Variants

The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship

15-16 | 2021

Textual Scholarship in the Twenty-First Century

Editors' Preface

Wout Dillen, Elli Bleeker, Laura Esteban-Segura and Stefano Rosignoli

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/1239>

DOI: 10.4000/variants.1239

ISSN: 1879-6095

Publisher

European Society for Textual Scholarship

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 July 2021

Number of pages: iii-x

ISSN: 1573-3084

Electronic reference

Wout Dillen, Elli Bleeker, Laura Esteban-Segura and Stefano Rosignoli, "Editors' Preface", *Variants* [Online], 15-16 | 2021, Online since 01 July 2021, connection on 16 July 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/variants/1239> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/variants.1239>

The authors

VARIANTS 15–16

Textual Scholarship in the Twenty-First Century

(Summer 2021)

ESTS Board members

Anne Baillot, France
Elli Bleeker, The Netherlands
Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas, Spain
Wout Dillen, Belgium
Palkó Gábor, Hungary
Jan Gielkens, The Netherlands
Roland S. Kamzelak, Germany
Anthony Lappin, Sweden
Elena Pierazzo, France
Wim Van Mierlo, United Kingdom
Gabriele Wix, Germany

General Editor

Wout Dillen

Associate Editor

Elli Bleeker

Guest Editor

Laura Esteban-Segura

Review Editor

Stefano Rosignoli

THE JOURNAL OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY
FOR TEXTUAL SCHOLARSHIP

GENERAL EDITOR
Wout Dillen

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Elli Bleeker

GUEST EDITOR
Laura Esteban-Segura

REVIEW EDITOR
Stefano Rosignoli

Variants. The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship.
Volume 15–16: Textual Scholarship in the Twenty-First Century.

ISSN: 1879-6095

ISSN-L: 1573-3084

© 2021

This volume, including all its contents, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license, and made available in Open Access at <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/>. The authors of the volume's individual contributions, who are identified as such, retain the copyright over their original work.

For more information on the CC BY 4.0 license, please refer to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>.

This volume was typeset in L^AT_EX by Wout Dillen using varianT_EX — a reusable template for journals in the Humanities, also developed by Wout Dillen. varianT_EX is open source, available on GitHub, and deposited in the Zenodo Open Science Repository. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3484652.

Contents

Editors' Preface	iii
-------------------------	------------

I. Essays	1
------------------	----------

1. <i>Lamyk Bekius</i> : The Reconstruction of the Author's Movement Through the Text, or How to Encode Keystroke Logged Writing Processes in TEI-XML	3
2. <i>Dirk Van Hulle</i> : Creative Concurrence. Gearing Genetic Criticism for the Sociology of Writing	45
3. <i>Ronald Broude</i> : Creators' Intentions and the Realities of Performance: Some Exemplary Editorial Problems from the Savoy Operas	63
4. <i>Paulius V. Subačius</i> : On the Threshold of Editorship. Or From <i>Collection</i> to <i>Oeuvre</i>	81
5. <i>Dariusz Pachoki</i> : Does the Editor Know Better? The Editorial Vicissitudes of the 20th Century Polish writers	105
6. <i>Anthony Lappin</i> : From <i>Christ the Saviour</i> to <i>God the Father</i> : Adjustments to Forgiveness in Donne's Short Poem, "Wilt thou forgive..."	123
7. <i>Mark Bland</i> : Some Answer Poems and their Manuscript History: Jonson, Herrick, and the Circulation of Verse	155
8. <i>Anne Baillot and Anna Busch</i> : Editing for Man and Machine. Digital Scholarly Editions and their Users	175

II. Work in Progress	189
-----------------------------	------------

9. <i>Hugo Maat</i> : Restricted Translation of Historical Dutch Text	191
10. <i>Michelle Doran</i> : Reflections on Digital Scholarly Editions: From Humanities Computing to Digital Humanities, the Influence of Web 2.0, and the Impact of the Editorial Process	213

Contents

11. <i>Dirk Van Hulle</i> : Dynamic Facsimiles: Note on the Transcription of Born-Digital Works for Genetic Criticism	231
III. Review Essays	243
12. <i>Stefano Rosignoli</i> : Tracing “Auto(bio)graphy” in “Three Novels” by Samuel Beckett: A Review Essay	245
IV. Reviews	255
13. <i>Christian Baier</i> : Thomas Mann, <i>Joseph und seine Brüder. Text und Kommentar</i>	257
14. <i>Manuela Bertone</i> : Carlo Emilio Gadda, <i>Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana</i>	261
15. <i>Jonas Rosenbrück</i> : Walter Benjamin, <i>Berliner Chronik / Berliner Kindheit um neunzehnhundert</i>	265
16. <i>Barbara Cooke</i> : Peter Shillingsburg, <i>Textuality and Knowledge: Essays</i>	269
17. <i>Hans Walter Gabler</i> : Paul Eggert, <i>The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies: Scholarly Editing and Book History</i>	273
Contributors	278
Peer Reviewers	284

Editors' Preface

The editorial team of *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship*, is proud to finally present you with its double Issue (15–16) titled “Textual Scholarship in the Twenty-First Century”. The title of this Issue was taken from the sixteenth annual ESTS conference of the same name, which took place in Málaga, Spain on 28–29 November 2019 where it was hosted by the Department of English, French and German Philology at the University of Málaga.

In good ESTS tradition, the Málaga conference brought together specialists in the theory and practice of textual scholarship from a wide range of countries, including Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland. Its 43 papers were organized into 12 sessions, which were arranged according to topics related to the theme of the conference such as: methods and tools in textual scholarship; types of editing; scholarly editions; texts worth editing; digital editing; the editing of historical texts; textual scholarship in the digital humanities; textual scholarship and translation studies; and directions and challenges in editing. In addition to the papers presented by members of the ESTS, the conference included two plenary lectures: one by Professor Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas (University of Alcalá) and another by Professor Jukka Tyrkkö (Linnaeus University and University of Turku). While de la Cruz Cabanillas delved into the topic of the editor's role by focusing on editorial interventions (and their implications) in Middle English texts, Tyrkkö was concerned with annotation practices of visual and paratextual features from both manuscripts and early printed publications, approaching the topic from the perspectives of both textual scholarship and corpus linguistics.

A lot has happened since those stimulating days in the temperate southern Spanish winter. Only a few short weeks later, a group of Chinese scientists would identify a new strain of the coronavirus that would rapidly hold the

world in its grasp — and is still wreaking havoc even now, eighteen months later, as nations around the globe are rushing to vaccinate their citizens. It has been an especially trying time for all of us, as we become restricted in our movement and personal interactions, as we try to strike a healthy work-life balance, and as we combat illness and hope for the health and safety of those close to us.

In academia, as indeed in all other professional fields, these events have invariably caused a plethora of delays as people struggle to adapt and re-adapt their daily routines to a “new normal” that itself continuously keeps evolving until this day. Priorities have to change when the infrastructures we have come to rely on suddenly fail us, and we personally have to take care of our elderly, our sickly family members, or our children. That is, of course, when we are lucky enough not to get sick ourselves, or have to mourn our loved ones. At the same time, infrastructures that we require for professional rather than personal reasons have in many cases become periodically inaccessible to us as well.

Indeed, as the world struggles to manage a global pandemic, it has become even more clear just how much our society relies on the affordances of (digital) technologies for the organisation of our personal and professional lives. Now more than ever, access to and proficiency with digital resources determine the extent to which individuals are able (or even allowed) to interact with each other, and to contribute to society. If the COVID-19 pandemic has taught our academic community anything, it is the inescapable fact that the resilience of our research relies upon the development, sustainability, interoperability, and conscientious criticism of our digital tools, technologies, and methodologies.

These and other exceptional circumstances have also caused the publication of this Issue to be delayed in all facets of our publication pipeline: from submissions to reviewing, from revisions to proofreading, and eventually to publication itself. As the editorial board of *Variants* 15–16, we apologize for these delays, which caused us to publish this Issue almost exactly a year later than originally planned. We thank our readers for their patience, but also all our contributors and other collaborators for their continued efforts and support in this difficult time.

The result of these efforts is a sizable and strong double issue that we believe will be the start of much further debate, inside and outside the *Variants* publication venue. The Issue combines eight full-length essays, three shorter work-in-progress pieces, one review essay, and five traditional literature reviews. Besides an obvious joint interest in and relevance to the field of textual scholarship, these contributions share a number of common threads.

The Issue opens with a promising look at what textual scholarship in the twenty-first century may yet hold in store for us, as early career researcher Lamyk Bekius explores the possibilities of critically analysing born digital writing processes in her essay titled “The Reconstruction of the Author’s Movement Through the Text”. There, she takes a closer look at the intricately detailed output of a keystroke logger called InputLog that was used by Flemish author Gie Bogaert when he wrote his novel *Roosevelt* (2016). InputLog tracks an author’s movements through the text in the smallest level of detail, resulting in informa-

tion that allows Bekius to map what she calls the “nanogenesis” of a literary work. The output of the InputLog software confronts researchers with new challenges: how should we approach the processing and analysis of these logs? To what extent can they be transformed and encoded into TEI-conformant XML? And, on a theoretical level, what constitutes a version? As Bekius’ remarkable essay elucidates, the difficulty here lies not just in learning to read and understand InputLog’s meticulous output, but also for a large part in visualizing the information and making it understandable for others — a struggle that will ring true to scholarly editors everywhere.

The preliminary implications of these difficulties are investigated further in a Work in Progress contribution by Dirk Van Hulle (one of Bekius’ PhD supervisors). Van Hulle suggests to visualize such nanogenetic analyses as “Dynamic Facsimiles”: filmic renditions of logged keystrokes as animated transcription videos. Interested readers will be able to view examples of such dynamic facsimiles in the online version of Van Hulle’s Work in Progress contribution on our Open Access journal’s website.¹ Van Hulle’s own full length essay in this Issue stays in the realm of genetic criticism as he contemplates what happens when a literary author composes several works simultaneously. Drawing on similar phenomena that are treated in the disciplines of bibliography and the history of the book, Van Hulle coins the term “Creative Concurrence” to denote the cross-pollination that may occur when such writing processes start to inform one another.

From authorial writing processes we then move on to editorial interventions — for better, or for worse. In “Creators’ Intentions and the Realities of Performance”, Ronald Broude provides us with a series of examples of typical problems that are posed by the editing of opera texts by focusing on Gilbert and Sullivan’s Savoy Operas. Over time, the opera texts have been altered for various reasons, such as the preference and talents of the different artists, the incorporation of opera traditions, censorship, and updates to outdated material. Mapping the textual development of these operas, writes Broude, offers readers “an unusual opportunity to study the dynamics of performing works over a substantial period”. Paulius V. Subačius goes on to examine the challenges of editing a collection of poems where the author (in this case: the Lithuanian poet Maironis) keeps rearranging, recomposing, and republishing his canonical collection of poems. Again, these changes were influenced by social and cultural developments. There exist about a hundred different textual variants, from authorial revisions of the metre, language, and length to editorial revisions of structural organisation, visual material, and dedications. And Dariusz Pachoki follows these inquiries into editorial difficulties by questioning whether the editor always knows best in an exploration of the quarrels between twentieth century Polish *émigré* writers and the editors-in-chief of the only two literary journals that would publish them at the time, *Kultura* and *Wiadomości*. Although the journals, based outside of Poland, did provide islands of intellectual freedom

¹ See: <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/1450>.

for Polish writers at the time, their editors often made far-reaching changes to the submitted articles.

The Issue then moves on to two essays where the authors use stemmatological analyses to expose the textual history of the poetic texts they study, propose scholarly edited versions of the poems in question, and consider the new implications their findings may have for our understanding of the texts. First, Anthony Lappin offers a thorough treatment of John Donne's poem "Wilt thou forgive...". In addition to the transmission history, Lappin's contribution includes a poetic analysis of the text. He shows that copyists slowly but surely "de-Donnified" it: over time, the poem in which Donne questioned faith was transformed into a religious hymn that fitted better with the author-image of Donne as a pious sermonizer. Secondly, Mark Bland investigates lingering questions of authorship attributions with regard to three seventeenth century answer poems. This genre of poems invited engagement or parody through their style and topic. Since answer poems often incorporated the original poem or imitated its style, it can be quite challenging to identify their authors. Using stemmatological methods, Bland is able to provide insight into the texts' transmission history and, in doing so, also sheds new light on the networks of manuscript circulation at the time. And for the final essay in this Issue, we return to the digital world we started from, as Anne Baillot and Anna Busch use their contribution titled "Editing for Man and Machine" to explore the affordances of digital scholarly editions. The accessibility of digital scholarly editions is a long-standing topic of discourse but, Baillot and Busch argue, anticipating multiple user scenarios can contribute to an edition's durability. With examples from the edition project "Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin 1800–1830", they illustrate new ways to make the content (textual transcriptions, facsimiles, metadata) of a digital edition accessible for human and algorithmic audiences alike.

After this rich collection of essays, we open the Work in Progress section of the Issue. This section traditionally houses shorter research narratives that are less formal, more practice oriented, and allow researchers to report on more preliminary research findings. Besides Van Hulle's aforementioned discussion of digital facsimiles, this Issue's Work in Progress section includes two more pieces. In the first one, Hugo Maat proposes an experimental (and arguably less time-consuming) new way of translating historical source materials to improve their readability that he devised in the early stages of the development of a digital edition for the correspondence of William of Orange. Maat has created a method to come to a "restricted translation": a modern translation of grammatical elements that keeps the lexical elements. It raises the question: is it possible (or feasible) to make a source text more accessible without obscuring its historical and semantic character?

In the second essay in this section, Michelle Doran reflects on the influence of Web 2.0 technologies on the field of digital scholarly editing. In particular, she discusses whether Twitter can function as an extra access point into the digital edition of "The Poems of Blathmac", an Early Irish poetry text. Could it be a

way for editors to interact with a wider audience, to show how the historical text can still be relevant? Her exploration of the current boundaries of digital editions invites a rethinking of what we consider a digital editorial product.

As we move on to the reviewing section of our *Variants* journal, we first encounter a review essay by our review editor Stefano Rosignoli. This relatively new section in the journal was first introduced in *Variants* 14, and provides reviewers with more space to offer a closer investigation into what usually comprises a larger body of work. In this case, Rosignoli reviews three connected modules of the *Beckett Digital Manuscript Project* (BDMP) — a groundbreaking digital genetic edition of Samuel Beckett's works — as well as their respective monographs in the project's *Making of* series, where the editors offer a first interpretation of each work's writing process. Finally, the Issue closes with five traditional literature reviews. The first three offer appreciations of scholarly editions: one by Christian Baier on an edition of a work by Thomas Mann, one by Manuela Bertone on an edition of a work by Carlo Emilio Gadda, and one by Jonas Rosenbrück on a new volume in the so-called "complete critical edition" of Walter Benjamin's *Werke und Nachlaß*. The last two reviews tackle new theoretical works that have been published in the field: Barbara Cooke offers a review of a new collection of essays by Peter Shillingsburg, and Hans Walter Gabler comments on Paul Eggert's recent reflection on the intersection of scholarly editing and book history.

As the Issue's title page reveals, the above collection of academic essays and reviews has been put together and edited by a new editorial board. Looking to pass the baton after serving as the journal's General Editor since 2013, *Variants* veteran Wim van Mierlo recruited Elli Bleeker and Wout Dillen to serve as Associate Editors for *Variants* 14 to learn the ropes and prepare to take the lead in publishing the journal's future issues. As newly appointed editors, we would both very much like to thank Wim for the many years of hard work that he has put into editing *The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship*, and for all the support he gave us in this transition. Not only did he shape six excellent Issues of *Variants*, each meticulously edited and presented, Wim was also instrumental in the journal's move to a new, Open Access publication venue: OpenEdition Journals. Since *Variants* 12–13 (2016), all new issues in our journal are now freely available to anyone with an internet connection — which can only help propel the research in our field forwards. We believe Wim's legacy speaks for itself, and are well aware that we have big shoes to fill as we follow in his footsteps.

Thankfully, Wout and Elli had some help taking the first of these steps when they became the new General and Associate Editors of *Variants*, respectively. For this Issue, Laura Esteban-Segura — who organized the 2019 ESTS conference in Málaga — is acting as a guest editor; and we are also very grateful to Stefano Rosignoli for continuing to take such good care of our journal's review section. To make it easier for all editors to collaborate on all aspects of the publication pipeline — in this Issue as well as future ones — we devised a new workflow

that makes use of more open and collaborative technologies. Developing the current Issue provided us with the opportunity to reuse, double check, fine tune, and document our solutions for moving away from the proprietary software package Adobe InDesign[®] and towards the open source alternative L^AT_EX for typesetting the PDF versions of new *Variants* issues.

To achieve this goal, Wout designed a L^AT_EX template called varianT_EX to resemble the typesetting style of previous issues as closely as possible. This template is made available on Overleaf,² hosted in a public repository on GitHub,³ documented in a GitHub Wiki,⁴ and archived on Zenodo⁵ to ensure the sustainability and reusability of our efforts. What is more, from this Issue onwards references to cited works are no longer painstakingly manually formatted, but instead use a newly designed citation style⁶ to automatically generate bibliographies from BibT_EX records — which are now also available in a public Zotero Group Library.⁷ And finally, Wout has also developed a simplified version of varianT_EX for authors (including a similar Overleaf template,⁸ GitHub repository,⁹ Wiki documentation,¹⁰ and Zenodo DOI).¹¹

We hope that this will encourage future contributors to *Variants* to submit their articles in L^AT_EX, and/or their references in BibT_EX, because it is through working together and distributing the responsibilities of formatting contributions that we can speed up the journal's turnaround and publish more, qualitative content in issues to come. While redesigning this workflow has been a great effort that has brought along its own series of publication delays, we strongly believe that it was a worthwhile endeavour that will save us time in the long run, and that helps us find a more accessible and reusable way of publishing academic research, that may also benefit others. Indeed, we are happy to see that the transparency of our approach has already paid off to some extent, as varianT_EX is currently being used to carry out the typesetting of another journal in the field: the *DH Benelux Journal*.¹²

Of course, as the editors of *Variants*, we are not only responsible for the formatting of new issues, but for their contents as well. And this also sometimes means that we have to make hard decisions. In the present Issue, for example, we needed to decide what to do with racial slurs when they were brought to

² <https://www.overleaf.com/latex/templates/variantex/dwjsvmwfcybk>

³ <https://github.com/WoutDLN/varianTeX>

⁴ <https://github.com/WoutDLN/varianTeX/wiki>

⁵ <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3484651>

⁶ <https://raw.githubusercontent.com/WoutDLN/varianTeX/main/variantex.bst>

⁷ <https://www.zotero.org/groups/2517977/variantsjournal>

⁸ <https://www.overleaf.com/latex/templates/variantex-for-authors/nsqffgrvshv>

⁹ <https://github.com/WoutDLN/varianTeX-for-authors>

¹⁰ <https://github.com/WoutDLN/varianTeX-for-authors/wiki>

¹¹ <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4013870>

¹² <https://journal.dhbenelux.org>

our attention by one of our reviewers — for which we are grateful. In “Creators’ Intentions and the Realities of Performance”, Ronald Broude details the complicated history of the editorial tradition of Gilbert and Sullivan’s Savoy Operas. And part of this history is that at some point in time, changes were made to the original text to avoid the use of racial slurs — in this case, specifically, the n-word.

In his essay, Broude compares the old versions with the new ones, to contemplate the context of the changes and the implications they have on the text’s transmission. Broude’s own position in this debate is clear from his essay: that a scholarly editor of a work should not attempt to rewrite history by distorting the original version of the text — however unpleasant or offensive that version may be, or however far removed from the editor’s own social or political views. But while this argument can certainly be made for a historical critical edition of a given work, the context of reporting on the research behind the construction of such a text in an academic journal is quite different still, and deserves its own careful consideration.

