projects and that the procedures of the Synoptic Edition need not be judged against widely accepted standards.

When the editors are accused of violating the usual rules of the game and their own declared principles as well, the answer has been, “Our critics do not know the rules; the critics play by different rules; the edition does not in fact break the rules; and the new rules were needed for the crisis at hand.” The simultaneous recitation of all four retorts is contradictory. The “resounding rebuttals” have had not an intellectual content so much as a political thrust.

NOTED ROSSMAN AN OCCASIONAL CONTRIBUTOR

Charles Rossman has tried to chronicle the political dimension as persistently as I have tried, with less success, to improve the intellectual component. Recently the controversy spilled over onto the editing of D.H. Lawrence, where Mr. Rossman has protested the attempt to discredit scholars who cite my work. To Mr. Groden’s credit, he has named more theorists and outlined more of the recent trends in textual criticism in his essay than are found in the totality of Mr. Gabler’s writings. He has correctly sensed that, although Mr. Gabler has for five years called me theoretically confused, the terms and practices Mr. Gabler generates in debate require explication. Despite the importance of this first detailed summary of the theoretical issues in the controversy, and notwithstanding the many authorities cited and technical terms redefined, the Response simply replicates the original posture: the critics do not understand that the Synoptic Edition has its own rules and need not be accountable to the rules others would follow.
SHINDY IN A WELLKNOWN JOYCEVILLE

In Miami last year I tried to inject into the debate the guidelines of the Committee on Scholarly Editions (CSE) and the governing practices of the admirable editions underway in Germany, but this attempt was blustered off the stage. (See Levitt, Maddox, O'Toole, and Robertson for Mr. Gabler's reluctance to reply in Miami; even earlier, Joerg Drews in the Süddeutsche Zeitung disapproved the evasions.) For the moment, then, I will suspend an appeal to scholarly standards and address the more abstract terms offered in justification of the Synoptic Edition. I should point out, however, that my discussion of Mr. Gabler's departures from the wellknown "Rationale of Copy-Text" and of his coinage "the continuous manuscript text" occupies 6% of the Inquiry and about 4% of my published work on the Synoptic Edition. My main effort as a critic of Mr. Gabler has been to show in detail what he does, not to discuss his claims about why he does it.

THO' QUARRELLING WITH THE STONY OBSTACLES

Half of Mr. Groden's essay is devoted to a quarrel over terminology purporting to be a quarrel over editorial principles. In brief, he alleges that by ignoring the phrase "the rule of the invariant context" I have ignored the principle itself under which Mr. Gabler worked. This is a rule that purports to determine when to accept a textual change not demonstrably from the author's hand: one should accept it if an authorial change is nearby, and if not, not. Calling this piece of isolated good sense a "rule" makes it sound much more decisive than in practice it is. Also, calling it "invariant context" is misleading jargon. So I did not use the term and the tables in my Inquiry show that Mr. Gabler did not consistently follow the "rule" either. "The rule of the invariant context" is by no means a principle that can be separated from ordinary editorial practices.


Before discussing, in the necessary detail, my own attention to an editor's concern for context in deciding whether to adopt or reject a variant, let me consider Mr. Groden's use of bibliographical authorities on this topic. Mr. Groden has brought into the debate not only W.W. Greg (the only theorist named in the Synoptic Edition), but Fredson Bowers, G.T. Tanselle, Peter Shillingsburg, and Jerome McGann. The mass of quotation from bibliographic experts that he
musters against my Inquiry consists almost entirely of passages with which I am in complete agreement. Commendable quotations from experts long known to me both professionally and personally are interspersed with assertions that I am ignorant of their writings or that I reject their conclusions.

It is possible that Mr. Groden sees Mr. Tanselle's work on the history and theory of textual criticism as so authoritative, so well reasoned, and so unassailable that if Mr. Tanselle's position can be shown to contradict mine, the Inquiry will wither away. But he is on shaky ground. The principle reason for my association with Mr. Tanselle is our mutual dissatisfaction with Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition. Mr. Tanselle, in fact, owned a copy before I did and had been doubtful about Mr. Gabler's proposed method of editing Ulysses since encountering his 1981 paper, "The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts." His initial reaction to Mr. Gabler's theories appears in "Historicism and Critical Editing" in the 1986 Studies in Bibliography. (Reprinted in his 1987 book, Textual Criticism Since Greg. An equally severe update on Mr. Gabler's work is in press for the 1991 Studies in Bibliography.) He opens with a section on the admirable work of Peter Shillingsburg, and then moves to Mr. Gabler's "Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts." Anyone conversant with Mr. Tanselle's work, such as his chapter in the MLA's Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures, could have predicted how coldly he would receive the jargon used to shore up the rule of the invariant context:

WHAT TANSELLE SAID

Gabler's position, far less well thought out than Shillingsburg's, serves to focus some of the issues. . . . In his pretentious language, the "total text" of a work "presents itself as a diachronous structure correlating the discrete synchronous structures discernible." . . . One sees what he is getting at here, despite the expression and despite two serious conceptual flaws: first, he continually refers to transmissional errors in such a way as to suggest that it is no problem to separate them from authorial revisions, when of course making that distinction is in many instances a central editorial activity; second, he repeatedly speaks of "discrete textual states" (even claiming that "there must always have been discrete textual states, in temporal succession, of a literary composition") without facing the fact that revision frequently does not proceed in readily separable "discrete" stages and that—when it does—such stages do not necessarily coincide with those represented by surviving documents. (145-46)

HELLO THERE, CENTRAL!

In light of Mr. Tanselle's position that documents used to transmit an author's text are often the only existing witness of now-lost drafts,
and that composition typically continues into new contexts in the "transmissional" documents, the charge that "Kidd confuses documents of composition and documents of transmission" (94) is an overreaction. Yet another wrinkle exists in Mr. Gabler's theory of "transmissional documents": in "James Joyce as Author and Scribe," Mr. Gabler correctly mentions that Joyce made transcription errors when preparing the Rosenbach Manuscript from his drafts. This 1982 article lists various phrases which dropped out or were altered in the fair copy, and hence are absent from all printed versions before 1984. Mr. Gabler adds that invariant contexts are "sometimes a matter of critical interpretation" (103). It would seem absolutely necessary, then, that an edition identify not only draft phrases which will be adopted in the reading text, but those which will not. It is typical of Mr. Gabler's procedures that several draft phrases listed in 1982 as necessary to correct the "defective" Rosenbach are mentioned nowhere in the 1984 Synoptic Edition. The "restorations" of 1982 are omitted in 1984 because the "stringent rules" of bibliography (105) have yielded to Mr. Gabler's change of mind.

=IN( + )VARIANT( + )CONTEXT=

Mr. Tanselle also takes issue with the "invariant context" invoked against me. After citing the passage in which Mr. Gabler uses the term, Mr. Tanselle writes:

The point that emerges from this verbiage is that authorial variants, being part of the literary work, are more appropriately reported in the running text than in an appended list. . . . However much Gabler wishes to make the presentation of variants a matter of theory, it remains a practical issue. All editors, whatever their theory of literature, recognize that variant readings, to be understood, must be placed in context. (146)

It is precisely the practical matter of how variants are recorded, ignored, and assessed that my Inquiry takes up. Like Mr. Tanselle, I am skeptical about the capacity of a theoretical "rule" to separate clearly "documents of composition" from those of "transmission," and like him I resist adopting Mr. Gabler's coinages. Mr. Groden thinks this resistance sinks my case:

Given Kidd's dogged pursuit of Gabler over more than four years, it is astonishing that he missed Gabler's rule of the invariant context. . . . Yet, because he missed the rule, whenever Kidd cuts through a body of data, as he does in the thirty-seven tables and elsewhere in the article, he sees only chaos and patterns that he himself, operating as a critic, has imposed . . . his ignorance of the rule of the invariant context.
affects his examples... the rule of the invariant context reduces the hundred pages of examples to nonsense. Finally, and needlessly to say, the rule of the invariant context never appears. Again, Kidd’s ignorance of the rule of the invariant context has caused him to make a critical inference when Gabler’s activities were motivated textually... he fails to acknowledge even the possibility of proceeding according to the rule of the invariant context. Gabler’s use of evidence as part of the rule of the invariant context is ignored (99, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107).

