

**FINN FORDHAM, ROBBERT-JAN  
HENKES, AND ERIK BINDERVOET**

ANNOUNCING: AN EMENDED *FINNEGANS WAKE*  
WITH FULL EXPLANATORY APPARATUS:  
A SAMPLE OF PAGES 3–9

‘Every letter is a hard but yours sure is the hardest crux ever’ (*FW* 623.33–4).

2014 saw the seventy-fifth anniversary of the first edition of *Finnegans Wake*. 2019 will see the eightieth anniversary and it will also see, we hope, the publication of a new edition with an emended text and an apparatus which will explain our emendations, and clarify many of the issues around unresolved textual cruxes. The edition will be published by Oxford University Press in two large hardback volumes — one with the emended text, the other with the ‘apparatus’. There will also be an online version. It will keep to the number of pages (628) and the number of lines per page (36) in the first edition in order to coincide for 99.5% of the text with the traditional form of references in annotations and critical commentaries.

As well as making this announcement in this special *Finnegans Wake* issue of the *Dublin James Joyce Journal*, we are also providing a sample of our research: of the textual errors and cruxes we have identified so far from the first 6 pages (3–9), and, more importantly, examples of the justificatory apparatus that will explain our choices. This is intended to provoke a discussion about methodology, and about whether or how to fine-tune the basic principles that we have developed. It is also intended to introduce new readers to the issues at play in working with Joyce’s manuscripts with a view to identifying errors. We thus wish to encourage feedback from experts, but also from readers who might be new to this material and who are interested in the genesis of these textual issues. We are planning to publish, as our work unfolds over the next three years, a ‘work in progress’ blog revealing some of the trickier textual issues that arise where we hope also to prompt, just as in this essay, responses to our scholarship. We are thus aiming to develop a kind

## DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

of ‘crowd sourcing’ involvement with textual matters. Included in our work here are particular questions for readers to consider: we would be grateful to hear answers. These questions appear in italics in the sample apparatus.

The work builds chiefly on the scholarship of Henkes and Bindervoet undertaken for their 2002 translation of *Finnegans Wake* into Dutch. But it also relies on and responds to work carried out by the many textual scholars who have bravely explored the archive of Joyce’s manuscripts since the late 1950s.<sup>1</sup> It is not our intention here to enter into a discussion about whether an emended text with an apparatus is justifiable, as this would not serve the purposes outlined above, and would become very involved very quickly. Suffice to say, we believe an emended text is necessary. Errors may well be portals of discovery — in a Dedalian world; but emendations may be also — and in anyone’s world. As with generations of scholars, we have seen how error crept in during Joyce’s composition processes, and also enjoyed the effects that potential emendations have on our understanding and appreciation of this, Joyce’s last and perhaps most extraordinary work.<sup>2</sup> A rough outline of these processes is essential to orientate readers new to the textual history of *Finnegans Wake*. It also indicates how easy it was for errors to occur.

\* \* \* \*

Joyce began *Finnegans Wake* towards the end of 1922 and it was completed over sixteen years later, a trial copy being presented by the publishers to Joyce on his 57th birthday: 2 February 1939. Actual publication was delayed until 4 May of that year. Over those years, the text was always evolving through many levels, at each stage of which there were accretive revisions. This brought also the possibility for what Hans Walter Gabler in his 1984 edition of *Ulysses* calls ‘transmissional departures’; that is, in copying (or transmitting) one revised document on to the next stage, mistakes (or departures) could occur.<sup>3</sup>

The process of drafting and redrafting, revising and expanding the text unfolded in a remarkably uniform manner, as follows. After reading and taking notes (which in fact he did throughout the composition process), Joyce would make a first draft of an episode.<sup>4</sup> He would revise this, and then make another — expanded — draft. Revision in Joyce’s case was nearly always accompanied by considerable expansion. He would revise this expanded text too and, at this stage, make a fair copy, prepared for someone to type it up,

### AN EMENDED *FINNEGANS WAKE*

giving it a nice clean look. In the early days this was often Harriet Shaw Weaver. She would make a couple of typed copies and send them back to Joyce. He then revised these typescripts in preparation for publication. There were many interim publications of episodes, usually in the form of chapters, before 1939, especially in the small magazine *transition*. In the case of *transition*, the printer would provide proofs for Joyce to check, often in two copies, which Joyce would not only check for printers' errors, but also revise again. The revisions were then incorporated and published in *transition*. There were several other interim publications of episodes of the novel elsewhere (sometimes whole chapters, sometimes sections of chapters); such as *Anna Livia Plurabelle*, *Haveth Childers Everywhere*, and *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*.<sup>5</sup> He would revise these yet again, in preparation for their publication. In 1933, Joyce gathered together all the issues of *transition* that had so far appeared, and began to revise them, often quite heavily. He finished revising these in 1936 and sent them all to the printers for *Finnegans Wake*. We call these the 'revised *transition*' pages. The printer worked from these revised pages to produce 'galley proofs'. Usually, two or more sets of these were made and, once again, Joyce revised them. This process of expansion was continuous right up to the final page proofs, with Joyce revising up to the last minute.

