Devils and Angels

Textual Editing and Literary Theory

EDITED BY PHILIP COHEN

University Press of Virginia
Charlottesville and London

Universitäts-
Bibliothek
München

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF VIRGINIA
Copyright © 1991 by the Rector and Visitors
of the University of Virginia
First published 1991

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Devils and angels : textual editing and literary theory / edited by
Philip Cohen.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8139-1315-2
1. Editing. 2. Criticism, Textual. I. Cohen, Philip G.
PN162.D48 1991
808'.02—dc20 90-22580
CIP

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

AAcknowledgments vii
IIntroduction ix

1 *Literary Pragmatics and the Editorial Horizon*
JEROME J. MCGANN 1

2 *The Autonomous Author, the Sociology of Texts, and the Polemics of Textual Criticism*
PETER SHILLINGSBURG 22

3 *Variety in Editing and Reading: A Response to McGann and Shillingsburg*
T. H. HOWARD-HILL 44

4 *Textual Product or Textual Process: Procedures and Assumptions of Critical Editing*
PAUL EGGERT 57

5 *The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing*
D. C. GREETHAM 78

6 *Notes on Emerging Paradigms in Editorial Theory*
PHILIP COHEN and DAVID H. JACKSON 103

7 *The Rhetorical Politics of Editing: A Response to Eggert, Greetham, and Cohen and Jackson*
STEVEN MAILLOUX 124

8 *Issues of Identity and Utterance: An Intentionalist Response to "Textual Instability"*
JAMES MCLAVERTY 134

9 *Unsought Encounters*
HANS WALTER GABLER 152

10 *The Textual Event*
JOSEPH GRIGELY 167

11 *Making Texts New: A Response to Gabler, McLaverty, and Grigely*
WILLIAM E. CAIN 195

Contributors 205
Index 209

9

Unsought Encounters

HANS WALTER GABLER

NGLO-AMERICAN TEXTUAL CRITICISM and editing has in the 1980s been subjected to some insistent theoretical probing. This is a new and unaccustomed situation for an empirical discipline. Since securing its foundations in bibliography, it had developed with great assurance a methodology derived from the paradigm of the transmission of Shakespeare's texts. Focused on the copytext pragmatics of W. W. Greg and the establishment of eclectic critical texts under the ultimate arbitration of author's final intentions, it was the methodology available when editorial interests moved into other areas. Textual situations encountered for authors and works in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did not prove this received methodology to be universally applicable. The widely recognized current crisis in Anglo-American textual criticism also stems from the failure of many textual critics to grapple with recent developments in literary theory. Structuralism, deconstruction, psychologism, text theory, and New Historicism have successively and together superseded the New Criticism. Anglo-American editors, however, have in general resisted employing these new approaches to question and modify the theoretical foundations and empirical procedures of modern textual criticism. While a small number of textual critics have challenged some of the tradition's basic assumptions, their work is in a curious way lagging behind the conceptualizations of "text," "authorization,"

"version," and "textual dynamics" found in German editorial scholarship and the French critical discipline of *critique génétique*. A critical reading of recent controversial books on textual criticism by Jerome J. McGann, Hershel Parker, and Peter Shillingsburg in light of such conceptualizations, while they have availed themselves of the above-mentioned theoretical developments, suggests that the Anglo-American editorial debate stands to profit from as yet unsought encounters with its continental counterpart.

The application of Greg's "Rationale of Copy-Text" to the texts of nineteenth-century American authors elicited fierce, yet on the whole unfocused, polemics. These responses and reactions gave way to the more careful competence of Jerome McGann's *Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (1983). He analyzes the elevation of a rule of procedure, Greg's rationale, to a theory of editing. The unquestioning assumption of an editor's obligation to fulfill the author's intentions he sees as ideologically rooted, ultimately, in a concept of the autonomy of the creative artist (40–42). Against this, he assumes an alternative ideological stance in emphasizing—as James Thorpe had unideologically done before him—the social forces that contribute to shaping a literary text in production. He convincingly argues that these are important for textual criticism. Their recognition helps to define the specific historicity of literary works and texts. The consideration of such historicity, in turn, advances a discussion of the textual-critical concept of the "version" to the extent of accounting for the outward, i.e., the socio-historical, determinants of versions. In another respect, McGann's emphasis on the social, and therefore ineluctably collaborative, shaping of texts as books suggests a need to reassess the conventional editorial treatment of textual variants that result in the process of such shaping. At the same time, McGann gives little thought to their relative marginality in relation to the comprehensive range of variance characteristically encountered in the composition and production of a literary work as a whole. Conceptually, he faces the full complexity neither of "version" nor of "variance." If his *Critique* thus sidesteps, or wholly ignores, central text-critical issues, the reason would seem to be that it also neither radically questions copytext editing as a principle nor attacks the notion of "text" in relation to current theories of literature and theories of text to the length that our present-day consciousness of theory would seem to require.