A PISGAH SIGHT OF PALESTINE

Patrick McGee points out that, far from being a decisive guide to editorial choice, “invariant context is of editorial making,” and quotes Mr. Gabler as saying in Miami that it depends on “editorial critical judgment” (158). Mr. Groden concedes that “the term ‘invariant context’ is somewhat misleading in its emphasis on the context and not on the variation” (95). Mr. Groden evidently did not realize that I was intentionally steering clear of the term. I had thought that Mr. Tanselle’s strong criticism of the phrase was better known. In any case, I agree with Mr. Groden that the term is unfortunate and also with Mr. McGee and Mr. Tanselle that, in so far as its meaning can be ascertained, it refers mainly to one part of a standard editing process. There can be no mechanical rule for contexts; there is just the thorough, rational gathering and presentation of textual evidence and the making of scholarly decisions.

The brief against the Inquiry hangs on the issue of “invariant context.” If, however, one cannot always use this “rule” to distinguish a typist’s change from an author’s, then one needs to take into account all known changes before reaching a decision. The example, quoted below, of “indubitable” in the Eumaeus episode shows Mr. Gabler not doing this.

RHYMES AND REASONS

I am unable to determine whether Mr. Groden believes that the Synoptic Edition is constructed according to hard and fast rules, or whether it is a congeries of “judgment calls” (as Hugh Kenner says in its defense) not to be disputed by outsiders. By asserting that I am oblivious to the rule of the invariant context, he means either that I know nothing about editorial procedures or that I have not diligently studied Mr. Gabler’s peculiar brand of “context.” In fact, I have studied the apparatus and supporting essays of the Synoptic Edition as carefully, I dare say, as any other reader. The Inquiry is largely the result of my investigation into the edition’s use and misuse of contextual evidence.
The occurrences of context in the Inquiry (which I reproduce below in bold type) touch on the full range of an editor's responsibilities to be equally informed about the author's handwriting and the slang of his era. Mr. Groden invokes “different orientations” (92), mentioning Peter Shillingsburg's scheme of "irreconcilable" approaches. These approaches may in some abstract sense be irreconcilable, but any editor must consider several varieties of context. Indeed, the “historical...aesthetic...authorial...sociological” orientations, according to Mr. Shillingsburg's scheme, all direct attention to context, and all require precise registration and handling of variants. (Mr. Gabler inadvertently added a fifth orientation by referring in Miami to the “intention of the text.” Mr. McGee speculates on what he might have meant by this in “The Error of Theory,” 158.)

THE COMPUTER AND THE PEN

The Inquiry is largely an account of varieties of context insufficiently heeded in the Synoptic Edition. My earliest reference is to “historical context” (416). There is a paleographical context in transcribing Joyce's hand, which the Inquiry discusses in detail (472). Context can also bear on the chronological relations of radiating texts or collateral texts or hypothetical texts. This is where one might consider Mr. Gabler's theory, rightly dismissed by Mr. Tanselle, of “discrete states” and textual “synchrony.” The Inquiry looks at the editing of two verses, one from the newspaper episode and one from the library episode, and concludes that Mr. Gabler is attentive to context for only one of the two verses: “The second reading is called an error, a 'corruption,' while the first, although it goes against manuscript, is ‘authorial.’ Gabler imagines he can isolate words of a poem in parallel drafts and label one word as being earlier or later than its context” (Inquiry 425).

The Inquiry also calls for a consideration of preceding drafts if the syntax is unclear. When Bloom is skimming a newspaper, of course, the context tells us that the syntax may be skewed. Reference to an earlier draft can help us decipher ambiguous markings which may or may not, in context, be punctuation.

SPOT THE WINNER

Several errors in transcribing the Rosenbach Manuscript could have been avoided if the editors had considered these two types of context:

125
With this transcription at hand, anyone working from the Rosenbach facsimile would be prepared for its lack of periods between "cup" and "Victory" and after "disaster". Certainly they are unneeded in context. [Clive] Driver got the punctuation right, but without the evidence of the early draft, he made the same error as Gabler in transcribing the Rosenbach's "sir Hugo" as "Sir Hugo". Transcription of the moderate ambiguity of the fair copy could be aided by checking its predecessor, which emphatically reads "sir Hugo". So all three of Gabler's errors would have been avoided by recourse to the early draft, and two of them by comparison with Driver. (Inquiry 447)

HOW A GREAT DAILY ORGAN IS Turned OUT

That Bloom has in hand fresh newsprint did not prevent the editors of the Synoptic Edition from ignoring their promise not to emend the capitals of newspapers quoted against the Inquiry. On the page where "sir" is mistranscribed as "Sir", Gabler also raised up four letters to capitals which Joyce wrote small. Given the explanation of invariant context, we aren't surprised by the three capitals Joyce didn't write but which he saw the printer provide in proof. Yet the fourth 1984 alteration, "Gold cup" to "Gold Cup", Joyce did not see in proof since the "Gold cup" was dropped by the typist. In the gap Joyce added several phrases to the first proof. The synopsis does not tell us that the jerky syntax (mistranscribed in 1984) of Bloom skimming the paper was reconstructed, totally refashioned, without the phrase "Gold cup" or "Gold Cup". Rather, the synopsis simply states that words were added, and omits the fact that the words synoptically adjoining were absent during revision. In Mr. Groden's view, "If Joyce did alter the context, by perhaps adding new words or reworking the sentence... the original passage cannot be admitted" (95). Not only was the dropped "Gold cup" of the Rosenbach inserted into a wholly reworked passage, but a capital was provided by Mr. Gabler. The source for the capital—the sporadically cited working draft. The draft Mr. Gabler draws on for "Cup" is not cited at all for the "sir Hugo" which prompted the discussion of context in the Inquiry. And if the rule of the invariant context has been violated here, the wording of The Corrected Text, as well as capitalization, is at stake.

PENÉLOPE'S KIDNEY TRANSPLANT

Every reader of Ulysses recalls how Molly Bloom's soliloquy is stubbled with odd capitals (I was a Flower of the mountain yes - 22U 732), as if she were borrowing the eighteenth-century typography of Moll Flanders, to which she does allude (another form of context).
But Mr. Gabler failed to see how in context some bizarre capitals provided by the typist were put to use by Joyce.

An oddity in Molly Bloom's closing soliloquy is a thread which when yanked nearly unravels the entire 1984 synopsis of the Penelope episode: "then he goes and burns the bottom out of the pan all for his Kidney" (18.567). The letter is no larger in "kidney" of line 26 than in "making" and "market" or "know" of lines 1, 2, and 4 of the leaf. In fact, "mark" at line 27 directly below "kidney" has a "k" about 10 percent greater in height. . . . The Rosenbach Manuscript is no more ambiguous for this "k" than hundreds of others, which are transcribed by reference to context . . . .

