

Copyright© 1990 by the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center,
The University of Texas at Austin

ISSN 0024-2241

Cover illustration: Woodcut from St. Bernard's *The Golden Pistle*, printed in 1531 by Robert Wyer. Reproduced from *Hand-Lists of English Printers, 1501-1556*, Part IV, ed. E.G. Duff, H.R. Plomer, A.W. Pollard (London: Blades, East & Blades, for the Bibliographic Society, September 1913). *HRHRC Collections*.

The Library Chronicle is published by
the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center
and the General Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin

Dave Oliphant, *Editor*

Robin Bradford, *Assistant Editor*

The Library Chronicle

Printed and bound by
The University of Texas Printing Division

Editorial Board

Thomas F. Staley
Carlton Lake
Sally Leach
Cathy Henderson
Harold Billings
William B. Todd

The Library Chronicle is issued quarterly at a subscription rate of \$30.00 for four issues. The purpose of the *Chronicle* is to present information on available materials in the special collections at The University of Texas at Austin, to publish scholarly articles based on these materials, and to record matters of interest concerning new acquisitions, exhibitions, and other events related to the University's special collections. Writers should query first before submitting articles for publication. All correspondence should be addressed to the Editors, P.O. Box 7219, Austin, Texas 78713.

Contents

LARRY CARVER <i>Introduction</i>	7
JEROME MCGANN <i>How to Read a Book</i>	13
MICHAEL WARREN <i>The Theatricalization of Text: Beckett, Jonson, Shakespeare</i>	39
RANDALL MCLEOD <i>from Tranceformations in the Text of "Orlando Furioso"</i>	61
D.F. MCKENZIE <i>Speech-Manuscript-Print</i>	87
IAN WILLISON <i>Editorial Theory and Practice and the History of the Book</i>	111
LOTTE HELLINGA <i>Editing Texts in the First Fifteen Years of Printing</i>	127
HANS WALTER GABLER <i>Textual Studies and Criticism</i>	151
ANNE MIDDLETON <i>Life in the Margins, or, What's an Annotator to Do?</i>	167
Notes on Contributors	184

Prolusions;

or,

select Pieces of antient Poetry,—

*compil'd with great Care from their severall Originals,
and offer'd to the Publick
as Specimens of the Integrity that should be found
in the Editions of worthy Authors,—*

in three Parts;

containing,

- I. *The notbrowne Mayde; Master Sackvile's In-
duction; and, Overbury's Wife:*
- II. *Edward the third, a Play, thought to be writ by
SHAKESPEARE:*
- III. *Those excellent didactic Poems, intitl'd — Nosce teipsum,
written by Sir John Davis:*

with a Preface.

Edw. Capell

*Impius hæc tam culta novalia miles habebit?
Barbarus has fegetes? VIRG. Ecl. I.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. and R. TONSON in the Strand.

1760.

Title page from Edward Capell's *Prolusions; or, Select Pieces of antient Poetry* (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1760). This copy was W. W. Greg's and is inscribed "Walter W. Greg/Trin: Coll. Camb./1911". The signature on the title page may be Capell's. *HRHRC Collections*.

Textual Studies and Criticism

BY HANS WALTER GABLER

In all fields of knowledge and scholarship, the twentieth century has been a period of progressive specialization, yet as it draws to its close, there are signs of a turning of the tides. As my title suggests, I discern a fresh desire for contact between Textual Studies and Criticism—distinct disciplines today, though the joint foundation of literary studies and philology as they were understood up until two or three generations ago. If we go back far enough—it doesn't have to be to Alexandria, eighteenth-century Shakespeare studies will suffice—literary study was textual study, and philology, in the vernacular, the securing (or divination, before, say, Johnson's *Dictionary*) of readings in Shakespeare's plays and those of his contemporaries. Towards the end of the century, the beginnings of a specialized methodology in textual criticism became evident—yet even if the systematic application by Edward Capell of what might be called proto-bibliography laid the first seeds of a disjunction, these took over a century to germinate.¹ Biblical, classical, and medieval textual scholarship apart—although we are aware of their influence—textual studies in the modern languages came into their own around the turn of the present century. This was one of several moves in a sub-dividing of the field of literary studies, parallel to the generating of historical, or biographical, or generic literary scholarship, or history-of-ideas, formalist, or evaluative criticism. Hierarchies were implied or postulated in the demarcation of the division. Textual studies, specifically, were relegated into subservience. The disjunction from criticism came to be increasingly marked as a consequence.