This is a delicate matter indeed, and as two white people in positions of privilege, who have no first-hand experience of being targeted by such racial slurs, we felt it was important to listen to those who do before making a decision. We sought advice from colleagues who are people of colour, to ensure that we examined the issue from all angles. After listening to their experiences and receiving their advice, we decided to avoid the publication of racial slurs altogether, and acknowledge that there are indeed very few circumstances (if any) where the printing of such words could be considered necessary to convey their meaning.

Generally speaking, we can treat appearances of racial slurs in citations the same way as we do grammatical inconsistencies or anonymized entities — i.e. by replacing them with conforming alternatives in [square brackets]. This way, the author can make their argument just as well without printing the original quote in full. What is more, because there is a difference between retaining the original phrasing in an official edition of a specific text on the one hand, and retaining it in an academic essay on that edition on the other, we believe that our redaction of Broude’s text does not have to contradict his original point. As long as the relevant edition is properly referenced so that people may have the opportunity to read the original phrasing if they wish, there is no need to duplicate it in the essay (especially when the original can be derived so easily from context as in this case).

For these reasons, we decided to use our editorial prerogative to redact the use of the n-word in Broude’s essay to conform to our new code of conduct. Of course, all of this transpired with the consent of (and, we hasten to add, without any resistance from) the author. Aware of the fact that this is likely a first in the history of *Variants*, and that some of our readers may find this practice contradictory to their own sensibilities as scholarly editors, we wanted to not only point out our decision in an editorial footnote attached to the essay

in question, but also to explain our reasoning in this Editors' Preface. This is not a decision that we have taken lightly, and by being transparent about the process of our decision making we try to become better at dealing with these issues, and to make sure that we are as inclusive and respectful as possible of the needs of all our readers.

As we close this Editors' Preface, we end with the hope that you will enjoy the contributions in this Issue! We have certainly enjoyed putting it together for you, and look forward to receiving more of your research for consideration in future issues. We also anticipate the opportunity to see you all again soon (preferably finally in person again!) possibly at our next annual meeting: ESTS 2022 in Oxford!

Wout Dillen, General Editor

Elli Bleeker, Associate Editor

Laura Esteban-Segura, Guest Editor

Stefano Rosignoli, Review Editor

Essays

The Reconstruction of the Author’s Movement Through the Text, or How to Encode Keystroke Logged Writing Processes in TEI-XML

Lamyk Bekius

Abstract: This essay demonstrates how the use of the keystroke logging tool Inputlog allows for a fine-grained analysis of literary writing processes. But before the writing process can be studied, the keystroke logging data needs to be transformed into an output that is suitable for a textual genetic analysis. For this purpose, this essay investigates the potential of combining text with keystroke logging data in TEI-conformant XML. Besides discussing how revisions can be specified in the encoding, the author asks herself how traces of *digital* writing processes differ from *analogue* traces (and, taking it one step further, how keystroke logging can be used to record more details about the genesis of a text), what kind of decisions need to be made when encoding keystroke logging data, and how the peculiarities of digital authorship leave their mark on its encoding — as well as on the interpretation and argumentation that underlies the transcription. This will demonstrate that the level of detail that is recorded in keystroke logging data requires us to consider the way in which the text was typed when we design our encoding schemas. The goal of the TEI-XML encoding of the keystroke logging data is to provide transcriptions of writing processes that could be used to analyse (the sequence of) revisions and text production in each logged writing session in relation to their specific location in the text.

1. Introduction

THIS ESSAY ILLUSTRATES how TEI-XML encoding of keystroke logging data can be used to arrive at a detailed examination of the genesis of present-day literary works that are recorded with a keystroke logger, using the writing processes of the Flemish novelist Gie Bogaert (1958) as a case study. Bogaert divides his writing process into two stages. The first part — the “creative process” as Bogaert calls it — consists of making notes in a paper notebook. Here, he comes up with the concept and structure of the novel, writes character descriptions, and collects additional material. The writing of this notebook must be completed before he can start the second part of the writing process: the “linguistic creative process”.¹ This part consists of the actual writing of the novel, for which he

¹ This is how Bogaert, in conversation, described his own working method. For a video for the Belgian publishing house Standaard Uitgeverij in which Bogaert describes his creative writing method, see Bogaert 2013.

uses a word processor. As such, Bogaert works both in a “traditional” analogue writing environment, and in a digital one. This way, his working method aptly illustrates the challenges textual scholars and genetic critics face in the (early) twenty-first century. For decades now, geneticists and editors have had methods and tools at hand to study the traces of the writing process in the paper notebook: different colours of ink, interlinear additions, and crossed out words provide valuable clues to gain an insight into the text’s genesis. But how do we analyse the genesis of a text that was written in a word processor?

Like Bogaert, most present-day authors predominantly work in a digital environment (Buschenhenke 2016; Kirschenbaum 2016; Kirschenbaum and Reside 2013; Ries 2018; Van Hulle 2014; Vauthier 2016). Common word processors tend to hide the author’s writing operations, which makes a detailed reconstruction of the writing process that includes immediate revisions a difficult endeavour (Mathijssen 2009). Without a doubt, as Matthew Kirschenbaum and Doug Reside argue in their essay on “Tracking the Changes”, the analysis of these “new textual forms require new work habits, new training, new tools, new practices, and new instincts” (Kirschenbaum and Reside 2013, 272). The consequences of the digital work process for genetic criticism are addressed in the interdisciplinary project *Track Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of Digital Literary Writing* that combines aspects of cognitive writing process research with textual scholarship.²

Within cognitive writing process research, tools have been developed to analyse non-literary writing processes, amongst them what is called *keystroke logging*: “as an observational tool, keystroke logging offers the opportunity to capture details of the activity of writing, not only for the purpose of the linguistic, textual and cognitive study of writing, but also for broader applications concerning the development of language learning, literacy and language pedagogy” (Miller and Sullivan 2006, 1). With the aim of broadening research coverage from short professional writing processes in educational and corporate contexts to include long-term literary writing processes, the team behind the keystroke logging tool Inputlog (Leijten and Van Waes 2013) at the University of Antwerp collaborated with Bogaert to log the writing process of his tenth novel, *Roosevelt* (2016). After Bogaert’s writing process had been recorded, collaboration was established between the Inputlog team, the Literary Department at Huygens ING (Amsterdam), and the Centre for Manuscript Genetics (University of Antwerp) in order to adequately address the analysis of this literary writing process. This resulted in the interdisciplinary project *Track Changes*, in which Bogaert’s writing process is examined from the perspective of cognitive writing process research, as well as

² This work has been conducted as part of my PhD research within the project *Track Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of Digital Literary Writing* (2018–2023), a collaboration between Huygens ING (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam) and the University of Antwerp (Antwerp Centre for Digital Humanities and Literary Criticism) funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO). Project members include Prof. Karina van Dalen-Oskam, Prof. Dirk Van Hulle, Prof. Luuk Van Waes, Dr Mariëlle Leijten, Vincent Neyt and Floor Buschenhenke.

from the perspective of genetic criticism. In turn, the collaboration with Bogaert illustrates the possibilities of keystroke logging for genetic criticism in future collaborative projects, or when writers choose to log their writing processes themselves as part of their personal archive.³

The Inputlog team invited Bogaert to record his writing process with Inputlog. For the purpose of this essay, it is important to keep in mind that this implies that Bogaert's writing process contained a researcher intervention. Throughout the writing process itself, however, this intervention was kept to a minimum: since Inputlog is designed to be as non-intrusive as possible, the further course of the writing process was not influenced (Leijten and Van Waes 2013). Whilst other keystroke logging tools (e.g. Scriptlog, see Wengelin et al. 2009) were designed for experimental word-processing environments — and so cannot be used to study writing in a more naturalistic setting — Inputlog logs the data of writing processes that take place in a word processing environment that the author is already familiar with: Microsoft Word (Leijten and Van Waes 2013).⁴ Each time an author activates Inputlog to start a new writing session, the Word document in which the author is working is saved in the background, in a folder that contains the session's date and number. Subsequently, the Word document is saved again when the author ends the writing session by de-activating Inputlog. This results in a session-version of the text for each session, which shows the text's gradual expansion. But Inputlog does not just save Word documents. When the program is running, every keystroke and mouse movement is recorded with a timestamp (Leijten and Van Waes 2013). While writing, authors retain control of the process: they can start and stop the logging when they choose, and the data is stored on their local PC or laptop.

Although Inputlog is developed for textual and cognitive study of writing, the data output from the writing process of Bogaert's *Roosevelt*, generated in Inputlog, is not immediately suitable for literary textual research. While Inputlog provides a video replay of the recorded writing session, some issues emerge when replaying Bogaert's writing process. Short writing sessions comprising linear text production are replayed accurately, but as soon as larger segments of text are relocated or deleted, when the writing is characterized with non-linearity, or when the logged session is of considerable length, the replay mode is affected and represents the revisions and text production at the wrong location in the text. Moreover, relying solely on a video replay of the writing session for text genetic analysis also seems undesirable, as one would need to watch a writing session of, say, two hours in its entirety, while constantly pausing to analyse the effect of the revisions. A static reconstruction of the writing session — whether or not in combination with a video replay, as in Dirk Van Hulle's

³ Part of the *Track Changes* project is the development of a new keystroke logger based on Inputlog, which improves the usability and the convenience for the authors so that it can be used for their own archival practices.

⁴ For an overview of logging tools, see Van Waes et al. 2011 and Lindgren et al. 2019a.

proposal for a “Dynamic Facsimile” in the present issue (Van Hulle 2021) — is favoured to ensure adequate analysis. Hence, in order to be able to study the revisions (contained in the keystroke logging data) in their textual context, the twofold output of Inputlog — the Word document and the keystroke logging data — requires some reassembly.⁵

Since TEI-conformant XML is widely used to create a digital form of humanities data — texts, manuscripts, archival documents and so on — I opted to encode the keystroke logging data in TEI-XML to visualize and analyse revisions in their textual context (Burnard 2014). For me, these transcriptions function as a tool to gain more insight into the textual genesis. They could eventually be used for visualizations of the writing process, but a proper discussion of the latter lies outside the scope of this article. In order to reflect on how keystroke logging data can be encoded in TEI-conformant XML, this essay discusses a) the way in which the traces of *digital* writing processes differ from traces of *analogue* writing processes (and how keystroke logging can be used to record more details about the genesis of a text); b) which decisions we need to consider when we encode keystroke logging data; c) the way in which the peculiarities of digital writing leave their mark on the encoding; and d) the interpretation and argumentation underlying the transcription. The goal of the TEI-XML encoding of the keystroke logging data is to provide transcriptions of the writing processes that could be used to analyse (the sequence of) the revisions and text production in each logged writing session in their location in the text.

2. Born-digital literature and genetic criticism

The digital environment in which present-day literature is composed significantly changes the materiality of the sources available for textual scholarship and genetic criticism. Miriam O’Kane Mara argues that “with digital manuscripts, scholars must investigate the methods that authors use as they save their work

⁵ Within cognitive writing process research, a method has been developed to study revisions in context: the S-notation (Kollberg 1998). This represents the changes in the text at their location and provides information about the range, order and structure of the revisions (Kollberg and Eklundh 2002, 91). This computer-based notation can be generated using the keystroke logging data from Inputlog and is provided within the “analyse” feature of the software. However, the S-notation was initially developed to visualize revisions of short writing processes in experimental settings. As such, it appeared to be unsuitable for the study of longitudinal literary writing processes logged in their natural setting. Literary writing processes may take up several years and hundreds of writing sessions, with the production of an extensive number of words. As a result, the S-notation could not be generated using the keystroke data gathered from Bogaert’s writing process. More generally, the S-notation does not allow for further annotation and processing. Another problem concerns the representation of deleted text. Since Inputlog logs the position of the event according to its position on the x- and y-axes of the MS Word document, the deleted text is not always presented correctly (the only information the keyboard provides about a deletion is usages of the delete or backspace key). This hinders an automatically generated visualization of the revisions in their textual context.

as well as the software and hardware systems through which they compose" (Mara 2013, 345). Several explorations of the digital literary writing process have already been published since then that explore digital files, file formats, and media types.

In *Track Changes. A Literary History of Text Processing* (2016), for example, Matthew Kirschenbaum describes the emergence of the word processor and its adoption among Anglo-American authors. And in "The rationale of the born-digital dossier génétique", Thorsten Ries analysed born-digital records from the hard drives of the German poet Thomas Kling (Ries 2018; see also Ries 2017). Ries argues that the digital forensic record of the writing process comprises "digital documents", but also metadata, automatically saved draft snapshots, recoverable temporary files and other fragmented traces scattered across the hard drive (Ries 2018, 417). The use of applications such as a hex editor, a binary parser, an undelete tool, or a file carver can reveal revision and intermediate steps in the writing process (Ries 2018, 418). For example, the so-called "scratch file" [~WRS0003.tmp] with the first paragraph of the first chapter of Kling's essay *Herodot* (2005) "contains an almost complete protocol of the first writing phase of this paragraph in the form of text additions and textual variants from the first written line on to a point of time between [~WRL3681.tmp] and [~WRA1775.wbk]" — two other temporal and backup files (Ries 2017, 141). After extracting the fragments, Ries could reconstruct the nonlinear development process of this paragraph, with inclusion of editing phases and correction of typing errors (Ries 2017, 142). Still, as Ries mentions, "although the relative, layered sequence of edits can be determined [...] due to textual fragmentation, it is not in all cases possible to determine a consistent text status at any given time with certainty" (Ries 2017, 142). Bénédicte Vauthier took on the task of investigating the digital files the Spanish writer Robert Juan-Cantavella saved during the writing of his novel *El Dorado* (2008). After comparing digital documents and analysing the tree structure of the folders and other metadata such as the file title and creation date, she concluded that, "although the dossier does not contain the normal traces of writing — cancellations, additions, shifts — whose absence [...] would appear to make our analysis practically impossible, collating and comparing the digital documents and files gives us more than a sound basis to allow a meaningful genetic investigation" (Vauthier 2016, 175). Although the research above has proven that the digital writing process can leave sufficient traces to ensure genetic analysis, immediate revision and correction of typing errors remain often — apart from some exceptions — irretrievable.

Most genetic studies of born-digital writing processes work with self-archived born-digital materials received directly from the authors in question (see, for example, Crombez and Cassiers 2017; Vásári 2019; Vauthier 2016). This already indicates how important it is to collaborate with authors for this kind of research. Collaboration between writers, scholars and archivists has already been advocated by Catherine Hobbs with regard to born-digital archives, "to understand the relationship between writers, their documentation and their creative vision"

(Hobbs, qtd. in Gooding et al. 2019, 384). To be able to study the genesis of a born-digital work of literature in more detail, the collaboration with authors may be extended, for example, by logging their writing process with a keystroke logger. Between 2014 and 2018, the English novelist C. M. Taylor collaborated with the British Library to record the writing process of his novel *Staying On* (2018) using the keystroke logging software Spector Pro. Taylor, driven by both the “lost drafts” in digital writing and the loneliness of the writing process, contacted the digital curation team of the British Library, and decided together to record the writing process (Taylor 2018, n.p.). As for copyright, they agreed that the recorded data would belong to the British Library, while that of the resulting book would belong to Taylor. On the “English and Drama blog” of the British Library, Taylor quoted Jonathan Pledge (curator of contemporary archives at the British Library) who stated that the used software “seem[ed] to have been specifically designed for low-level company surveillance of employees, potentially without their knowledge” (Taylor 2018, n.p.). This use case scenario becomes apparent in the material that was recorded: the document with the text was not automatically saved after each writing session, although the software did save a screenshot “captured every few seconds each time activity on the host computer is detected”, and Taylor saved some intermediate versions himself (Taylor 2018, n.p.). Also, the software did not record the location of the keystroke within the document itself, nor the time of each individual keystroke. This suggests that while the recorded material undeniably contains valuable information about Taylor’s writing process, the software that was used seems to make it even more difficult to pursue a detailed reconstruction of the revisions in their textual context than is the case with Inputlog.

Although keystroke loggers originated as spyware, both Inputlog and Scriptlog (another keystroke logging program) have been developed specifically to observe writing processes for research purposes (Wengelin et al. 2009). The keystroke logging files logged with Scriptlog can be read and processed within the Inputlog environment (Van Hoorenbeeck et al. 2015).⁶ As a result, the proposed encoding below could also be applied to writing processes logged with Scriptlog. In addition, if it is possible to represent the revisions made by Taylor — as well as revisions logged with other keystroke loggers — in their textual context, the revision types given below may also be distinguished in this material.

3. Keystroke logging data and its use for genetic criticism

So what does Inputlog’s recorded keystroke logging material consist of? Bogaert wrote *Roosevelt* in 266 days — from July 2013 to December 2015 — during which

⁶ The same applies to eye and handwriting observation software EyeWrite, EyePen and HandSpy (Van Hoorenbeeck et al. 2015).

447 writing sessions took place, each logged with Inputlog. Of these sessions, 422 were dedicated to the writing of the novel. Luuk Van Waes assisted Bogaert in installing Inputlog, and was available for questions or when problems occurred. The 422 writing sessions resulted in 453 session-versions⁷ showing the gradual expansion of the text, and 277 hours, 14 minutes and 22 seconds of keystroke logging data.⁸

Let us zoom in on the the composition of a single sentence written by Bogaert in session thirty:

Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo'n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit.

[Sometimes he can get more than he asks for such a work of art, but he never wants that.]⁹

All the writing actions performed in composing this sentence are listed in Table 1. Since all the different steps Bogaert took to arrive at this sentence are recorded in Inputlog's General Analysis logs, keystroke logging facilitates an analysis of the text with a granularity that cannot be obtained when working with analogue materials.

In the typology of writing processes of literary works, genetic criticism distinguishes between exogenetic, endogenetic, and epigenetic writing processes — all of which can be studied from a microgenetic point of view, and from a microgenetic one (Biasi 1996; Van Hulle 2016). "Microgenesis" here includes all intra-textual processes: "the processing of a particular exogenetic source text; the revision history of one specific textual instance across endogenetic and/or epigenetic versions; the 'réécritures' or revisions within one single version" (Van Hulle 2016, 50). The "macrogenesis" on the other hand, embodies "the genesis of the work in its entirety across multiple versions" (Van Hulle 2016, 50). When examining keystroke logging data, the geneticist can examine the writing process at an unprecedented level of granularity. The fine-grained data of keystroke logging therefore allows for a new type of what can be called "nanogenetic" research.¹⁰

Central to a work's nanogenesis would be the author's movement through the text, as the writing process is taking place. Thanks to keystroke logging software, this highly detailed form of sequentiality can be deduced from logged events that allow us to reconstruct the order in which the text was typed — for

⁷ In some sessions the initial document did not correspond with the end document from the previous session, so there are more session-versions than sessions.

⁸ For an example of how the successive events in these sessions were logged, see Table 8 in the Appendix below, which shows a detail from the General Analysis generated by Inputlog. The General Analysis of each writing session represents every event that was recorded during that session.

⁹ All the translations of Bogaert's sentences are my own. I have tried to stay as close as possible to the original Dutch sentences in my translation.

¹⁰ See also Dirk Van Hulle's contribution on "Dynamic Facsimiles" in the present issue of *Variants*.