Eight lines below "all for his Kidney" in the synopsis is "he got doctor Brady to give me belladonna" for which no variants are given (18.575). Yet at the moment Joyce was capitalizing "Kidney" in proof, "Belladonna" stood before him on the same page. Because the typist had provided the capital B, it is not mentioned in the synopsis, but occurs in the historical collation which states that editions 1922-61 had the capital. What was unclear to the 1984 editors is that Joyce was peppering the episode with illogical capitals at the same time he was eccentrically reducing some proper nouns to lower case. In the placards, Joyce revised his Rosenbach forms in order to capitalize in mid-line Blessed Virgins, Queens, Loves old sweet sonnng, Lord, Bull, Officers, Gorgeous, Jack, Easter, O, Banana, Buttons, Bishop, Body, Parliament, God, Suggester, Flower, and Yes (Joyce Archive 21:147-376).

As Joyce worked over these pages, he saw a pattern which he elaborated and balanced. The context for these revisions is not available in the synopsis, however. Many of the capitalizations, such as Belladonna, are not recorded, because they originate with the typist . . . . That "kidney" was revised, and that Belladonna was passed for the fifth time escapes the synopsis. Instead, we read "Kidney" and "belladonna" with no hint that they ever were otherwise. (Inquiry 471-73)

? ? ?

In the past year three important critiques of the Synoptic Edition have drawn on "The Scandal of Ulysses" (1988) for its discussion of a page involving two words in the Eumaeus episode. This passage is irreparably weakened in the Synoptic Edition by inattention to context. From "The Scandal of Ulysses":

He looked sideways in a friendly fashion at the sideface of Stephen, image of his mother, which was not quite the same as the usual handsome blackguard type they unquestionably had an insatiable hankering after as he was perhaps not that way built.
First the addition of "handsome." It is in neither the final Rosenbach Manuscript which Joyce gave his typist nor any [edition] published in his lifetime. Exhumed from the early draft, it plumps out the passage with no allowance for context... Stephen is attractive, but not a hunk... [T]o say Stephen's beauty "was not... the usual handsome" plasters over one of the rare glimpses of the physical Stephen we get. Ulysses is more than pure style; a portrait of Stephen is emerging and Joyce deleted a word to sharpen up that portrait...

Like the gratuitous "handsome", the substituted "insatiable" for "indubitable" is born of inattention to context... The palpable genius of Joyce's typescript revision is absent from the 1984 synopsis. The breakdown is traceable to the odd theory of the Synoptic Edition that all the fragments in Joyce's hand from early drafts through last proof insertions can be assembled like mosaic chips. In service of this ill-conceived theory is a "synoptic" apparatus that omits entirely words or punctuation not in Joyce's hand. Thus the typist's error "indubitable"—which inspired Joyce to stitch in "unquestionably"—is banned from the display of revisions in the Synoptic Edition. We are told instead that Joyce added "unquestionably" two words to the left of "insatiable hankering after." Not so. The "insatiable" was nowhere on the page when Joyce thought up "unquestionably." The synopsis and footnotes have no record of the typed "indubitable" which catalyzed the revision. ("Scandal" 36)

**WHAT?—AND LIKewise—WHERE?**

Turning to my article for his chief example of editorial "falsification," Fritz Senn concludes that the Synoptic Edition claims to allow for context but does not. Mr. Senn pointedly quotes the promises to "allow the compositional process to be traced in reverse" (84U 1901). In his essay for Studies in the Novel, Mr. Senn, who had endorsed the Synoptic Edition in its prepublication brochure, demands to know why Mr. Gabler's phrase, "the synoptic presentation of Ulysses in progress from manuscript to print," does not mean what we expect. Senn asks, "what exactly—what EXACTLY—does it mean?" (185). Thomas Vogler's essay in Studies in the Novel also takes "indubitable" as the major departure point for a discussion of context in Finnegans Wake. Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart, in their introduction to Ulysses: A Review of Three Texts (1989), also make "indubitable" the central example of how the 1984 practice slights the context of Joyce's revisions. Although they are named on the title page of the Synoptic Edition, Mr. Gaskell, one of England's leading bibliographers, and Mr. Hart, a founder of the "Joyce industry" as we know it, reject the wording of Ulysses: The Corrected Text in well over 400 places.

When confronted with the evidence about "indubitable" and "insatiable" (and six other textual cruxes on this one page of Ulysses),
Mr. Gabler does not concede. Instead, he replied in the August 18, 1988, New York Review of Books:

it is a particularly bad example on which to indict the edition’s theoretical foundations. On the contrary, a perceptive discussion of the editorial potential inherent in variously handling it would help to set into proper relief the edition’s system of principles. How casuistically Dr. Kidd dismisses or accepts what little he allows himself to understand... (63)

I find it striking that the debate has dragged on so long when conducted at this level. Mr. Gabler rejects *ad hominem* an example that Messrs. Senn, Vogler, Hart, and Gaskell consider exemplary in its clarity. The decision to key the case against my *Inquiry* on a demonstration of “ignorance of the rule of the invariant context” is curious when others find my work especially attentive to context.

A POLISHED PERIOD

A confusion as great as any ascribed to me in his Response befalls Mr. Groden when he attempts to demonstrate how “invariant context” prevents the *Synoptic Edition* from adopting the wording and punctuation of the typed final working draft for the Aeolus episode:

It is hard to guess what makes Kidd think that the documents show Joyce “carefully reshaping” and “polishing” the passage since, contrary to the implication of Kidd’s analysis, Joyce did not work on this passage on the typescript and six sets of proofs (JJA 12:286; 18:4, 14, 22-23; 23:8-9, 24-25, 40-41). [Kidd] on the next page [462]... endorses editing according to passive authorization (the procedure rejected by Gabler and Tanselle). (100)

Nowhere does the *Inquiry* “endorse... passive authorization,” and certainly not on the page cited by Mr. Groden. In fact, this phrase is mentioned only once in the *Inquiry*, 43 pages after the place where Mr. Groden claims to have found it. When it *is* mentioned, I accept the prerogative of the *Synoptic Edition* to choose whether to adopt such a policy: “An edition constructed from ‘continuous manuscript text’ need not follow a printer’s deviations from autograph and could decline the ‘passive’ authorization of the 1922 version” (505). Not even the most partisan defense of the *Synoptic Edition* can legitimately claim that the *Inquiry* sanctions “passive authorization” or indicts Mr. Gabler for not himself adopting it.

Beyond the attribution to me of endorsements neither made nor intended is Mr. Groden’s citation of eleven pages of the *Joyce Archive*
in an effort to prove "Joyce did not work on this passage" in proof. Were the proofs devoid of authorial revision, I should look quite the fool for having written, "In this sequence the 1922 text of Ulysses as quoted descends from the revised final draft carefully reshaped on typescript, first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth proof" (Inquiry 461). I preferred "Joyce's final revisions...polished in proof," but Mr. Groden asserts that there were no such revisions. The 15 lines which "Joyce did not work on" include 14 words added by him to the typescript and 21 added in proof. Joyce also added in proof a headline (His Little Joke) which he subsequently deleted, and later revised another headline:

**HIS LITTLE JOKE**

A meek smile accompanied him as he lifted the counterflap, as he passed in through the sidedoor and along the warm dark stairs and passage, along the now reverberating boards. But will he save the circulation? {Thumping, thumping.}

He pushed in the glass swingdoor and entered, stepping over strewn packing paper. Through a lane of clanking drums he made his way towards Nannetti's reading closet.