¹Among works edited by Edward Capell (1713-1781) are *Mr. William Shakespeare. His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies*, 10 vols. (London: Dryden Leach for J. and R. Tonson in the Strand, 1768) and *Prolusions; or, Select Pieces of antient Poetry,—compil'd with great Care from their Several Originals, and offer'd to the Publick as Specimens of the Integrity that Should be found in the Editions of worthy Authors,—in three Parts* (London: Printed for J. and R. Tonson, 1760). See also *Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare; Part the first* (London: Printed for Edw. and Cha. Dilly, 1775), and the later three-volume subscription set of Capell's commentary (1779-1783) which superseded this edition.

The development was by no means unique to English Studies. It happened in German literary scholarship; the emergence of “Textology” in the Soviet Union presumably had something to do with it; and as for France, the curious reluctance one senses that there was until recently to develop modern textual studies much beyond a nineteenth-century state of the art may have been the inhibitive result, in this instance, of the divisions in the realm of literary studies. About Italy I know little; yet the sense I get is of a strong allegiance to medieval textual scholarship extended into the areas of post-medieval and modern literature, and with considerable emphasis on theory (e.g., a theory of the variant) which in fact would warrant closer acquaintance.² Yet, if not unique, the disjunction of textual studies from criticism was perhaps most pronounced in English Studies, carried as it was by two strong impulses. One was the blazoning of a dichotomy between criticism and scholarship (an American division this, in the first place; responsible, I believe, for much in the present modern topography of the academic landscape in English, American, and modern languages and literatures; and never whole-heartedly embraced as a mode of self-definition in literary studies in Europe). The other impulse came from inside textual studies themselves as they adapted the tools of antiquarians, book collectors, and librarians to new ends. Redefining the very term “bibliography,” they developed analytical and textual bibliography into their dominant, indeed all but exclusive, methodology. When I first encountered the discipline some twenty years ago, it so excited me that I didn’t stop to think how odd it was to find the terms “bibliography” and “textual criticism” used as virtual synonyms.

The relegation of textual scholarship to the periphery of literary studies and into subservience to criticism had the counter-effect of strengthening textual studies themselves. If the mode of the division owed much to the claims of criticism to be both “other” and hierarchically superior, these were claims implicitly conceded by textual scholarship. Emphasizing, in its turn, its “otherness” by demanding recognition of the scientific quality of bibliography, it raised a rival claim to superiority by shifting ground—which meant neutralizing, yet not rebutting, criticism’s claims on its own terms. This opened a path to autonomy—an autonomy for a time imagined to lie ideally in the exclusive observation and analysis of inked shapes on paper without regard to their meaning.³ Not criticism but inexorable logic was to provide the foundations and determine the results of editing. Not altogether unlike a car assembled in the factory and then sold to an owner left to explore and utilize all its built-in capacity, a text was constructed in the editor’s workshop and

²D’Arco S. Avalle, *Principi di critica testuale* (Padova: Antenore, 1978 [1972]); and C. Segri, “L’analisi del testo letterario,” *Avviamento all’analisi del testo letterario* (Torino: Einaudi, 1985).

³See several of Greg’s position papers in W. W. Greg, *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

handed to the critic who, expected to accept it as definitive (and himself expecting to take it as such), was left to perform on it his criticism.

There are reliable cars; and there are reliable texts. Far be it from me to cast aspersions on the methodologies of modern editing, or to look askance at the bibliographical way of textual scholarship. Nevertheless, from the dominance of bibliography in textual criticism in particular, and from the highly specialized skills it demanded, the situation developed which is our present concern. The editing of literary texts ceased to be the common pursuit of literary and textual critics. The logical, formal, even technological intricacies of text-critical and editorial thinking and procedure on the one hand developed their own self-sufficiency, and on the other hand, were no longer understood by literary critics either in themselves, or as the conditioning factors of edited texts. The not uncommon consequences of the estrangement of critics from textual scholarship were: belief that all was well, or facile dismissal; complacent acceptance, or misunderstanding; and on the whole a nagging irritation at the hermeticism of editing. The estrangement on the side of the textual specialists was from meta-critical developments: advancing conceptions of the literary work; philosophical perspectives on meaning and significance in texts; theories of text; the phenomenology of writing processes; structural or sociological concepts of text versions.