In advance by some twenty years, the German-speaking countries have

since the 1950s seen an indigenous discussion of theories and principles of textual criticism and critical editing. Even though there may be some truth in the self-criticism that (perhaps by a typically Teutonic failure) the intensive debate for a time prevented rather than furthered the realization of critical editions, most if its issues, if not all of its propositions, would seem relevant in the Anglo-American crisis. As it is, the Anglo-American debate has on its own terms in many cases hardly begun to discern pivotal problem areas. Of these, the most central one is that of the concept of "text" itself.

When Jerome McGann endeavors to dissociate the guiding principle of fulfilling the author's intentions from W. W. Greg's proposals for copytext editing, he attempts to revert to, but does not question the validity of, their original pragmatism. He concedes an applicability of copytext editing procedures in principle and does not submit the concept of text that implicitly underlies them to his critique, neither in general nor in relation to the textual situations for which these procedures were specifically devised. In "Struktur and Genese in der Editorik. Zur germanistischen und anglistischen Editionsforschung" (1975), Hans Zeller puts the theoretical objections to copytext editing most succinctly. The copytext editor in his avowed eclectic procedures acts in the manner of the medieval scribe, conflating, or "contaminating," textual versions of a work. Moreover, his notion of text is one unreflectedly inherited from editors of classical texts. He perceives variants only in their stemmatological relations forwards and backwards and assumes that such was also the author's perception. The critical text for him results merely from a sum of textual elements individually exchangeable and does not take their functional relationships into account. The sum of variants of the states of a work appears to him as the variants of a *single* text (114–15).

Zeller's objections are carefully aimed. They concern specifically the treatment in copytext editing of the order of variance that holds true interest for present-day German textual criticism and editing: namely, the variance of authorial composition and revision. Their unaccustomed perspective also helps to recognize the extent to which it is not authorial variance, but transmissional variance, that stands at the center of attention in the Anglo-American practice of the disciplines. Culminating in the sophistications of bibliography, the main thrust of their methodology is directed toward detecting, analyzing, and undoing transmissional corruption. Eclectic editing according to the author's final intentions, carried out

as the grafting of later revisions onto the chosen copytext, is then simply patterned on the received model of emending textual error. This is how the perception of variants in their stemmatological relations and of a text in progression as an additive series of readings, a sum of variants, has come to be upheld. While McGann's main concern in his *Critique* is with variance resulting from social collaboration, his call is thus for their inclusion rather than subtraction from the critically edited text. His argument revealingly links variants of production to Greg's type of the "indifferent variant" (113– 15). Since they are capable of rescuing categorizable readings from the illegitimacy of error into the realm of legitimate text, the attitudes to text and the routines of procedure of copytext editing appear here expressly called upon to serve McGann's ulterior theoretical and critical objectives. Text-critically speaking, his frame of reference remains the text considered as the sum of its variants.

A textual error—a mistake in authorial inscription, a corruption in transmission—signals its "illegitimacy" by its apparent lack of a systematic or structural relation to the text in which it occurs. That it stands out unsystematically and as a fault in the structure are conditions upon which error-oriented textual criticism depends. To emend a textual error means to restore the system and heal the structure—and it is editors alone who confront texts to be emended. Although incidentally correcting or emending, authors, by contrast, have before them texts they are writing or wish to revise. These are not corrupt texts. If they are deemed imperfect—calling for rewriting or revision—the imperfection is not material, not on the level of the signs on paper (save for the incidental inscriptional flaw or misprint in need of emendation or correction). Rather the imperfection is conceptual and compositional, on the level of thought and imagination and their articulation in language. In shaping and reshaping language and thereby creating the total linguistic performance that constitutes a work through all its stages of composition and revision, authors bring forth texts upon texts. By way of generating and inscribing variants, they manipulate linguistic structures, be it the incipient structures of the work in composition or the temporarily stabilized structures of completed drafts and published texts. The authorial variance, consequently, is always systematic. Superseded and superseding readings each stand in a relational context, and every antecedent text, just as every succeeding text, is to be regarded as a structural system of language. If these texts are successive synchronic structures, the work as a whole appears diachronically struc-

