



Review Essay

“A Splendid Bazaar”: The Shopper’s Guide to the New *Dubliners*

by Mark Osteen

- DUBLINERS* by James Joyce. New York: Dover, 1991. vi + 152 pages. \$1 paper.
- . New York: Bantam, 1990. xxiii + 182 pages. \$3.95 paper. Introduction by Brenda Maddox.
- . New York: Signet Classic, 1991. xi + 240 pages. \$3.95 paper. Introduction by Edna O’Brien. Select Bibliography.
- . New York and London: Viking/Penguin, 1993. xlix + 317 pages. \$7.95 paper. Introduction and Notes by Terence Brown. Appendices.
- . Edited by Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche. New York: Vintage, 1993. viii + 285 pages. \$10 paper. A Note on the Text by Hans Walter Gabler. Afterword by John S. Kelly. Select Bibliography. Appendices.
- . New York: Modern Library, 1993. xv + 286 pages. \$13.50. Note on the Text by Robert Scholes.
- . New York: Everyman’s Library/Alfred A. Knopf, 1991. lv + 287 pages. \$15. Introduction by John S. Kelly [same as Afterword to Vintage text]. Select Bibliography. Appendices.
- . *AN ILLUSTRATED EDITION*. With Annotations. Edited by John Wyse Jackson & Bernard McGinley. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993. Illustrations. xvi + 200 pages [two sided pages: text on recto, notes on verso]. \$35. Introduction by Jackson & McGinley. Afterword following each story.
- . Edited by Hans Walter Gabler with Walter Hettche. New York & London: Garland, 1993. 455 pages. \$50. Introduction by Gabler. List of Symbols and Sigla. Manuscript Traces. Joyce’s Suppressed Preface. Emendation of Accidentals.

James Joyce was not averse to advertising his books like the commodities they are. One of Joyce’s more bizarre stratagems was his idea to include a preface in the first edition of *Dubliners*, to be entitled “A Curious History,” relating his difficulties getting the book published. He seemed to believe that an account of these injustices would create a “notable affect [sic]” (*Letters 2*: 329) and thereby act as an advertisement for the collection. When Grant Richards finally published the book in 1914, he

mercifully omitted the preface, which has, thus far, appeared only in fragmented form in Joyce's published *Letters* (2: 291–93; 324–25). But with the lapsing of the copyright on the first edition of *Dubliners*, editions of the text have proliferated like espresso bars in Seattle.¹ In three editions the suppressed preface has been printed in full, so that Joyce scholars can now read and interpret this metatext for themselves.² Some Joyceans may, like the boy narrator of "Araby," perceive this wealth of reprints as a "splendid bazaar" (Vintage *D* 23), full of attractive goods calling out for purchase. However, the professor merely seeking a good classroom text for undergraduates may be as confused as the youthful shopper of "Araby" when confronted with a heap of nearly identical goods selling at different prices. Looking for the best bargain but lacking the time to wade through all the editions, the intrepid professor may burn with "anguish and anger" (Vintage *D* 27) before finally giving up and staying with the most familiar version. This, however, would be a mistake: although many of the editions offer the same text, each possesses a unique set of strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, the *Dubliners* edited by Hans Walter Gabler et al.—available in both the Vintage paperback and in the Garland critical edition—constitutes a new text that more closely resembles the book Joyce wrote than any version we have previously seen.

A Curious History

The complex textual history of *Dubliners* is largely a result of the difficulties Joyce encountered in getting the book published. He first submitted his book of (then) 12 stories to Grant Richards in late 1905. Richards agreed to publish the book, and Joyce added a thirteenth story ("Two Gallants") in early 1906. Unfortunately, the printer chose to typeset this story first; liable under English law for prosecution, he refused to print what he perceived as obscenity. Spooked, Richards asked the young author to omit that story, and "An Encounter"—and to delete offensive words in "Counterparts." Joyce refused, and the book was withdrawn. After numerous

¹However, as of July 1995, the UK has altered its copyright laws to conform with those of the European Union. Hence, any Joyce text entering the public domain after July 1974 will regain its UK copyright status until 2012—the year of Joyce's death plus 70 years. Editions published in good faith after July 1992 will be sold but not reprinted (McCleery and Gunn 155).