**WITH UNFEIGNED REGRET IT IS WE ANNOUNCE THE DISSOLUTION OF A MOST RESPECTED DUBLIN BURGESS**

Hynes here too: account of the funeral probably. {Thumping thump.} This morning the remains of the late Mr Patrick Dignam. Machines. Smash a man to atoms if they got him caught. Rule the world today. His machineries are pegging away too.

(22U 114; cf 84U 7.69-82)

Key:

**bold**: verbal revision(?) between Rosenbach and final draft, witnessed by typescript

**bold with grey outline**: verbal addition found only in typescript

**grey outline**: words added by Joyce onto proof

**grey outline with underline**: words added by Joyce onto typescript

**strikeout**: words added in proof, deleted in next proof

{Braces}: Two 1922 passages altered in 1984 addressed in the Inquiry. Words revised before the first edition are omitted here.

The Inquiry foregrounds this passage not to illustrate Joyce's careful revisions in proof, but to reveal the peculiar treatment of the typescript variants in the Synoptic Edition. At issue are four instances of wording and two phrases whose 1922 punctuation, spelling, and capitals are "corrected" in 1984 and 1986. The four changes in wording between the Rosenbach Manuscript are given in bold; of these,
“clanking” first appears in the typescript and is in both the 1922 and the “corrected” editions. The typescript’s authority for the changes “Castelli’s” to “Nannetti’s” and “working” to “pegging” is also accepted in 1984. But the first of these four verbal differences, “a sidedoor” versus “the sidedoor”, is rejected by Mr. Gabler. The passage of the Inquiry accused of “sweeping rhetoric” by Mr. Groden challenges the adoption of the one Rosenbach variant from among a possible four: “The final draft is lost; all four were scanned repeatedly by Joyce, merged with his proof revisions, joined tongue and groove with the reverberating planks of the printing hall, issued into print, and stood from then to now unquestioned” (462). Mr. Groden insists that since “Joyce did not work on this passage,” all four words can be explained by “Gabler’s different orientation favoring the manuscript” (100-01). Since the Synoptic Edition rejects the manuscript for three of the four, it is difficult to justify this claim. If “Gabler’s justification for his [four] choices is the invariant context,” Mr. Groden’s failure to invoke the “rule” in a passage expanded by 35 words in five stages on the typescript and proofs is puzzling.

The change of “the sidedoor” to “a sidedoor” is not the most objectionable of the three “corrections.” Mr. Gabler’s choice of “Thumping, Thumping” and “Thumping, Thump” over the versions of the typed final draft are protested in the Inquiry:

[O]ne can sense how carefully Joyce shaped these lines, which closes with the rhythm of the printing press: “Thumping, thumping.” With slight variation, this recurs seven lines later as “Thumping thump.” and again on the next page, “The machines clanked in three-four time. Thump, thump, thump.” (Inquiry 461)

Even if Joyce had not thoroughly revised the context of these phrases the typed final draft has presumptive authority as the only remaining witness of Joyce’s lost final draft. The 1922 edition reflects Joyce’s final intentions. And, as Mr. Groden has inadvertently shown in discussing a nearby crux, “Joyce’s activity in the ‘Aeolus’ passage, however, directs the editor to accept the transmitted version from the typescript and proofs” (100).

QUICKLIME FEVER PITS

Mr. Groden’s comments on “invariant context” also stray from the Bibliographical Way with his first example after claiming Joyce did not revise the “Thumping” passage. Explaining in detail why the Synoptic Edition does not follow “Quicklime feverpit” of the Rosenbach Manuscript, but uses a plural, “feverpits”, Mr. Groden restates
the "rule": "When Joyce corrected or revised an error, or when the context shows that Joyce worked on a passage, the [1984] edition admits the later version, as it does here" (102). But the Synoptic Edition explicitly rejects Joyce's final proof corrections, the two-word "fever pits" (22U 110.13), and lists the compound as an emendation introduced by Mr. Gabler for the first time in any edition. That is, The Corrected Text does not follow "the later version," but one created by Mr. Gabler. A second slip by Mr. Groden leads him to turn unfairly against the Inquiry: "Kidd seems frequently to forget... the synopsis does not indicate printing errors that Joyce corrected" (101). For the variant at hand, "fever pits", the 1984 edition does give the printer's error in a note for Hades 6.986. The Inquiry merely points out that the footnote is itself in error since the second proof does not read "fever pits" as recorded in 1984, but "fever pist". After chastising me for quoting Mr. Gabler out of context, Mr. Groden omits from his long quote of the Inquiry the opening of the passage he objects to: "The note to 'feverpits' at Hades 6.986 (110.13) has another error, in that it mistranscribes the second proof reproduced at Joyce Archive 17:261" (Inquiry 480). Mr. Groden seems unable to read the synoptic symbols well enough to see that the footnote labels the second proof "TD": namely a Transmissional Departure—a printer's error. Mr. Groden's own misreading causes him to conclude that "Kidd's misunderstandings and misstatements of Gabler's procedures are so extreme as to appear willful" (101).

ORTHOGRAPHICAL

The Inquiry quotes Ulysses 1,000 times and discusses scores of individual readings in the essay section. Mr. Groden feels that few of my examples are of earthshaking importance; this could probably be said of much bibliographical work, or of any serious scholarship. To conclude that the Synoptic Edition did not drop any chapters of Ulysses is not the same as to say that it is accurate or well conceived. I am sorry that Mr. Groden has not fully responded to my conviction that throughout every episode the wording of the Synoptic Edition unjustifiably departs from that of earlier texts. Given that no one has tried to defend The Corrected Text against my challenge to the alteration in four places of the wording on the first page of Ulysses, a subject I raised not once but twice in the Inquiry (446, 492), in an interview on National Public Radio, and in the New York Review, I will instead address Mr. Groden's remarks on punctuation and capitalization. (Joyceans would probably prefer a debate about the
wording of *Ulysses* but my objections to the sweeping verbal changes of *The Corrected Text* have not been seriously considered.)

**THEN THE TWELVE BROTHERS, JACOB'S SONS**

Since "Errors of Execution in the 1984 *Ulysses*" (1985), there has been considerable dispute over whether or not some thirteen categories of emendation were applied to what Joyce actually wrote. As Éyal Amiran argues in "The Rhetorics of Simulation," my early writings "provide a categorical rather than an exhaustive assessment of [the *Synoptic Edition*]. This kind of thinking is potentially more dangerous [to the reputation of the edition] than a list of errors would be, however long the list. After all, one can correct those errors, as Gabler has already done in some instances" (145). Amiran concludes that for five years the 1984 editorial team has avoided the categories by demanding more examples: "Gabler in effect denies Kidd's implicit claim that what is at stake is not only how many errors there are but also of what kind, and what these kinds reveal about the edition" (146). Mr. Groden's Response to the Inquiry appears to be another version of the same rhetorical strategy: to deny flatly the edition's policies of emendation—whether in three or thirteen or thirty categories. If the categories can be denied, then all criticism can be silenced.