tured as a succession of such synchronic texts. Their invariance provides the structural base, while the variance indicates the relational complexity in time of the work's texts. In total contrast to textual error, authorial variance thus provides a twofold measure to the linguistic system of a work of literature, accentuating the contextual space of their texts and sounding the temporal depth of their writing.

From such theorizing about text and variance, the objections on principle to copytext editing ultimately derive, insofar as the copytext editing method—handling authorial variance formally like textual error—reaches out to establishing a critical text of the author's final intention eclectically from a succession of discrete author's texts. (The objections do not detract from the admiration of it as a method where it operates within the confines of its error-oriented origins.) The attitude toward "text" and "variance" which I have sketched is clearly structuralist in orientation. Given our present-day state of theoretical awareness in literary studies—an awareness the Anglo-American debate over textual criticism has hitherto remained virtually untouched by—such an attitude betrays its age. The focus on authorial composition and revision in German textual criticism and editing set in with Friedrich Beissner's Hölderlin edition of the 1940s. With it arose the perspective on the context relationship of variance and, more generally, a desire to define concepts of "text." Beissner's concept centered on organic growth toward unity and superior aesthetic integrity. Since the 1960s, it has given way to the structuralist concept mainly under the influence of the work on linguistics, poetics, and aesthetics of the Prague structuralists. The first of the major collections of original essays through which the German text-critical debate has been carried forward, *Texte und Varianten* (1971), edited by Hans Zeller and Gunter Martens, therefore significantly includes a contribution by Miroslav Červenka, "Textologie und Semiotik." Followers of the Thorpe/Gaskell/McGann line of thought that attributes ontological significance for the work to the "socializing" act of publication will be gratified to find that Červenka's arguments similarly take their departure from the semiotics of the act of publication. Yet as these arguments proceed to considerations of the relationship of textual criticism (or "textology") to poetics, of diachrony and synchrony, and of the semiotics of the variant as well as of the linguistics and stylistics of variance, they reveal an attitude of exploring and questioning the fundamentals of textual criticism as yet beyond the ken of the Anglo-American debate. From

its underlying concepts of "text" and "variance," the German discussion has encouraged further endeavors to situate textual criticism in relation to main critical concerns—e.g., production and reception aesthetics—and to develop principles for establishing critical texts and formats for the apparatus presentation of variance by which editions may best serve such concerns.[1]

Beissner's concept of text, under which the contextual correlations of variance were perceived in terms of an organic growth, could and did easily coexist with an orientation in editorial procedure toward authorial intention similar to that still current in Anglo-American text-critical and editorial thought. Linked with a shift of focus from author to text implied in the structuralist concept, the orientation toward intention has since been neutralized, or even abandoned, in German theorizing. With a view to the editorial realization of its system of principles, this has consequently led to an emphasis on the strict historicity of texts and their documentation. Such an emphasis follows logically, in particular, from understanding the work as a diachronic succession of discrete texts. At the same time it signals a continued adherence to the notion of textual criticism as a branch of historical scholarship despite the latent ahistoric implications of structuralism.