\* \* \* \*

With so many layers, not to mention a language featuring unfamiliar words, many with non-English roots, or entirely new word formations, it is hardly surprising that there were departures during the transmission of one revised text into another. Typists mis-typed Joyce's handwritten revisions, type-setters mis-set text, amanuenses mis-copied handwritten revisions whether in Joyce's hand, or in the hand of another amanuensis. The locations of revision marks were misinterpreted. Words, phrases, and lines were skipped. Different revisions were combined incorrectly as one revision. Type-setters applied a publisher's house style, which Joyce subsequently — but not always — corrected. Joyce might, for example, write a note in his own hand on his galley proofs that was then typed up incorrectly by an assistant on the page that accompanied these corrections. Then, that same incorrectly typed word is mis-set by the printer preparing the new proofs. Identifying these non-authorial transmissional departures is the primary concern of our scholarship.

We also note what might be called either 'authorial' transmissional departures or authorial 'variants'; that is where Joyce redrafts or copies out his

## DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

own work and, while making many intentional changes as he does so, also — possibly — makes unintentional errors. This leads to a trickier set of questions and judgements.

### *BASIC EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES*

The identification of transmissional departures depends on and emerges out of basic editorial principles. These have grown out of those principles which Henkes and Bindervoet developed, out of practical necessity, during their translation of *Finnegans Wake*. Since there are many different kinds of narratives of transmission which will require particular judgements, we have built in a degree of flexibility during their construction. They are at present, therefore, somewhat provisional, and something about which we, again, encourage critical feedback. At present they look like this:

1. Our copy text is the Faber 1975 third edition. This incorporates Joyce's corrections made in 1940, and also corrects some errors that slipped into the corrected second edition.

Except in the special cases (see below) where a transmissional departure (TD) is subsequently incorporated and adapted into a new textual form, a TD comprises:

2. the erroneous reproduction of a textual form, initially inscribed by Joyce, with the involvement of another hand;
3. the erroneous reproduction of a textual form, initially inscribed by a hand other than Joyce's, with the involvement of a hand other than Joyce's;
4. the erroneous reproduction of a textual form initially inscribed by Joyce through the involvement of Joyce himself when, through *currente calamo*, it leads to incoherent syntax. (The loss of rhythm or balance in context may also be used as a reason to identify a variant as a TD, and then restore an earlier version).
5. where textual forms inscribed by a hand other than Joyce's are then altered by Joyce, the latter will become the authorized first appearance of the textual form.
6. We do not generally accept the notion of 'passive' or 'mute authorization', except in certain cases where it can be argued that Joyce seems to have accepted what looks like the imposition of a 'house style', for example, when Faber turns the 'ampersand', or '&', into the word 'and'.

## AN EMENDED *FINNEGANS WAKE*

7. Special cases, which we will call ‘adapted departures’, each one being *sui generis*, will be treated individually. We will call on our Advisory Board for help here.<sup>6</sup>

Principle 5 involves the identification of ‘authorial TDs’ or ‘authorial variants’. This is perhaps most open to judgement and interpretation, and will undoubtedly require careful handling and fine-tuning. A full explanation will be given for every emendation. There will also be explanations for unresolved textual cruxes in which no change is made. These will appear in the apparatus.

### THE APPARATUS

Another key concern of our scholarship is to find a way of expressing the reasons behind our decisions to emend the text, or discuss an unresolved crux in as clear and as lucid a way as possible within the apparatus. The apparatus will appear in an Appendix after the emended text. Here is an example, the very first emendation we have identified, followed by our explanation:

#### 003.02 For ‘commodius’ read ‘commodious’

On the duplicate *transition* 1 pages prepared for the printer of *Finnegans Wake*, probably early in 1936, Joyce added ‘by a commodious vicus of recirculation’ to the first sentence.<sup>1</sup> On the first set of galley proofs this word became ‘commodius’, mis-set, we suggest, by the typesetter for MacLehose, the printers of the galleys, and of the first edition for Faber itself.

As the emendation follows from a clear transmissional departure, we do not enter a debate about any perceived loss of the allusion to the Roman Emperor Commodus through the restoration of the ‘o’. The format of the footnotes will follow a distinct pattern, as instanced here. In pursuit of clarity, and fluency of reading, we have banished archival codes — which, being hard to digest, may be a distraction — to the footnotes, where it should be easy, if so desired, to follow up on the evidence. The footnote will always refer to the location of the evidence in the manuscripts as reproduced in the *James Joyce Archive*, or in the as yet unpublished source material, on which the emendation is based. Readers can follow up on this evidence and judge for themselves.