Consider that the entire tradition of Shakespearean textual scholarship converges on the authentic Shakespeare text. Behind the printed texts there may have been a theatrical manuscript, yes, or a scribal transcript; but in back thereof were authorial papers, and their authenticity was to be editorially recovered, if at all possible. Marvellously, and brilliantly, R. B. McKerrow, at the height of the bibliographical era in England, was able to show that quite a number of plays were in fact printed directly from foul papers, from the very fountainhead, that is, of the transmission.⁴ In other cases, stemmatic thinking, derived from classical and medieval editing, helped to determine and recover the putative authentic text. The two texts of *King Lear*, as we know, were defined as collateral so as to fit the pattern for retrieval of an archetype from its descendants. Whether foul-papers or archetype-derived, the most authentic Shakespeare text was pre-theatrical, and therefore, as it were, a book text, not a play text. It was to the recovery of book texts, after all, that editing was geared for other literary genres, no categorical distinction being made for plays.

Now, the book text goes very well with the poetic drama, the most authentic Shakespeare in this respect that of the dramatic poet. Textual criticism indeed responded to New Criticism. In the reconsideration of the *Lear* question that Michael Warren initiated in 1976, and which has been such

⁴R. B. McKerrow, "A Suggestion Regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts," *Review of English Studies* 11 (1935): 459-465.

an exciting new chapter in Shakespearean textual criticism, the textual specialists were caught somewhat unawares by the shift in critical interest towards the theatrical dimensions in Shakespeare which had been felt for a decade or more before it imploded into the textual domain.⁵ It was owing to the force of their archetype- and book-text-oriented traditions that the textual specialists had so doggedly rejected the critical minority view of distinct versions for *King Lear*—voiced intermittently since the eighteenth century—until the critics finally simply refused to follow their specialist dictate.⁶ When the attitude changed, the event bore the signs of a minor Kuhnian scientific revolution, leading to a change of paradigm. The impulse for the change came from the outside, and that the “outside,” namable as an area of Shakespearean criticism, should really have been in such proximity, highlights precisely the disjunction of literary and textual criticism I have been talking about.

The new paradigm, in text-critical and editorial terms, suggested by the *King Lear* case for Shakespearean textual studies is “the version,” to replace (or, realistically, to stand beside) the model of the archetype, or of the foul-papers “Urtext.” To think of texts and textual transmission in terms of versions requires drawing upon critical faculties and resources in ways that Anglo-American mainstream textual criticism, developed out of classical medieval textual criticism and reinforced by bibliography, has sought to eliminate. By “Anglo-American mainstream textual criticism,” I mean the type of retrogressive approach, ascending against the line of transmission, always trying to get behind what has been preserved and attempting to recover and reconstruct what has been lost—a Platonic approach in its search for the pure ideal, and at the same time a curiously Derridean one, before Derrida, in its awareness of always being at a remove from the original. Reinforced by bibliography, as we have seen, it relies heavily on theological concatenation of formal elements, desemanticized where possible, of texts and their documents of transmission. A critical reasoning about textual situations and editorial choices and decisions tends to be held back and admitted only when the bibliographical evidence is unavailable or exhausted.

To regard works of literature and their texts in terms of “versions” implies, by contrast, not to proceed against, but to follow the advancing, or descending, line of the writing, revision, and transmission. To define a version is essentially a critical act. The well-known standby examples from English and American literature are the two texts each of Wordsworth’s *Prelude* and Henry James’s *Roderick Hudson*. They are critically determined first as

⁵Michael J. Warren, “Quarto and Folio *King Lear* and the Interpretation of Albany and Edgar,” *Shakespeare, Pattern of Excelling Nature*, ed. David Bevington and Jay L. Halio (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1978), pp. 95-107.

⁶This is programmatically the stance of Steven Urkowitz, *Shakespeare’s Revision of “King Lear”* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980). The question is fully developed in *The Division of the Kingdoms*, ed. Gary Taylor and Michael Warren (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

THE PRELUDE,

OR

GROWTH OF A POET'S MIND;

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL POEM;

BY

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH.

LONDON:

EDWARD MOXON, DOVER STREET.

1850.

RODERICK HUDSON.

BY

HENRY JAMES, JR.



BOSTON:

JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY,

142 NASSAU ST. N.Y. AND FIELD, OSGOOD, & Co.

1876.