Table 1: Writing actions in the composition of the sentence “Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit.”*

<i>Writing action</i>	<i>Text</i>
adds: Soms beiden	<i>Soms beiden</i>
adds: krijgt h	Soms <i>krijgt</i> hbeiden
adds kan hij meer	Soms <i>kan hij meer</i> krijgt hbeiden
adds: en dan wat hij voor zon’ kunstwerkje vraagt	Soms kan hij meer <i>krijgen dan wat hij voor zon’ kunstwerkje vraagt</i> hbeiden
deletes: n	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’ kunstwerkje vraagt hbeiden
adds: n	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt hbeiden
deletes: t hbeiden	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt
adds: , maar dat il hij niet	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, <i>maar dat il hij niet</i>
adds: w	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat <i>wil</i> hij niet
adds: .	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij niet.
adds: ooit	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij <i>nooit</i> iet.
deletes: iet	Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit.

example, whether the author left a sentence while composing it — and the way in which words were deleted. This level of detail of movement through a text cannot be deduced from an analogue document in which “the documentary evidence is often so complex that it becomes impossible to determine the order in which these revisions were made with any degree of certainty” (Dillen 2015, 90). The fact that the analysis of keystroke logging data here allows us to succeed exactly where traces of analogue writing processes crucially fall short warrants

* These writing actions are deduced from Inputlog’s General Analysis logs. A copy of the original logs can be found in Appendix B below.

the coinage of a new concept such as that of nanogenesis. In addition, it is important to realize that a work's microgenesis and nanogenesis can be studied separately: one could, for example, study the variation of one specific paragraph without taking the fine-grained details about the exact order of the keystrokes into account, or, conversely, solely focus on the author's movement through the text.

In the case of digital documents, Mara claims that "different types of software mould and shape the writing process, making software a collaborator of sorts" (Mara 2013, 344). Although primarily relying on how the Irish writer Nuala O'Faolain describes writing in a word processor in her memoirs, Mara indicates changes in the author's writing process as they move to the digital environment, "a process that differs from traditional drafting and revision" (Mara 2013, 345). For O'Faolain, "the digital environment provides a sense of freedom and lack of fear because so-called mistakes can be easily rectified and revision can be immediate" (Mara 2013, 346). Writing on a laptop computer provided O'Faolain with a freedom and fluidity that "indicates *for her* a willingness to play with words and structures that other media might not promote" (Mara 2013, 344; emphasis in original). It is exactly this new mode of writing that is recorded with keystroke logging, and could be described by means of nanogenetic research.

The disadvantage of keystroke logging data such as those recorded by Input-log, however, is that the processes are recorded in such detail that the logs become almost incomprehensible to the untrained eye. To make these logs more accessible to researchers, they need to be presented in a way that captures only the relevant information, and conveys the researcher's interpretation of the data in a format that is easy to read and preferably familiar to their peers. This is exactly the strength of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), whose guidelines recommend the use of XML tags to both transcribe the text as it is recorded on the document, and to encode the researcher's interpretation of that record in a human and computer readable format.

Within the vast realm of possibilities that the TEI allows for, we will do well to check out the work done by its Work Group on Genetic Editions (part of the TEI's Special Interest Group for Manuscripts) that produced the "Encoding Model for Genetic Editions" (2010) to facilitate the encoding of genetic phenomena. The Workgroup focuses on two main requirements: "the ability to encode features of the document rather than those of the text, and the ability to encode time, sequentiality and writing stages in the transcription" (Dillen 2015, 81). These two requirements make for a perfect starting point for a discussion of the differences between analogue and digital textual genetic material.

First of all, in case of digital writing, the spatial organization of the document no longer contains the majority of the information about the genesis of the text — given that an analogue document is a solid (static, physical) information carrier while the digital document is ephemeral (dynamic, virtual). In analogue documents "the dialectic between a document's physical limitations (as a two-dimensional surface of limited size) and the internal structure of its different

writing zones on that surface often contains important clues in the investigation of the text's writing process" (Dillen 2015, 71). For example, the position of the two text zones in the top margin of the notebook page in Figure 1 (within the black squares) and the cramped position of the word "heeft" might indicate that the text in the right-hand zone was written before the text in the left-hand one. The dynamic visualization environment of a word processor, on the other hand, discards this type of information, since it allows text to be inserted at any given position. In case of keystroke logging, the information about the text's writing process is saved in a separate file outside of the main document.

Secondly, the keystroke logging data offers detailed information about the time and sequentiality of all the activities during writing. The genetic scholar can only hypothesize about the sequence in which the two zones in the top margin of the notebook page were written, and can in no way be entirely certain about the sequence of their writing in relation to the rest of the text. When the writing process is logged, the sequence of the writing of the text can be deduced from the keystroke logging data — effectively eliminating the need for this type of guesswork.

4. What does the document reveal?

Since the "Documentary Turn" in the late twentieth century, the document has gained a special position in textual criticism — especially within the genetic orientation (Dillen 2015, 81). For our understanding of the text, and to understand its genesis, the documentary context is regarded as a crucial source of information (Dillen 2015; Pierazzo and Stokes 2011). But for born-digital materials, the spatial organization of the document becomes less substantial in the analysis of the text's genesis, since digital documents are essentially distinct from analogue ones. As Mats Dahlström has noted, digital documents cannot be defined materially. In digital documents, works are constituted "by the pattern of signals and tensions at the binary level of the material carrier" (Dahlström 2000, n.p.). Indeed, the graphical user interface (GUI), like the print layout in MS Word, only creates the illusion of the materiality of digital documents (Van Hulle 2019, 468). Yet, at the same time, as Kirschenbaum notes, "a digital environment is an abstract projection supported and sustained by its capacity to propagate the illusion [...] of immaterial behavior: identification without ambiguity, transmission without loss, repetition without originality" (Kirschenbaum 2008, 11). Indeed, as Katherine Hayles argued in "Translating Media: Why We Should Rethink Textuality", digital documents are always bound to a material carrier, in which "data files, programs that call and process the files, hardware functionalities that interpret or compile the programs, and so on" are required to produce the digital document (Hayles 2003, 274). Still, as Ries reminds us, we have to keep in mind that these digital documents "are not bound to a single physical entity, not even to a single processing system context or display application" (Ries 2018, 397). The everyday use of the term

"document" also seems to complicate its use in textual scholarship: we "speak of the 'same' digital document when we save 'it' after changing its content, after copying 'it' to a pendrive and 'open it' on a different computer with a different word processor which might display the content in a different way" (Ries 2018, 397). In my comparison with the analogue document, I therefore use the term "document" to refer to *each* Word file in the material recorded with Inputlog: each writing session creates two documents (Word files with .docx extension) and one XML file with the keystroke information (.idfx extension).¹¹ Each Word file represents a different stage of the text (session-version) and can be collated as such to gain a first impression of the development of the text during each session.

At the document level, there are two main differences between analogue source materials and born-digital source materials logged with a keystroke logger: 1) keystroke logging abolishes the distinction between interdocumentary and intradocumentary variation; and 2) the document layout no longer contains the primary information about the genesis of the text.

4.1. Interdocumentary versus intradocumentary variation

The first difference arises at the level of intradocumentary and interdocumentary variation. In writing on paper, the document pages bear witness of textual genesis through *intradocumentary* variation (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 165). Besides this stratification visible on the page, a large part of the textual development also happens *off the page*, for example in the rewriting of a text (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 165). This kind of *interdocumentary* variation can only be made apparent by means of collation. To account for these differences, Schäuble and Gabler proposed a distinction between textual *layers* and *levels*. Textual layers represent the intradocumentary variation (i.e. the revisions made to a single document) while textual levels describe the interdocumentary variation (i.e. the differences between two documents) (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 169).

Encoding interdocumentary changes causes a number of interpretative problems for the editor. When there is no materialization of the change, rules need to be developed for the encoding of the revision (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 171). To illustrate this need, Schäuble and Gabler discuss how Virginia Woolf changed the phrase "'my mothers [*sic*] name' (Woolf MS.A.5.b, n3)" to "'my mothers [*sic*] laughing nickname' (Woolf TS.A.5.a, 54)" during her transcription of her manuscript into a typescript (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 171). This change could be encoded in several ways:

It could be encoded as a single substitution of the word "name" with "laughing nickname" or as an addition of the word "laughing" followed by a substitution of "name" with "nickname". If we tokenise on a finer level of granularity than the word, it could even be encoded as a single

¹¹ How to preserve those files is yet another question (see, for example, Kirschenbaum et al. 2010).

addition of the string “laughing nick” that builds a new compound with the following invariant string “name”.

(Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 171)

Each of these solutions provides a correct representation of the typescript, but for the editor it is difficult to decide which encoding models the writing act best (Schäuble and Gabler 2018, 171).

For digital writing processes that are tracked with keystroke logging software, the encoding of the writing act would be less ambiguous, since interdocumentary variation is always preceded by intradocumentary variation — which (in most cases) will be recorded through keystroke logging, and saved in a separate file.¹² When using Inputlog, for example, the author can continue to write in a single document for the duration of their entire writing process, while intermediate versions are simultaneously saved as separate documents in the background. If these are logged consistently and without errors, the keystroke logging data encompasses all intradocumentary variation, which in turn provides the information about the interdocumentary variation; in this case, the difference between the Word documents saved at the beginning and the end of a writing session can be visualized by means of collation. An example from Bogaert’s writing process may help to clarify how this would work.

A collation of the Word documents that were saved at the start and the end of the seventeenth writing session points at an interdocumentary variant. Here, Bogaert changed the sentence “Mijn oude huis?” [*My old house?*] into “Mijn oude huid?” [*My old skin?*]. Following the reasoning used by Gabler and Schäuble, this could be encoded as a substitution of “huis” with “huid” or, at an even finer level, as a substitution of “s” with “d” — both options would be feasible. Since this substitution was logged with Inputlog, the question of how to change occurred is no longer an object of speculation. The keystroke logging data details the sequence of how the revision was carried out: Bogaert first pressed the key “d” and then used the delete key to remove the “s” (see Table 2).

¹² The exceptions to this are the writing sessions in which Bogaert inserted fragments of texts, which he had written in Evernote at times when he did not have his laptop at his disposal. Of these fragments, the keystrokes were not recorded.

Table 2: The replacement of “s” by “d” in the keystroke data.[†]

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock
21	keyboard	LEFT	1838	4501	4501	42308	00:00:42.308	42355	00:00:42.355
22	keyboard	d	1838	4501	4501	43228	00:00:43.228	43306	00:00:43.306
23	keyboard	DELETE	2285	4501	4502	43369	00:00:43.369	43431	00:00:43.431
24	replacement	[1839:1840]	2285	4501	4502	43369	00:00:43.369	43431	00:00:43.431
26	mouse	Movement	2285	4501	4502	45397	00:00:45.397	46083	00:00:46.083

Table 3: General Analysis of typing “Of is het m” and deleting “M”.[†]

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock
2460	keyboard	O	1862	4573	4774	1077967	00:17:57.967	1078014	00:17:58.014
2461	keyboard	f	1863	4574	4775	1078295	00:17:58.295	1078342	00:17:58.342
2462	keyboard	SPACE	1864	4575	4776	1078498	00:17:58.498	1078560	00:17:58.560
2463	keyboard	i	1865	4576	4777	1078747	00:17:58.747	1078778	00:17:58.778
2464	keyboard	s	1866	4577	4778	1078825	00:17:58.825	1078903	00:17:58.903
2465	keyboard	SPACE	1867	4578	4779	1078966	00:17:58.966	1079028	00:17:59.028
2466	keyboard	h	1868	4579	4780	1079184	00:17:59.184	1079231	00:17:59.231
2467	keyboard	e	1869	4580	4781	1079324	00:17:59.324	1079387	00:17:59.387
2468	keyboard	t	1870	4581	4782	1079418	00:17:59.418	1079465	00:17:59.465
2469	keyboard	SPACE	1871	4582	4783	1079730	00:17:59.730	1079777	00:17:59.777
2470	keyboard	m	1872	4583	4784	1080666	00:18:00.666	1080728	00:18:00.728
2471	keyboard	DELETE	1911	4583	4785	1081243	00:18:01.243	1081321	00:18:01.321
2472	replacement	[1873:1874]	1911	4583	4785	1081243	00:18:01.243	1081321	00:18:01.321

[†] Unfortunately, Inputlog occasionally gives the wrong position in *Pos.*, as is the case with the deletions in Table 2 and Table 3. The correct positions are given in *Output*, respectively [1839:1840] and [1873:1874] (as opposed to the position given in *Pos.*, respectively 2285 and 1911). For a more detailed explanation of what type of data is logged in which of Inputlog’s “General Output” columns, see Appendix B below.

Table 4: General Analysis of typing “M” and deleting “Of is het m”.[‡]

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock
8828	keyboard	M	1834	4513	5517	2647478	00:44:07.478	2647524	00:44:07.524
8829	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4513	5518	2648336	00:44:08.336	2648336	00:44:08.336
8830	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4513	5518	2648336	00:44:08.336	2648336	00:44:08.336
8832	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4512	5518	2648835	00:44:08.835	2648835	00:44:08.835
8833	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4512	5518	2648835	00:44:08.835	2648835	00:44:08.835
8835	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4511	5518	2648866	00:44:08.866	2648866	00:44:08.866
8836	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4511	5518	2648866	00:44:08.866	2648866	00:44:08.866
8838	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4510	5518	2648913	00:44:08.913	2648913	00:44:08.913
8839	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4510	5518	2648913	00:44:08.913	2648913	00:44:08.913
8841	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4509	5518	2648944	00:44:08.944	2648944	00:44:08.944
8842	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4509	5518	2648944	00:44:08.944	2648944	00:44:08.944
8844	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4508	5518	2648975	00:44:08.975	2648975	00:44:08.975
8845	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4508	5518	2648975	00:44:08.975	2648975	00:44:08.975
8847	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4507	5518	2649006	00:44:09.006	2649006	00:44:09.006
8848	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4507	5518	2649006	00:44:09.006	2649006	00:44:09.006
8850	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4506	5518	2649053	00:44:09.053	2649053	00:44:09.053
8851	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4506	5518	2649053	00:44:09.053	2649053	00:44:09.053
8853	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4505	5518	2649084	00:44:09.084	2649084	00:44:09.084
8854	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4505	5518	2649084	00:44:09.084	2649084	00:44:09.084
8856	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4504	5518	2649116	00:44:09.116	2649131	00:44:09.131
8857	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4504	5518	2649116	00:44:09.116	2649131	00:44:09.131
8859	keyboard	DELETE	1835	4503	5518	2649553	00:44:09.553	2649615	00:44:09.615
8860	replacement	[1835:1836]	1835	4503	5518	2649553	00:44:09.553	2649615	00:44:09.615

The keystroke data appears to contain even more information about the composition process of this sentence, in that it reveals another modification as well. Somewhat later in the writing process, Bogaert adds the clause “Of is het m” to the beginning of the sentence and deletes the capital letter “M” (See Table 3). The sentence now reads: “Of is het mijn oude huid?” [*Or is it my old skin?*]. But after a while, Bogaert returns to this sentence and changes it back to its previous variant by first adding “M” and then deleting “Of is het m” (see Table 4).¹³ Because this substitution was both performed and undone during the same session, it is not visible in the end document of this particular session (the session-version).

¹³ Note that Inputlog’s “General Analysis” only shows keystrokes and mouse movements. This explains why the deleted text is not visible in the log of Table 4, but only Bogaert’s pressing of the delete key. Still, the “General Analysis” *does* provide information about the position of the deleted characters. The letter “M” is positioned at 1834 and the subsequent letter at position 1835 is deleted eleven times. This allows us to reconstruct the deleted text.

When we try to encode this sentence, merging the text with the keystroke data, all the modifications can be put together as follows:

```
<seg><add>M</add><del><add>Of is het m</add></del>
<del>M</del>ijn oude hui<add>d</add><del>s</del>?</seg>
```

(Example 1)

The keystroke logging data thus provides more information about interdocumentary revisions than we can extract from analogue material: all interdocumentary variation is captured as intradocumentary variation within the keystroke logging data. When a keystroke logger is used while writing, textual development can no longer occur *off the page* — or at least: when authors keep their writing process within the confines of their Inputlog enabled computer, and when that process is logged without errors). In Bogaert's case, the records suggest that he occasionally pasted new or revised textual materials into the document that were produced in between explicitly logged writing sessions. This means that for these passages, there is no data available about how the variation came to be.

4.2. Encoding keystroke logging data instead of the document's layout

This leads us to the second difference between analogue and born-digital writing processes at the document level, which concerns the appearance of the document page itself. Complex handwritten draft materials often consist of chaotic pages that contain multiple textual fragments that were written at different positions and in different directions on the page. The page of Bogaert's notebook (See Figure 1) shows text written in different colours, in the margins of the page, and between two lines. If we want "to gain insight about the composition, time of revisions, and flow (flux) of the text", we therefore need to carefully consider the physical aspects of the document (its layout, the arrangement of the text on the page, and what this tells us about how the text was written), and to inform that reading of the page with a good understanding of the text (Workgroup on Genetic Editions 2010, §1.3). But when Bogaert uses a word processor, the document remains clean with every modification to the text (see Figure 1): additions are always represented as inline insertions, and deleted text "disappears" from the surface. Logging the process with a keystroke logger that saves these modifications in a separate file prevents them from becoming untraceable. The crucial information about the genesis of the text thus shifts to the keystroke logging data. This calls for a different encoding of the revisions, that focuses on exactly those elements that make a difference in the keystroke logging data.

When the text is composed in a word processor, revisions cannot be specified with the attributes used in encoding analogue material. Instead of indicating the specific writing tool (which may be encoded in @rend) or the location in the

Figure 1: A comparison of Gie Bogaert's analog and digital writing processes. Left: a page in Bogaert's notebook his novel *Roosevelt* (left). Right: a screenshot of a page in one of Bogaert's MS Word documents for the same novel.

document (which may be encoded in @place), digital revisions (specifically: <add>s and s) can be further specified using their location in the text. These diverging behaviours in the writing of analogue versus digital documents forces us to completely rethink the ontology we use for encoding relative location in our transcriptions. In the following, I therefore propose a list of “revision types” on the basis from Lindgren and Sullivan’s so-called “revision taxonomy” (2006a). By using their taxonomy as a starting point, we can encode the relative location of additions and deletions in the attributes of <add> and tags in a way that is more relevant to born-digital writing processes (see Tables 5 and 6).¹⁴

The first step in adopting Lindgren and Sullivan’s taxonomy is to define revisions according to their relative location in the text, that is “where and when in the writing process revision occurred” (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006b, 42). With regard to this location, the taxonomy distinguishes “pre-contextual” revisions (i.e. “revisions made before an externalised context is completed”) from “contextual” revisions (“revisions made within a completed externalised

¹⁴ For good measure, the attributes for additions and deletions in witnesses of born-digital writing processes (Table 6 are contrasted to those for analogue writing processes (Table 5). The specific examples that were used to compile these tables are taken specifically from analogue and digital witnesses to Bogaert’s writing process, but could be applied more generally.

context"; see Lindgren and Sullivan 2006a, 159).¹⁵ These location-based revision types best resemble the use of attributes like `@rend` or `@place`, as they are based on the relationship between the keystroke data and the place in the document, rather than purely on the editor's interpretation.