²The new editions present the preface as a multiply framed text: after a bracketed editorial introduction, the text begins with Ezra Pound's preface to the preface, which is followed by Joyce's account. This story also contains frames within frames, incorporating his 1911 letter to the British and Irish press, his letter to King George V, the controversial passages from "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," and his framing letter, dated 30 November 1913 (Vintage 207–11, Garland 158–62; in a slightly different form in the Everyman's Library edition [259–65]).

other rejections, in 1909 the Dublin firm of Maunsel & Company accepted the (now 15-story) collection. But this time the publisher, George Roberts, got cold feet about a passage concerning the late King Edward VII in "Ivy Day in the Committee Room"; after much legal wrangling and angry correspondence (Joyce, with marvelous *chutzpah*, actually wrote to King George V to ask if he found the "Ivy Day" passages objectionable), Maunsel destroyed the copies that had been set up.³

Although it was never published, the Maunsel edition went through three stages of proof, each of which survives in fragments. When Richards reconsidered and agreed in early 1914 to publish the collection, an early stage of the Maunsel page proofs (a copy of which Joyce had secured) became the copy-text for the first edition. Thus when Joyce read proof on the Richards edition, he reintroduced some of the changes he had made on a later-stage of the Maunsel proofs; but, since he did not have a copy of them at hand, he neglected to incorporate into the first edition 26 other changes he had made to those proofs. In addition, Richards's printer ignored both a list of 200 corrections that Joyce had sent, and another list of 30 misprints that Joyce had sent separately.⁴ Thus the first edition has come down to us as a corrupt text, not only because it did not incorporate more than 200 changes that Joyce expressly desired—including the use of dashes instead of quotation marks for dialogue—but also because it is based upon an early stage of the Maunsel proofs that lacks those 26 other changes Joyce made to the late-stage Maunsel proofs. As Gabler notes, the late-stage Maunsel proofs, therefore, represent the *Dubliners* stories "most closely and consistently under [Joyce's] control" (Garland edition 22; Vintage 232). When Robert Scholes prepared the 1967 Viking edition of *Dubliners*, he restored most of the changes made on the late Maunsel proofs, as well as the corrections Joyce provided in his two lists. Superseding the flawed first edition, the Viking edition has rightfully stood as the preferred text for almost 30 years.

Clay

The impatient reader may be thinking, "So what? Even with quotation marks, the stories are still Joyce. My eyes glaze over when anyone starts talking about textual editing, and my students couldn't care less about such details." If you share these sentiments (and I hope that you don't, since in

³In his introduction to the Garland text, Gabler concludes that Joyce's account is implausible, deeming it unlikely that Maunsel would have printed the 1000 copies Joyce claims were destroyed, since such a decision would have been "tantamount to a decision to go ahead with publication" (15). Joyce aired his own bitter view of Roberts and his printer in the broadside "Gas From a Burner" (*Critical Writings* 242–45).

⁴Only the latter of the two lists survives, and is printed as an appendix to Scholes, "Some Observations" 205.

one case the change of a single letter alters the meaning of a story), two inexpensive paperbacks based on the first edition might suit your needs. Easily the cheapest *Dubliners* available is the Dover Thrift edition, which offers a no-frills printing of the first edition preceded by a two-paragraph “note”—all for only a buck. If you assign this text, your students will love you—all that extra money for noshing and moshing! Only slightly more expensive (\$3.95) is the Bantam Classic edition, which provides a decent introduction by Brenda Maddox covering Joyce’s life, the publishing history of the collection and Joyce’s reputation as a stylist. If Maddox’s discussion of epiphany seems reductive,⁵ and her claim that at the end of “The Dead” Joyce “leaves his country in the graveyard” (xxi) is a touch misleading, these flaws do little harm. But the reader may stop short when, after reading Maddox’s paragraph describing Joyce’s abhorrence of quotation marks, he or she discovers that the text actually uses those despised marks. Forced to add an “author’s note,” Maddox essentially disowns the edition she has just introduced.⁶ My advice: ignore this edition. The Dover Thrift edition is cheaper, and all the other editions (except one) provide more accurate texts.

Maddox’s introduction may be the sole redeeming feature of the Bantam edition, but the same can’t be said for Edna O’Brien’s introduction to the Signet Classic. Not only are her “facts” inaccurate (she claims that the volume was first accepted for publication in 1904 [viii], and misspells the name of Stephen Daedalus [vii]), but as criticism it is superficial, never going beyond such platitudes as “great art is a mystery.” Still, because the Signet edition uses the 1967 Viking text and provides a brief bibliography, I would prefer it over the Bantam. At \$3.95 it also costs less than the new Penguin edition. But if you plan to use this text in the classroom, tell your students to ignore the introduction. Let us move on to the next booth.