The Anglo-American discussion has recently seen its own turn, or return, to a mode of historicism in Hershel Parker's *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (1984). From a critical point of departure, and thus by a route different from McGann's, he too perceives in the premises of received textual criticism an allegiance to a notion of autonomy, the autonomy of New Criticism's "verbal icon," by conception an ahistoric text. Against this notion he urges the historicity of the author and of the creative process. With suggestive, if on the whole unsustained, sidelights on the psychology of the creative process, he situates textual historicity biographically in the author and the conditions and circumstances of the acts of writing and revision. Assuming something like a one-to-one relationship of intention to words and of articulated language to meaning, Parker champions intention—linking it as he does not only to the words inscribed but to the meaning they embody—far beyond the observance of intention in received textual criticism. He takes intention to be unequivocally written into the words and language of the original acts of composition by the authority of the author, whence it can and must be elicited as meaning by evaluative acts of interpretation in total deference to that

authority. While deploring the alleged critical affinities of the principles and practice of textual criticism he attacks, Parker appears thus at bottom not to have shed his own allegiance to the modes of interpretation and evaluation of New Criticism. He recognizes, it is true, writing as a process. Yet the acts of revision which the process involves tend to fall victim, as "flawed texts," to his evaluative grasp because he has so strongly privileged the original acts.

In the final resort, texts—the *text* itself, as it were—recede under the heavy, and at the same time curiously biography-restricted, emphasis on the author and his intentions and meanings in Parker's mode of a historicist approach to textual criticism. If an approach to textual criticism it is. Indeed, were it not for Parker's insistent and provocative engagement with current assumptions and practices in editing, one would not need to see his theses in the light of the ongoing text-critical debate. Foremost, his book is an essay in genetic criticism, a mode of criticism that, as the current French *critique génétique* demonstrates, may be profitably divorced, or kept apart, from text-critical and editorial concerns. It is clear, however, that the book is wholly unaware that the questions it empirically grapples with represent part—albeit but a fraction—of the problematics for which *critique génétique* was developing theories and a discourse during the very years that Parker's views were forming.[2] The essay nevertheless has the merit of blazoning the interdependence of textual and literary criticism.

In the present attempts to redefine the coordinates for textual criticism, it is doubtless desirable, indeed essential, to reestablish its links with literary criticism. What must be doubted, however, is that the path laid out by Parker is viable. He either rejects or ignores too much of what literary criticism and linguistics and literary theory today believe to know about the ontology and structures, as well as of the potentials of meaning and significance, of texts and the literary artifacts both in production and reception. Again, the way in which Parker's issues have been dealt with in the German text-critical discussion of longer standing may be profitably looked at.

German editorial commentary recognizes the critical activity of interpretation as relevant in two senses. Hans Zeller's position essay, "Befund und Deutung" (1971), addresses its text-critical and editorial relevance, subjecting the notion of an absolute objectivity in editing to a careful critique. Text-critical and editorial activity may begin from a given ("Be-

fund"), but the moment it engages with that given, it enters upon interpretation ("Deutung"). It is only from admitting and accepting this basic implication of subjectivity that a critical edition can be organized and shaped to attain a controlled objectivity. From pronouncing an apparent home truth, Zeller penetrates to a systematic evaluation and coordination of the premises and practices of textual criticism and editing. He analyses the interpretative demand on the textual critic and editor arising from the textual documents, the author's will and intention, the conditions of textual authorization, the exigencies of transmission (e.g., how to define, localize and deal with "textual error"), and the social determinants of texts. The interpretative demands in every one of these areas make editorial judgment integral to a critical edition. Setting the conditions for its controlled objectivity by signaling both "Befund" and "Deutung," a critical edition in turn calls upon the critical judgment of the reader as counterpart to the editor's. The inevitability of interpretation renders textual criticism and editing a hermeneutic discipline.

In the second sense, interpretation—the reader's and the user's interpretation—engages with the critical edition to unlock the text. Gunter Martens focuses on this question in "Texterschliessung durch Edition" (1975), emphasizing the key function that critical editions have in their singular formating—established texts correlated to a multilevel system of apparatus—for critical interpretative discourse. Martens's argument is representative of the thorough revaluation that the apparatus of critical editions has experienced in German textual criticism and editing. The apparatus dimensions have been developed to carry the entire weight and complexity of the editor's understanding of his object, his or her critically subjective engagement with it, and the documentary as well as communicative function in relation to it. The transformation into apparatus in particular of textual genesis and textual history has established the integral apparatus—displaying variance in context—as categorically opposed to the conventional apparatus isolating individual variants by lemmata.