---

1. BL 47475-92, JJA 44:253. Restored 003.02.

## DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

Here the endnote says: 'BL 47475-92; JJA 44:253. *Restored* 003.02'. This can be parsed as follows:

- 'BL 47475' is our abbreviated version of the British Library Catalogue number for a volume of the Weaver manuscripts; 'Weaver' refers to Harriet Shaw Weaver, Joyce's patron and also guardian of Joyce's manuscripts;
- -92 is the folio number within that volume;
- JJA stands for the *James Joyce Archive*;
- 44 is the volume number in the *James Joyce Archive* series;
- 253, the page number of the volume.
- *Restored* indicates that the emendation coincides with one that appears in the 2010 Rose and O'Hanlon edition of *Finnegans Wake*. It is followed by page and line number of that edition (in this case the second line of page 3).
- Emendations in *Restored* that do not coincide with ours will appear in a separate list.

The Rose and O'Hanlon edition appeared some years after Henkes and Bindervoet published their list of variants in their translation.<sup>7</sup> Rose and O'Hanlon did not supply any archival references for their emendations, as Henkes and Bindervoet did, nor did they provide any methodological or editorial explanations for them. For emendations not recorded in the 2002 Henkes and Bindervoet version, but present in their edition, we acknowledge their work, but also provide detailed explanations, as we see them, for the emendations.

So without further ado, here is a sample of our research, the emendations, and our explanations.

### SAMPLE OF THE EXPLANATORY APPARATUS

- 003.02 For 'commodius' read 'commodious'  
See above.
- 003.10 For 'venissoon' read 'venigsoon'  
On the proofs for *transition* 1, dated by the printers '25 Feb 1927', Joyce altered 'venissoon' by crossing through the first 's' and

## AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE

indicating that it should be a 'g', producing 'venigsoon',<sup>1</sup> balancing the French-English 'passencore' with a German-English nonceword for 'wenig soon'. This change did not make it through to *transition* 1 nor any subsequent printing. In the typescript that preceded the *transition* 1 galley proofs, the word had two 's's, with one of them crossed through.<sup>2</sup> Up until this typescript the word had had only one 's'.<sup>3</sup>

- 003.24 For 'devlinsfirst' read 'devlins first'  
On the first set of galleys for *Finnegans Wake*, the word 'Devlinsfirst' appeared, the typesetter mistakenly joining two words that had been separate — 'Devlins first' — until that point.<sup>4</sup> On all previous draft levels the 'D' is capitalized. However, on a later set of proofs Joyce demoted the capital to the lower case.<sup>5</sup>

*We have chosen to reinstate the earlier forms of the words when they were separated, while also incorporating Joyce's de-capitalisation. The result is an 'ideal solution': previously the words had not existed in this form. Note that any emended text will, in its whole, be an ideal. During the London 2016 Joyce Symposium, Hans Walter Gabler suggested that Joyce may have put the 'Devlinsfirst' in lower case when he noticed that the words were welded together, and then welcomed the opportunity to make a new, nonce, word. When the matter was put to the vote (to emend or not), the result was inconclusive. Our solution is justified by our editorial principles, to minimize the supposition of 'passive authorization'*

- 004.02–03 Note on 'Ualu Ualu Ualu! Quaouauh!'  
These words developed through a protean sequence. In their first appearance in the margin of the fair copy, all capital 'U's in the first three words were originally accented, and 'Quáouáuh' had two accents on its 'a's.<sup>6</sup> They were typed up incorrectly (as 'Nahn Nahn Nahn Quaonauh!') without any accents, and the first three words were then corrected by hand, while the fourth word was left — perhaps passed over by Joyce, though it would be

- 
1. BL 47472-74, JJA 44:204.
  2. Private Collection, JJA 44:145.
  3. BL 47482a-83, 47471a-2, 47472-4, JJA 44:3,45,105.
  4. BL 47475-92, JJA 44:254; and BL 47476a-3, JJA 49:5. *Restored* 003.21.
  5. Tulsa 1.
  6. BL 47472-5, JJA 44:106.

## DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

corrected later. For the next stage — the *transition* 1 proofs — a semi-corrected version appeared: ‘Úalu Úalu Úalu! Quáonauh!’ The mistaken ‘n’ was corrected probably on a missing second set of proofs for *transition* 1, since in *transition* 1 it reads ‘Úalu Úalu Úalu! Quáouauh!’ However, the original accent on the second ‘a’ never returned. Then for the galleys, the accents on the capital ‘U’s have disappeared, a transmissional departure, due to the typesetters presumably being unable to find an accent that would fit on the ‘U’. The accent on ‘Quáouauh!’ remained, however. Hence, the first edition’s reading: ‘Ualu Ualu Ualu! Quáouauh’. When Joyce went through correcting the first edition, he chose to delete the lone accent, seeing it as something of an orphan. While Joyce could have reinstated the accents on the capital ‘U’s, he instead followed the lead set by the transmissional departure.