Counterparts

None of these bottom-end texts measures up to the two best paperbacks available: the British Penguin Classic and the Vintage International. Each of these fine editions offers a good text, a competent critical essay, a bibliography and a set of appendices. Terence Brown’s well-informed, witty and cleanly organized introduction to the Penguin edition is a model of its kind. Brown is especially strong on the socioeconomic backgrounds of the stories, and directs our attention away from symbol-hunting and back toward

⁵E.g., in all the stories but “The Dead,” she claims, the characters do not share the reader’s revelation (xvii). But what about Chandler in “A Little Cloud,” and the narrator of “Araby”: if they don’t achieve some revelation, then why do they weep?

⁶Because the Viking text, which first introduced dialogue dashes for *Dubliners*, remains in copyright, any edition not returning to the manuscripts and offering a freshly-edited text must use the first edition’s punctuation.

the realistic, historical contexts in which Joyce's works reside. His excellent explication of Joyce's critical attitude toward the Irish Literary Revival is matched by an enlightening treatment of the collection's important role in the development of the short story. Refreshingly, Brown's discussion of Joycean epiphanies properly emphasizes "the givenness of the real, in time and place" through which "psychological, social, cultural and moral realities will reveal themselves" (xxxv) to create a unique blend of irony and compassion, realism and symbolism. But although Brown clearly describes turn-of-the-century Dublin's dismal economic conditions, he neglects to stress the role of English economic imperialism in bringing about these conditions; indeed, his introduction is surprisingly skimpy on politics in general. Nevertheless, in most ways Brown's essay does just about everything that one could ask an introduction to do.

The Penguin edition also furnishes three appendices: the first lists the order of the stories' composition; the second catalogues the characters in *Dubliners* who reappear in *Ulysses* and where they reappear; the third gives the dramatis personae and plot summary of Balfe's opera *The Bohemian Girl*. This third appendix, although of some use to scholars, may baffle students; while the opera is mentioned in "Eveline" and "Clay" (it contains "I Dreamt That I Dwelt In Marble Halls," the second verse of which Maria "forgets" to sing), surely this information could have been covered in notes. In fact, these notes are the best feature of the Penguin text, offering especially helpful information about Catholic rituals and the Dublin social background. For example, in a note to "The Sisters" Brown explains that only a higher authority than a priest could grant absolution for so serious a sin as simony; his notes for "Grace" delineate the errors of Mr Cunningham and his circle even better than do those of Scholes and Litz in the earlier Penguin edition. Brown also fleshes out Joyce's wit in "Two Gallants" by noting that Lenehan's "rotundity" is remarked just as he is passing the maternity hospital known as "the Rotunda." Unfailingly clear and judicious, Brown's notes seldom give us less or (worse) more than we need, and never spoon-feed us interpretations in the guise of annotations. A couple of minor quibbles: the note on the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque provides insufficient details about her self-mortification, and therefore misses a chance to explain Eveline's self-denial; the note concerning Mr Alleyne's "north of Ireland accent" in "Counterparts" makes it sound as though Farrington is bothered only by its unpleasant sound, rather than by the exploitative personal and political power it signifies.

The Vintage International edition is almost as good. Its primary selling point, of course, is the new Gabler-edited text, about which I shall comment in more detail below. Like the Penguin text, the Vintage offers a long critical essay (here appearing as an Afterword), this time by John S. Kelly. Whereas Brown's introduction focuses on the social, biographical and literary-

historical backgrounds, Kelly's essay centers around style.⁷ Lacking the crispness and polish of Brown's essay, Kelly's also suffers from some too-obvious critical ax-grinding. For example, in one place he rails against those who view Joyce as a "destructive satirist, lacerating the obtuse and cowardly venalities of his fellow-citizens with sarcasm, irony and parody" (245). But these are straw critics; if anything, recent Joyce criticism has overemphasized his humane, comedic side at the expense of his lacerating irony. But if Kelly tries to do too many things at once, his readings of individual stories are sometimes acute. His brief comments on the relevance of the sacred heart in "Eveline," for example, may prompt one to reconsider the meaning of Frank's "openheartedness." Even so, Kelly's omissions are sometimes significant: despite an ingenious explication of Joyce's setting "Ivy Day" in the "Royal Exchange Ward," Kelly neglects to tell us just who Parnell was. Another irony appears in his discussion of "The Dead," where Kelly accumulates some enlightening details about Gabriel Conroy's speech patterns. But when Kelly quotes the passage late in the story where Gabriel confronts his ludicrousness and sentimentality, he leaves out the reinstated sentence that is the Vintage's text's most significant addition.