In the encoding of the keystroke data, these revision types may be applied to the textual unit of a sentence.¹⁶ Building upon the taxonomy by Lindgren and Sullivan, the attribute `@type="context"` can be used to indicate that the revision is a contextual one, that is: a revision made in a previously written sentence. The attribute `@type="pre-context"`, by contrast, may then be used to indicate revisions made before a sentence is completed and so concerns the author's most recently typed characters. Diverging from Lindgren and Sullivan's definition of pre-contextual revisions, pre-contextual deletions can take place at a point in the text with externalized text after the deleted text.¹⁷

A large number of revisions in digital writing occur as a result of typographical errors. Within the scope of genetic criticism, such "typos" are not the most meaningful entities because they do not immediately affect the meaning of the text. Within cognitive writing process research, typos are regarded as a revision type that "often blur[s] the picture of the writing session" (Kollberg 1998, 68). Typographical errors are "low-level, and hence less important, types of revision", and filtering them out would therefore allow for a more nuanced analysis of revision (Conijn et al. 2019, 71). But the revision of typographical errors can also break the flow in writing and therefore influence the writing process (Conijn et al. 2019, 72). For this reason, I propose to encode this type of revisions with a separate `@type` attribute: `@type="typo"`. This allows such errors to be filtered out in visualizations where they are irrelevant, while still allowing us to evaluate their effect on the writing process.¹⁸

¹⁵ Within cognitive writing process research, the writing process is generally divided into three consecutive components: first the text has to be planned, then these internal ideas have to be translated (externalized) into linguistic forms, and then those forms have to be evaluated and revised where necessary (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006b). While writing, different types of revision occur, and revision is mostly understood as "making any changes at any point in the writing process" (Fitzgerald 1987, 484; Lindgren et al. 2019b, 346). Two major categories for such revisions are *internal* and *external* revisions. The former encompasses "overall, conceptual revision as well as conscious evaluative revision and revision of pre-text" (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006b, 37). The latter are all "visible changes made to the written text" (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006b, 37). Inputlog only logs revisions made in already externalized text; the encoding therefore covers the external revisions.

¹⁶ In the proposed encoding scheme, each sentence is encoded with a `<seg>` tag.

¹⁷ In the taxonomy by Lindgren and Sullivan (2006), one feature of a pre-contextual revision is that there is no externalized text after the place of revision (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006a, 159). As literary writing is often a non-linear process, new context can be created in other places than at the end of the text. In order to be able to distinguish revision within a sentence before this sentence is completed, I also regard these revisions as "pre-contextual".

¹⁸ Typing errors can be hard to distinguish from spelling errors. In the encoding of

The use of a keystroke logger allows for an exact reconstruction of the textual development. This includes the moment a new sentence is produced. Therefore, the production of new sentences can also be incorporated in the encoding (`@type="nt"; "new text"`), to be able to differentiate between “new” and “old” sentences.¹⁹ Writing is not always a linear process and sentences are not always finished before modifications are performed elsewhere in the text. The author could, for example, move away from the point in the writing where new meaning is produced: the so-called “leading edge” (Lindgren et al. 2019b). In the definition formulated by Lindgren et al., the leading edge is located “typically at the end of the text produced so far, but can also occur at the end of insertions within previously written text where a writer inserts new ideas (not only revises form)” (Lindgren et al. 2019b, 347). Unlike the point of inscription, which comprises “all writers’ actions in previously written text as well as at the end of the text produced so far”, the leading edge is restricted to the creation of new meaning (Lindgren et al. 2019b, 347). During the production of a sentence the author can decide to leave the sentence produced so far to make a revision elsewhere — in the same sentence or at another segment of the text — after which they return to the end of the sentence they were writing. This would not be an addition, because the sentence is not yet completed. However, the fact that the author moved away from the leading edge is meaningful for the interpretation of the writing process, as it provides information about the steps that were taken to write the sentence. To be able to identify this return to the leading edge, the text can be encoded using `<mod>`. According to the TEI P5 Guidelines, the `<mod>` element may be used to represent “any kind of modification identified within a single document” (TEI Consortium 2020, §11.3.4.1). For the purpose of analysing digital writing processes, it may also be used for the “modification” of unfinished sentences — the continuation of writing the sentence — using the attribute: `@type="continue"`. A transcription with the inclusion of `<mod>` tries to model the flow of writing.

the typing errors, I therefore used a list of criteria (developed by Stevenson et al. 2006) for distinguishing *typing* revisions from *spelling* revisions. According to the checklist developed by Stevenson et al., a revision can be identified as a typing revision, if one or more of the following applies: “a. the pre-revision form does not conform to the orthographic rules of the language; b. the pre-revision form involves a letter string which does not conform to a likely pronunciation of the word; c. the semantic context indicates that the pre-revision form could not have been intended; d. the same word is written correctly at an earlier point in the text; e. a letter is replaced by an adjacent letter on the keyboard” (Stevenson et al. 2006, 232).

¹⁹ Some text segments may also be deleted and added again in a revised form; thereby maintaining a semantic relationship with the previously deleted text. This is not necessarily “new” text and may therefore be given another attribute: `@type="rt"` (‘revised text’). However, the encoding of such revised text adds a new level of interpretation to the transcription. Whereas “new text” is a fairly objective interpretation — as the text is typed into the document for the first time — the classification “revised text” relies on the editor’s interpretation and their understanding of the text.

Table 5: Specifications for additions and deletions in analogue material.

<add>	@hand="#GB"	@rend="#blueInk" @rend="#blackInk"	@type="#alternative"	@place="#marginleft" @place="#supralinear" @place="#inline"
	@hand="#GB"	@rend="#blackInk"	@type="#crossed Out" @type="#overwritten" @type="#instant Correction" @type="#underlined"	

Table 6: Specifications for additions and deletions in digital material.

<add>	@seq="201308230815"	@type="context" @type="pre-context" @type="typo" @type="nt" @type="translocation"	@n="15"	@evidence="6514-6556"
	@seq="201308230830"	@type="context" @type="pre-context" @type="typo" @type="translocation"	@n="16"	@evidence="6557-6567"
<mod>	@seq="201308230840"	@type="continue"	@n="17"	@evidence="6576-6599"

Most of these revision types can be illustrated using the steps taken by Bogaert when he wrote the example sentence from Table 1 (“Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit”). He started by writing “Soms beiden”, then moved his cursor between the two words using the left arrow key. There he wrote “krijgt h”. This is a pre-contextual addition, because it takes place before the sentence is finished.

```
<add type="nt">Soms <add type="pre-context">kan hij
meer </add><add type="pre-context">krijg<mod
type="continue">en dan wat hij voor zo< type="typo">
n</del>'<add type="typo">n</add> kunstwerkje vraagt
</mod> <del type="pre-context">t h</del></add><del
type="pre-context">beiden</del><mod type="continue">,
maar dat <add type="typo">w</add>il hij n<add
type="context">ooit</add><del ="context">iet</del>
</mod><mod type="continue">.</mod></add>
```

(Example 2)

Bogaert then continued writing with another pre-contextual addition between “Soms” and “krijgt”: “kan hij meer”. After inserting this fragment, he relocates the cursor between the letter “g” and the letter “t” in the word “krijgt” and continues writing. Bogaert left the leading edge (the point where he created new meaning) to make the pre-contextual additions, but after these

insertions a new leading edge is created as he continues writing the sentence between the letter “g” and the letter “t”. At the new leading edge he writes: “en dan wat hij voor zon’ kunstwerkje vraagt”; the screen would now have displayed the sentence as:

Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zon’ kunstwerkje vraagt
hbeiden.

The new leading edge was not positioned at the end of the unfinished sentence, but after the letter g in the word “krijgt”. It was thus followed by “t hbeiden”.

Bogaert then corrects the typo made in the production “zon’” (the apostrophe was incorrectly positioned) after which he eventually deletes the bulk of unused characters at the end of the sentence. These are all pre-contextual deletions; the sentence is still not finished. Now the leading edge is positioned at the end of the sentence, where Bogaert continues writing: “ , maar dat il hij niet”. After correcting the typo with an addition — he missed the letter “w” in writing “wil” — he types the full stop. This marks the moment the writing of the sentence is finished. Somewhat later in the session, Bogaert returns to the sentence to make a contextual revision. He substitutes “niet” with “nooit” by adding “ooit” and deleting “iet”. The writing process of this sentence illustrates the complexity of digital writing, but also demonstrates that the proposed encoding succeeds in capturing every step in the process.²⁰ Still, this encoding misses an important aspect of the writing process: time.

5. Specific encoding of time

Inputlog logs every keystroke and mouse movement in combination with a timestamp. Unlike analogue writing processes, the keystroke logging data allows us to incorporate the specific time of writing into the encoding. Through this temporal aspect, the writer can — so to speak — be followed through the text. Lindgren and Sullivan mention this aspect of keystroke logging too when they argue that the location of revisions

shows how the writers move their points of focus during text composition; this can be viewed as the route writers take through their texts. The actions writers perform during composition can, for example, hint at the writers’ developing ideas and associated shifts in text focus.

(Lindgren and Sullivan 2006b, 39)

Incorporating the recorded time of the revision into the encoding thus offers a

²⁰ Bogaert explained in conversation that, when writing in the Word document, he focuses primarily on finding the right words. For him, this is the hardest part of the writing process. The rather complex way in which he types this sentence could reflect this. While doing so, he seems primarily orientated towards its reformulation. However, this also reflects Bogaert’s personal typing habits.

unique opportunity to study the text's genesis at a microscopic level — what I referred to as its “nanogenesis” earlier.

The timestamp enables the genetic scholar to investigate the location at which the author was working before they made a revision at another place in the text, when (and how quickly) revisions were made, and if there were certain revision campaigns. To analyse this, the editor may encode the timestamp for each addition and deletion and every other event worth mentioning, by using the `@seq` attribute (e.g. `@seq="yyyymmddhhmmss"`). The editor can choose to incorporate the dates of the writing sessions, so as to visualize the chronology of the writing process, not only within a single session but also across several (or all) sessions. The hours, minutes and seconds indicate the time after the start of the session added to the time the session is started.²¹ As such, this notation provides the exact time the textual input took place. The TEI P5 Guidelines propose the attribute `@seq` (sequence) for assigning “a sequence number related to the order in which the encoded features carrying this attribute are believed to have occurred” (TEI Consortium 2020, §11.3.1.4). In the case of the logged writing processes, the `@seq` attribute can be very specific as the data provides information about the time the deletions and additions were being made.

The timestamp given in `@seq` can subsequently be used to number all the changes in `@n`. Using an XSLT script, the events can be listed chronologically in `<listChange>` and allocated a number.²² The `@n` includes the number of appearances of all insertions and deletions, as well as all returns to the leading edge. From a computational perspective, the number in `@n` provides the same information as is given in `@seq`: the chronology of the modifications. The benefit, however, is for the (human) reader. In the eventual transcription, the numbers will offer the reader the possibility to see the sequence of the revision in one glance (see section 7). This is one step into making the complexity of the (digital) writing process more easily analysable for the reader. The example below shows the encoding of the same sentence discussed above, with the inclusion of the time and the order of appearance, starting from 27.

```
<add seq="20130826151155" type="nt" evidence="1342"
n="27">Soms <add seq="20130826151216" type="pre-context"
evidence="1400-1411" n="29">kan hij meer </add><add
seq="20130826151210" type="pre-context" evidence="1374-
1383" n="28">krijg<mod seq="20130826151221"
type="continue" evidence="1423" n="30">en dan wat hij
voor zo<del seq="20130826151232" type="typo"
```

²¹ The time is derived from the “StartClock” in the “General Analysis” of Inputlog, which is added to the start time of the session in question. In order to be able to retrieve the event in keystroke data, the unique ID of each event in the keystroke data needs to be included in `@evidence`. As the time of every keystroke is given, the editor needs to make a decision as to which time to incorporate in the encoding. For a genetic analysis, the time of an event's first keystroke may be the most fitting option; for example, when the first key is pressed to start production of a new sentence.

²² I would like to thank Vincent Neyt for writing the XSLT script for this purpose.

```
evidence="1508-1509" n="31">n</del>'<add
seq="20130826151233" type="typo" evidence="1513" n="32">
n</add> kunstwerkje vraagt</mod><del seq="20130826151236"
type="pre-context" evidence="1552-1557" n="33">t h</del>
</add><del seq="20130826151237" type="pre-context"
evidence="1559-1581" n="34">beiden</del><mod
seq="20130826151241" type="continue" evidence="1595-1643"
n="35">, maar dat <add seq="20130826151248" type="typo"
evidence="1643" n="36">w</add>il hij n<add
seq="20130826154211" type="context" evidence="10622-
10625" n="170">ooit</add><del seq="20130826154212"
type="context" evidence="10626-10633" n="171">iet</del>
</mod><mod seq="20130826151254" type="continue"
evidence="1666" n="37">.</mod></add>
```

(Example 3)

The number gives the exact order in which the modifications were carried out while keeping editorial interference to a minimum. This contrasts with analogue sources, where the complexity of documentary evidence turns the numbering of revisions into a highly interpretative act resulting only in speculative readings (Dillen 2015, 90). By comparison, the keystroke data allows for a detailed reconstruction not only of the revisions made at sentence level, but those at complete-text level as well. If the author first made a revision to a sentence in the middle of the text and then another in a sentence at the top of the text, this movement through the text can be reconstructed, and also — crucially — referenced in analyses of the writing process.²³

6. Peculiarities of digital writing

In the encoding of the keystroke logging data, the way the text is typed is taken into account. This way, we can distinguish between different typing styles. In this respect, at least two characteristics in digital writing become apparent: 1) the recycling of words and characters, and 2) the different ways of performing a deletion. These characteristics may guide editors in the decisions they make in the encoding of born-digital writing processes.

6.1. Recycling

Although the act of deleting is effectively free of cost in a word processor (Sullivan 2013, 256), authors might recycle words and characters in rewriting their texts. This characteristic is also noted by Py Kollberg in her study of digital revisions (1998). She discusses how a writer in her corpus keeps the “t” in substituting “there” for “it”:

²³ The transcriptions below (see Figure 2 and Figure 4) and the discussion thereof, provide an example of how the numbers in @n can be used to quote specific revisions.

Probably in order to minimize the effort to make this change, the writer keeps the *t* in *it*, and uses it in the new word *there*. Two elementary character level revisions performed at different positions are the result, but the effect of both revisions is at the word level (and the words are at the same position). Many writers would have deleted the whole word in this situation.

(Kollberg 1998, 78; emphasis in original)

Kollberg concludes that people develop personal habits in their use of the word processor; each writer has their “own personal set of organization of operations” and is used to performing “certain actions in certain ways” (Kollberg 1998, 78). Not unlike handwriting, typing styles contain a “fingerprint” of the writer (Lindgren et al. 2019a, 5).²⁴ Because genetic criticism is interested in the author’s way of working, the way in which they make use of the word processor also needs to be apparent in the transcription.

As for Bogaert’s way of typing, his recycling of words is very prominent. Indeed, it is already present in the sample sentence discussed above (see Examples 2 and 3). Here, Bogaert added the clause “en dan wat hij voor zon’ kunstwerkje vraagt” between “krijg” and the letter “t” of the word “krijgt”. As such, he recycles the word part “krijg”, re-using it in the word “krijgen”. This re-use can be detected at the word level as well, as Bogaert kept the letter “n” in the substitution of “niet” with “nooit”. This is quite characteristic of Bogaert; as Kollberg remarked in a similar situation quoted above, many others would have deleted the entire word.

This recycling of words and characters makes transcription of the writing process a complex matter, as it makes the concise representation of the flow of writing more challenging. This characteristic therefore highlights the importance of encoding the returns to the leading edge with a different tag. In the genetic transcription (Figure 2), it is possible to reconstruct that “en dat wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt” (n30) was written between “krijg” (n28/1) and “t h” (n28/2) while taking into account that this is not a regular addition, but the writing of the sentence itself. In this visualization, the process of the writing is emphasized and the singularity of Bogaert’s writing accentuated. Hence, it is important to encode the separate steps in the writing process in order to be able to reconstruct the flow of writing.

²⁴

This also depends on the computer or laptop used; the keyboards used in a desktop PC set-up are more likely to incite use of the delete key, which is not available as a single button on many laptop keyboard layouts — see also section 6.2.

²⁷Soms kan hij meer ²²krijg ³⁰en dan wat hij voor zo ²⁴n ³²kunstwerkje vraagt ²³h ²²beiden ³⁴35, maar dat
²⁶w ²⁶il hij nooit ¹²⁰tet ²²⁴37.
 ★ ²⁷Soms ²²kan hij meer ²⁹◀ ²⁹◀ krijg ³⁰en dan wat hij voor zo ²⁴△ ²⁴△ ³²△ kunstwerkje vraagt ²³★
 h ²²◀ ²²◀ ²²beiden ³⁴35, maar dat ²⁴△ ²⁴△ ²⁴il hij n ²⁶ooit ¹²⁰▶ ²²⁴▶ ²²⁴▶ ²³★ ²³★

Figure 2: Transcription of a paragraph in session 30, showing all the different modifications.
 For a legend of the colours and symbols used in this transcription, see Table 7 in Appendix A below.

6.2. Deletions

Another way in which typing styles become apparent is the usage of the keyboard in making a deletion. As Kollberg notes, a delete operation can be performed in two directions: forwards and backwards (Kollberg 1998, 29). A forward deletion removes characters to the right of the cursor, a backward deletion those to its left (Kollberg 1998, 29). A forward deletion may be carried out by using the delete key or by selecting the characters to the right of the cursor and pressing the backspace key. Using only the backspace key performs a backward deletion. The way the writer uses the keyboard in performing revision affects the encoding of the revision.

When a writer uses the backspace key to delete characters in a substitution — a backward deletion — the deleted word will usually appear in front of the inserted word. If the author uses the backspace key to delete words during the production of a sentence, the cursor is continuously positioned at the end of the leading edge. During production of the clause in Example 4, “de sheerne khoran kan worden gebracht” [*the sheerne khoran can be brought*], Bogaert changed the simple past tense verb “kon” into the simple present tense “kan”. After writing “kon”, he deleted “on” and then continued writing by typing “an”:

```
<seg>[...]de sheerne khoran k<del seq="20140717142431"
type="pre-context" evidence="6689-6690">on</del>an
worden volbracht [...]</seg>
```

(Example 4)

This pre-contextual deletion can be considered as the digital equivalent of *currente calamo* deletions in analogue material, which “usually characterize writing produced by an author in the throes of composition, with corrections or revisions made immediately rather than later” (Beal 2011, 104). The linearity of the pre-contextual deletions and the production of the sentence facilitate the readability of the encoding.

The author may also use the delete key to remove a part of the text — a forward deletion. Bogaert prefers this technique: when he makes a substitution, he writes the addition prior to the deletion so that the new word appears to the left of the

older one — in the substitution of “niet” with “nooit”, for instance, the writing of “ooit” preceded the deletion of “iet”. The addition therefore appears before the deletion in the encoding. In the encoding of analogue material, however, Elli Bleeker notes that a deletion is normally located

before [i.e. “to the left of”] an addition in a transcription (regardless of the actual positioning of these elements [on the document]), simply because — in the western world — we read a transcription from left to right and we usually assume that a word is first deleted and then replaced.

(Bleeker 2015, 98)

This choice is usually guided by the goal of the transcription of analogue material: to render the text more readable (Bleeker 2015, 98). In the transcription of a digital writing process, the goal is also to reconstruct that process — as this is not visible in the document — and to capture the author's way of working. The additions and deletions are therefore best placed in the position at which they occurred: the way the deletions are performed dictates the decisions made in the encoding.

7. Interpretation, selection and argumentation

The proposed encoding produces a transcription of the keystroke logging data in order to provide data output suitable for a genetic analysis. Specifically, it allows for the examination of revisions and new text production, their sequences and their effect on the text. This transcription alone is not sufficient to create a digital genetic edition, but it provides a sound basis for the visualization of the writing process. Moreover, the act of encoding the keystroke logging data does coincide with the encoding practice for analogue material in that, here too, “relatively simple text encoding forces us to make editorial decisions” (Bleeker 2015, 112). In the case of keystroke logged writing processes, the need for abstraction (and therefore interpretation) of the recorded material only increases, because there is so much additional information available to the editor. As the examples above demonstrate, simply converting the writing actions that are recorded in the logging data to their editorial representations already implies making a series of editorial choices, such as selecting the data and deciding where the encoded insertions and deletions should be located in the transcription. While the keystroke logging data serves to make more objective observations about the sequence of the writing, it also forces the editor to make their interpretation of the material even more explicit.