Martens takes a reception-oriented approach that at the same time is linked back to the semiotic perspective of the Prague structuralist aesthetics. It is in the apparatus, and the interrelation of text and apparatus, that interpretation may localize the full range of material for a comprehensive critical discourse. The function of an edition is to mediate "on the one hand, the historic determinacy of the artifact and its object representations, and on the other hand, the openness [indeterminacy] of the aes-

thetic object" (Martens 90). The potential of critical editions in particular is to lay open and render penetrable the nature of aesthetic language. The deployment of language in literary creation may be conceived as a process of desemanticization where the language tokens lose their unequivocal representational character. In the apparatus presentation of the creative process, of textual genesis, the increased self-reflexivity of language in literary texts becomes tangible.

In editions, works in their texts are laid out to be read in their diachronic depth. This may lead to the recognition that the acts of reading made editorially possible for the critical edition's user (as for no reader of straight readings texts) repeat or reenact the author's acts of reading in the writing process that shaped the text under his pen. Henning Boetius develops this notion into a model for a cybernetically dynamic simultaneity of production and reception, of writing and reading. Since the author in writing always, and near-simultaneously, is also the reader of the text in production, he may on the one hand still be regarded as the text's originator, guided by the idea of the text he wishes to produce. On the other hand, the text itself becomes the originator of its own continued production, since it will progressively guide the author's linguistic selections in writing. Not only reading acts, then, but in a sense also writing acts are acts of interpretation, and a consideration of this fact may serve to widen the appreciation of the hermeneutic implications in scholarly editions to be elicited in the critical discourse of the interpretation of literature.

From the vantage point of the theoretical considerations instanced by Zeller, Martens, and Boetius, it becomes obvious that Hershel Parker's empiric materials are amenable to a radically different understanding and critical treatment—even, and particularly, when genetically approached—from what *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* accords them. The strengths of the mode of historicism adumbrated in the German debate, too, become more clearly distinguishable. Its epicenter lies in the concept of the version. On the one hand, the version is defined by extrinsic historical determinants: versions are the finished draft or the published text with all the social ramifications of collaborative or contemporary reception (the German stock example is Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* which in its time, by the suicide it narrates, provoked a wave of suicides) or the radical postpublication revision (e.g., Wordsworth's second *Prelude*). The extrinsic definitional criteria are echoed both by McGann in his *Critique* (101)

and Peter Shillingsburg in *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age* (1986). The latter gives these criteria an extra twist by linking them to intention and ideality (47 ff., 51 ff.). On the other hand, the version is intrinsically definable in relation to textual variance. This is the criterion that orders the successive synchronic textual states within the diachrony of the work. Shillingsburg marginally touches upon the intrinsic differentiation of versions, yet neither McGann nor he seriously pursues the concept of the version much beyond the question of which version to select as the reading text of an edition. This is a question purely of editorial pragmatics. It may become problematic when the editing rationale is both dominantly single-text-centered and intention-oriented. Without such orientation, the issue is text-critically moot and may be settled at the editor's critical discretion and in consideration of the general interest in the edited work the edition expects to be catering to.

The specific text-critical relevance of the concept of the version lies in its intrinsic determinants. From a strict structuralist understanding of "text," Hans Zeller, as is well known, has gone in "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts" (1975) to the extreme of declaring a single variant sufficient to differentiate versions, since by a single variant a text attains a new system of structural interrelationship of its elements (241). For all its editorial impracticability, this is a sound enough theoretical proposition. From Anglo-American respondents, it has sensibly encountered empirical objections.[3] In German editorial theory, one may say that it has been balanced from within the system. It is tempting to recognize in the one-variant determination of the version a last foothold of a notion of the static, or stable, text. By logical application of the definition, the diachrony of the work is divided into a virtually endless series of discrete texts, each of them stable as a synchronic structure. The integral apparatus then in a sense cuts across this unwiedly abstraction, functionalized as it is to transform editorially a virtual series of stabilities into a presentation of the dynamics of a genetic process as textual progress. By force of the close interrelation of text and apparatus, the basic concept of the version is not jeopardized. While dynamically correlated in the apparatus presentation, the intrinsic criteria that mark the versions remain transparent as the variance representing the acts of writing whose history resides in the documents of composition and revision. Moreover, the version selected as a given edition's reading text additionally accentuates that history.