The best feature of the Vintage edition is its appendix, which includes Joyce's rejected preface to the first edition, and the *Irish Homestead* versions of "The Sisters," "Eveline" and "After the Race." Even these, however, may be more interesting to graduate students or professional scholars than to undergraduates. It also offers a brief "Note on the Text" by Hans Walter Gabler that will be difficult to follow unless one is already familiar with *Dubliners'* textual history. As for the text, I doubt that most readers will find its changes from the Scholes-edited Penguin text to be very significant. Even Gabler admits that "the present text and that of Robert Scholes' Viking edition of 1967. . . are close in their readings" (233). Hence, for its excellent notes, fine introduction, and slightly lower cost (\$7.95 vs. \$10), I would select the Penguin over the Vintage for upper-level undergraduates. Nonetheless, Joyceans are fortunate to have these two competently edited and well-presented paperbacks from which to choose. Let's move on to the big, expensive books, shall we?

Two Gallants

Four new clothbound editions have recently appeared. Two of them, the Modern Library and Everyman's Library editions, present the 1967 Scholes text in attractive, long-lasting bindings. The Modern Library edition, like all the volumes in the series, is a compact book with a highly readable typeface.

⁷One major blooper: Kelly cites Stanislaus Joyce's memoir *My Brother's Keeper* as the source of a conversation in which James compared his writing to the Mass. But on the cover this quotation is mistakenly attributed to "a letter to his brother."

Robert Scholes's prefatory note on the text briskly covers the publishing and textual history of the volume. The Everyman's Library edition is even more handsome. More importantly, it also incorporates the Vintage edition's appendices, bibliography and essay by Kelly. These additional selling points make the Everyman's Library volume a better buy at \$15 than the Modern Library text, which retails for \$13.50. But either book would grace everyman or -woman's library.

A Painful Case

On first looking into the Illustrated Edition of *Dubliners* published by St. Martin's Press, one is enthralled by its detailed notes and numerous illustrations and visual aids. The book is indeed a feast for the eyes, providing, among many other treats, several maps of Dublin (the lack of which is a deficiency in all the other editions), one even listing the businesses operating during Joyce's era; contemporary advertisements (my favorite is the ad for an Irish-made "porous rainproof" coat, perhaps designed to allow umbrella makers to stay in business); notices for the Irish concert in which James A. Joyce sang "The Croppy Boy" (no doubt a trenchant rendition); photos of Dublin landmarks, Italian popes, English knights. Edited by Bernard McGinley and John Wyse Jackson, the edition provides a readable text on the recto of each page, with notes and photos on the verso and in the right-hand margin of the recto. But a closer study of this edition exposes it as a major disappointment. One problem is that the editors don't seem clear on their own aims. For example, they find it necessary to jab at the "academic James Joyce industry" (xiv) for making all of his works as obscure as the *Wake*. And yet their entire project bespeaks a scholar's interests and aims: "an increased knowledge of some of these details can only increase the reader's appreciation of the causes and effects of the collection" (xv: I'm not sure what the "causes" of a book would be, but never mind). This confusion about their editorial function is manifest everywhere in the edition.

Perhaps the most flagrant examples occur in the textual editing: the editors fall victim to what Laurie Teal calls "random eclecticism" (188), alternating between following the first edition and the late Maunsel proofs, sometimes within a single story. What is worse, they are either confused or disingenuous about the textual history. For example, one of the late-stage Maunsel changes (reinstated by Scholes) to "Counterparts" turned "funds were getting low" into "running low." McGinley and Jackson (properly) accept the late Maunsel reading, noting that the line was "originally 'getting low'" (83). Since the first edition's version derives from an earlier stage of the Maunsel printing, it is indeed previous (if not exactly "original"). But on the next page they retain the first edition's "stupid familiarity" over the late Maunsel reading "loutish familiarity," commenting that "previously Joyce had 'loutish familiarity.'" Now they pretend that the late Maunsel version

precedes that of the first edition, apparently adjusting the chronology as it suits their editorial preferences. This simply won't do. The same misrepresentation or confusion occurs in "The Dead," when they choose the late Maunsel proofs' "words" (for Gabriel's altercation with Molly Ivors) over the first edition's "row" (171), but a few pages later select the first edition's "fooling at the piano" over the Maunsel's "strumming" (184). In the first case, they claim "row" to be "previous," but in the latter case they call "strumming" "original." McGinley and Jackson have founded a whole new method of textual editing—let's call it the Humpty-Dumpty school—in which a word (such as "originally" or "previous") means "precisely what [they] choose it to mean—neither more nor less" (Carroll 269). But unlike Mr. Dumpty, they don't even pay the word for its extra work.