The transcription of the keystroke logging data tries to be as objective as possible. In its proposal to complement a text-oriented approach with a document-oriented one, the TEI Ms SIG refers to the opposition in German editorial theory — as coined by Hans Zeller — between the “Befund” and the “Deutung”. Respectively, these refer to “what is there in the source document, the record” (Befund), and “the interpretation of this phenomenon” (Deutung) (TEI Consortium 2020,

§1.1). The Workgroup notes that one cannot talk about the record without any interpretation (especially not in the realm of genetic criticism) but does make a distinction between different levels of interpretation:

there is an obvious difference between the interpretation that some trace of ink is indeed a specific letter and the assumption that a change in one line of a manuscript must have been made at the same time as a change in another line because their effects are textually related.

(TEI Consortium 2020, §1.1)

The Workgroup therefore proposes making a distinction between the interpretation of “what’s there” (document/fact) and “how does it relate” (text/interpretation) (TEI Consortium 2020, §1.1). A similar distinction is made in research into cognitive writing process, when it differentiates between what are called *elementary revisions*, and *interpreted revisions*. According to Kollberg, an elementary revision is a single deletion or insertion, and the analysis of such elementary revisions is therefore based only on “the writer’s overt action in manipulating the text, with a minimum of interpretation of how revisions may be related according to the writer’s intentions” (Kollberg 1998, 16). Interpreted revisions, on the other hand, are revisions which are analysed at a higher level. For example, if “two or more elementary revisions that are seemingly united by the same goal may be combined and interpreted by the researcher as a unit” (Kollberg 1998, 17).

Following that logic, the proposed encoding therefore focuses solely on the elementary revisions. For example, the distinction between contextual and pre-contextual revisions rests only on the author’s actions as they are recorded in the keystroke logging data. When a revision is made during the production of a sentence (before the author presses the full stop), it is marked as a pre-contextual revision. When the revision is made within a completed sentence (after the full stop is typed), it is marked as a contextual revision. In addition, revisions are encoded according to the way they are performed and the replacement of one word with another is not encoded as a substitution.²⁵ Nevertheless, this can only allow for a certain degree of objectivity, since the selection of the material already involves interpretation (Dillen 2018, 38).

Selection plays a pivotal part in the encoding of the keystroke logging data. Although the transcription sets out to represent the author’s movement through the text, many indications of movement have been left out of the encoding. The encoding marks only the textual output, as generated by the keyboard, consisting of characters and punctuation marks. As such, it omits the keyboard events “UP”, “DOWN”, “LEFT” and “RIGHT”. The same applies to the mouse movements. In focusing on the textual output, the encoding also ignores data provided about pauses, their locations and the timing of each action. Moreover, as the only time that is encoded in the transcription is the start time of any modification, the time

²⁵ For example, when “niet” is changed to “nooit” by adding “ooit” and deleting “iet”, only “ooit” and “iet” are marked with elements.

between the end of one revision and the start of another is omitted as well. This means that the time between two subsequent revisions cannot be deduced. This does not imply, for instance, that long pauses or other time indications cannot be encoded in the transcription, but rather that such an encoding does not lie within the scope of this particular transcription. The main aim of this transcription is to help the scholar/reader follow the sequence of text production and revisions with a focus on the text and its meaning.²⁶ By reducing the presentation of other kinds of information, the scholar/reader is less distracted from analysing the text. Still, even with a focus on the textual output, interpretation remains a key factor in the encoding as “the idea of presenting a text in an objective way is problematic and arguably impossible” (Bleeker 2015, 114). This seems even more true when encoding keystroke logging data, as the editor is setting out to reconstruct a state of the text which has never existed in full.

When all the deletions and insertions within a given session are encoded, we arrive at a state of the text that has never actually appeared on the author's computer screen as such, and has therefore never interacted with. This might present us with some issues, such as the question where to encode insertions and deletions when several revisions are located at virtually the same position in the logs (Kollberg 1998, 34). The editor's interpretation is necessary in these instances, especially when the author makes an insertion next to a place in the document where there was a previous deletion. That is the case because when the author inserts text, the text is inserted at the cursor location. But since any previously deleted text remains visible in the encoding, there is no straightforward place to locate the insertion in relation to the previously deleted text (Kollberg 1998, 34). A protocol for such cases could be that when it pertains a single insertion, the insertion should be encoded to the right of the previous deletion — in line with Bleeker's argument for encoding deletions and additions in analogue witnesses. And when it comes to substitutions, the way in which the insertion and deletion were performed could help make the most accurate decision. For example, when new text was inserted first, and the old text forward deleted afterwards, we could transcribe the insertion first (i.e. to the left) and the deletion second (i.e. to the right).

The editor's interpretation also comes to the fore in the transformation of the TEI-XML encoding. Joris van Zundert and Tara Andrews argue that the interface of the digital edition functions as an argument: “Our first observation is that a digital edition's interface is an argument — not just an argument about the text, but also an argument about the “attitude” of the editor, a window into his or her take on methodology and the digital edition itself” (2018, 7). The interface of a digital scholarly edition “is always closely linked to the data model of the underlying data and the editorial principles expressed in this data model”, so they function as “an interpretation of knowledge and provide users with

²⁶ Providing another transcription in which the pauses are encoded would indeed be useful, as it would provide information about the fluency of the writing. This may help interpret the sequence of the revisions from a cognitive perspective.

a more or less “guided” tour through the data and its general presentational setting” (Bleier and Klug 2018, VII). While different transcriptions given below cannot be considered as a fully developed interface, they already function as “an integral part of rhetorical form” since they foreground the textual development (Andrews and Van Zundert 2018, 8). As an example, I shall discuss some possible transcriptions of the paragraph that includes the example sentence I referred to above, with a view to guiding attention towards the dynamics and non-linearity of the writing process — in this case within a single writing session.

The first option is to display a transcription that simply presents a reconstruction of all the textual operations within their textual context. This transcription promotes reading of the text with all the modifications made during this session. The different types of modification are visualized in different colours, which indicate that the writing of this paragraph proceeded in different steps. At a glance, one can see the dynamics that underlie the writing process:

~~Laaten ik we hem voor het gemak de krijtkunstenaar noemen.~~ Niemand weet hoe hij heet of waar hij vandaan komt. ~~Laat ik hem voor het gemak de krijtkunstenaar noemen.~~ ~~Erg~~ ~~echt~~ ~~veel~~ ~~kan ik niet over hem~~ ~~kwijt~~. Hij is hoogst bescheiden. Nogal ~~get~~steld op zijn privacy ook. Hij leeft van wat hij verdient met de ~~sch~~ilderijtjes die hij maakt en verkoopt ~~aan en paar vrienden en wat verwanten~~familieleden. 'Prutserij,' noemt hij zijn werk ~~het zelf~~. Maar het is best ~~we~~l goed. Soms ~~kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo'n~~ kunstwerkje vraagt ~~heiden~~, maar dat wil hij ~~nooit~~het. Hij is ~~ook~~ dooddeerlijk. ~~Het~~ ~~ij~~ is zo'n ~~jone~~gen waarvan ~~wie~~ je alleen maar kan houden.

Figure 3: Transcription of another paragraph in session 30, displaying all the different modifications.

The transcription can then be modified to show how the text developed during the session. By removing all the added text, this transcription visualizes the text within the paragraph that was already written at the moment Bogaert started this new session:

~~Laaten we hem voor het gemak de krijtkunstenaar noemen.~~ Niemand weet hoe hij heet of waar hij vandaan komt.

Figure 4: Transcription of the same paragraph in session 30, displaying the text as it was at the beginning of the session.

Conversely, the deleted text can also be removed. This enables readers to see the state of the text at the end of the session. By providing the option to read the state of the text at the beginning and the end of the session, one is encouraged to focus on how the text developed and on which steps were taken during its writing. This shows that the first and the second sentence were transposed and that Bogaert added eight new sentences:²⁷

²⁷ In fact, Bogaert added nine of them: one of the sentences was then deleted during the same session.

Niemand weet hoe hij heet of waar hij vandaan komt. Laat ik hem voor het gemak de krijkunstenaar noemen. Hij is hoogst bescheiden. Nogal gesteld op zijn privacy ook. Hij leeft van wat hij verdient met de schilderijtjes die hij maakt en verkoopt aan en paar vrienden en wat verwanten. 'Prutserij,' noemt hij zijn werk. Maar het is best goed. Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo'n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit. Hij is doodeerlijk. Het is zo'n jongen van wie je alleen maar kan houden.

Figure 5: Transcription of a paragraph in session 30, displaying the text at the end of the session.

Next, the sequence of all the modifications can be studied by displaying their numbers in sequential order. The first modifications in this paragraph are the insertions of four new sentences (n14-n17),²⁸ the writing of the fourth of these is interrupted by typing errors in “shilderijtjes [sic]” (n18-n20; [paintings]), which Bogaert corrects before finishing the sentence with “die hij maakt en verkoopt.” (n21; [which he makes and sells]). Hence, if one continues following the sequence of all the writing operations in chronological order, the nanogenesis can be analysed. This shows, for example, that Bogaert wrote the seventh sentence (n22) and then returned to the sixth sentence to insert the clause, with typos, “aan en [sic] paar vieden [sic] en famileileden [sic]” (n23; [to a few friends and family members]). He then immediately substituted “famileileden [sic]” (n25; [family members]) with “verwanten” (n24; [relatives]). The sentences “Maar het is best wel goed” (n99; [But it is pretty good]) and “Het is zo'n jongen van wie je alleen maar kan houden” (n150; [He's the kind of guy you can only love]) were inserted later, which indicates that he did not work continuously on this paragraph but relocated the point of inscription to other locations in the text in the meantime. The order of some revisions might also indicate a relationship between them; the quest to correct typos (n91-n94) and inserting a new sentence after deleting another (n149-n150). The sequence of the modifications shows the continuous shaping and reshaping of the text by Bogaert, a process made possible by the word processor:

Laat¹⁴³ en¹⁴⁴ ik¹⁴⁵ we¹⁴⁶ hem voor het gemak de krijkunstenaar noemen.¹⁴⁶ Niemand weet hoe hij heet of waar hij vandaan komt. Laat ik hem voor het gemak de krijkunstenaar noemen.¹²⁷ 14 Erg⁸²cht⁸³ veel kan ik niet over hem kwijt.¹⁴⁹ 15 Hij is hoogst bescheiden. 16 Nogal get⁹¹st⁹²cld op zijn privacy ook. 17 Hij leeft van wat hij verdient met de sh¹⁸ch¹⁹ilderijtje²⁰j²¹es²¹ die hij maakt en verkoopt aan en paar vr²³ien²⁴den en wat verwanten²⁴ famileileden.²⁵ 23 22 Prutserij,' noemt hij zijn werk²⁵ het zelf⁹⁶ 96 92 92. 99 Maar het is best wel goed. 27 Soms kan hij meer²⁹ krij³⁰en dan wat hij voor zo'n³¹ kunstwerkje vraagt t³²h³³ beiden³⁴ 35, maar dat w³⁶il hij nooit¹²⁹ tet¹²¹ 37. 38 Hij is ook¹⁰⁸ doodeerlijk. 150 Het¹²² t¹²³ is zo'n jone¹⁴¹ ge¹⁵²n waar¹⁴³ van wie¹⁵³ je alleen maar kan houden.

Figure 6: Transcription of a paragraph in session 30, displaying the sequence (numbers) of the modifications. For a legend of the colours and symbols used in this transcription, see Table 7 in Appendix A below.

²⁸ The numbers (e.g., n14) refer to the chronology of each modification made in this paragraph during this logged writing session and coincide with the @n attribute in XML (see also Appendix A).

Lastly, symbols can be added to the transcription to provide an option for colour-blind users to still be able to distinguish the different modifications (see Appendix A). Adding these symbols can also enhance readability at the borders of the insertions and deletions; for example, by distinguishing the contextual addition “verwanten” within the contextual addition “aan en [sic] paar vienden [sic] en familieleden [sic]”:

↗La↗a¹⁴³↗en¹⁴⁴↗ik¹⁴⁵↗we¹⁴⁶hem voor het gemak de krijkunstenaar noemen.↗¹⁴⁶
 Niemand weet hoe hij heet of waar hij vandaan komt. ↗Laat ik hem voor het gemak de krijkunstenaar
 noemen.↗¹²⁷★¹⁴↗E↗rg¹²⁷↗cht¹²⁸↗veel kan ik niet over hem kwijt.↗¹⁴⁸★★¹⁵Hij is hoogst
 bescheiden.★★¹⁶Nogal ge↗t↗s¹²⁴↗t↗eld op zijn privacy ook.★★¹⁷Hij leeft van wat hij verdient met
 de s↗t↗h¹⁴⁸↗h¹⁴⁹↗ilderijt↗e↗jes¹²⁰★²¹die hij maakt en verkoopt ↗aan en paar v↗r↗a²³↗e↗n↗den²⁴
 en wat ↗verwanten²⁴↗familieleden²⁴↗²³★★²²Prutserij, noemt hij ↗zijn werk↗⁹⁵↗het
 ↗zelf²⁶↗²⁶↗0↗²⁸↗⁴⁷★★⁹⁹Maar het is best ↗wel↗¹⁴⁹goed.★★²⁷Soms ↗kan hij meer↗²⁹
 ↗krijg³⁰en dan wat hij voor zo↗n↗n²⁴↗n³²kunstwerkje vraagt↗↗h²⁴↗²⁸↗beiden↗²⁴★³⁵,
 maar dat ↗w↗il hij n↗ooit↗¹²⁰↗iet↗¹²³★¹⁷★★³⁶Hij is ↗ook↗¹⁰⁸doodcerlijk.★
 ★¹⁵⁰H↗et↗¹⁷²↗ij↗¹²³is zo'n jon↗e↗g↗e↗n↗¹⁵²↗waar↗¹⁵³van ↗wie↗¹⁵⁴je alleen maar kan
 houden.★

Figure 7: Transcription of a paragraph in session 30, displaying the sequence (numbers) of the modifications and symbols.

Overall, these different transcriptions aim to make the argument that the sequence of the writing operations and the overall development of the text are our main points of attention, and can then be used for further analysis. For example, to examine the effect of the revisions, and how they relate and interact with one another.

8. New perspectives

The combination of the Word documents (the session-versions) with the keystroke logging data (the process) serves to uncover a text that had become invisible during the writing process because of the overwriting nature of word processors. The example transcriptions I provided throughout this paper prove that it is possible to arrive at a genetic transcription of born-digital works of literature that were composed using a keystroke logger in a way that also makes it possible to represent all the different actions that were performed as the text was written. By adding the time to the revision, the sequentiality of all the revisions can also be reconstructed, which enables a detailed analysis of the way the author moved through the text and how sentences were produced. According to Elena Pierazzo, such a scholarly consideration of time plays a pivotal role in the case of modern autograph drafts and working manuscripts because:

the stratification of corrections, deletions and additions can give insights into an author's way of working, into the work itself, the evolution of the author's *Weltanschauung*, the meaning/interpretation of the text.

(Pierazzo 2009, 171)

Compared with analogue text genetic material, the keystroke data encompasses detailed information about the process in which the text was produced. Logging writing processes with a keystroke logger enables an analysis of the textual genesis at a finer granularity: at the level of the work's nanogenesis. Future research will have to indicate whether such a nanogenetic perspective will lead to new perspectives on (the genesis of) a text and the way present-day authors write their texts. In addition, born-digital writing processes alter our notions of "variants" and "versions" (Van Hulle 2019). The transcriptions of the keystroke logging data offer a starting point for reflection on this question and for help in redefining these key concepts. In other words, there are still challenges aplenty for textual scholars in the twenty-first century.

Appendix

A. Genetic Visualization Notation Legend

In the transcriptions that were visualized in Figures 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (see pages 26 and 30–32 above), the different types of modifications are indicated with different colours, and, if preferred, with symbols (see Table 7 below). The numbers in superscript refer to the chronology of each modification made during the logged writing session and coincide with the *@n* attribute in XML. The numbers belong to nearest textual element in the same colour, and the numbers associated with the insertion of new text and the continuation of unfinished sentences are positioned at the beginning of the relevant text segment, while those associated with the revision types are located at its end. Since insertions can be made within insertions, higher numbers can appear within text elements which have been allocated another (lower) number. The same applies to deletions within previous inserted text. If not interrupted by a number and text segment in orange (indicating the continuation of an unfinished sentence) or text and number in red and bright green (respectively pre-contextual deletions and pre-contextual additions) the production of a new sentence was uninterrupted and therefore runs from start to end.

Symbol	Colour	Indicates
★	medium violet red	newly produced text
☆	orange	returns to the leading edge
◀	bright green	pre-contextual additions
▶	dark green	contextual additions
◀	bright red	pre-contextual deletions
▶	dark red	contextual deletions
△	blue	typo-related deletions
▲	indigo	typo-related additions
◇	light blue	relocation of text (deletion)
◆	light blue	relocation of text (addition)

Table 7: Legend

B. Inputlog’s General Analysis

Table 8 below shows the General Analysis of the writing process of following sentence in Gie Bogaert’s *Roosevelt* (referenced in Table 1, p.10; Figure 2, p.26; Example 2, p.21; and Example 3, p.23):

Soms kan hij meer krijgen dan wat hij voor zo’n kunstwerkje vraagt, maar dat wil hij nooit.

In the table, the first column (*#id*) shows the number of the event (consecutively). In the second column the *Event Type* indicates the kind of event that was recorded, be that of the type *keyboard*, *mouse*, *speech*, *focus*, *insert* or *replacement*. The next column then shows the event’s *Output*. In case of a keyboard event, this output records the typed letter. The position in the fourth column (*Pos.*) represents the “cursor position”. The fifth column (*Doc. Len.*) shows the “length of the document” expressed in characters. This differs from the character production represented in the sixth column (*CP*), which shows all the characters produced during all the writing sessions so far. The *Start Time* and *Start Clock* (columns seven and eight) show the time of the “key in” — respectively in milliseconds and in clock time — and the *End Time* and *End Clock* (columns nine and ten) of each “key up”. The *Action Time* (*Act. Time*; column eleven) represents the time between each key in and key up, the *Pause Time* (column

twelve) the time between two key ins. The location of the pause is shown in *Pause Location* (column thirteen).

As such, this table reproduces all the information from Inputlog's logging output, except for three columns: *x*, *y*, and another *Pause Location* column (of the same name). In the original output, the *x* and *y* columns respectively track the location of the mouse on the *x* and *y*-axes on the screen (Leijten and Van Waes 2013), and are only logged for mouse event types (and therefore remained empty for this writing action). The other *Pause Location* column was logged a number code for each of the (written out) location types (such as BEFORE WORDS, WITHIN WORDS, etc.) — and therefore carries no additional relevant information. Overall, then, the General Analysis provides information about what was written where and when, and therefore provides all the details needed for a fine-grained reconstruction of the writing process.