Of course, the thirteen categories of emendation are never addressed, but Mr. Groden implies that they are a fiction constructed to discredit the *Synoptic Edition*. Amiran's essay on the "Rhetorics" predicts the silence (about twelve of the thirteen categories) that would fall once the further examples so long demanded by Messrs. Gabler and Groden were displayed in the *Inquiry*: "a loud silence has followed [Kidd's] *PBSA* essay. That essay seems to tell all, and in so doing threatens to end the conversation" (146). The silence has grown louder with Mr. Groden's denial of the thirteen categories: "Kidd repeatedly claims that Gabler's text reveals a desire for regularization but fails to achieve it. Gabler's Afterword, however, rejects such a goal, except in specific stated instances" (98). The "specific stated instances" all fall under capitalization, Category 10 in the list of thirteen published in "The Scandal of *Ulysses*." A third of the *Inquiry* is devoted to the thirteen.

**A STREET CORTÈGE**

The one category of emendation to which Mr. Gabler admits is quoted in the *Inquiry* on page 494 (except for the clause marked with an asterisk, which is paraphrased on 493):
Normalisation affecting every episode is confined to a consistent introduction of lower-case initial letters for ‘street’, ‘road’ etc. in Dublin street names. Joyce became increasingly regular in writing them with minuscule initials; “however, where a capital in such a position seems intended to represent graphically the print of an advertisement, the inscription on an envelope or the like, it is of course not reduced by editorial emendation. (84U 1898)

FOUR CLEAN STROKES. SCISSORS AND PASTE

Mr. Groden feels that I have deceptively suppressed a crucial component of the 1984 policy:

The irony rebounds on Kidd, however, for by failing to quote the second part of the passage (he stops at the semi-colon after “initials”), he omits the rationale for the upper-case letter, since in the “Proteus” passage Stephen is thinking of a newspaper obituary notice. (98)

I am criticized for not including in my quotation the clause marked above with an asterisk. The 1984 exclusion of graphic language from emendation is sensible enough, but the Inquiry’s sharp criticism of Mr. Gabler’s inconsistency follows from my paraphrase of what he actually said, as well as what he ought to have said:

The conventions for capitalization have undergone considerable changes in English (and some other languages) in the period since 1700, and Joyce’s practice can be considered idiosyncratic. There can be no question but that Joyce consciously developed a personal system, though it is unevenly applied. Observing Joyce’s habits will not solve all the problems for an editor hoping to lend a belated hand to the author because Joyce is so often quoting printed materials, constructing parodies, and shifting narrative voices that many apparent inconsistencies may appear intentional on second glance, then lose their significance on third or fourth examination. . . .

For example, on the first page of episode 2, Nestor, “Vico Road” of the Rosenbach Manuscript and all prior editions is emended in 1984 to “Vico road”. On the first page of the next episode, Proteus, “Bride Street” stands unemended. The irony of this oversight is that the regularization of addresses is the only category of emendation discussed in Gabler’s writings on Joyce. (Inquiry 493)

There is only one rule of systematic emendation offered in the entire Synoptic Edition: to use minuscules for “street” and “road.” There is only one exception offered for this rule: the capitals of printed or handwritten materials are not to be altered. Because I paraphrased and commended the exception immediately before quoting the rule, I am surprised to read Mr. Groden charging that “failing to quote the second part of the passage... [Kidd] omits the
rationale” (98) for capitals. I had, in fact, greatly amplified the 1984 policy in ways untouched in its Afterword.

BEARING IN HIS ARMS THE TABLES OF THE LAW

The one example of the failure to carry out its stated policy of normalization for street names cited in the essay portion of the Inquiry was selected from Tables 29-30, not for its egregiousness, but because it appeared to be the first of many such slips in The Corrected Text. Highlighting “Bride Street” as an inconsistency was unfortunate, however, because one could imagine that “Street” is capitalized in Stephen’s mind. Walking alone along the strand, he sees two women he thinks may be midwives: “Number one swung lourdily her midwife’s bag, the other's gamp poked in the beach. From the liberties, out for the day. Mrs Florence MacCabe, relict of the late Patk MacCabe, deeply lamented, of Bride Street” (22U 38). With confidence Mr. Groden announces the reason “Bride Street” should have capitals: “in the ‘Proteus’ passage Stephen is thinking of a newspaper obituary notice” (98). From this conjecture, Mr. Groden leaps to the conclusion that I have invented the system of normalization announced on page 1898 of the Synoptic Edition: “The conceptual procedure here is typical of ‘An Inquiry’: failing to notice Gabler’s clearly stated principle, Kidd invents one of his own, and then berates Gabler for failing to follow the Kidd system” (98).

BRIDE STREET REVISITED

Let’s look again at the fragment in contention: “Mrs Florence MacCabe, relict of the late Patk MacCabe, deeply lamented, of Bride Street” (22U 38; 84U 3.33). From the 1904 Dublin newspapers I have read, this is not recognizable as “an obituary.” But Joyce does compress Patrick to “Patk”, a characteristic of something written and not spoken. Therefore, I am inclined to say that, although the Synoptic Edition offered no note, “Bride Street” could fall under the rationale in the Inquiry for printed matter, obituary or not. It is a standard procedure of both Anglo-American and German editing that every exception to an editorial policy be discussed in a textual note. This was not done for “Bride Street” (or 90% of the exceptions and hardest cruxes), leaving the reader in the dark about the editor’s interpretation of it as an obituary in the mind of Stephen Dedalus.

Is there really a “Kidd system” which the Synoptic Edition may ignore? Or, on the contrary, do Tables 29-30 show that Mr. Gabler set out to emend place names, erratically overruling Joyce’s hand? Despite Mr. Groden’s assurances that the Synoptic Edition and Corrected
Text are consistent in the only category of emendation addressed in the 1984 Afterword, the Inquiry’s criticism still stands:

IN THE HEART OF THE HIBERNIAN METROPOLIS

Gabler’s unsuccessful attempt to impose order on Joyce’s place names is documented in several tables. The emendations of capitals Joyce wrote are listed in table 29. Places where the 1922 edition appears to follow Joyce’s style and The Corrected Text does not are also found in table 29. Places where an emendation would have been expected under Gabler’s stated policy, but was not enacted, are in table 29. Some specific inconsistencies and problems presented by Joyce’s capitals for compound place names are listed in table 30. (494)

Table 29 begins with six instances where Mr. Gabler applied his rule to place names. (These include Halls, Quays, Gates, and Stations; the Afterword is silent on these.) One of these is Joyce’s addition of “Arran Quay”, on the fifth proof of Wandering Rocks. Departing from all prior editions, Mr. Gabler “corrected” Joyce to read: “Between Queen’s and Whitworth bridges lord Dudley’s vice-regal carriages passed and were unsaluted by Mr Dudley White, B.L., M.A., who stood on Arran quay” (84LT 10.1184; cf 22LT 242). Table 29 shows the Synoptic Edition lowering Joyce’s capital in “Quay” according to the acknowledged 1984 system. The phrase contains three separate categories of emendation, two of which Mr. Groden denies. Aside from “quay”, which is emended in accord with stated rules, Joyce’s “Lord” is emended to “lord” for the first time in any edition, and an abbreviation point has been added to Joyce’s “B, L,” to create “B. L,” as found in the 1922 edition.

SHORT BUT TO THE POINT

(Mr. Groden writes that abbreviation points are not really important [97]; Mr. Gabler, however, thought enough of them to follow the first edition rather than what Joyce wrote about 60 times. Mr. Gabler also refused 60 abbreviation points that Joyce had seen the printer insert.) Is “Arran Quay” a special type of “invariant context”? No, Joyce subsequently never added a word or even letter to the passage, and it was unchanged during his life. One is only left to guess why Mr. Gabler made the changes.