The editors also misrepresent their practices. In their introduction, they write: "Some alterations . . . have been made in this edition to accord with Joyce's expressed—but ignored—wishes" (xiv). They can only be referring to the fact that Joyce did not get a last look at proofs on the first edition, which resulted in the discrepancy between the first edition and late Maunsel proofs. But the example they draw from "Clay" (in the late Maunsel proofs Maria's coat is called a "raincloak"; in the first edition it is called a "waterproof") won't hold water: in choosing the first edition's word over the late Maunsel version, they're actually doing the opposite of what they claim to be doing. Admittedly, all textual editors must use critical acumen to adjudicate between variants, if all other things are equal. Even Scholes didn't follow his own policies in every case, either by inadvertence or design leaving out a couple of late Maunsel changes. But if one is going to proceed on the assumption that the late Maunsel proofs represent Joyce's final intentions, one cannot simply decide that, on the other hand, sometimes they don't.

The larger question is whether these editorial blunders are attributable to intention or to simple incompetence. Other editorial mistakes point to the latter conclusion. The most egregious instance of ineptness occurs in "The Dead." After the Morkans' party, Gabriel and Gretta are walking toward the cab, and Gabriel recalls an incident when they saw a man making bottles in a furnace. In all the extant manuscripts and proofs it is she who asks, "Is the fire hot, sir?" But the first edition mistakenly attributed the speech to Gabriel, and Richard Ellmann famously wove an interpretation of the story around Gabriel's alleged question.⁸ Joyce attempted to correct this misprint, which is one of the 30 he sent to Richards. The editors' perpetration of this error (they compound the mistake by writing "previously 'she'": 189) in a text not bound to the first edition is inexcusable.

⁸In his introductory note to the Modern Library edition, Scholes recalls Ellmann's gracious recantation of this interpretation when Scholes proved to him that it was based on a misprint (xiii).

McGinley and Jackson have made another controversial choice by electing to represent dialogue in a manner that follows neither the first edition nor any other recent Joyce text. Instead of using quotation marks or following Joyce's mature practice of marking direct dialogue with a single dash at the beginning, they have chosen to preserve a system that Joyce tried early in the collection's composition. In one MS of "Ivy Day," Joyce used dashes both at the beginning *and at the end* of every paragraph containing direct speech (not at the end of the speech, but at the end of the paragraph in which the speech occurs). McGinley and Jackson have adopted this allegedly "elegant and readable" (xiv) method instead of the now standard practice of using a single dash. I can't condemn their choice: at this stage in his career, Joyce was still experimenting with ways of obviating "perverted" commas (*Letters* 3: 99), which he deemed "an eyesore" (*Letters* 1: 75). In fact, in the last-cited letter he argues that the "page reads much better with the dialogue *between* dashes" (my emphasis). Although Joyce's words do not quite mandate McGinley and Jackson's choice (Joyce seems to mean that *only* the dialogue, not attributive phrases, should go between dashes), they do suggest that this edition offers a more accurate picture of Joyce's early punctuation habits than any other previous version. Individual readers will surely have their own preferences. Unfortunately, once again the editors' justification for their decision is confused. They claim to be using the method Joyce arrived at in the "second fair copy" of the story. I presume they mean the second *extant* fair copy. But if so, they're wrong: the manuscript in which Joyce employs this method, dated 29 August 1905, is actually the *earliest* extant fair copy of "Ivy Day," and precedes a slightly later MS of the story that Gabler uses as the copy-text for his edition. Again, the editors' unclear justification undermines the persuasiveness of their choice. It's a pity they didn't follow the salutary advice given by Scholes in his introductory note to the Modern Library edition: "in a text that is still a live book rather than a museum piece it is important to change nothing without a good reason" (xii-xiii).