*Note that this is another crux and our solution is to accept Joyce’s final version. Rather than restoring the original reading, we follow Joyce’s adaptation to the printers’ errors of losing the accents whereby he removed the one that remained.*

- 004.03 For ‘Baddelaries’ read ‘Baddelaires’  
A handwritten addition by Joyce on the second, duplicate set of galleys is mis-typed on the accompanying page with the typed up additions.<sup>7</sup>
- 004.06 For ‘Assiegates’ read ‘Assiegales’  
As above.<sup>8</sup>
- 004.07 For ‘larms, appalling’ read ‘larms appalling’  
As above.<sup>9</sup>
- 004.11 Note on ‘false jiccup!’  
On the first draft Joyce wrote ‘with false voice of haycup, what rorycrucians byelected by rival emilies!’ which was revised on the page to read ‘with false voice of jiccup, what rosycrucians

---

7. BL 47476a-134, JJA 49:291. Restored 003.25.

8. BL 47476a-134, JJA 49:291. Restored 003.27.

9. BL 47476a-134, JJA 49:291. Restored 003.27.

### AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE

contested of simily emilies!' Overwritten, this revised text is not easy to read and so in the second draft of the passage, Joyce copied up to 'jiccup', brought forward the exclamation mark, and ignored the rather obscure text that followed.<sup>10</sup>

004.13 Note on 'how hath fanespinned most high heaven the skysign of soft advertisement!'

There is a variant here in the first draft which reads: 'how has finespinned *in* high heaven the skysign of soft advertisement'. The senses of the two versions are subtly different, and there is some logic to both, even though 'finespinned', being a nonce word combining 'finespan' and 'spanned', puts the very idea of 'logic' into question. In the first draft, the 'advertisement' has spanned *in* (and been 'finespun' *in*) heaven. In the second draft, the advertisement has 'spanned' heaven, the direct object conforming to a more conventional usage of 'to span': but the echo of a nonce past participle of 'finespun' — 'finespinned' — no longer has the force it had in the first draft.<sup>11</sup>

004.14 For 'Iseut?' read 'Is eut?'

Early drafts did indeed have two separate words: the second draft, the fair copy, and the corrected proofs for *transition* 1 had 'Is aught?' In *transition* 1, 'Is aught' was changed to 'Is ent' — a plausible misreading of the typesetter for Joyce's 'Is eut'. 'Is ent' it remained, until the printer decided that it should be one word on the *Finnegans Wake* galleys: 'Isent!'<sup>12</sup> In his corrections of the first edition, Joyce wrote out the whole sentence and replaced the exclamation mark with an interrogation mark, but the word is no longer separated as in earlier versions. It is clearer with the separation as an echo of the question 'Is it?'

10. BL 47482a-85, JJA 44:5, FDV 46:26-27 and BL 47471a-3, and JJA 44:146.

11. FDV 46:29. This revises Henkes and Bindervoet's suggestion in *Genetic Joyce Studies* 3 (2003).

12. BL 47472-75, JJA 44:205; BL 47475-3v, JJA 44:232; BL 47476a-1, JJA 49:5. Restored 004.05.

DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

- 004.15 For 'askes' read 'ashes'  
The word was always 'ashes', from first draft to *transition* 1. When set for the galley proofs, it became 'askes', the typesetter most likely misreading the 'h' as a 'k'.<sup>13</sup>
- 004.22 For 'struxk' read 'stuck'  
Joyce wrote 'stuck' on the revised pages of *transition* 1, intended for the printer preparing the galleys for *Finnegans Wake*. This was copied incorrectly as 'struck' by an amanuensis, and then additionally mis-set by the printers as 'struxk'.<sup>14</sup> The word 'stuck' is a clear echo of 'stook' in the next line.
- 004.22 For 'future' read 'futures'  
The 's' in 'futures', a mere squiggle in Joyce's hand, was copied correctly by his amanuensis but was, as above, mis-set by the galley proof printer.<sup>15</sup>
- 004.23 For 'moses' read 'Moses'  
In a handwritten marginal addition to the revised *transition* 1 pages, an amanuensis (perhaps Paul Léon) underlined (faintly) the 'M' of the word 'Moses', indicating its capitalization.<sup>16</sup>
- 004.24 For 'eviparated' read 'eviperated'  
Again, copied correctly on the revised *transition* 1 pages, but mis-set by the galley printer of *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>17</sup>
- 004.29–30 For 'part inher' read 'partinher'  
Written initially as a one-word distortion of 'partner', this word went awry on the page proofs of *Finnegans Wake* where it appeared with an awkward hyphen to read 'par-tinher'. The instruction on these proofs was given to remove the hyphen entirely, but was misunderstood as an instruction to sever the words.<sup>18</sup>