NOBLE MARQUESS MENTIONED

The third change in these three lines is “Lord” to “lord”. No one doubts that Joyce generally used the lower-case form, so I will merely point out that here Joyce emphatically wrote the capital.
edition prior to 1984 chose to make it consistent. Compare this practice, however, with “the bookhunt along Bedford row, Merchants’ Arch, Wellington Quay” (17.2048). Should that not be, according to the only category of emendation admitted to by Mr. Gabler, “Wellington quay”? Or is there some reason that in Bloom’s last bedtime recollection, the “Quay” he walked along should not be the “quay” lord [Lord] Dudley crossed? Why the change in Ithaca but not in Wandering Rocks? The apostrophe in “ Merchants’ Arch” prevents one from imagining an “invariant context” of Joycean proof corrections nearby, since it first appeared in 1932. A case for not emending “Quay” (the Groden system) would rather spoil the case for having emended “ Merchants” (the Gabler system). These are but randomly drilled core samples from the monumental incoherence of the Synoptic Edition documented in the Inquiry tables.

YET CAN YOU BLAME THEM?

In his Afterword and subsequent debates with me, Mr. Gabler assured us that he “eschew[s] as a source of emendations... [the] normalisation and sophistication” of the 1932 edition (84U 1899). Yet the Synoptic Edition adopts more 1932 changes of what Joyce first wrote than from any other edition. Each time I state this, denial ensues. There can be no resolution until Mr. Gabler first, admits that he is emending, and second, admits that his emendations agree with variants from other editions, and finally, explains what relation those editions may have had to Joyce. No other scholarly edition in recent years has emended so heavily without providing an essay on its policies.

This has been a long diversion from the realization that “Bride Street” seems to be a special case, one for which the Synoptic Edition neglected to provide a textual note. In Table 29 of the Inquiry for emended place names, we find a passage in Wandering Rocks with three emendations, two in categories Mr. Groden denies are applied in the Synoptic Edition. Agreeing that the third emendation—to “Arran quay”—follows the only rule on normalization discussed in the edition, we discover that even this rule does not prevail since “Wellington Quay” is not emended in the same line of the Ithaca episode where “ Merchants’ Arch” is found. By now no one should be surprised to learn that the two occurrences of the Arch in Wandering Rocks are spelled “arch.” Had Mr. Groden followed up on the first six items in the tables which include “Bride Street”, within minutes he would have confirmed that Mr. Gabler is a heavy emender, and an erratic one.
A MAN OF HIGH MORALE

The *Inquiry* and Mr. Groden's Response both focus on the Hangman's letter of the Cyclops episode in order to extract a "paradigm." A paradigm may simply be a *pattern* or a *characteristic example*, but has a technical sense as *all the inflected forms of a word or class of words*. I wanted in the *Inquiry* to look in such detail at a passage of the *Synoptic Edition* within as many contexts as possible.

The Hangman's letter is a passage that any reader of the *Inquiry* would recall. The 1922 version differed from the manuscript not only in punctuation, but also in italics, spelling, and even capitalization. Moreover, my interest in Joyce's use of allusive minutiae to link his text to a network of associations in Irish history, classical literature, and personal feuds, made this a particularly intriguing project. I hoped that readers would want to follow my discussion about the design of the 1984 apparatus, in order to see a philological exhumation yield something fresh about Joyce the artist.

VIRGILIAN, SAYS PEDAGOGUE. HOMERIC, SAYS NUMEROLOGIST

The professional role which Mr. Groden disparages as literary criticism (99) might more accurately have been called "literary history" without the force of his argument being diminished. After all, a literary historian, like any other, analyzes objects, events, and even ideas of the past. Perhaps an antiquarian impulse was at work—one might find a new "text" of *Ulysses* to dust off. Or an interest in Joycean puzzles, something Mr. Groden dragged into the TLS in 1988. As if *Quellenforschung* (the Germans did not invent it, the Hebrews did) were disreputable, Mr. Groden asks in the TLS, "Do we want an editor of *Ulysses* who finds hidden and secret patterns...?" (That pretty well disqualifies the preponderance of those with books on Joyce, from Richard Ellmann on down.) Whatever the intrigue the Hangman's letter held for me, I set out to analyze it "synoptically." The 1922 version looks like this:

7, Hunter Street,
Liverpool.

To the High Sheriff of Dublin,
Dublin.

Honoured sir, I beg to offer my services in the abovementioned painful case I hanged Joe Gann in Bootle jail on the 12 of February 1900, and I hanged...

—Show us, Joe, says I.
—...private Arthur Chace for foul murder of Jessie Tilsit in Pentonville prison and I was assistant when...
Jesus, says I.

... Billington executed the awful murderer Toad Smith...

The citizen made a grab at the letter.

- Hold hard, says Joe; I have a special knack of putting the noose once in he can't get out hoping to be favoured I remain, honoured sir, my terms is five ginnees.

H. Rumbold,
Master Barber.
(22U 291; cf 84U 12.415)

Going letter by letter, document by document through the Hangman's letter, I noticed that in the Rosenbach Manuscript Joyce has the Barber H. Rumbold write the first person pronoun five times as a small 'i' and once as a capital. This single 'I' seems to allude to the one-eyed Cyclops, as do many other details in the episode. There are few chapters of world literature from Gilgamesh to our day where an "eye" is more likely to leap off the page than Joyce's "Cyclops." The first sentence of the episode begins and ends with homonyms: "I was just passing the time of day with old Troy of the D.M.P. at the corner of Arbour hill there and be damned but a bloody sweep came along and he near drove his gear into my eye" (22U 280). Figures in the episode suggestive of the one-eyed giant include the bluff and anti-Semitic first-person narrator and The Citizen, a former Irish national champion in the shotput who tosses a biscuit tin at a fleeing Leopold Bloom. The tribal cannibalism of the Cyclopes is shared by the executioner (two eyes, though, glower through his hood) and the infamous hangmen whose miscellaneous letters stashed behind Barney Kiernan's counter are fetched for gruesome entertainment.

In a grotesquely florid description, Joyce sketched an axewielding executioner who "tested the edge of his horrible weapon by honing it upon his brawny forearm or decapitated in rapid succession a flock of sheep" (22U 296). The allusion is to the flocks of Polyphemus. In its turn, the letter of H. Rumbold has "i" five times and "I" once. The Homeric allusion revealed by studying the Rosenbach Manuscript is hardly remarkable chez Joyce.

YOU CAN DO IT!