I'd like to be able to say that the edition is redeemed by its notes, but no such luck. One can assess the defects of their annotations by comparing them to Brown's: whereas his are restrained, judicious and concerned with clarifying the stories, theirs are intrusive, eccentric, excessive. From the first story, it is clear that they are foisting interpretations upon the reader in the guise of annotations. Moreover, the content of the notes is often only tangentially related to the story at hand. For example, for the line from "The Sisters" that reads "I pretended to pray but could not gather my thoughts" (3), they remark, "the narrator is forced to dissemble again. Inability to pray is a common complaint," and then lead us on a merry chase through *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and even "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner." This is not annotating; it is merely annoying. Similarly, for Eliza's malapropic "rheumatic wheels," we are shown a photo of J. B. Dunlop, inventor of the tire. Perhaps

the worst victim is “Counterparts,” which is plagued by the editors’ fetish for eighteenth-century and classical allusion-spotting. Thus for Farrington’s copying mistake (he writes “Bernard Bernard” instead of “Bernard Bodley”) the editors aren’t content just to suggest a highly dubious parallel to “The Dunciad”; they also take us on a detour through Virgil. In case we’re interested (I was not), they even reproduce the title page of the first edition of Pope’s poem (79). Another ludicrous instance of loony annotation (one of many) occurs in “An Encounter,” when Mahony tells the old jossler that he has “three totties” (i.e. sweethearts: 17). The editors don’t stop, as Brown does, at defining the word; they feel it necessary to remind us that Graham Greene lost a famous libel case in 1937 for referring to Shirley Temple as a “totsie.” This is an interesting and humorous story, but it has absolutely nothing to do with Joyce. At their worst, the notes appear to have been written by Kinbote, Nabokov’s demented annotator in *Pale Fire*. A chance word will call forth an entire tale, as when a reference to “harbour” in “After the Race” produces a story from the *Evening Mail* of 6 July 1903 about a yachting accident experienced by a Mr. and Mrs. Bloom (39). Again, this is all very intriguing, and even suggests a possible model for the famous couple in *Ulysses*; but it has nothing to do with the story at hand. I could go on, but one last example must suffice. During Gabriel’s speech in “The Dead,” he criticizes today’s less “spacious age” (181). Glossing this passage, the editors write, “The Wide Streets Commission was set up in Dublin in 1757, and has been widely praised for its achievements in laying out the city.” Here at least they seem to be trying to be funny.⁹ More seriously, despite the editorial excesses, too many notes provide all but the one thing needed. Thus, for example, the note about “National school boys” in “An Encounter” neglects to tell us that these schools were generally attended by poorer boys. Compare this to Brown’s excellent but unobtrusive note in the Penguin edition, which gives a brief history of National schools and sketches why they are viewed with suspicion by Catholics and Nationalists, and the difference between competent and incompetent editing becomes glaringly obvious.

In some cases the editors’ labors bear fruit: they provide, for example, the full text of the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Purdon’s biblical text) for “Grace,” the model for the newspaper story in “A Painful Case” and a photo of a gold sovereign for the end of “Two Gallants.” The Afterwords to each story are generally brief, insightful explications; it’s a pity the editors didn’t exercise similar restraint elsewhere in the volume. In sum, while the visual material is sometimes illuminating, too often the editors allow their personal

⁹This is characteristic of the editors’ irritating attempts to foist labored “wit” upon us. Another example: for the line “Cards! Cards!” in “After the Race,” they write: “Which these cavaliers and gallants are” (39). Ho Ho Hohe vraitment!

hobbyhorses to trample the text. Reading this edition is like eating watermelon: you're so busy picking out the inedible seeds that you can no longer savor the tasty flesh. Let us move on, shall we?