Table 8

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock	Act. Time	Pause Time	Pause Location
1342	keyboard	S	4155	6702	6737	284827	00:04:44.827	284889	00:04:44.889	265	655	BEFORE WORDS
1343	keyboard	o	4156	6703	6738	285154	00:04:45.154	285217	00:04:45.217	63	327	WITHIN WORDS
1344	keyboard	m	4157	6704	6739	285279	00:04:45.279	285357	00:04:45.357	78	125	WITHIN WORDS
1345	keyboard	s	4158	6705	6740	285310	00:04:45.310	285388	00:04:45.388	78	31	WITHIN WORDS
1346	keyboard	SPACE	4159	6706	6741	285498	00:04:45.498	285560	00:04:45.560	62	188	AFTER WORDS
1347	keyboard	b	4160	6707	6742	285685	00:04:45.685	285747	00:04:45.747	62	187	BEFORE WORDS
1348	keyboard	e	4161	6708	6743	285825	00:04:45.825	285888	00:04:45.888	63	140	WITHIN WORDS
1349	keyboard	i	4162	6709	6744	285903	00:04:45.903	285966	00:04:45.966	63	78	WITHIN WORDS
1350	keyboard	d	4163	6710	6745	286044	00:04:46.044	286122	00:04:46.122	78	141	WITHIN WORDS
1351	keyboard	e	4164	6711	6746	286231	00:04:46.231	286278	00:04:46.278	47	187	WITHIN WORDS
1352	keyboard	n	4165	6712	6747	286356	00:04:46.356	286418	00:04:46.418	62	125	WITHIN WORDS
1353	keyboard	SPACE	4166	6713	6748	286590	00:04:46.590	286636	00:04:46.636	46	234	AFTER WORDS
1368	keyboard	LEFT	4160	6714	6749	298368	00:04:58.368	298399	00:04:58.399	31	11778	UNKNOWN
1370	keyboard	RIGHT	4159	6714	6749	298773	00:04:58.773	298898	00:04:58.898	125	405	UNKNOWN
1372	keyboard	RIGHT	4160	6714	6749	298976	00:04:58.976	299085	00:04:59.085	109	203	UNKNOWN
1374	keyboard	LEFT	4161	6714	6749	299319	00:04:59.319	299429	00:04:59.429	110	343	UNKNOWN
1376	keyboard	k	4160	6714	6749	300505	00:05:00.505	300567	00:05:00.567	62	1186	BEFORE WORDS
1377	keyboard	r	4161	6715	6750	301098	00:05:01.098	301145	00:05:01.145	47	593	WITHIN WORDS
1378	keyboard	i	4162	6716	6751	301691	00:05:01.691	301769	00:05:01.769	78	593	WITHIN WORDS
1379	keyboard	j	4163	6717	6752	301800	00:05:01.800	301878	00:05:01.878	78	109	WITHIN WORDS
1380	keyboard	g	4164	6718	6753	302096	00:05:02.096	302143	00:05:02.143	47	296	WITHIN WORDS
1381	keyboard	t	4165	6719	6754	302237	00:05:02.237	302299	00:05:02.299	62	141	WITHIN WORDS
1382	keyboard	SPACE	4166	6720	6755	302455	00:05:02.455	302502	00:05:02.502	47	218	AFTER WORDS
1383	keyboard	h	4167	6721	6756	302736	00:05:02.736	302798	00:05:02.798	62	281	BEFORE WORDS
1384	keyboard	LEFT	4168	6722	6757	304483	00:05:04.483	304545	00:05:04.545	62	1747	UNKNOWN
1386	keyboard	LEFT	4167	6722	6757	304670	00:05:04.670	304717	00:05:04.717	47	187	UNKNOWN
1388	keyboard	LEFT	4166	6722	6757	304811	00:05:04.811	304857	00:05:04.857	46	141	UNKNOWN
1390	keyboard	LEFT	4165	6722	6757	304967	00:05:04.967	305013	00:05:05.013	46	156	UNKNOWN
1392	keyboard	LEFT	4164	6722	6757	305107	00:05:05.107	305169	00:05:05.169	62	140	UNKNOWN
1394	keyboard	LEFT	4163	6722	6757	305263	00:05:05.263	305325	00:05:05.325	62	156	UNKNOWN
1396	keyboard	LEFT	4162	6722	6757	305419	00:05:05.419	305497	00:05:05.497	78	156	UNKNOWN
1398	keyboard	LEFT	4161	6722	6757	305622	00:05:05.622	305684	00:05:05.684	62	203	UNKNOWN

Table 8: continued

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock	Act. Time	Pause Time	Pause Location
1400	keyboard	k	4160	6722	6757	306480	00:05:06.480	306527	00:05:06.527	47	858	BEFORE WORDS
1401	keyboard	a	4161	6723	6758	306558	00:05:06.558	306651	00:05:06.651	93	78	WITHIN WORDS
1402	keyboard	n	4162	6724	6759	306667	00:05:06.667	306729	00:05:06.729	62	109	WITHIN WORDS
1403	keyboard	SPACE	4163	6725	6760	306839	00:05:06.839	306885	00:05:06.885	46	172	AFTER WORDS
1404	keyboard	h	4164	6726	6761	307041	00:05:07.041	307088	00:05:07.088	47	202	BEFORE WORDS
1405	keyboard	i	4165	6727	6762	307197	00:05:07.197	307307	00:05:07.307	110	156	WITHIN WORDS
1406	keyboard	j	4166	6728	6763	307291	00:05:07.291	307369	00:05:07.369	78	94	WITHIN WORDS
1407	keyboard	SPACE	4167	6729	6764	307494	00:05:07.494	307572	00:05:07.572	78	203	AFTER WORDS
1408	keyboard	m	4168	6730	6765	307650	00:05:07.650	307712	00:05:07.712	62	156	BEFORE WORDS
1409	keyboard	e	4169	6731	6766	307790	00:05:07.790	307868	00:05:07.868	78	140	WITHIN WORDS
1410	keyboard	e	4170	6732	6767	307931	00:05:07.931	308009	00:05:08.009	78	141	WITHIN WORDS
1411	keyboard	r	4171	6733	6768	308009	00:05:08.009	308055	00:05:08.055	46	78	WITHIN WORDS
1412	keyboard	SPACE	4172	6734	6769	308196	00:05:08.196	308274	00:05:08.274	78	187	AFTER WORDS
1413	keyboard	RIGHT	4173	6735	6770	309849	00:05:09.849	309912	00:05:09.912	63	1653	UNKNOWN
1415	keyboard	RIGHT	4174	6735	6770	310037	00:05:10.037	310068	00:05:10.068	31	188	UNKNOWN
1417	keyboard	RIGHT	4175	6735	6770	310161	00:05:10.161	310271	00:05:10.271	110	124	UNKNOWN
1419	keyboard	RIGHT	4176	6735	6770	310349	00:05:10.349	310458	00:05:10.458	109	188	UNKNOWN
1421	keyboard	RIGHT	4177	6735	6770	310707	00:05:10.707	310785	00:05:10.785	78	358	UNKNOWN
1423	keyboard	e	4178	6735	6770	311409	00:05:11.409	311487	00:05:11.487	78	702	BEFORE WORDS
1424	keyboard	n	4179	6736	6771	311550	00:05:11.550	311597	00:05:11.597	47	141	WITHIN WORDS
1425	keyboard	SPACE	4180	6737	6772	311706	00:05:11.706	311784	00:05:11.784	78	156	AFTER WORDS
1426	keyboard	d	4181	6738	6773	311831	00:05:11.831	311909	00:05:11.909	78	125	BEFORE WORDS
1427	keyboard	a	4182	6739	6774	311987	00:05:11.987	312065	00:05:12.065	78	156	WITHIN WORDS
1428	keyboard	n	4183	6740	6775	312096	00:05:12.096	312143	00:05:12.143	47	109	WITHIN WORDS
1429	keyboard	SPACE	4184	6741	6776	312252	00:05:12.252	312330	00:05:12.330	78	156	AFTER WORDS
1430	keyboard	w	4185	6742	6777	312392	00:05:12.392	312486	00:05:12.486	94	140	BEFORE WORDS
1431	keyboard	a	4186	6743	6778	312548	00:05:12.548	312626	00:05:12.626	78	156	WITHIN WORDS
1432	keyboard	t	4187	6744	6779	312626	00:05:12.626	312689	00:05:12.689	63	78	WITHIN WORDS
1433	keyboard	SPACE	4188	6745	6780	312829	00:05:12.829	312907	00:05:12.907	78	203	AFTER WORDS
1434	keyboard	h	4189	6746	6781	313188	00:05:13.188	313250	00:05:13.250	62	359	BEFORE WORDS
1435	keyboard	i	4190	6747	6782	313359	00:05:13.359	313469	00:05:13.469	110	171	WITHIN WORDS
1436	keyboard	j	4191	6748	6783	313453	00:05:13.453	313547	00:05:13.547	94	94	WITHIN WORDS
1437	keyboard	SPACE	4192	6749	6784	313687	00:05:13.687	313765	00:05:13.765	78	234	AFTER WORDS
1438	keyboard	v	4193	6750	6785	313812	00:05:13.812	313890	00:05:13.890	78	125	BEFORE WORDS
1439	keyboard	o	4194	6751	6786	313921	00:05:13.921	313968	00:05:13.968	47	109	WITHIN WORDS
1440	keyboard	o	4195	6752	6787	314046	00:05:14.046	314108	00:05:14.108	62	125	WITHIN WORDS
1441	keyboard	r	4196	6753	6788	314155	00:05:14.155	314217	00:05:14.217	62	109	WITHIN WORDS
1442	keyboard	SPACE	4197	6754	6789	314264	00:05:14.264	314358	00:05:14.358	94	109	AFTER WORDS
1443	keyboard	z	4198	6755	6790	314451	00:05:14.451	314529	00:05:14.529	78	187	BEFORE WORDS
1444	keyboard	o	4199	6756	6791	314592	00:05:14.592	314654	00:05:14.654	62	141	WITHIN WORDS
1445	keyboard	n	4200	6757	6792	314810	00:05:14.810	314857	00:05:14.857	47	218	WITHIN WORDS
1446	keyboard	'	4201	6758	6793	314919	00:05:14.919	314966	00:05:14.966	47	109	WITHIN WORDS
1447	keyboard	SPACE	4202	6759	6794	315075	00:05:15.075	315138	00:05:15.138	63	156	AFTER WORDS
1448	keyboard	k	4203	6760	6795	315543	00:05:15.543	315606	00:05:15.606	63	468	BEFORE WORDS
1449	keyboard	u	4204	6761	6796	315746	00:05:15.746	315793	00:05:15.793	47	203	WITHIN WORDS
1450	keyboard	n	4205	6762	6797	315918	00:05:15.918	315980	00:05:15.980	62	172	WITHIN WORDS
1451	keyboard	s	4206	6763	6798	316027	00:05:16.027	316105	00:05:16.105	78	109	WITHIN WORDS
1452	keyboard	t	4207	6764	6799	316152	00:05:16.152	316183	00:05:16.183	31	125	WITHIN WORDS
1453	keyboard	w	4208	6765	6800	316277	00:05:16.277	316355	00:05:16.355	78	125	WITHIN WORDS
1454	keyboard	e	4209	6766	6801	316526	00:05:16.526	316620	00:05:16.620	94	249	WITHIN WORDS

Table 8: continued

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock	Act. Time	Pause Time	Pause Location
1455	keyboard	r	4210	6767	6802	316589	00:05:16.589	316667	00:05:16.667	78	63	WITHIN WORDS
1456	keyboard	k	4211	6768	6803	316760	00:05:16.760	316823	00:05:16.823	63	171	WITHIN WORDS
1457	keyboard	j	4212	6769	6804	316916	00:05:16.916	316963	00:05:16.963	47	156	WITHIN WORDS
1458	keyboard	e	4213	6770	6805	317025	00:05:17.025	317088	00:05:17.088	63	109	WITHIN WORDS
1459	keyboard	SPACE	4214	6771	6806	317150	00:05:17.150	317213	00:05:17.213	63	125	AFTER WORDS
1460	keyboard	v	4215	6772	6807	317369	00:05:17.369	317415	00:05:17.415	46	219	BEFORE WORDS
1461	keyboard	r	4216	6773	6808	317540	00:05:17.540	317587	00:05:17.587	47	171	WITHIN WORDS
1462	keyboard	a	4217	6774	6809	317634	00:05:17.634	317696	00:05:17.696	62	94	WITHIN WORDS
1463	keyboard	a	4218	6775	6810	317790	00:05:17.790	317868	00:05:17.868	78	156	WITHIN WORDS
1464	keyboard	g	4219	6776	6811	317961	00:05:17.961	318008	00:05:18.008	47	171	WITHIN WORDS
1465	keyboard	t	4220	6777	6812	318180	00:05:18.180	318211	00:05:18.211	31	219	WITHIN WORDS
1504	keyboard	LEFT	4202	6778	6813	321581	00:05:21.581	321596	00:05:21.596	15	3401	UNKNOWN
1506	keyboard	LEFT	4201	6778	6813	321908	00:05:21.908	321986	00:05:21.986	78	327	UNKNOWN
1508	keyboard	DELETE	4200	6777	6813	322298	00:05:22.298	322329	00:05:22.329	31	390	REVISION
1509	replacement	[4200:4201]	4200	6777	6813	322298	00:05:22.298	322329	00:05:22.329	0	0	CHANGE
1511	keyboard	RIGHT	4200	6777	6813	322517	00:05:22.517	322595	00:05:22.595	78	219	UNKNOWN
1513	keyboard	n	4201	6777	6813	323546	00:05:23.546	323609	00:05:23.609	63	1029	BEFORE WORDS
1546	keyboard	RIGHT	4218	6778	6814	324903	00:05:24.903	324935	00:05:24.935	32	1357	UNKNOWN
1548	keyboard	RIGHT	4219	6778	6814	325231	00:05:25.231	325309	00:05:25.309	78	328	UNKNOWN
1550	keyboard	RIGHT	4220	6778	6814	325481	00:05:25.481	325496	00:05:25.496	15	250	UNKNOWN
1552	keyboard	DELETE	4221	6777	6814	325949	00:05:25.949	325995	00:05:25.995	46	468	REVISION
1553	replacement	[4221:4222]	4221	6777	6814	325949	00:05:25.949	325995	00:05:25.995	0	0	CHANGE
1555	keyboard	SPACE	4221	6777	6814	326448	00:05:26.448	326541	00:05:26.541	93	499	AFTER WORDS
1556	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6777	6815	326838	00:05:26.838	326916	00:05:26.916	78	390	REVISION
1557	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6777	6815	326838	00:05:26.838	326916	00:05:26.916	0	0	CHANGE
1559	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6776	6815	327041	00:05:27.041	327103	00:05:27.103	62	203	REVISION
1560	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6776	6815	327041	00:05:27.041	327103	00:05:27.103	0	0	CHANGE
1562	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6775	6815	327181	00:05:27.181	327181	00:05:27.181	0	140	REVISION
1563	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6775	6815	327181	00:05:27.181	327181	00:05:27.181	0	0	CHANGE
1565	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6774	6815	327696	00:05:27.696	327696	00:05:27.696	0	515	REVISION
1566	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6774	6815	327696	00:05:27.696	327696	00:05:27.696	0	0	CHANGE
1568	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6773	6815	327727	00:05:27.727	327727	00:05:27.727	0	31	REVISION
1569	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6773	6815	327727	00:05:27.727	327727	00:05:27.727	0	0	CHANGE
1571	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6772	6815	327758	00:05:27.758	327758	00:05:27.758	0	31	REVISION
1572	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6772	6815	327758	00:05:27.758	327758	00:05:27.758	0	0	CHANGE
1574	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6771	6815	327789	00:05:27.789	327789	00:05:27.789	0	31	REVISION
1575	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6771	6815	327789	00:05:27.789	327789	00:05:27.789	0	0	CHANGE
1577	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6770	6815	327836	00:05:27.836	327836	00:05:27.836	0	47	REVISION
1578	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6770	6815	327836	00:05:27.836	327836	00:05:27.836	0	0	CHANGE
1580	keyboard	DELETE	4222	6769	6815	327867	00:05:27.867	327899	00:05:27.899	32	31	REVISION
1581	replacement	[4222:4223]	4222	6769	6815	327867	00:05:27.867	327899	00:05:27.899	0	0	CHANGE
1583	keyboard	RETURN	4222	6769	6815	328476	00:05:28.476	328569	00:05:28.569	93	609	BEFORE PARAGRAPHS
1584	keyboard	RETURN	4223	6770	6816	328647	00:05:28.647	328710	00:05:28.710	63	171	BEFORE WORDS
1585	keyboard	LEFT	4224	6771	6817	329147	00:05:29.147	329240	00:05:29.240	93	500	UNKNOWN
1587	keyboard	LEFT	4223	6771	6817	329334	00:05:29.334	329396	00:05:29.396	62	187	UNKNOWN
1589	keyboard	LEFT	4222	6771	6817	329490	00:05:29.490	329584	00:05:29.584	94	156	UNKNOWN
1591	keyboard	LEFT	4221	6771	6817	329693	00:05:29.693	329771	00:05:29.771	78	203	UNKNOWN
1593	keyboard	RIGHT	4220	6771	6817	330020	00:05:30.020	330130	00:05:30.130	110	327	UNKNOWN
1595	keyboard	,	4221	6771	6817	330847	00:05:30.847	330894	00:05:30.894	47	827	AFTER WORDS
1596	keyboard	SPACE	4222	6772	6818	330988	00:05:30.988	331050	00:05:31.050	62	141	AFTER WORDS

Table 8: continued

#id	Event Type	Output	Pos.	Doc. Len.	CP	Start Time	Start Clock	End Time	End Clock	Act. Time	Pause Time	Pause Location
1597	keyboard	m	4223	6773	6819	331175	00:05:31.175	331237	00:05:31.237	62	187	BEFORE WORDS
1598	keyboard	a	4224	6774	6820	331206	00:05:31.206	331284	00:05:31.284	78	31	WITHIN WORDS
1599	keyboard	a	4225	6775	6821	331362	00:05:31.362	331456	00:05:31.456	94	156	WITHIN WORDS
1600	keyboard	r	4226	6776	6822	331518	00:05:31.518	331565	00:05:31.565	47	156	WITHIN WORDS
1601	keyboard	SPACE	4227	6777	6823	331736	00:05:31.736	331799	00:05:31.799	63	218	AFTER WORDS
1602	keyboard	d	4228	6778	6824	331830	00:05:31.830	331892	00:05:31.892	62	94	BEFORE WORDS
1603	keyboard	a	4229	6779	6825	331986	00:05:31.986	332064	00:05:32.064	78	156	WITHIN WORDS
1604	keyboard	t	4230	6780	6826	332111	00:05:32.111	332142	00:05:32.142	31	125	WITHIN WORDS
1605	keyboard	SPACE	4231	6781	6827	332282	00:05:32.282	332345	00:05:32.345	63	171	AFTER WORDS
1606	keyboard	i	4232	6782	6828	332579	00:05:32.579	332626	00:05:32.626	47	297	BEFORE WORDS
1607	keyboard	l	4233	6783	6829	332688	00:05:32.688	332766	00:05:32.766	78	109	WITHIN WORDS
1608	keyboard	SPACE	4234	6784	6830	332906	00:05:32.906	332938	00:05:32.938	32	218	AFTER WORDS
1609	keyboard	h	4235	6785	6831	333203	00:05:33.203	333250	00:05:33.250	47	297	BEFORE WORDS
1610	keyboard	i	4236	6786	6832	333374	00:05:33.374	333515	00:05:33.515	141	171	WITHIN WORDS
1611	keyboard	j	4237	6787	6833	333484	00:05:33.484	333577	00:05:33.577	93	110	WITHIN WORDS
1612	keyboard	SPACE	4238	6788	6834	333702	00:05:33.702	333749	00:05:33.749	47	218	AFTER WORDS
1613	keyboard	n	4239	6789	6835	333889	00:05:33.889	333952	00:05:33.952	63	187	BEFORE WORDS
1614	keyboard	i	4240	6790	6836	333998	00:05:33.998	334076	00:05:34.076	78	109	WITHIN WORDS
1615	keyboard	e	4241	6791	6837	334123	00:05:34.123	334186	00:05:34.186	63	125	WITHIN WORDS
1616	keyboard	t	4242	6792	6838	334279	00:05:34.279	334342	00:05:34.342	63	156	WITHIN WORDS
1637	keyboard	LEFT	4233	6793	6839	336775	00:05:36.775	336791	00:05:36.791	16	2496	UNKNOWN
1639	keyboard	LEFT	4232	6793	6839	337025	00:05:37.025	337087	00:05:37.087	62	250	UNKNOWN
1641	keyboard	RIGHT	4231	6793	6839	337399	00:05:37.399	337508	00:05:37.508	109	374	UNKNOWN
1643	keyboard	w	4232	6793	6839	338351	00:05:38.351	338413	00:05:38.413	62	952	BEFORE WORDS
1644	keyboard	RIGHT	4233	6794	6840	341580	00:05:41.580	341658	00:05:41.658	78	3229	UNKNOWN
1646	keyboard	RIGHT	4234	6794	6840	341767	00:05:41.767	341767	00:05:41.767	0	187	UNKNOWN
1648	keyboard	RIGHT	4235	6794	6840	342266	00:05:42.266	342266	00:05:42.266	0	499	UNKNOWN
1650	keyboard	RIGHT	4236	6794	6840	342298	00:05:42.298	342298	00:05:42.298	0	32	UNKNOWN
1652	keyboard	RIGHT	4237	6794	6840	342344	00:05:42.344	342344	00:05:42.344	0	46	UNKNOWN
1654	keyboard	RIGHT	4238	6794	6840	342376	00:05:42.376	342376	00:05:42.376	0	32	UNKNOWN
1656	keyboard	RIGHT	4239	6794	6840	342407	00:05:42.407	342407	00:05:42.407	0	31	UNKNOWN
1658	keyboard	RIGHT	4240	6794	6840	342438	00:05:42.438	342438	00:05:42.438	0	31	UNKNOWN
1660	keyboard	RIGHT	4241	6794	6840	342485	00:05:42.485	342485	00:05:42.485	0	47	UNKNOWN
1662	keyboard	RIGHT	4242	6794	6840	342516	00:05:42.516	342547	00:05:42.547	31	31	UNKNOWN
1664	keyboard	RIGHT	4243	6794	6840	343000	00:05:43	343109	00:05:43.109	109	484	UNKNOWN
1666	keyboard	.	4244	6794	6840	344216	00:05:44.216	344279	00:05:44.279	63	1216	AFTER WORDS

Bibliography

ANDREWS, TARA L. and JORIS J. VAN ZUNDERT, 2018. “What Are You Trying to Say? The Interface as an Integral Element of Argument.” In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 3–34.