Title pages from William Wordsworth's *The Prelude* (London: Edward Moxon, 1850), and Henry James's *Roderick Hudson* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1876). HRHRC Collections.

distinct works, or versions, under the identical title before textual criticism and editing are brought to operate upon them separately. The same is of course true for the two texts of *King Lear*. In the new Oxford edition of Shakespeare's *Complete Works*, as I need not remind you, they have been separately edited.⁷ The two *Lear* plays in the Oxford *Complete Works* are the clearest indication of the reorientation in Shakespearean editing that the Oxford Shakespeare has attempted to put into practice. Not only is it the first edition ever to offer Shakespeare's plays in chronological order, but it is the first scholarly edition to review the canon thoroughly with regard to the minor poetry. It is also the first edition that turns a consciousness of versions of the dramatic texts into a program of editing the plays, where possible, not in the most original "Urtext" approximation recoverable, but in the shape they attained in the theatre.

This raises critical questions before and after the event. First, obviously, all facts and opinions about the Shakespearean texts and their transmission need to be weighed for their critical impact. The editors of the Complete Oxford Shakespeare could never have attempted what they have undertaken without full reliance on the Shakespearean bibliographical textual criticism of the twentieth century. What is remarkable is that they have put the results and insights of critical bibliographical research to new uses. Helped by bibliography to distinguish traces of versions, they have not only proceeded editorially to separate them, but also to accept for the constitution of their edition elements of text that previous editors rather rejected. Conversely, they have eliminated again and again, and printed as addenda, lines and passages which were critically deemed never to have had a version co-existence with their textual surroundings, but which, by virtue of being a Shakespearean text, had been left in place by a book-text-oriented editorial approach. After the editing of the Oxford *Complete Works* of Shakespeare, questions must arise perhaps about the authenticity, certainly about the degree of authority, of the theatre-related versions of Shakespeare's plays editorially prepared, and no doubt also about how to square edited texts derived from theatrical manuscripts, in preference over authorial papers, with the postulate of fulfilling authorial intention in scholarly editing. These implications of the Oxford Shakespeare have hardly begun to be focused on or explored in their consequences for Shakespearean textual studies or criticism or, since Shakespearean textual scholarship has traditionally provided the paradigm for textual studies in the entire range of the literature, explored in their potential for a shifting of emphasis, a reorientation, a rethinking in Anglo-American textual scholarship as a whole.

⁷Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, gen. eds., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

To me, the new venture of the Oxford *Complete Works* of Shakespeare is of particular interest since it chimes in with central tenets of editorial theory and practice developed for German literature. The relationship is distant enough, not only because there is really no equivalent to the Shakespearean textual situation in all German literature, but also because there is no background of bibliographical methodology in German textual scholarship, whereas of course, as I have indicated, the Oxford Shakespeare upholds strong allegiances to the bibliographical way. The versional editing is only one aspect of the Oxford Shakespeare; and even if it is pivotal theoretically to the enterprise, the transmissional situation for the majority of the plays prevents it from becoming the editions's dominant mode. It should be all the more interesting, therefore, to observe more closely a school of textual criticism to which versional editing is central and there to consider the contexts of theory, criticism, and editorial practice to which it relates.

In contrasting archetype, or "Urtex"–oriented, and version-oriented textual criticism, I have already pointed to the opposed directional perspective in the two approaches to the textual materials. In the one mode, textual criticism endeavors to ascend from the extant textual states to the recovery of a lost, purer text behind them. In the other, it follows the compositional and transmissional descent. This means also that the modes focus on different orders of variance. To recover the purer text requires stripping the transmission of its corruption. Yet where versions are concerned, transmissional corruption is really only a side issue. The variance that matters here is not transmissional but revisional (and, hence, generally authorial). Versions may be distinguished by the revisions which transform them, one into another.

Or perhaps I had better say—with a view, for example, to theatre versions of Shakespeare's plays—the variance that distinguishes versions is not corruptive but text-constitutive. Corruptive variance is what textual criticism has long traditions of handling. The underlying authentic text is thought of as stable, merely impaired in isolated spots or areas of textual error, and restorable to full integrity by spot correction and emendation. While corruptions impair an original context, and contextual considerations therefore may help to define and isolate the textual error, their elimination does not alter but precisely restores the original context. Revisions, by contrast, are always alterations of text and modifications of context. Therefore, they can never be conceived of as confined in isolation to the spots or areas of text they manifestly alter.