13. BL 47475-92v, *JJA* 44:254. Compare with the next level: BL 47476a-1, *JJA* 49:5.

14. BL 47475-92v, *JJA* 44:254.

15. BL 47475-92v, *JJA* 44:254.

16. BL 47475-92v, *JJA* 44:254. *Restored* 004.14.

17. BL 47475-92v, *JJA* 44:254.

18. Tulsa 1.

**AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE**

- 004.32 Insert comma after 'Eggeberth'  
The comma in the addition on the revised *transition* 1 pages was overlooked by the printer of *Finnegans Wake* when setting the galley proofs.<sup>19</sup>
- 005.08 For 'scutschum' read 'scutchum,'  
The word was written as 'scutchum' on the second draft, and remained 'scutchum' at each level, until the galley printer of *Finnegans Wake* mis-set it as 'scutscum', omitting the following comma as well. In the first page proofs for *Finnegans Wake*, the missing 'h' was returned, but the superfluous 's' was left, and the lost comma was not reinstated. The emendation here reverts to Joyce's initial, longstanding word.<sup>20</sup>

*Note that it is possible Joyce approved of the erroneous 's', producing a pile up of consonants which perhaps echo 'pftjschute' on 003.19.*

- 005.13 For 'thundersday' read 'thuddersday'  
Joyce wrote an interlinear addition to the fair copy, and revised either the word 'thuddersday' to 'thundersday', or the other way round. But in the next typescript Joyce clearly revised the first 'n' into a 'd'.<sup>21</sup>
- 005.16 For 'muzzlenimiissilehims' read 'muzzlehimüssilehims'  
The addition in Joyce's hand of 'muzzlehimüssilehims', on the second, duplicate set of galley proofs for *Finnegans Wake*, contained an echo of the words 'muslim muslims', joined like Siamese twins at the middle 'm'.<sup>22</sup> The typist, on the fly, hammered a correct 'h' over a mistaken 'n', which is understood the other way round by the printer when setting the page proofs. The ü was also misread and mis-typed as two 'i's and set in print as such. Both corrections here make this a far more satisfying reading in the context.

19. BL 47475-92v, JJA 44:254.

20. BL 47475-92v, JJA 44:254; and Tulsa 1. Restored 004.31.

21. BL 47472-6 JJA 44:107, Private Collection, JJA 44:147.

22. BL 47476a-135, JJA 49:293.

DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

- 005.18 For 'tightousness' read 'rightousness'  
Perhaps an inspired typo, but still a typo: the handwritten addition, on the second, duplicate set of galleys, is clearly an 'r', whereas the typist adopted a 't'.<sup>23</sup>
- 005.19 For 'toothmick' read 'toothpick'  
The same paragraph, the same typist, as at 005.16, .18 and .21.<sup>24</sup>
- 005.21 Note on 'better than wink'  
*Restored* 005.03 inserts an 'a', so it reads 'better than a wink'. This might make grammatical sense but, as there is no 'a' in Joyce's addition to the second, duplicate set of the galleys, it is unwarranted.<sup>25</sup>
- 005.23 For 'jypsian' read 'jypian'  
Added, on the second, duplicate set of galleys, as 'jypsian' and typed correctly, but mangled in the subsequent page proofs.<sup>26</sup>
- 005.28, .30 Note on '(There are...)' and 'abbles, (what with...'.  
*Restored* 005.11 corrected Joyce's own punctuation by changing 'There' to a lower case 'there', and deleting the comma. The former change is unwarranted. The latter may be grammatically incorrect, but at no point did Joyce correct it. We leave both as Joyce wrote them.
- 005.31 Note on 'stonengens'. *Restored* 005.11 has 'stoneengens'.  
In the second draft, Joyce wrote 'stoneengens', but he telescoped the two 'e's in the fair copy to read 'stonengens'.<sup>27</sup>
- 006.09 Note on 'There was a wall...'  
*Restored* 005.23–24 removes brackets around the sentence '(There was a wall of course in erection.)' But the fair copy clearly has brackets which remained in subsequent versions.<sup>28</sup>