- BEAL, PETER, 2011. *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology: 1450-2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BIASI, PIERRE-MARC DE, 1996. "What is a Literary Draft? Toward a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation." *Yale French Studies* 89, pages 26–58. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2930337>.
- BLEEKER, ELLI, 2015. "The Future of the Digital Scholarly Editor. Interpretation, Subjectivity and Presence?" *Manuscritica. Revista de crítica genética* 28, pages 112–22.
- BLEIER, ROMAN and HELMUT W. KLUG, 2018. "Discussing Interfaces in Digital Scholarly Editing." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages V–XV.
- BOGAERT, GIE, January 2013. "Gie Bogaert over zijn bijzondere manier van schrijven." Available from: <https://youtu.be/EhRFiw-RZ0Y> (Accessed: 2020–07–09).
- , 2016. *Roosevelt*. Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij.
- BURNARD, LOU, 2014. *What is the Text Encoding Initiative? How to Add Intelligent Markup to Digital Resources. New Edition* [online]. Marseille: OpenEdition Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.oep.426>.
- BUSCHENHENKE, FLOOR, 2016. "Het literaire werk anno 2016. Digitale schrijfprocessen vastleggen en analyseren." *Vooy's* 34(4), pages 8–20.
- CONIJN, RIANNE, MENNO VAN ZAAANEN, MARIËLLE LEIJTEN, and LUUK VAN WAES, 2019. "How to Typo? Building a Process-Based Model of Typographic Error Revisions." *The Journal of Writing Analytics* 3, pages 69–95.
- CROMBEZ, THOMAS and EDITH CASSIERS, 2017. "Postdramatic methods of adaptation in the age of digital collaborative writing." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 23(1), pages 17–35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqv054>.
- DAHLSTRÖM, MATS, 2000. "Drowning by Versions." *Human IT* 4(4). Available from: <https://humanit.hb.se/article/view/174/187> (Accessed: 2021–06–30).
- DILLEN, WOUT, 2015. *Digital Scholarly Editing for the Genetic Orientation: The Making of a Genetic Edition of Samuel Beckett's Works*. DPhil, University of Antwerp, Antwerpen.

- , 2018. "The Editor in the Interface: Guiding the User through Texts and Images." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces*, *Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 35–59.
- FITZGERALD, J., 1987. "Research on revision in writing." *Review of Educational Research* 57(4), pages 481–506. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170433>.
- GOODING, PAUL, JOS SMITH, and JUSTINE MANN, 2019. "The forensic imagination: interdisciplinary approaches to tracing creativity in writers' born-digital archives." *Archives and Manuscripts* 47(3), pages 374–90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01576895.2019.1608837>.
- HAYLES, N. KATHERINE, 2003. "Translating Media: Why We Should Rethink Textuality." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 16(2), pages 263–90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/yale.2003.0018>.
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW G., 2008. *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination*. Cambridge (MA): MIT University Press.
- , 2016. *Track Changes: A Literary History of Word Processing*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW G., RICHARD OVENDEN, and GABRIELA REDWINE, 2010. "Digital Forensics and Born-Digital Content in Cultural Heritage Collections." Technical report, Council on Library and Information Resources, Arlington (TX).
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW G. and DOUG RESIDE, 2013. "Tracking the Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of the Born Digital." In *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders, Cambridge (MA): Cambridge University Press, pages 257–88.
- KOLLBERG, PY, 1998. *S-notation – A computer based method for studying and representing text composition*. Lic. thesis, University of Stockholm, Stockholm.
- KOLLBERG, PY and KERSTIN S. EKLUNDH, 2002. "Studying Writers' Revising Patterns with S-Notation Analysis." In *Contemporary Tools and Techniques for Studying Writing*, *Studies in Writing*, volume 10, edited by Thierry Olive, C. Michael Levy, and Gert Rijlaarsdam, Dordrecht: Springer, pages 89–104.
- LEIJTEN, MARIËLLE and LUUK VAN WAES, 2013. "Keystroke Logging in Writing Research: Using Inputlog to Analyze and Visualize Writing Processes." *Written Communication* 30(3), pages 358–92.

- LINDGREN, EVA, YVONNE KNOPSE, and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2019a. "Researching Writing with Observational Logging Tools from 2006 to the Present." In *Observing Writing. Insights from Keystroke Logging and Handwriting, Studies in Writing*, volume 38, edited by Eva Lindgren, Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Raquel Fidalgo, and Thierry Olive, Leiden: Brill, pages 1–29.
- LINDGREN, EVA and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2006a. "Analysing Online Revision." In *Computer Keystroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications, Studies in Writing*, volume 18, edited by Eva Lindgren and Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Oxford: Elsevier, pages 157–88.
- , 2006b. "Writing and the Analysis of Revision." In *Computer Keystroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications, Studies in Writing*, volume 18, edited by Eva Lindgren and Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Oxford: Elsevier, pages 31–44.
- LINDGREN, EVA, ASBJØRG WESTUM, HANNA OUTAKOSKI, and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2019b. "Revising at the Leading Edge: Shaping Ideas or Clearing up Noise." In *Observing Writing. Insights from Keystroke Logging and Handwriting, Studies in Writing*, volume 38, edited by Eva Lindgren, Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Raquel Fidalgo, and Thierry Olive, Leiden: Brill, pages 346–65.
- MARA, MIRIAM O'KANE, 2013. "Nuala O'Faolain: new departures in textual and genetic criticism." *Irish Studies Review* 21(3), pages 342–52.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09670882.2013.808873>.
- MATHIJSEN, MARITA, 2009. "Genetic textual editing: the end of an era." In *Was ist Textkritik? zur Geschichte und Relevanz eines Zentralbegriffs der Editionswissenschaft, Beihefte zu Editio*, volume Bd. 28, edited by Gertraud Mitterauer, Werner Maria Bauer, and Sabine Hofer, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- MILLER, KRISTVAN S and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2006. "Keystroke Logging: An Introduction." In *Computer Keystroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications, Studies in Writing*, volume 18, edited by Eva Lindgren and Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Oxford: Elsevier, pages 1–9.
- PIERAZZO, ELENA, 2009. "Digital Genetic Editions: The Encoding of Time in Manuscript Transcription." In *Text Editing, Print and the Digital World*, edited by Marilyn Deegan and Kathryn Sutherland, Farnham: Ashgate, pages 169–86.
- PIERAZZO, ELENA and PETER A. STOKES, 2011. "Putting the Text back into Context: A Codicological Approach to Manuscript Transcription." In *Codicology and Palaeography in the Digital Age 2, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 3, edited by Franz Fischer, Christiane Fritze, and Georg Vogeler, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 397–429.
- RIES, THORSTEN, 2017. "Philology and the digital writing process." *Genrehybriditeit in de literatuur* 9, pages 129–58.

- , 2018. "The rationale of the born-digital dossier génétique: digital forensics and the writing process with examples from the Thomas Kling Archive." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 33(2), pages 424–391.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqx049>.
- SCHÄUBLE, JOSHUA and HANS WALTER GABLER, 2018. "Encodings and Visualisations of Text Processes across Document Borders." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 165–91.
- STEVENSON, MARIE, ROB SCHOONEN, and KEES DE GLOPPER, 2006. "Revising in two languages: a multi-dimensional comparison of online writing revisions in L1 and FL." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15(3), pages 201–33.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.06.002>.
- SULLIVAN, HANNAH, 2013. *The Work of Revision*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- TAYLOR, C.M., September 2018. "C M Taylor on 'keystroke logging project' with British Library." Available from:
<https://blogs.bl.uk/english-and-drama/2018/11/c-m-taylor-on-keystroke-logging-project-with-british-library.html> (Accessed: 2020-06-24).
- TEI CONSORTIUM, 2020. "TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange." Available from:
<https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/Guidelines.pdf> (Accessed: 2020-06-24).
- VAN HOORENBEECK, ERIC, TOM PAUWAERT, LUUK VAN WAES, and MARIËLLE LEIJTEN, 2015. "A generic XML-structure for logging human computer interaction." White Paper. Available from: https://www.inputlog.net/wp-content/uploads/Generic_XML_structure_version-1_3.pdf (Accessed: 2021-06-30).
- VAN HULLE, DIRK, 2014. *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing from Darwin to Beckett and Beyond*. London: Bloomsbury.
- , 2016. "Modelling a Digital Scholarly Edition for Genetic Criticism: A Rapprochement." *Variants* 12-13, pages 34–56.
- , 2019. "De logica van de tekstversie in digitaal geschreven literatuur." *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal en letterkunde/Journal of Dutch Linguistics and Literature* 135(4), pages 465–77.

- , 2021. "Dynamic Facsimiles: Note on the Transcription of Born-Digital Works for Genetic Criticism." *Variants* 15–16, pages 233–43.
- VAN WAES, LUUK, MARIËLLE LEIJTEN, ÅSA WENGELIN, and EVA LINDGREN, 2011. "Logging Tools to Study Digital Writing Processes." In *Past, Present, and Future Contributions of Cognitive Writing Research to Cognitive Psychology*, edited by Virginia Wise Berninger, New York (NY): Psychology Press, pages 507–34.
- VÁSÁRI, MELINDA, 2019. "Securing the Literary Evidence. Some Perspectives on Digital Forensics." In *Philology in the Making. Analog/Digital Cultures of Scholarly Writing and Reading*, edited by Pál Kelemen and Nicolas Pethes, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, pages 287–309.
- VAUTHIER, BÉNÉDICTE, 2016. "Genetic Criticism Put to the Test by Digital Technology: Sounding out the (mainly) Digital Genetic File of El Dorado by Robert Juan-Cantavella." *Variants* 12–13, pages 163–86.
- WENGELIN, ÅSA, MARK TORRANCE, KENNETH HOLMQVIST, SOL SIMPSON, DAVID GALBRAITH, VICTORIA JOHANSSON, and ROGER JOHANSSON, 2009. "Combined eye-tracking and keystroke-logging methods for studying cognitive processes in text production." *Behavior Research Methods* 41(2), pages 337–51. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.2.337>.
- WORKGROUP ON GENETIC EDITIONS, 2010. "An Encoding Model for Genetic Editions." Available from: <https://tei-c.org/Vault/TC/tcw19.html> (Accessed: 2020–06–24).

Creative Concurrence. Gearing Genetic Criticism for the Sociology of Writing

Dirk Van Hulle

Abstract: This essay is an attempt to come to terms with a phenomenon that characterizes many authors’ oeuvres: the concurrent composition of several works. My suggestion is to refer to this phenomenon as *creative concurrence*, drawing on experiences from two related disciplines, bibliography and the history of the book — notably D. F. McKenzie’s “sociology of texts” and the concept of “concurrent production” — in order to cross-pollinate genetic criticism.

GENETIC CRITICISM HAS SO FAR WORKED WITH A MODEL — most explicitly put forward in Pierre-Marc de Biasi’s functional typology of genetic documentation (Biasi 1996) — in which the so-called *bon à tirer* or the pass-for-press moment plays a crucial role. This is the moment the genesis *generally* moves from a private to a public enterprise.¹ Genetic criticism has traditionally focused on the so-called private component of the writing process, not so much on the public part, because that public genesis, according to Pierre-Marc de Biasi, follows a different logic:

The mutations of the *avant-texte* took place in a private writing domain where everything was possible at any time, including the complete extinction of the writing, even if the work seemed to be moving in the direction of a publishable text. By contrast, postpublication modifications are made in a public sphere where the book’s reality cannot be ignored: they successively affect equally definitive textual versions of the “same” work, each of which can claim the status of a completely separate text each time, without it’s [sic] being in general possible to recognize the logic of a process comparable to the pre-textual one between them.

(Biasi 1996, 40)

There is a historical explanation for this focus on the somewhat too black-and-white dichotomy between the text and the so-called *avant-texte*, the writing process preceding the *bon à tirer* moment when the author decides the text is

¹ The “Typology of Genetic Documentation” is presented as “a *general* table of the stages, phases, and operational functions that enable the classification of different types of manuscripts according to their location and status in the process of a work’s production” (Biasi 1996, 32; emphasis added).

ready to be printed. In the first few decades of its existence, genetic criticism understandably emphasized its difference from related fields of study in order to establish itself as a discipline in its own right. Although this tendency is understandable, the downside is that there have been relatively few efforts (from the perspective of genetic criticism) to see how these related fields of study dealt with modern manuscripts. Thus, for instance, in *The Study of Modern Manuscripts* (1993), Donald H. Reiman distinguishes between private, confidential, and public documents, “based on the functions their authors intended them to play in communicating with specific intended readers” (Reiman 1993, xi). According to Reiman, “the primary factor that categorizes a manuscript as *private*, *confidential*, or *public*” is “the nature and extent of the writer’s intended audience” (Reiman 1993, 65; emphasis in original): “A manuscript is *private* if its author intended it to be read only by one person or a specific small group of people whose identity he knew in advance; *confidential* if it was intended for a predefined but larger audience who may — or may not — be personally known to or interested in the author; and *public* only if it was written to be published or circulated for perusal by a widespread, unspecified audience” (Reiman 1993, 65; emphasis in original). Possible objections to Reiman’s categorization are its exclusive reliance on authorial intention and the compartmentalization of a creative space that is fluid and un compartmentalized by nature. But at least Reiman’s suggestion adds nuance to a phenomenon that is treated rather implicitly in de Biasi’s typology.

In its generality, de Biasi’s more dichotomous understanding of a movement from private to public in *creative* composition is similar to an equally general statement in a related field of study, Bibliography, about another form of composition. In Bibliography, composition usually refers to the work of the compositor at the printer’s. With reference to this type of composition in the early modern period, R. B. McKerrow had made the general claim that “for a printing house to be carried on economically there must be a definite correspondence between rate of composition and the output of the machine room” (qtd. in McKenzie 2002, 26, suggesting that the printing house functioned as a well-oiled machine, focusing on one book at a time. Donald F. McKenzie, however, explained how “McKerrow’s valid general statement is transformed into an invalid particular statement”, by looking more closely at the day-to-day business of specific printing houses. For instance, in his bibliographical study of the first sixteen years of Cambridge University Press, McKenzie concluded that a small printing house, “never using more than two presses, [...] habitually printed several books concurrently” (26). McKenzie was able to demonstrate that this principle of concurrent production “applied to virtually all book manufacture” (McDonald and Suarez in McKenzie 2002, 14).

Genetic criticism can benefit from McKenzie’s insights in bibliography and book history. On the one hand, his notion of the sociology of texts can be an incentive to pay more attention (in genetic criticism) to the sociology of *writing*. And on the other hand, his notion of “concurrent production” can be a

source of inspiration to examine a phenomenon that is understudied in genetic criticism: writers working on several projects simultaneously, which I propose to call “creative concurrence” and which cannot be studied without its diachronic counterpart: “creative recurrence”.

These two principles of the “sociology of writing” and “creative concurrence and recurrence” are tied to each other in the sense that they both tend to challenge traditional forms of compartmentalization: the “sociology of writing” sees writing in terms of a collaborative ecology and therefore challenges any tendency to compartmentalize different agents of textual change, such as treating for instance the author as a self-contained unit, in isolation from editors, translators, typists, publishers and other agents of textual change; the notion of “creative concurrence” sees writing in terms of a textual ecology and therefore challenges any tendency to study every single work by an author as a self-contained textual unit, unrelated to their other works or to the oeuvre as a whole.

1. The Sociology of Writing

McKenzie’s sociology of texts was mainly conceptualized on the basis of his study of early modern texts and printing houses, which explains the relative lack of engagement in genetic criticism with his work. As discussed above, according to de Biasi’s rationale, the “different logic” of the postpublication phase sets it apart from the *avant-texte* (Biasi 1996, 40–41). In the meantime, however, these postpublication modifications have been recognized as part of a work’s “epigenesis”, the continuation of the genesis after publication (Van Hulle 2014). But there is another aspect in de Biasi’s dichotomy that might need to be nuanced. Not only does the genesis often continue after publication, the public aspect of texts sometimes also precedes publication, especially in the case of pre-book publications. As a consequence, the creative process is often more “public” than generally assumed and therefore calls for some remodelling to accommodate the sociology of writing.

A good example in twentieth-century literature is the collaboration between Gordon Lish and Raymond Carver, the author of the short-story collection *What We Talk About When We Talk About Love*. Apparently, the minimalistic writing style Carver is famous for is actually to a large extent the work of his editor, Gordon Lish. As the fiction editor of the magazine *Esquire* from 1969 to 1977, Lish edited Carver’s story “Neighbors” for publication in *Esquire* in 1971. The radical editing is considered to have had such an impact that it largely created the Carver style. As Tim Groenland notes in *The Art of Editing*, “Lish’s mediating and gatekeeping activities” illustrate how “editors function as key players in the production of fiction” (Groenland 2019, xi). Carol Polsgrove describes how drastic the editorial intervention was: “On several pages of the twelve-page manuscript, fewer than half of Carver’s words were left standing. Close to half were cut on several other pages” (Polsgrove 1995, 241). Lish’s pruning was relentless, as his papers at the Lilly Library at Indiana University in Bloomington

show. In some cases, one could even regard the result as a rewriting, and it does not come as a surprise, therefore, that the 2009 edition of the *Collected Stories* chose to publish some of the stories in both the edited and the unedited versions.

Playwrights often count on directors to help them give shape to the script, as the case of Alan Bennett and director Nicholas Hytner illustrates. For instance, in the spring of 1991, Bennett sent the first draft of his play *The Madness of George III* to Hytner to ask his feedback, as Hytner recalls in his memoirs: “It was based on fact. In 1788, George III apparently went mad. [...] But in the spring of 1789, in the nick of time, the king seemed to come to his senses, so the Regency bill failed” (Hytner 2018, 117). Historical facts were important to Bennett, who had studied History at Oxford. On the other hand, Hytner’s major concern was not historical truth but dramatic suspense: “I’ve never stopped pressing the claims of narrative tension, urging Alan to channel more of what he wants to say into dramatic action” (Hytner 2018, 120). Although, according to Hytner, Bennett “cooperated only up to a point” (Hytner 2018, 120), the Bennett papers at the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Bennet 1989–92, 588–89) suggest that he did revise his early versions quite drastically (especially the ending) due to comments made by both the director and the lead actors.