To consider context determination of variants means relating text-critical and editorial concerns to theories of text. No theoretical concept of the text is required to deal adequately with textual corruption, since the business here is to identify and eliminate textual error. If we observe how this is done—excising and replacing the corrupt element in the edition base text—we cannot fail to notice that this is a pattern of procedure which, in editing as we

are used to seeing it practiced, is equally employed to cope with revisional variance. The procedure is called copytext editing. In fulfillment of W.W. Greg's suggestions for a pragmatic approach to editing in the face of typical transmissional situations for Renaissance texts—his "Rationale of Copy-Text"⁸—variance recognized as revisional in derivative, post-first-edition witnesses is grafted onto the edition base text, or copy-text, to yield the critically edited text. (It may be noted in passing that this is a significant extension of the reward-directed text-critical and editorial approach.) Such an edited text of additive elements is justified by invoking authorial intention. The objection voiced by, for example, German version-oriented textual criticism against copy-text editing is that the copy-text editor proceeds like a medieval scribe contaminating sources. In so doing, he obliterates the constitutive determinants of the version. Pragmatically, the objection may be, and has been, brushed aside. Yet theoretically, it deserves serious consideration.⁹

The concept of the "version" as currently defined by German editorial scholarship derives from a structuralist view of the literary text. What constitutes the literary text is not the additive accretion of its elements, but their mutual relationship on multiple structural levels. Hence, a change, a revision, is never simply an isolated replacement, addition or subtraction. As it may be induced by the context relationship of the word or passage touched in the revision, so it in turn affects and modifies the context into which it enters. What this implies is the essentially critical relevance of revisional variance. The versional approach, having taken as its point of departure from text theory control and balance the pragmatism towards text inherent in textual studies themselves, operates under a critical premise conceived in advance of the formalisms which rule textual criticism and editing.¹⁰

The critical premise of the versional approach has three main consequences. One concerns the pre-decisions on the text-to-be-edited, or the edition base text. What is to be regarded as a version of a literary work is determined in literary-critical terms and under the auspices, further, of the circumstances of its composition and the history of its publication and reception. Thus, an edition may opt for a compositional state before publica-

⁸W.W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-51): 19-36; and *Collected Papers*, pp. 374-391.

⁹See Hans Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231-264, and the response by G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," *Studies in Bibliography* 29 (1976): 167-211.

¹⁰Several collections of essays over the past two decades have served to define and discuss the positions of German editorial scholarship: *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Hans Zeller and Gunter Martens (München: Beck, 1971); "Edition und Wirkung," *LiLi. Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975), Heft 19/20; and *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 101 (1982), Sonderheft "Probleme neugermanistischer Edition," and 105 (1986), Sonderheft "Editionsprobleme der Literaturwissenschaft."

tion, or for the first-edition version (as in the case of Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werther*, regardless of the fact that the author much revised it for inclusion in his *Collected Works*; it was the first-edition version that all Europe read and responded to with a wave of suicides), or for a post-publication authorial revision, or, if a play, a theatre version. Free in his options, the editor is not constrained by an all-ruling respect for the author's final intentions. He is not the author's executor, but the historian of the text. This consideration leads to the second and third consequences, which concern the treatment of the text and the design of the apparatus. With regard to the text, the version edited must be left inviolate, emended only in instances of indubitable textual error. The design of the apparatus must carry the weight of the history of the text, which in editorial terms now means the body of the revisional variance, and must be able to relate in a meaningful way (meaningful, that is, under the critical premise of the context relationship of variants) those variances of the edited text.

In editing, the inherited apparatus forms were designed to deal with corruptive variance. They record the isolable incidence of corruption in itemized cumulative lists. A reference and a lemma identify the spot or area of elimination of a textual error. The juxtaposition in the lemmatized entry of established and rejected readings allows the editorial decisions to be judged individually. Inherent in the body of the rejected readings is a history of the text, which, however, under the auspices of the "pure-text" edition, is strictly a history of its corruption in transmission. In variorum editions, interestingly, this type of listing becomes a record of the editorial, or the variant printing history. The emendatorial mode of treating revisional variance in copytext editing, finally, has also led to adapting the lemmatized list as the apparatus format for recording authorial text superseded in revision.

It goes without saying that the lemmatized list was inherited also by German editors. Yet with the awareness of the fundamental difference in nature between transmissional and revisional variance, and the growing sensitivity to the contextual relationship of revisions, a record of variants in fragmented isolation by lemmata came to be recognized as unsuited to rendering revisional variance readable in context. The demand arose instead for integrative apparatus forms to fulfill this purpose. The most expansive form would be the parallel presentation of complete, and individually integral versions—feasible perhaps (and occasionally practiced) for brief lyrics, but unwieldy (and economically prohibitive) for texts of greater length. The task of analysis was given over largely to the reader and user of such an edition of parallel texts, and the synthesizing potential of editing was forgone entirely.