23. BL 47476a-135, JJA 49:293. *Restored* 005.01.

24. BL 47476a-135, JJA 49:293. *Restored* 005.02.

25. BL 47476a-135, JJA 49:293.

26. BL 47476a-134v, JJA 49:292; Tulsa 1.

27. BL 47472-6, JJA 44:107.

28. BL 47472-6, JJA 44:107.

**AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE**

- 006.10 For 'he was dud.' read 'He was dud.'  
On the ink fair copy, Joyce wrote: 'Dimb! He stottered from the latter. Damb! He was dud. Dumb! Mastabatoom...'. The sequence shows that a capital letter follows the exclamation. In the typed version that Joyce sent to Harriet Shaw Weaver on 20 December 1926, the shift key may have stuck, and the capital 'H', here restored, was lost.<sup>29</sup>
- 006.13 For 'diie?' read 'diie,'  
On the fair copy, Joyce crossed out his own question mark, the interrogatory sentence not yet being finished, but he did it too discreetly and the typist read the resulting squiggle as a question mark. At this and later stages, the word was 'diii', but the final 'i' was changed to an 'e' on one set of proofs.<sup>30</sup>
- 006.18 Note on 'And the all gianed in'.  
*Restored* 005.31 reads 'And all gianed in', deleting the (admittedly odd) 'the'. But both second draft and fair copy clearly have the final reading.<sup>31</sup>
- 006.20 For 'Hanandhunigan's' read 'Hanandhinnigan's'  
The handwritten addition on the revised pages of *transition 1* for the printer of the galley proofs is inconclusive. There is no dot over the 'i', but that is quite common, in this very revision. 'Hinnigan's' makes some sense as a rhyme with 'Finnegans'.<sup>32</sup>
- 006.21 Delete comma after 'more'.  
The handwritten addition is on the revised pages of *transition 1* prepared for MacLehose, the printer of the galleys. The comma was gratuitously inserted by this printer.<sup>33</sup>

---

29. BL 47472-6, JJA 44:107 and Private Collection, JJA 44:149. *Restored* 005.24.

30. BL 47472-7, JJA 44:108, and Tulsa 1. *Restored* 005.27.

31. JJA 44:108

32. BL 47475-4v, JJA 44:234. *Restored* 005.31.

33. BL 47475-4v, JJA 44:234. *Restored* 005.34.

DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

- 006.22 For 'filling' read 'felling'  
Same handwritten addition as at 006.21. The word rhymes with 'belling'.<sup>34</sup>
- 006.22 For 'steady' read 'steady,'  
As on the revised page proofs, this is a top-marginal addition, on the revised *transition* pages made for the galley printer.<sup>35</sup>
- 006.29 For 'young gleve' read 'young glebe'  
The word 'gleve' first appeared on the first set of galleys for *Finnegans Wake*, made up from revised transition sheets. Both *transition* 1 and the revised *transition* 1 sheets showed 'glebe', so this is most likely a printer's error that arose when making up the galleys.<sup>36</sup>
- 006.32 For 'platterplate. ¶' read 'platterplate ¶.'  
The first and second drafts, and the fair copy all show a full stop appearing *after* the sign for HCE turned on its back.<sup>37</sup> When setting the proofs for *transition* 1, the printers misread HCE's sign as a 'w'. The correction to this is bodged and, when *transition* 1 was printed, the full stop moved backwards between 'platterplate' and the sign. We have returned it to its initial position after the sign.<sup>38</sup>
- 007.06–07 For 'gifs à gross if we are,' read 'gif, a gross if, we are'  
An interlinear addition on the ink fair copy, expanding 'gif, we are,' into 'gif, a gross if, we are', which was mis-typed as 'gifs a gross is we are'. Two missing commas were added, that were not adopted, and in *transition* 1 an *accent aigu* suddenly appeared.<sup>39</sup>

34. BL 47475-4v, JJA 44:234. Restored 005.34.

35. BL 47475-4v, JJA 44:234.

36. BL 47475-93v, JJA 44:256, and (BL 47476a-3) JJA 49:7. Restored 006.01.

37. BL 47482a-89, BL 47471a-6, BL 47472-7, JJA 44:11, 51, 108.

38. BL 47475-4v, JJA 44:149, JJA 44:207, JJA 44:234, and Tulsa 1. Restored 006.04.

39. BL 47472-8, JJA 44:109, Private Collection JJA 44:149, BL 47472-77, JJA 44:207. Restored 006.13.

**AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE**

- 007.20 After 'outlined' insert a comma.  
The fair copy showed a clear comma after the word 'outlined', as did both the subsequent typescript, and *transition* 1, p. 5. It fell out when the galleys were being set.<sup>40</sup>
- 007.22 For 'lean on.' read 'lean on?'  
The question mark was slightly obscured on the ink fair copy when Joyce squeezed in '*Hic cubat edilis. Apud libertinam paroulam.*' The typescript omitted any punctuation mark. The full stop appeared without manuscript authorization in *transition* 1.<sup>41</sup>
- 007.24 For 'sundyechosies' read 'sundyeclosies'  
The fair copy clearly showed the word 'sundyeclosies', echoing 'Sunday clothes'. When this was typed up, the 'l' is misread as an 'h' producing an echo of 'chose'. We restore the original reading.<sup>42</sup>
- 007.24 For 'mint of mines' read 'mint of monies'  
In the first two drafts and the fair copy, the phrase here is clearly 'a mint of monies'. The word 'monies' appeared incorrectly in the galleys as 'mines'.<sup>43</sup>
- 007.25 For 'pinnyweight. Arrah,' read 'pinnyweight, arrah'.  
In the second draft, Joyce clearly wrote the reading above. When Joyce made a fair copy, he omitted the comma between the words, which was restored on the typescript. Then on the proofs for *transition* 1, an amanuensis for Joyce (the correction is not in Joyce's hand) turned this into a full stop, clearly a mistake, especially as 'arrah', now beginning a new sentence, is not capitalized. This is later capitalized, an adaptation of sorts, but the structure of the sentence which began 'What if...' has been lost through a needless error which we emend.<sup>44</sup>