Such a concept of the version is distinctively text-related. Its historicity resides less in the author than in the text. With a view to Parker's contentions, such a concept does not view the text as a function of the author's biography. Rather the author and his biography are regarded as functions of the text. The basis for such a reversal of the commonsense perspective lies in the structuralist concept of the text. From it, a notion of the autonomy of the text may be freshly entertained as residing not in the realm of meaning and significance, or even of language positivistically conceived as a sum of readings and variants, but as arising from the dynamic reciprocity of writing and reading and hence to be defined as a semiotic autonomy of indeterminate potential.[4]

At this point in our survey, we can see that the notions in the German text-critical debate of text, interpretation, apparatus, and version interrelate and contribute to what may be called a "textual orientation in editing." We form the phrase by analogy to Peter Shillingsburg's key statement for the organization of his argument in *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age:* "The authorial orientation in editing has been for thirty or more years the dominant one in American scholarly editing" (31). Alone among the recent contributors to the Anglo-American controversies, Shillingsburg endeavors to systematize the terms and concepts relevant to textual criticism and editing. Unsurprisingly, in view of the approach he rethinks, the book's "Theory" section mainly sets out the conditions for arriving at an author-oriented *text.* Reflections on the apparatus, by contrast, remain a matter of "Practice." Predictably, too, the problem areas of "Authority" and "Intention" loom large as problem areas in his discussion. At their logical intersection we may observe intriguing ripples in the argument. It shows in the introduction of the notion of the "authenticated text" as the editorial result of observing authorial authority and intention and in a sense of the insufficiency of the "authenticated text" as an exclusive editorial goal in view of compositional and revisional variance (40–43). With an awareness of the German text-critical discussion, one recognizes that Shillingsburg is here on the brink of a consideration not only of the practical but also of the logical status of the apparatus in an edition. He also seems ready to consider the text-critical and editorial implications of an exploration of the genetic process in the specificity of the acts of writing.

A particular strength of Shillingsburg's book lies in the theory sections "Forms" and "Expectation." Options of editorial orientation are identified in the one, and their consequences outlined in the other. Together,

these chapters show how theories and principles of textual criticism as well as rationales and procedures of editing both derive from and influence the editor's medial position between authors and texts, on the one hand, and users and readers of editions, on the other. In light of our present endeavor to sketch out the contrast between the Anglo-American and the German text-critical approaches, we may take a step further and say that, given a shift in the dominant orientation—the authorial orientation here, the textual orientation there—distinct differences follow, for the definition, weighting, and correlation of what, by name, appears to be a largely identical series of theoretical and practical terms and issues.

This applies with some force to the notions of intention and authority. Problematical under the authorial orientation, they become marginalized under the textual one. Early in the German discussion, intention was discredited by its association with what was called *Intuitionsphilologie,* the type of subjective, even divinatory, editorial approach that in Germany, owing to the absence of a methodological control movement like that of harnessing bibliography to text-critical ends, persisted far longer than in England and America. In "Befund und Deutung," Zeller rejects the intuitional approach, and its authorial orientation and invocation of intention. Zeller's subsequent encounter in "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts" with the principles of copytext editing in general, and a close reading of the controversies around the CEAA Hawthorne and Crane editions in particular, reinforces that rejection. The complexities of definition that characterize the Anglo-American intention debate, as well as the contradictory editorial results under the auspices of authorial intention, lead him to the conclusion that "intention" is unsuitable as a text-critical and editorial guiding principle.

Taking pride of place instead as the editorial guiding principle in the German conceptual system is the notion of "authorization." By its nature it is a concept from which the author cannot be eliminated; yet by the way it is defined it does not admit to the full his authority over the text. (Hence it implicitly allows from the outset for the collaborative and social factors in text production that have been so bothersome in the intention debate). Under the overall historical and textual orientation of the German approach, "authorization" is peculiarly document-related. Its definition is a purely formal one, which is considered an advantage. A manuscript or typescript is regarded as authorized if the author has written it, has participated in its production or has demonstrably ordered it to be produced. A printing is regarded as authorized if the author has requested or

sanctioned it and if, moreover, he has provided copy, taken influence on its production, contributed his own revisions, or has requested it to be revised. By deliberate extension of the definition, as Zeller argues in "Struktur and Genese in der Editorik," the authorized document furnishes the editor with an authorized text version (118).