Yet no editor should be inflexibly bound to Joyce's use of the solitary capital I. Mr. Groden misquotes me as saying that I found "Gabler to be in error for not making" a change (106). The only occurrence of the word "error" in my pages on the Hangman is in the phrase "each setting of a text may be shaped by housestyle, compositor's habit, or plain error" (506). Clearly this reference to "error" has nothing to do with Mr. Gabler or his edition. Beyond not having
said Mr. Gabler was in error to substitute the minuscule for Joyce's majuscule is my opinion that an edition taking the 1922 *Ulysses* as its copytext need not raise up the *i* back to Joyce's *I*:

How might an editor approach the hangman's letter? One possibility is to let the 1922 version stand, or to emend it only to restore the Cyclopian "I" of the Rosenbach Manuscript. If, on the other hand, an editor felt that the Rosenbach Manuscript was a reasonably final version in which six later commas and periods do not belong, the principal emendations to consider would be the addition of italics and the change to "ginnees" from "guinees". The Cyclopian "I" would already be in this Rosenbach version. Allowing for the addition of italics and one spelling change, a "manuscript" version of the hangman's letter would not adopt a capital for "Street" nor the six pieces of punctuation added by Gabler. (Inquiry 508)

**ONLY ONCE MORE THAT SYNOPSIS**

What then is my real criticism of the *Synoptic Edition*? That the Hangman's letter looks more like the 1922 version than the stated 1984 policies would suggest. As strong as my criticism of the final text is, the bulk of the five pages on the Hangman's letter in the *Inquiry* focuses on the shortcomings of the 1984 apparatus. Throughout his Response Mr. Groden insists that the "Genetic Synopsis" is under no obligation to be genetic or synoptic in the manner all textual scholars have come to expect. Those not on the editorial board of the *Synoptic Edition* who have commented on my position (Messrs. Rossm, Senn, Vogler, Hart, Gaskell, Goldman, Amiran, et al.) believe that too much is missing from the synopsis. As for the Hangman's letter, the *Inquiry* makes it clear that however tentative a theory about the Cyclopian "I" one might hold, tracing its periplus through the documents is impossible from the skimpy information given in the 1984 synopsis (Inquiry 505-06).

Mr. Groden concedes that the synopsis is flawed: "Kidd does seem to have found an error when he notes that the synopsis lacks the comma after '7' in the address '7 Hunter Street';... if Joyce's note to the printer authorizes the transmitted version of the letter's punctuation, then the comma should be admitted. But Kidd's paragraphs following this observation are hopelessly marred" (106). Why does Mr. Groden use the word "error" to say that Mr. Gabler made a poor editorial choice?

Because the *Inquiry* does not mention "the rule of the invariant context," Mr. Groden feels that I am right—but for the wrong reasons. In fact, the evidence Mr. Groden gives in favor of the comma as well as the minuscule *i* is studied at length in the *Inquiry*. After the
umpteenth discovery of "Kidd's ignorance of the rule of the invariant context," Mr. Groden goes on to explain that Joyce was asked by the printer about the punctuation and capitals, and approved the passage. That the Inquiry—and not the Synoptic Edition—quotes the words exchanged between Joyce and printer cannot be deduced from Mr. Groden's narrative. Mr. Groden's conclusion that the Synoptic Edition unwisely mixed the punctuation of the Rosenbach and 1922 versions could have been reached from the evidence presented in the Inquiry (or through independent work), but not from the 1984 synopsis.

GENTLEMEN OF THE PRESS

No amount of manipulation of the 1984 synopsis could have yielded the form of the letter found in 1922 and endorsed by Mr. Groden. Yet the Inquiry "misrepresents" (104). Its details are relevant:

From one editorial viewpoint, establishing final intention is simplified by the rare case of a note to the foreman Hirschwald approving the 1922 version. With the final page proofs at Texas is Hirschwald's query to Joyce: "291—passage in italics: Is the little i intentional? Is the punctuation as it should be?" Next to this Joyce wrote "Yes" (JA 25:162; relevant proof page, JA 25:99). . . . The 1984 edition does not accept the text of the letter which Joyce approved when queried by Hirschwald. (Inquiry 505)

In other words, the reasons Mr. Groden gives for conceding that the 1922 version of the Hangman's letter is superior to The Corrected Text are the same given in the Inquiry. The Response invokes "the rule of the invariant context"; the same principle (without the jargon) is in the Inquiry. Its facts are correct, Mr. Groden writes, but somehow the Inquiry's theory is "flawed" and its implications "dangerous" (108).

FROM THE FATHERS

The second section of the Inquiry, "What is a Critical Edition," addresses the Synoptic Edition's insistence that its method is the only valid one. The 1984 declaration that a text arising from a comparison of the first edition with all manuscripts would not be a "critical edition" was so provincial that Mr. Gabler eventually retracted it. His pre-emptive strike against future scholarship on Ulysses tells us much about Mr. Gabler's view of scholarly enterprise. In response to this I wrote: "If the last two decades of debate on the aims and
methods of scholarly editing have taught us anything, it is that no single approach, however carefully executed, can accommodate all the conflicting pulls" (*Inquiry* 416). These words have now returned to haunt me, but not in the cliché sense. Five pages from the start, the *Inquiry* criticizes the chauvinism surrounding the 1984 edition. At the same distance into his essay, Mr. Groden attributes to me the confining viewpoint, announced on the first page of the *Synoptic Edition*’s Foreword, that there can be only one approach to editing *Ulysses*: “nowhere in the critique does he discuss the debates during the past forty years.... Kidd’s claims are odd ones in that they ignore the protracted debate.... Kidd’s failure or refusal to acknowledge different orientations towards editing” (84, 85, 92).

**THE WEARER OF THE CROWN**

At the time of my *Inquiry*, it seemed reasonable to suggest that the tenuous relation of W.W. Greg’s “Rationale of Copy-Text” to the practice of the *Synoptic Edition* invited inspection, since the *Synoptic Edition* cited no textual scholar except Greg. (Mr. Groden’s Response, the first extended discussion of Greg by any member of the editorial team, arrives after a decade of promoting the edition’s theoretical sophistication.) If I argued that applying classic textual theory would yield a more coherent *Ulysses* than found in the *Synoptic Edition*, it was not out of allegiance to a theory, but out of disappointment with the poor results of Mr. Gabler’s variations on and departures from the Greg-Bowers-Tanselle method.

**SUFFICIENT FOR THE DAY...**

Because I set out to examine how thoroughly and accurately Mr. Gabler had gathered his evidence, how useful is his apparatus, and how persuasive his arguments for a radical remaking of *Ulysses*, I discussed theory only briefly, my agenda being already full. I disavowed an attempt to write a synopsis of editing: “This is not the occasion for a primer on Anglo-American editing, nor is it the place to open the debate to dissident voices such as Hans Zeller, Morse Peckham, and Donald Pizer” (418). The four years’ research for the *Inquiry* were shaped by my commission from the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* to review the *Synoptic Edition*. Unlike other journals seeking prompt notice of a new book, *PBSA* was able to accommodate an essay of any length, and almost without a deadline. Had John Lancaster and Ruth Mortimer not been retiring as editors, the longest work published in 80 years of the *PBSA* would have been longer. Further lists of 1984 factual errors and lists of
disputable 1984 emendations at the last minute were omitted from the PBSA because Mr. Lancaster had to generate special tables from my computer disks. In the PBSA, computer-generated tables are as closely proofread as handset material. (The Inquiry has a list of 1984 "ghost variants" in the collation lists caused by Mr. Gabler's confidence in computerized data and failure to check physical editions of Ulysses before attributing to them variants they do not have.)

GRAVEN IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE OUTLAW

Editors are free to use any terms they like. Redefinitions can be adopted, but conceptual confusion is more grave. Mr. Groden asserts that the Inquiry "never spells out the theoretical position from which [it] is mounting the critique" (82). In support of this charge is a running narrative about my naivete and, in something of a contradiction, my rigid adherence to dogma. Whenever Mr. Groden has an opportunity to explain a concept he feels is germane to the debate, he inserts an aside about my ignorance, my confusion, or my dogmatic rejection of the Synoptic Edition's ground rules.

Among the textual commonplaces of which I am said to be unaware, and for which correction is administered by Mr. Groden with supporting citations from Fredson Bowers and Thomas Tanselle, are:

SOME COLUMN!