- 
40. BL 47472-8 JJA 44:109, Private Collection JJA 44:149, BL 47476a-3, JJA 49:7. Restored 006.24.
41. BL 47472-8 JJA 44:109, BL 47472-50 JJA 44:179, BL 47475-5, JJA 44:235. Restored 006.26.
42. BL 47472-8, JJA 44:109. Restored 006.27.
43. BL 47472-8, JJA 44:109, and BL 47476a-136, JJA 49:295.
44. BL 47471a-9, JJA 44:54; BL 47472-8, JJA 44:109; Private Collection, JJA 44:150; BL 47472-78, JJA 44:208.

DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL

- 007.32 For 'sisterin shawl' read 'sister-in-shawl'  
Following the ink fair copy, 'sister-in-shawl' was typed up correctly, but in *transition* 1 the second hyphen got lost, while the function of the first was obscured because it doubled as a break at the end of a line. When the text was reset for the *Finnegans Wake* galleys, the hyphen was misinterpreted as just a line break, deemed redundant and extracted, glueing the two words more closely together.<sup>45</sup>
- 007.33–34 For 'Ill Sixty, ollollowed ill!' read 'Ill Sixty, ollollowed ill,'  
Joyce added 'ollollowed ill' after the comma in 'Ill Sixty, bagsides of the fort' on the second typescript.<sup>46</sup> A rogue exclamation mark appears on the first proofs for *transition* never to disappear. The exclamation mark may have been a misreading of a comma that was added to a missing typescript level between the fair copy and the first transition proofs.<sup>47</sup>
- 007.34 For 'tarabom, tarabom' read 'tarabom, tararabom'  
The second draft had 'tarrarabom', the fair copy 'tararabom'. The extra 'ra' was last seen in *transition* 1 and disappeared on the *Finnegans Wake* galleys.<sup>48</sup>
- 008.03 For 'and the two' read 'and they two'  
The fair copy clearly read 'and they two' and so did all texts including *transition* 1. When typed up for the galleys, the phrase became the grammatically less ambiguous 'the', but, without any clear witness sanctioning this change, we have restored the original reading.<sup>49</sup>

---

45. BL 47472-9, *JJA* 44:110, BL 47472-78, *JJA* 44:208. *Restored* 006.35.

46. BL 47472-50, *JJA* 44:179.

47. The typescript level 1.3‡/2.3‡, see *JJA* 44:143. *Restored* 006.36 suggests substituting the exclamation mark with a bracket, and then bracket the whole phrase.

48. BL 47475-94, *JJA* 44:257. *Restored* 006.38.

49. BL 47472-9, *JJA* 44:110, BL 47476a-4, *JJA* 49:8. *Restored* 006.42.

**AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE**

008.04 For 'gigglesomes' read 'gigglesome'  
It was 'gigglesome' on the fair copy, and on the subsequent typescript, but acquired, most likely by mistake, an 's' on the *transition 1* proofs.<sup>50</sup>

008.06 For 'shelenk!' read 'shelenk.'  
The exclamation mark was added when the galley proofs were being prepared, a mis-reading of a full stop that Joyce had placed beneath an addition mark on the revised *transition 1* pages.<sup>51</sup>

008.07 For 'pousseypram' read 'pousseyprams'  
When revising *transition 1* for the galley printers, Joyce clearly wrote 'pousseyprams', though the 's' is a little squeezed at the edge of the page which might explain why it disappeared in the transmission to the galleys.<sup>52</sup>

008.08 For 'mistress' read 'Mistress'  
The capital 'M' is clear up to the first typescript, but became a lower case when set on the *transition 1* proofs.<sup>53</sup>

008.18 Add comma after 'magnetic'  
Missed by the typist who typed up the ink fair copy.<sup>54</sup>

[008.26–7 Note: *Restored* 007.21 has 'Fitz Tuomush' as one word, but neither the fair copy nor the first draft showed it conclusively as one word.]