Grace

The Garland critical edition of *Dubliners*, while much less visually stimulating, is much more useful to the serious scholar. It contains Gabler's detailed introductory essay about *Dubliners'* textual and publication history, an explanation of the editing symbols and sigla, a set of manuscript traces (transcripts of the extant manuscripts on which the critical text was *not* ultimately based—e.g., the early “Christmas Eve”—but not the *Irish Homestead* versions of the stories), Joyce's suppressed preface, a meticulously edited and collated text, and, finally, a list of emendations of accidentals and a historical collocation. Gabler's introduction wastes no time: he presents two important discoveries within the first three pages. The first is the claim that the genesis of “The Sisters” was influenced by AE's directive for Joyce to read the story in the 2 July 1904 *Irish Homestead*, which featured a tale called “The Old Watchman,” in which a 12-year-old boy recalls the death of an old man he had befriended. Although Gabler's claim that Joyce “rewrote” the earlier story seems exaggerated (2), nonetheless the parallels are striking. His second discovery may be described as a bombshell, and could revise one of our cherished critical commonplaces. In a letter to Constantine Curran,¹⁰ Joyce is supposed to have written that he was writing “a series of ten epicleti . . . to betray the soul of that hemiplegia or paralysis which many consider a city” (*Letters* 1: 55). For years critics have attempted to define what Joyce meant by “epicleti,” usually tracing the word to the Greek *epiklesis*, which refers to an invocation in ancient Christian liturgies calling upon the Holy Spirit to effect the transformation of bread and wine into Christ's blood and body.¹¹ But after having looked at the original letter, Gabler concludes that Joyce actually wrote “ten epiclets” (Gabler 3). I suspect that Gabler's claim will be controversial: not only does it eliminate a striking liturgical parallel, but it also removes the accusatory connotations of “epicleti” (as suggested by Scholes and Litz 256) that extend some of Joyce's other condemnatory comments on his city. I wouldn't presume to judge whether Gabler is correct without looking at the original letter, but I must say I find “epicleti” to be

¹⁰This letter has been dated August, 1904, but Gabler argues from Joyce's description of the weather that it was more likely 15 July 1904.

¹¹See, for example, the section entitled “Epiphanies and Epicleti” in the Scholes/Litz Viking Critical edition of *Dubliners* (255–56), and Brown's introduction to the new Penguin (xxxiv).

plausible in the context of words like “hemiplegia.”¹² On the other hand, if Joyce conceived of the stories as mini-epics, then *Ulysses* (after all, originally conceived as a *Dubliners* story) may be even more continuous with the earlier work than has been previously thought.

Although Gabler’s discussion of the textual history and collocation is less clear than Scholes’s, Gabler’s editing is meticulous. With a little practice, most interested readers will be able to make sense of the sigla. Even so, most of the changes from the 1967 text are minor, and probably less significant than the discoveries just mentioned: punctuation changes, a word here and there. Gabler has also chosen to follow Scholes’s lead in using single dashes to mark only the beginning of dialogue passages. The most significant alterations are two sentences, one each in “Ivy Day” and “The Dead.” That “Ivy Day” contains the largest number of new readings is not surprising, since it has the most complicated set of texts and manuscripts, including the only extant set of intermediate page proofs from the aborted Maunsel edition. Gabler has incorporated several changes made to the second manuscript, including a sentence written in the margin that Scholes mentioned but did not restore (Scholes, “Further” 121). As the men discuss the King’s impending visit, Bantam Lyons asks, “Do you think now after what he did Parnell was a fit man to lead us?” Then the new sentence follows: “Do you think he was a man I’d like the lady who is now Mrs Lyons to know?” (Garland 293; Vintage 119; 12. 474–46).¹³ This emendation adds to the humor and hypocrisy of the scene, as the horseplayer and toper Lyons presumes to judge Parnell’s sins.

The second major addition comes in “The Dead,” just after Gretta tells the jealous Gabriel that Michael Furey was “in the gasworks.” Here is the passage, with the new sentence interpolated between brackets:

Gabriel felt humiliated by the failure of his irony and by the evocation of this figure from the dead, a boy in the gasworks. [The irony of his mood soured into sarcasm.] While he had been full of memories of their secret life together, full of tenderness and joy and desire, she had been comparing him in her mind with another. (Garland 380; Vintage 200; 15. 1476–81)

¹²Steppe makes a more detailed case for reading the word as “epiclets,” and provides a reproduction of the debated phrase in Joyce’s handwriting. He argues not only that the word looks more like “epiclets” than “epicleti” (which I find debatable: there seems to be a dot over the alleged “s”), but that Joyce’s poor command of Greek makes it unlikely that he “would have been capable of coming up with the *epicleti* notion” in 1904 (Steppe 604, 603). Despite Steppe’s and Gabler’s meticulous research, I find myself less than totally convinced by their reading.

¹³As he did for his *Ulysses*, Gabler lists each story by its position in the volume (e.g., “Ivy Day” is story 12) and line number. Both the Garland and the Vintage texts furnish line numbers in the right-hand margins.