- Theory and practice are not "separate, 'pure' matters."
- There have been debates and new ideas about editing in the past 40 years.
- Spelling has not only a philological but "literary interest."
- Since "1972 at least," editors have attempted to reconstruct lost documents.
- Edited versions of a work are not identical to the unedited sources.
- There is more than one defensible way to edit a work.
- A typescript revised over time carries evidence of more than one version.
- A physical document is not identical to the text it transmits.
- Documents can "actually say" more than one thing at once.
- "The best possible text" can only be approximated.
- An author's relation to a variant must be determined.
- If an author saw a variant in print, the editor may still emend it.
- Interpretative decisions should not ignore the bibliographical facts.
• An editor's taste and inclinations should not interfere with the author's.

**LOST CAUSES**

Mixed with the textual platitudes in Mr. Groden's Response are arguments with which I strongly disagree:

• To oppose a one-theory, one-text mindset is to oppose "guiding principles."
• A critic sympathizing with more than one editorial option is untrustworthy.
• If a draft is typed for publication and then discarded, it is "theoretically less important" than a fair copy manuscript not sent for publication.
• Lists about punctuation in an edition are not very useful or important.
• Errors in an apparatus are less grievous than errors in a trade edition.
• A critic should not complain that an editor sometimes regularizes and sometimes not.
• Instead of demanding that an editor lay out his policy a critic should offer one.

**LINKS WITH BYGONE DAYS OF YORE**

Beyond the theoretical knots further tangled by the elaborations of the present Response is the impenetrable set of symbols and codes invented for the *Synoptic Edition*. In our 1988 exchanges in the *TLS*, Mr. Groden asserted that not only had I exaggerated the errors of *The Corrected Text*, but the errors of his articles promoting it. "The Scandal of Ulysses" notes that of ten "new" 1984 readings he cited in a single paragraph praising the edition, six were not new at all, as they had originally been correct in 1922. Nevertheless, Mr. Groden replied, "Kidd consistently distorts or misrepresents evidence to support his claim that the errors [of *The Corrected Text*] are numbered in the thousands." However, he insists, there were only six errors in one paragraph of his 1985 *James Joyce Quarterly* "review" of the edition:

I regret and am embarrassed by these errors. But if there are six mistakes of this kind in this one paragraph, it is also the case that, of the twenty-eight passages I cite in the article, these are the only six such mistakes. Kidd implies here and throughout ["The Scandal"] that when he cites a specific example it is representative. (*TLS* 7 October 1988, 1109)
Because Mr. Groden made only a cameo appearance in “The Scandal of Ulysses,” it seemed unproductive in 1988 to publicize his other errors. But the Inquiry confronts the confusions about the symbols and procedures of the Synoptic Edition that beset every scholar trying to penetrate its turgid Afterword and Table of Symbols. Mr. Gabler’s failure to follow his own terms or to use correctly the symbols he invented were disclosed. But Mr. Groden was the least reliable on the synoptic method.

IMPRONTU

Mr. Groden’s present Response has silently passed over whole areas of concern to the Inquiry. One can see why:

As an adviser of seven years’ standing, a coeditor when the project was first announced, and (strangely enough) the reviewer of the edition for the James Joyce Quarterly, Michael Groden is uniquely qualified to explicate the synoptic levels . . . . Despite his closeness to the project, Groden [in his 1985 J/Q article] has misidentified both levels A and B and added a dimension to level R not developed in the edition itself . . . . One can see how Groden misinterpreted the list of symbols . . . . As much as it shifts, level A never fits Groden’s definition . . . . Level R is correctly described by Groden as fair copy readings not found in the typescript; yet the synopsis identifies no level R revisions made after the actual typing, the second part of his explanation . . . . Level B, which bedevils anyone trying to explain it, is far more compendious than hinted at in Groden’s statement “‘B’-‘D’ mean the rounds of revision in the typescript.” (Inquiry 455-56)

Apparently Michael Groden is not the only one on the title page of this edition who is confused about the meaning of reticulated level B and its symbols B, (B), tB, (tB), aB, (aB), and e;B, which implies e:(tB) . . . . None of the correct uses of these five lettered levels in ten possible combinations, including inferred readings of lost documents, corresponds to the definitions of A or B provided by Groden in the James Joyce Quarterly, and the two possible forms beginning with “e;” were never used in the edition because the synoptic rules apparently changed without the list of symbols being adjusted. (Inquiry 459, 462)

HOUSE OF KEY(E)S

The technical vocabulary of the Synoptic Edition, twelve years after the phrase “continuous manuscript copy-text” surfaced in a review by Mr. Gabler, still has a linguistic community of one (Hans Walter Gabler). The abstruse symbol system created for the edition has not produced a single imitator in print, and literally no one can summarize its principal symbols. When the editors and advisers cannot decipher the codes, the project as a whole is doomed.
WE HAVE A LITERATURE

“Our present task,” Mr. Groden writes at the close of his Response, “is to study and assess Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition and Ulysses: The Corrected Text in the responsible scholarly manner that the editor asked for and deserves.” This task is offered as a prolegomenon to a “third narrative” about editing Ulysses. The first narrative, according to the schema at the start of his essay, was one of “glowing reviews” as The Corrected Text gained worldwide hegemony as the only version of Ulysses in print. The second narrative “came from the attacks, most notably John Kidd’s ‘The Scandal of Ulysses’ in the New York Review of Books, that called the edition into serious question and put its continued existence in doubt.” My Inquiry into "Ulysses: The Corrected Text" was the “culmination” of the second narrative.

Now Mr. Groden is appealing to the community of scholars to join him in dismissing my Inquiry as a “distraction from the work that lies ahead” (a phrase he found in the Inquiry itself). The appeal is disingenuous for several reasons, not the least being that as a principal author of “the first narrative” of adulatory praise for The Synoptic Edition, Mr. Groden seeks reinstatement as its spokesman. And as with his criticism that the Inquiry founders on a misinterpretation of the term “error,” Mr. Groden’s proposal for further study is neither original nor new. And as with the claims of Mr. Gabler which he retailed uncritically for years before the edition appeared, and in the only “review” of the Synoptic Edition published in the James Joyce Quarterly, Mr. Groden is again pouring Mr. Gabler’s old wine into his own new bottle.

The appeal for a New Era when responsible scholars can study and assess the controversial edition was first voiced by Mr. Gabler during the “second narrative” discrediting his work. In a letter to the Times Literary Supplement in December 1988, Mr. Gabler wrote: “I welcome a recent independent initiative by the Joyceans at the University of Miami to convene a conference in February 1989 which should provide a platform for the issues without the bias of polemics and partisanship.” Anyone familiar with the Miami conference is aware that while the organizers provided Mr. Gabler with ample opportunity to answer questions about his work, he was, according to all published accounts, unresponsive.

THE CALUMET OF PEACE

Will those responsible scholars who join Mr. Groden in endless study of the Synoptic Edition fare any better than he, who, after ten
years of writing about the synoptic method, still cannot decipher the edition’s symbols? Some who rejoin Mr. Groden may still find Mr. Gabler’s theories perplexing, his apparatus inaccurate and incomplete, and his final reading text far wide of either what Joyce first wrote or finally intended. Will they then be mocked as ignorant and confused? Will the New Jerusalem be free of the polemic launched by Mr. Gabler, and sustained by editorial team members Groden, O’Hanlon, Rose, and Steppe?

Mr. Groden has offered a peace pipe, a calumet, not to his opponents but to his friends and collaborators in *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition*. Will his friends accept? Of course. Will those who have followed this long imbroglio accept his reassurances? I think not.
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