008.29 For 'the Grand Mons' read 'the grand Mons'  
On the fair copy, 'grand' plainly has a lower case 'g', but on the typescript copy, it is mistakenly capitalized, perhaps by association with 'Mons Injun'.<sup>55</sup>

---

50. BL 47472-50, JJA 44:179, BL 47472-78, JJA 44:208. *Restored* 007.01.

51. BL 47475-94, JJA 44:257. *Restored* 007.03.

52. BL 47475-94, JJA 44:257. *Restored* 007.04.

53. BL 47472-50, JJA 44:179; 47472-78, JJA 44:208. *Restored* 007.05.

54. BL 47472-10, JJA 44:111. *Restored* 007.13-14.

55. BL 47472-10, JJA 44:111, Private Collection, JJA 44:151. *Restored* 007.23.

**DUBLIN JAMES JOYCE JOURNAL**

- 009.01      Insert missed line 'toocisive bottle of Tilsiter. This is the libel on the battle.' between 'most' and 'Awful'.  
When setting the galley proofs of *transition 1*, the printers missed this entire line which originally read: 'This is me Belchum sneaking his phillippy out of his most toocisive bottle of Tilsiter. This is the libel on the battle. Awful Grimmett Sunshat Cromwelly, Looted.'<sup>56</sup> The text as printed in *transition 1* without this line makes some kind of sense, but not the kind that was intended. The sentence about a 'Belgian' belchily taking his fill from a bottle first appeared as extra material on the first draft.<sup>57</sup>
- 009.02      For 'Cromwelly. Looted.' read 'Cromwelly, Looted.'  
As the explanation above shows, there was originally a comma after 'Cromwelly' which was lost in the production of the first set of galley proofs.<sup>58</sup>
- 009.04      For 'cross' read 'across'  
The first letter mysteriously disappeared in the transmission from typescript to *transition 1* galley proofs.<sup>59</sup>
- 009.08      For 'boycottoncrezy' read 'boycotton crezy'  
The word 'crezy' was inserted as a separate word between 'boycotton' and 'onto' on the duplicate *transition 1* pages revised for the printer of *Finnegans Wake*.<sup>60</sup>
- 009.13      For 'Salamangra!' read 'Salamangral!'  
On the second set of galleys for *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce added 'Salamangral!' with an exclamation mark. The exclamation mark was missed on the final page proofs, and the mark requesting the insertion was read as an instruction to cross out the 'l' as well.<sup>61</sup>

---

56. BL 47475-94v, JJA 44:258, and BL 47476a-5, JJA 49:9. *Restored* 007.30-31.

57. BL 47482a-92v, JJA 44:18.

58. BL 47475-94v, JJA 44:258, BL 47476a-5, JJA 49:9, and Tulsa 1. *Restored* 007.31.

59. BL 47472-50, JJA 44:179 and BL 47472-79, JJA 44:209. *Restored* 007.33.

60. BL 47475-5v, JJA 44:236, and BL 47475-94v, JJA 44:258. *Restored* 007.36-37.

61. BL 47476a-138, JJA 49:299, and Tulsa 1. *Restored* 007.42.

## AN EMENDED FINNEGANS WAKE

### NOTES

1. This comprises a long list including: David Hayman, Jack Dalton, Fred Higginson, Michael Groden, Danis Rose, John O'Hanlon, Geert Lernout, Daniel Ferrer, Laurent Milesi, Vincent Deane, Bill Cadbury, Ingeborg Landuyt, Wim Van Mierlo, Dirk Van Hulle, Sam Slote, Luca Crispi, Mikio Fuse, et al. Much valuable work has been published online in *Genetic Joyce Studies (GJS)*: <<http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/>>.
2. See Robbert-Jan Henkes and Erik Bindervoet, 'Finnegans Wake, the Corrected Text', *GJS* 4, 2004: <[http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS4/GJS4\\_RJE\\_Corrected\\_Text](http://www.geneticjoycestudies.org/articles/GJS4/GJS4_RJE_Corrected_Text)>
3. Hans Walter Gabler, *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition* (New York: Garland), 3 vols; Vol, III, p.ix.
4. These 'episodes' might be only the length of a couple of pages, or stretch out to a few dozen pages. They could eventually become discreet chapters, sections within chapters joined to other 'episodes', or broken up into a couple of chapters.
5. For an exhaustive list of these publications and publication details see Luca *How Joyce Wrote 'Finnegans Wake': A Chapter-by-Chapter Genetic Guide*, edited by Luca Crispi and Sam Slote (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), p. 490–4.
6. At present our Board is: Dirk Van Hulle (chair), Derek Attridge, Bill Cadbury, Daniel Ferrer, Mikio Fuse, Mike Groden, Clare Hutton, Jeri Johnson, Terence Killeen, Geert Lernout, Vincent Deane, and Roland McHugh.
7. *Finnegans Wake*, edited and translated by Robbert-Jan Henkes and Erik Bindervoet (Amsterdam: Athenaeum—Polak & Van Gennepe, 2002); *The 'Restored' Finnegans Wake*, edited by Danis Rose and John O'Hanlon (Dublin: Houyhnhnm Press, 2010); cited throughout as *Restored*.