At this juncture, an all-important factor in the versional orientation of textual studies comes into play which I have hitherto held back from mentioning. To think in terms of revisional variance and the "version" means to focus on the genetics of a text, as well as on the genetic relationship of the



Portrait of Friedrich Hölderlin (circa 1792) from a pastel by F.C. Hiemer, reproduced in Hölderlin's *Selected Poems* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1944). *HRHRC Collections*.

text, or textual states, of a literary work. Just as the Shakespearean textual situation provided the strong incentive for developing bibliography as the centerpiece of methodology in Anglo-American textual criticism and editing, so it was the ample preservation of texts in manuscripts and successive states of revision for Goethe, and nineteenth-century literature in general, that fostered an early awareness of the genetic dimension of textual materials in the German approach.

Specific editorial responses, however, were slow to develop. The combined legacy of “best-text” editing and the lemmatized apparatus remained strong. The turning point to a new mode of editing came in the 1940s with Friedrich Beissner’s edition of Hölderlin’s poetry.¹¹ Rooted in an aesthetics of organic growth, he devised an apparatus model to display the stages of composition of the poetic texts from first seeds to final fruition. It was an integrative apparatus by which the text in successive accretion and revision was made readable as a consecutive arrangement of contexts. The underlying aesthetic concept was teleological, so there was no question but to privilege the end state of composition as the reading-text version of the edition.

Beissner’s new departure set in motion a whole new wave of text-critical theory and editorial practice. The manuscript—i.e., the many-layered working draft—became an editorial object in its own right. Though unachieved texts—text abandoned in composition, left as fragments, never published—led to the recognition of the fallacy in Beissner’s organic growth aesthetics, nevertheless Beissner’s approach proved compositional processes amenable to editorial treatment and presentation. The compositional process, too, came to be seen increasingly in its relevance to the published text, and if the versional approach to editing had begun by considering revisional variance between published versions, there was no great difficulty in recognizing composition and revision as two sides of the same coin, flipped, as it were, about the moment of first publication. Consequently, no ontological significance for the work tended to be invested in the act of publication.

Clearly, text-critical thinking in these dimensions arrived at its own material-based insights into the simultaneous process and product character of texts, which modern text theory has developed independently by analytical abstraction. The awareness of text genetics in text-critical pragmatism has developed an understanding of the dialectic coexistence, in the documents preserving and transmitting a work and its texts, of textual stability (in the version) and textual instability, or dynamics (in the documented composition and revision). (In terms closer to structuralist thinking, I have elsewhere

¹¹Friedrich Hölderlin, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Friedrich Beissner (Stuttgart: Grosse Stuttgarter Ausgabe, 1943), ff.

referred to this dialectic coexistence as one of the “synchrony and diachrony of texts.”)¹²

Some interest perhaps may attach to a few aspects of the debate by which the new understanding was developed. The notion of “the version” in fact came under some pressure from the ubiquity, proliferation, and multi-level occurrence of revisional variance, especially in compositional documents, i.e., manuscript drafts. In the extreme, an attempt at formal definition of the “version” in terms of the “variant” led to the proposition that even a single revision constituted a new version of a text.¹³ There are examples in lyrical poetry which answer to the proposition in practice.¹⁴ Yet applied to most texts and documents that carry revisions, it is unwieldy, hair-splitting, fragmentizing, disintegrative—since what it does is break up a text by its revisions into an all but endless series of sets of differently correlated textual elements. Or so it seems to do as long as each set is regarded as a stable text, potentially, in its own right.

From an opposite angle in the debate, textual stability was categorically denied and the concept of “the version,” if not rejected, at least evaded or suspended. An entirely new textual body was proposed as the object of editing, namely the dynamic text in the shape of an integral apparatus incorporating every act and stage of composition and revision in one continuous presentation. Both analytic and synthetic, the apparatus was the text itself in its very dimension of chronology and verbal and structural articulation. A reading text, deemed a concession mainly to the “general reader,” could be dispensed with—so it was proclaimed—in a scholarly edition.¹⁵ I hasten to add that I have not yet seen an edition realizing the relentless purity of this idea. In more sober practice, editions proceeded to synthesize the theoretical opposition. With a chosen version as reading text, the dynamic apparatus became the vehicle for putting the revisional variance, readable as a text in genetic progress, at the critic’s disposal.