The authorized text version, then, is what the editor under the system must present with historical faithfulness and with emendation only of induitable textual errors. This begs the question of the textual error. The attempts to define it have been deliberately narrow. A textual critic trained in bibliography and empirically aware of the vagaries of textual transmission will balk, in particular, at Zeller's restricted conception of textual error in "Struktur und Genese in der Editorik": in a linear series of authorized documents/texts, errors definable as such in one document/text but untouched by correction in a subsequent act of document/text authorization must no longer be regarded as errors (120–21). If this is logical, it is nevertheless insistently contradicted by common sense and experience.[5] The logical fault appears to lie in the premise of equating document and text under the notion of authorization, and a concept of the authority of the text as distinct from that of the authorization of the document would seem to be called for.

To develop a broader definition of textual error, German theory would stand to profit from closer encounters with Anglo-American text-critical thinking. Initial steps in this direction have been taken. For its part, Anglo-American editors would gain an added orientation by confronting continental editorial scholarship. Such contact might, for example, modify the school of Greg's hitherto almost exclusive focus on the empiric and theoretical problems surrounding the text. For the discipline of textual criticism and editing, it is no less important to reflect on the nature and potential of conceptions and designs of the apparatus. In certain respects, apparatus and apparatus forms may, in editing, claim functional precedence over text. The encounters of Anglo-American textual criticism with theories and methodologies outside its school, however, have as yet remained unsought.

Notes

1. The focal essay is Gunter Martens, "Texterschliessung durch Edition."
2. A comprehensive survey of the aims and methods of *critique génétique* is

P. M. de Biasi's "Vers une science de la littérature. L'analyse des manuscrits et la genèse de l'oeuvre."

3. See, e.g., G. Thomas Tanselle's "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," esp. 197.

4. Jerome McGann has perceptively explored the critical potential of an edition which, as it happens, represents an attempt to wed Anglo-American and German text-critical thought and editorial procedure. In "'Ulysses' as a Post-Modern Text," he recognizes that the notional indeterminacy of texts according to deconstructionist theory is yet determinate within the textual materiality of scholarly editions.

5. Hans Zeller has recently reviewed the state of the art in German text-critical theory and editorial methodology in "Fünfzig Jahre neugermanistischer Edition." Among future requirements he mentions the need for further reflection on the concept of textual error.

Works Cited

Biasi, P. M., de. "Vers une science de la littérature. L'analyse des manuscrits et la genèse de l'oeuvre." *Encyclopaedia universalis*. Paris: Encyclopaedia Universalis France, 1988. 466–76.

Boetius, Henning. "Vorüberlegungen zu einer generativen Editionstheorie." In *Lili. Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975). Heft 19/20: *Edition und Wirkung*. 147–59.

Červenka, Miroslav. "Textologie and Semiotik." In *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*. Ed. Hans Zeller and Gunter Martens. München: C. H. Beck, 1971. 143–63.

Greg, W. W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–51): 19–36. Rpt. in *Collected Papers*. Ed. J. C. Maxwell. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966. 374–391.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke*. Ed. Friedrich Beissner and Adolph Beck. 7 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1946–1977.

Martens, Gunter. "Texterschliessung durch Edition." *Lili. Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975). Heft 19/20: *Edition und Wirkung*. 82–104.

McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

———. "'Ulysses' as a Post-Modern Text: The Gabler Edition." *Criticism* 27 (1985): 283–306.

Parker, Hershel. *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons: Literary Authority in American Fiction*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1984.

Shillingsburg, Peter. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1986.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention." *Studies in Bibliography* 29 (1976): 167–211.

Thorpe, James. *Principles of Textual Criticism*. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1972.

Zeller, Hans. "Befund und Deutung." In *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*. Ed. Hans Zeller and Gunter Martens. München: C. H. Beck, 1971. 45–89.

———. "Fünfzig Jahre neugermanistischer Edition. Zur Geschichte und künftigen Aufgaben der Textologie." *Editio* 3 (1989): 1–17.

———. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts." *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–64.

———. "Struktur und Genese in der Editorik. Zur germanistischen und anglistischen Editionsforschung." *Lili. Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 5 (1975). Heft 19/20: *Edition und Wirkung*. 105–26.

——— and Gunter Martens, eds. *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*. München: C. H. Beck, 1971.