The textual case for its inclusion is definitive: the sentence exists in the late Maunsel proofs, and was even revised from an earlier version (“changed into sarcasm”) in the manuscript. That Joyce deleted it is highly unlikely, for it would be the sole case in the entire collection of such a deletion between the Maunsel proofs and the first edition. I agree with the choice to reinstate the sentence, which deepens the portrayal of Gabriel’s self-hatred. But I must point out that it is not a new discovery. In fact, this reviewer argued for the inclusion of the same sentence in a note published in 1988 in the *James Joyce Quarterly* (see Osteen). Gabler implies that it is entirely new, devoting two full paragraphs to it in his introductory essay, and echoing some of my arguments (30–31). And yet nowhere does he cite this note, which precedes the new text by several years.¹⁴

This somewhat troubling neglect of scholarly credit aside, the Gabler-edited *Dubliners* is probably the best text of the book we’re likely to get. It is also a relief to see that it does not come burdened with the label of “Corrected Text” that rendered the Gabler-edited *Ulysses* so controversial. Indeed, Gabler’s claims for it are quite modest. He reminds us that decisions about textual editing are always “conditioned and relative,” and that textual editing is no longer a matter of authoritative “rights and wrongs,” but “a field of critical interchange where assessments of the degree and quality of the editorial solutions for given textual situations become significant categories of reception for the genre of scholarship termed ‘the critical edition’” (32). Gabler’s defusing of potential criticisms may disappoint those anticipating another Kidd-Gabler donnybrook. Given the length at which he earlier justified his choices, his conclusion may also seem a bit wishy-washy. But he is right: while some Joyceans will disagree with his choices, or accept them reluctantly, nobody should complain without first imitating the difficult, tedious labor that Gabler and his associates have performed. Whatever one thinks of his text, Joyceans owe him a debt.

Joyce would be pleased, I think, that the troubled publication of his first book of fiction—a painful incident in his career—has been transformed into an embarrassment of riches for Joyce scholars. What’s more, he finally got his advertisement-*cum*-preface printed. As usual, Sunny Jim has the last laugh.

WORKS CITED

- Carroll, Lewis. *The Annotated Alice: Alice’s Adventures In Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass*. Introduction and notes by Martin Gardner. New York: Forum/World, 1960.
- Gabler, Hans Walter. E-mail to the author. 7 September 1995.

¹⁴In an e-mail message to me, Gabler explained that the omission of credit was simply an oversight. I accept his explanation that he and I simply “c[a]me to identical conclusions independently” (Gabler e-mail).

- Joyce, James. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. Eds. Richard Ellmann and Ellsworth Mason. 1959. Rpt. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1989.
- . *Dubliners: Text, Criticism and Notes*. Eds. Robert Scholes and A. Walton Litz. New York: Viking/Penguin, 1969.
- . *Letters of James Joyce*. 3 vols. Vol. 1. Ed. Stuart Gilbert. New York: Viking, 1957. Vols. 2 & 3 Ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking, 1966.
- McCleery, Alistair and Ian Gunn. Letter. *James Joyce Quarterly* 32 (1994): 155.
- Osteen, Mark. "Gabriel's Sarcasm: A Lost Line in 'The Dead.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 25 (1988): 259–62.
- Scholes, Robert. "Some Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*: 'The Dead.'" *Studies in Bibliography* 15 (1962): 191–205.
- . "Further Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*." *Studies in Bibliography* 17 (1964): 107–22.
- Steppe, Wolfhard. "The Merry Greeks (With a Farewell to *epicleti*)." *James Joyce Quarterly* 32 (1995): 597–617.
- Teal, Laurie. "New James Joyce Texts: A Review Essay." *English Literature in Transition 1880–1920* 38 (1995): 187–94.

Appendix: Your Handy *Dubliners* Shopping Tips

Editions using the first edition: Bantam, Dover Thrift.

Editions using the 1967 Scholes edition: Signet Classic, Penguin, Modern Library, Everyman's Library.

Editions using the new Gabler text: Vintage; Garland Critical Edition.

Editions using a combination of first ed. and Scholes: St. Martin's Illustrated Edition.

1. The Dover Thrift edition is the cheapest; however, it's based on the flawed first edition.
2. The best inexpensive edition is the Signet Classic, but skip the introduction.
3. The new Penguin classic is first-rate in every way, and probably the best choice for the classroom.
4. The Vintage is almost as good, and offers the best available text.
5. The Modern Library and Everyman's Library editions are both handsome volumes, but the latter offers more scholarly tools for only a little more money.
6. The St. Martin's Illustrated Edition is an unreliable and annoying mess as scholarship, but some Joyceans may still want to own it for its many extra features.
7. The Garland edition is a must for any college library that deems itself respectable; serious Joyceans should also have a copy.