The critical relevance of compositional and revisional variance is uppermost in much discussion of the integral apparatus format and the idea of encoding in it a text in progress. In emphasizing the opportunity for looking into the author’s workshop, early rationalizations of an interest in compositional and revisional materials may seem to admit to not much more than a wish to satisfy scholarly curiosity. Yet eventually questioning into the status of such mate-

¹²Hans Walter Gabler, “The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*,” *TEXT* 1 (1984 for 1981): 305-326.

¹³Zeller entertains this notion in “A New Approach.”

¹⁴A stunning example is Paul Eluard’s renaming of a love poem as “Liberté.” See Louis Hay, “Le texte n’existe pas,” *Poétique* 62 (1985): 157-58, and “Does Text Exist?,” *Studies in Bibliography* 41 (1988): 75-76.

¹⁵This is the thesis of Gunter Martens, “Textdynamik und Edition,” in *Texte und Varianten*, pp. 165-201.

rials became more searching, reflecting as it did on the hermeneutical relevance of text history, on instability as an ontological duality of texts, and on the inherent poetics of a text as interpretable from the patterns of its variation. (Gunter Martens has been perhaps the most articulate reasoner in the German debate for the theoretical implications inherent in the variance dimensions of texts.)¹⁶ On a more pragmatic level, it has been argued that the variation patterns along the diachronic axis of a text provide the textual basis for interpretations distinctly less speculative than any critical discourse responding to a one-level text alone. (This was one of my points, exemplified by a passage from *Ulysses*, in a paper delivered at the first STS conference in 1981.)¹⁷ Early and late, too, compositional and revisional variance has of course been related to the author. The look into the workshop means glancing over the author's shoulder. Beissner, in his premise of the organic growth of the text, assumed an authorial intention towards perfection. An exploration of writing processes with an understanding of psychology will bring out an author's failings as well as his successes in achieving a text. From his work of composition and revision in manuscripts and successive published editions, moreover, he will appear both as writer and as reader of his texts. With James Joyce as with Henry James, I have found it an extraordinarily fruitful critical path to fold back, as it were, the interests and perspective of a reader-response approach onto the text production, the writing process itself.¹⁸ From all points of view, then, there is an insistence on the critical potential of textual materials over and above their assumed role as the raw materials of scholarly editing—a potential which, if realized, is capable of bridging the gap between textual studies and literary criticism and of leading textual studies and literary criticism out of the ghetto of their self-inflicted specialist hermeticism.

There are signs that new forms of critical discourse are growing out of text-critical and editorial activity. In two recent instances that I wish to mention the attempt has been made to employ an edition's apparatus in new ways to integrate critical discourse. One instance is the commentary on emendations in the Oxford Shakespeare. The extent of discursive reasoning about readings in the *Textual Companion* to the Oxford *Complete Works* is unparalleled, as far as I can see, in twentieth-century editions.¹⁹ It exceeds the conventional "Textual Notes" sections and abandons the austere formalism of apparatus entries (in regular "Lists of Emendations"), on which modern editions have

¹⁶Gunter Martens, "Texte ohne Varianten? Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Frankfurter Hölderlin-Ausgabe in der gegenwärtigen Situation der Editionsphilologie," *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 101 (1982), Sonderheft "Probleme neugermanistischer Edition," pp. 43-64.

¹⁷Gabler, "Synchrony and Diachrony."

¹⁸For Joyce, see Hans Walter Gabler, "Joyce's Text in Progress," *Texte. Revue de Critique et de Théorie Littéraire* 7 (1988): 227-247.

¹⁹Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, eds. with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare. A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

prided themselves, in favor of an amply verbalized discourse achieving an easy transition between text-critical and literary critical argument.

Perhaps we are seeing the beginnings of a "New Commentary" (what with "New Literary History," or "New Historicism," why not "New Commentary?"). While commentary (as one of the sectional categories of the editorial apparatus) used to be a basic function of textual studies and editing, we need little reminder that, with the specializations of text-analytical and text-critical skills, editorial and critical commentary in editions has been drastically reduced, and the critical commentary often abandoned altogether, or else segregated and delegated by the textual editor to a collaborator.

Again, the development hasn't been so radical in German as in Anglo-American editing, and Gerhard Seidel—in the second of my instances of a new deployment of the apparatus—has been able to depend on a continual lip-service, at least, being paid to the commentary requirement for scholarly editions.²⁰ Against the background of tradition for the sectional categories of the editorial apparatus, he has rethought their correlation. The text in his proposal is a poem by Bertolt Brecht as it went through a series of drafts and rewritings. On paper—at the material surface, so to speak—the process is textual, and amenable therefore, and to that extent, to a genetic apparatus encoding. However, the draft changes and rewritings spring from the nature of the poem itself, its intellectual and emotional core. A poetic address to Karl Kraus, satirist and cultural and social critic in post-World-War-I Vienna whom Brecht admired and considered his literary and intellectual ally, it reflects in its rewritings Brecht's inner turmoil at what he perceived, or thought to perceive, as Kraus's compromises at the rise to power of German fascism. Yet in the writing, and as it appears, through the writing, Brecht's attitude and understanding altered and became transformed in textual processes possessing qualities beyond those formalizable in apparatus notations.

Acts and impulses of writing constantly interpenetrate, but it is to the analysis and record of the "acts," more than the "impulses," that apparatus formalizations lend themselves. Only critical interpretative discourse can explore the "impulses"—yet editors have commonly left the field of interpretative discourse entirely to the critics. This is true even where Hans Zeller makes the important distinction between "Befund" and "Deutung," emphasizing that, for the successful critical editing of draft manuscripts, it is necessary both to ascertain with care and precision what is there on the manuscript page ("Befund") and to interpret it ("Deutung").²¹ The kind of

²⁰Gerhard Seidel, "Intentionswandel in der Entstehungsgeschichte. Ein Gedicht Bertolt Brechts über Karl Kraus historisch-kritisch ediert," *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 101 (1982), Sonderheft "Probleme neugermanistischer Edition," pp. 163-188.

²¹Hans Zeller, "Befund und Deutung. Interpretation und Dokumentation als Ziel und Methode der Edition," *Texte und Varianten*, pp. 45-89.

interpretation he envisages, however, is of the marks on paper to correlate them, and it certainly does not become discursive but enters wholly into the system of the genetic apparatus symbols. On the commentary level, Zeller remains one of the staunchest upholders of the division between editing and interpretation. Yet his distinction between "Befund" and "Deutung" may be found to hold greater potential than he intended for it. For this distinction would seem to have added an incentive to Seidel's procedure in his paradigmatic case where, as he persuasively argues, the acts of writing and rewriting demand to be critically interpreted, even to be correlated, and so to be interpreted not merely as marks on paper but for the writing impulses behind them. But then it would make only partial sense to communicate the interpretation of the material acts by apparatus formalizations and not also the text-critical and editorial reading and exploration of the impulses. Thus, Seidel proposes an integral (genetic) apparatus whose formalizations modulate into discourse. Interrelating the acts and impulses of the writing, the apparatus as extended into commentary responds to the writing process as both a scribal and a mental activity.

With the discursive emendation notes for the Oxford Shakespeare and with Seidel's model of a genetic apparatus extended into commentary—the point reached with the critically reinforced "new commentary"—present-day textual studies and editing are ready to encounter French "critique génétique."²² Strictly speaking, "critique génétique" is not a branch of textual studies, as textual studies have conventionally been understood to lead to scholarly editing. "Critique génétique" is a critical discipline operating on the material immediacy of authorial manuscripts. Granting at the outset a structuralist view of the text, the discipline has made the "avant-textes" (notes, sketches, drafts, proofs) its field of study. "Critique génétique" is concerned with the critical implications of the writing process, with the psychology of writing and the image of the author as projected through his creativity, with the Derridean "différance" of all writing as it materializes in sequences of variants and in the advancing and receding of textual states. In the words of Louis Hay, its main originator, "critique génétique" does not claim for itself new theoretical foundations, it opens up, rather, the "third dimension of literature"—which, with a reassessment of the role of criticism in textual studies, is precisely the way of the future for these disciplines.²³

²²Comprehensively surveyed in P.M. de Biasi, "Vers une science de la littérature. L'analyse des manuscrits et la genèse de l'oeuvre," *Encyclopedia universalis* (Symposium, 1988): 466-476.

²³Louis Hay, "Die dritte Dimension der Literatur. Notizen zu einer 'critique génétique,'" *Poetica* 16 (1984): 307-323.