As McKenzie noted, “a book is never simply a remarkable *object*. Like every other technology it is invariably the product of human agency in complex and highly volatile contexts which a responsible scholarship must seek to recover if we are to understand better the creation and communication of meaning as the defining characteristic of human societies” (McKenzie 1999, 4). This insight has had quite an impact on textual scholarship and book history, and — with some delay — also on literary studies more broadly. For instance, in Joyce studies. Whereas in 1977, Michael Groden suggested that the writing of *Ulysses* consisted of three stages (the development of an interior monologue technique; the abandonment of experimentation with the monologue for “a series parody styles”; and the creation of several new styles, followed by the revision of earlier episodes (Groden 1977, 4), a more recent textual approach replaces this three-phase process by a five-phase scheme, importantly devoting a separate stage to the serialization: “(i) conception, (ii) drafting, (iii) serialization, (iv) continued post-serial drafting, and (v) the formation of plans for publication in volume form” (Hutton 2019, 74). This new attention to serialization as part of the writing process marks the increased attention to the sociology of texts, to a large extent thanks to McKenzie’s *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (1999) and Jerome McGann’s work on the “socialization of the text” in *The Textual Condition* (1992).

Joyce’s awareness of the “human agency” involved in his literary enterprises seems to be thematized in *Finnegans Wake*, where this agency is referred to as “the continually more and less intermisunderstanding minds of the anticollaborators” (Joyce 1939, 118.25). These textual agents range from typists, secretaries and amanuenses to proofreaders, patrons, journal editors, printers, champions, critics and even “enemies”. Especially this latter, inimical category seems to

have been a type of agency that sparked Joyce's creativity. In Joyce's case, the self-styled "enemy" par excellence was Wyndham Lewis, who asked Joyce for a contribution to his new journal *The Enemy*. Joyce obliged and submitted the piece, but Lewis then decided not to publish it. Moreover, in its stead he published his own critical "Analysis of the Mind of James Joyce". According to Lewis, Joyce had basically nothing to say; he was merely interested in "ways of doing things" rather than in "things to be done"; and he did not have any "special point of view, or none worth mentioning" (Lewis 1993, 88). Joyce's point of view in this matter seems to have been that "only the second-rate imagine that they have messages to deliver" (Banville 1989). He kept calm and carried on, cleverly using Lewis's poison to inoculate his own "work in progress" with it.

Joyce may be famous for his disrespect of publishers' and printers' general insistence on not making any changes at proof stage. Indeed, he often kept adding text wherever he found a white space in the margins. The ending of *Ulysses*, for instance, kept expanding to such an extent that it necessitated no less than four sets of placard proofs (Sullivan 2013, 179). But on other occasions, he did show great respect for printers, as the following textual tale illustrates. Partially in reply to Lewis, he wrote a fable, called "The Ondt and the Gracehoper", loosely based on Aesop's fable of the ant and the grasshopper, the Lewisian ant who saves up for winter and the spendthrift grasshopper who is associated with the Penman Joyce. The fable appeared several times in pre-book publications (Van Hulle 2016, 143ff.) and expanded with every new version. It ends with a poem, which was originally fairly short, consisting of only 12 lines. When it was first published in the magazine *transition* (March 1928), it had 18 lines. The fable subsequently came out as part of *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun* in a deluxe edition by The Black Sun press (1929), run by Harry and Caresse Crosby. At proof stage, it had ten extra lines, 28 in total, and it was to expand even further, resulting in 34 lines when the book appeared. This accretion was partially due to the printer. In her memoir, Caresse Crosby mentions an "unexpected incident" relating to the master printer Roger Lescaret during the production of *Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*:

The pages were on the press and Lescaret in consternation pedaled over to the rue de Lilly to show me, to my horror, that on the final "forme", due to a slight error in his calculations, only two lines would fall *en plaine* [sic] *page* – this from the typographer's point of view was a heinous offense to good taste. What could be done at this late date! Nothing, the other *formes* had all been printed and the type distributed (we only had enough type for four pages at a time). Then Lescaret asked me if I wouldn't beg Mr. Joyce to add another eight lines to help us out. I laughed scornfully at the little man, what a ludicrous idea, when a great writer has composed each line of his prose as carefully as a sonnet you don't ask him to inflate a masterpiece to help out the printer!

(Crosby 1953, 187; see also Ellmann 1983, 614–15)

But that was exactly what the “great writer” did. Behind Crosby’s back, Lescaret secretly went to Joyce, asked him if he could write a few extra lines, and Joyce indeed produced the requested lines. Evidently, if *Finnegans Wake* can be considered a masterpiece, that is not only thanks to “anticollaborators” such as Roger Lescaret, but they did play an active role in the creative development of the work in progress.

Later in the writing process of *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce even outsourced his reading. Thus, he asked Samuel Beckett to read a book that was sent to him by Heinrich Zimmer Jr., called *Maya: Der indische Mythos* (1938). Beckett made notes for Joyce on three pages, preserved at the University at Buffalo (Van Hulle 1999, 143ff.). Joyce also involved his friends in collective notetaking, as Stuart Gilbert’s Paris journal entry on a reading session in preparation of *Haveth Childers Everywhere* shows: “Five volumes of the Encyclopaedia Britannica on his sofa. He has made a list of 30 towns, New York, Vienna, Budapest, and Mrs. Fleischman has read out the articles on some of these” (Gilbert 1993, 20–21). Gilbert was irked by the way Joyce, “curled on his sofa”, kept on “pondering puns” while exploiting his friends, such as Padraic Colum, Helen Fleischman, Paul Léon, Lucia Joyce, and Gilbert himself.² Gilbert gives the example of the word “Slotspark”, which became “Slutsgartern” in *Finnegans Wake* (Joyce 1939, 532.22–23): “Thus ‘Slotspark’ (I think) at Christiania becomes Sluts’ park. He collects all queer names in this way and will soon have notebooks full of them” (Gilbert 1993, 20–21). In his journal, Gilbert ventilated his resentment: “With foreign words it’s too easy. The provincial Dubliner. Foreign equals funny” (Gilbert 1993, 21), thus giving voice – albeit in the privacy of his personal journal – to the social tensions involved in Joyce’s literary corporation, in which he assumed the entrepreneurial role of CEO. This image is at a far remove from the private enterprise of the writing process as it is presented in de Biasi’s model. Evidently, this model is a conscious generalisation, as de Biasi readily admits, but now that genetic criticism exists more than fifty years, the time seems propitious to refine the model and find a place for the sociology of writing in genetic criticism.

2. Creative Concurrence

A second way in which I would like to suggest a remodelling is related to the phenomena of creative concurrence and recurrence. Traditionally, genetic criticism tends to approach an author’s oeuvre work by work. It would be useful to also consider a work’s genesis within the development of the author’s oeuvre in its entirety, and consider all the geneses of its components, including vestigial notes, drafts and unpublished works, constituting the *sous-œuvre* — not so much in Thomas C. Connolly’s general sense of the marginalized parts of a work that

² “I ‘finish’ Vienna and read Christiania and Bucharest. Whenever I come to a name (of a street, suburb, park, etc.) I pause. Joyce thinks. If he can Anglicize the word, i.e. make a pun on it, Mrs. F. records the name of its deformation in the notebook” (Gilbert 1993, 20–21; qtd. in Van Hulle 2016, 163)

are traditionally eclipsed (Connolly 2018), but in the sense of the entire oeuvre's genetic dossier.

The focus on separate works is understandable, given the complexity of most literary works' geneses. The reality for many writers, however, is that they divide their time between multiple book projects on a daily basis. For instance, as Vincent Neyt has shown,³ the genesis of Stephen King's novel *IT* cannot be studied in isolation. In the period of seven years between 1980, when King started the first draft of *IT*, and 1986, the year the novel was published, King published no less than thirteen books, some of them under the pseudonym Richard Bachman.⁴ This was possible because King regards writing as a craft, which requires a certain discipline. Every day, he tries to write half a dozen of pages, and in the afternoon or evenings, he tends to revise another work, often to meet a scheduled submission deadline. These deadlines, imposed by the publisher, are a significant social element in the writing process, either as an incentive or as a form of pressure that can stifle creativity. As a consequence, there are constantly several book projects underway concurrently. Analogous to McKenzie's principle of concurrent production, I therefore suggest we introduce a principle of concurrent writing or *creative concurrence* in genetic criticism, which implies reconstructing the everyday reality of how a work, in all its draft versions, interacted with the other works that populated the author's writing desk at any given moment.

Creative concurrence does not necessarily have a sociological dimension. A writer can simply be working on several projects at the same time. But often a social aspect does play a role. To illustrate just how interwoven the geneses of an author's individual works can be, it is useful to have a brief look at Samuel Beckett's writing desk in the late 1970s. He was already working on a longer piece of prose, called *Company*, when he received a commission. In the fall of 1977, the English actor David Warrilow requested Beckett to write "a monologue on death", to which Beckett replied on 1 October with the line "My birth was my death" (Beckett 2016, 471 note 1). The next day, under the preliminary title "Gone", he immediately started developing the theme: as soon one is born, one starts dying. Thus began what was to become *A Piece of Monologue*, translated into French as *Solo* (Pilling 2016, 205). On a piece of paper, Beckett wrote some loose jottings on the theme of death, such as "Not much left to die" and "Dead & gone / Dying & going" (UoR MS 2460, m28, 01v; qtd. in Van Hulle 2019, 75). Some of the more concrete stage settings clearly presage *A Piece of Monologue*, such as this idea for the "End: fade out general light. Hold on globe. Fade out

³ Vincent Neyt is currently working on a PhD on the genesis of King's *IT* at the University of Antwerp.

⁴ One work of non-fiction, called *Danse Macabre* (1981); one collection of four novellas (*Different Seasons* (1982)); a collection of short stories (*Skeleton Crew* (1985)) and ten novels, some of them under a pseudonym: *Firestarter* (1980), *Cujo* (1981), *Roadwork* (1981 — as Richard Bachman), *The Gunslinger* (1982), *The Running Man* (1982 — as Richard Bachman), *Christine* (1983), *Pet Semetary* (1985), *The Talisman* (1984 — with Peter Straub), *Thinner* (1984 — as Richard Bachman), *The Eyes of the Dragon* (1984).

globe.” And this one for the opening: “Fade up. 10”. ‘Birth.’ 10”.” (UoR MS 2460, m28, 01v; qtd. in Van Hulle 2019, 75) The note “Birth was his death. Etc.” clearly echoes Beckett’s letter to Warrilow. The difference is that the narrative voice has changed from a first-person to a third-person narrator. This change marks an interesting turn in Beckett’s late work for the theatre, which tends to present itself as staged narratives, or what Matthijs Engelberts has termed *récit scénique* (Engelberts 2001, 211–12). In the case of this opening sentence, the third-person narrative adds depth and ambiguity, because the sentence “Birth was his death” (which was to become “Birth was the death of him” in the published version of *A Piece of Monologue*) leaves open the possibility that the protagonist’s birth meant the death of someone else. In the case of the author himself, who was born on Good Friday 1906, that “someone else” was Jesus Christ, whose suffering on the cross therefore always marked Beckett’s birthday – a concurrence that never stopped leaving an imprint, also on his works.

The note “Birth was his death. Etc.” is not dated, but on the back of the piece of paper, Beckett drafted a poem (“fleuves et océans”) that is dated “Ussy Toussaint 77”, that is, 1 November 1977. The next day, on 2 November 1977, he told Jocelyn Herbert he was “taking it very easy through 2 prose pieces underway — snail like — one very limited in scope and ambition, the other I hope to keep me going (company) for the duration” (Beckett 2016, 471). As Beckett’s pun indicates, *Company* was the longer text that was keeping him company, the shorter one was *A Piece of Monologue*. Beckett does not even mention the poem, but the manuscripts indicate that, on 1 November 1977, Beckett was working on at least three literary projects in three different genres at the same time: poetry, prose and drama. The commissioned piece of monologue clearly had a thematic impact on the poem’s content, as the opening lines already indicate, playing as they do with the standard expression “ils l’ont laissé pour mort” (they left him for dead): “fleuves et océans / l’ont laissé pour vivant” (rivers and oceans / have left him alive) (Beckett 2012, 217). So life (‘vivant’) is, again, presented as a process of dying. This is a clear case of creative concurrence, materialized on the recto and verso sides of one single scrap of paper (UoR MS 2460, m18, 01r and 01v; qtd. in Van Hulle 2019, 72).

The concurrence between the drafts of *Company* and *A Piece of Monologue* even became a form of confluence at some point, however briefly. After having been working on both projects concurrently for about eight months, Beckett tried on 17 May 1978 to insert this excerpt from *A Piece of Monologue* into *Company*, as paragraph 54, written without errors or revisions. Here, the pronoun (‘you’) is different yet again, less ambiguous this time:

Birth was the death of you. At close of day. Sun sunk behind the larches.
Needles turning green. Light dying in the room. Soon none left to die. No.
No such thing as no light. Dies on the dawn & never dies. Slowly in the
dark a faint hand. It holds high a lighted spill. In light of spill faintly the
hand & milkwhite globe. Second hand. In light of spill. It lifts off globe &

disappears. Reappears empty. Lifts off chimney. Two hands & chimney in light of spill. Spill to wick. Chimney back on.

(BDMP 9, EM, 25r)

To make this confluence possible, however temporarily, Beckett decided to leave out four sentences from the dramatic fragment, because they all related to the act of looking (Engelberts 2001, 211). But then again, Beckett soon decided that this confluence did not work after all, and he cancelled the paragraph with a large St. Andrew's cross.

In the end, the three concurrent projects were published separately: *A Piece of Monologue*, *Company* and the poems as part of the *mirlitonmaades*. But the creative concurrence still shows in the theme of life as a form of dying, "his" birth thus being both the death of the protagonist and that of Christ. The biographical link is even more explicit in *Company* than in *A Piece of Monologue*, both of which were written while Deirdre Bair was preparing her biography of Beckett:⁵ "You first saw the light of day the day Christ died" (Beckett 2009, 9).

Sometimes, the creative concurrence can materialize in a single document, such as a notebook. Beckett's so-called "Été 56" Notebook is a good example ("Été 56" because that is what Beckett has written on its cover). The very idea of identifying his notebook with a period (summer 1956) rather than giving it a title (as he did in other cases, such as the "Molloy" Notebooks or the "Whoroscope" Notebook), suggests the remarkable concurrence of several projects at this point in time. To be correct, the notebook also contains drafts that were written later than the Summer of 1956, but several drafts do testify to the concurrence of various literary projects in the same creative space. As a physical environment, the notebook serves as a creative ecology. It contains notes and drafts pertaining to several works, as Beckett retrospectively noted on the front flyleaf: the play *Fin de partie*, the radio play *All That Fall*, the play *Krapp's Last Tape*, the prose work *Comment c'est*, the play *Happy Days* (BDMP 3, 'Été 56' Notebook). And he even forgot to mention the radio play *Words and Music*. The back of the notebook also contains an attempt to design the typography of a title page for his radio play *Embers*. As this list already indicates, the creative concurrence in this notebook involves an interesting generic interaction between prose writing and dramatic texts, but also between media (as the notebook also contains notes and texts for the radio medium).

Even if the temporal coincidence is not preserved in one particular document, it is possible to observe the impact of creative concurrence and its relevance to genetic criticism. Writers often allude to their previous works, creating a so-called "intratextual" network of references, a set of "links established by a reader between at least two texts written by the same author" (Martel 2005, 93). To see how concurrent writing on different projects can result in intratextual interference across versions, the winter of 1957-58 is a particularly interesting juncture. In the late fall of 1957, Beckett was struggling with the translation of

⁵ Bair's bibliography was published on 14 September 1978; see Pilling 2016, 207.

his own novel *L'Innommable* into English, and so he interrupted his translation to write a first draft of a radio play, *Embers*. At that moment (10 December 1957), the BBC broadcast a fragment from Beckett's novel *Molloy*, read by Patrick Magee. Beckett was struck by the actor's voice, but the transmission was not ideal. While Beckett temporarily abandoned his work on the radio play and continued translating *L'Innommable*,⁶ he went to the BBC studios in Paris where they played a recording of Magee's reading. This was probably the first time Beckett saw a tape-recorder, which prompted him to start writing the play *Krapp's Last Tape* (originally called "Magee Monologue") even before the end of his translation of *L'Innommable* — which he finished when he was three days into the writing process of *Krapp's Last Tape* (Van Hulle 2015, 138–50).

But that is still just concurrent writing in general, chronological terms. If we look at the texts, we see that this creative concurrence has a direct intratextual effect on the content of these works. A notebook at Harvard University's Houghton Library (BDMP 7, HU MS THR 70.3) contains an early version of the radio play *Embers*,⁷ which can be read as an inquiry into the workings of the human mind that was inspired partly by listening to Patrick Magee's readings of the *Molloy* fragments (10 December 1957)⁸ and *From an Abandoned Work* for the BBC.⁹ But *Embers* was also inspired by the act of translating *L'Innommable*. In the manuscript of *The Unnamable*, just before "Basil is becoming important" and the narrator decides to "call him Mahood instead" (BDMP 2, EN1, 21r), the first-person narrator describes his own voice, which — he says — was "like the sea":

I strained my ear towards what must have been my own voice still, so weak, so far, that it was *like the sea*, a calm distant sea far calm sea dying — no, none of that, no beach, no shore, the sea is enough, I've had enough of *shingle*, enough of sand, enough of earth, enough of sea too.

(BDMP 2, EN1, 21r; emphasis added)

While Beckett was making this translation, he started writing *Embers*, which opens with the directions: "*Sea scarcely audible. Henry's boots on shingle*" (Beck-

⁶ In his manuscript of *The Unnamable*, Beckett marked this moment on page 23v of the second notebook, referring to *Embers* as "Henry & Ada": "Reprise 21.1.58 après échec de Henry et Ada" ["Taken up again 21.1.58 after failure of Henry and Ada"] (BDMP 2, EN2, 23v).

⁷ This early English version of the radio play *Embers* starts on folio 10r in the form of a dialogue between "He" and "She", which ends on page 20r.

⁸ On 11 December 1957 Beckett wrote to Donald McWhinnie at the BBC: "I was in Paris last night and there listened to "Molloy". Reception execrable, needless to say, but I got enough, knowing the text so well, to realize the extraordinary quality of Magee's performance." (Beckett 2014b, 77)

⁹ In the same letter of 11 December, Beckett wrote he was "hoping to get it clearer on Friday, and on Saturday FAW [From an Abandoned Work] which I am waiting for with acute curiosity" (Beckett 2014b, 77–78).

ett 1959, 20). Here, the creative concurrence obviously had a direct intratextual impact.

But there were also *intertextual* connections that were partly triggered by concurrence.¹⁰ The opening directions of *Embers* with the sea in the background and the boots on the shingle recall the Joycean image of Stephen Dedalus walking on Sandymount strand in the “Proteus” episode of *Ulysses*. At this point, one might object that this is reading too much Joyce into the text. But when we look at the chronology of Beckett’s day-to-day business, we see that he had just been reading Joyce’s letters shortly before he started writing *Embers*¹¹ and that, after interrupting this writing process and taking *Embers* up again, he read Stanislaus Joyce’s book *My Brother’s Keeper*, about which he reported to Con Leventhal on 29 February 1958 (Van Hulle and Nixon 2013, 39). Beckett thus seems to have been reminded of Joyce’s famous experiment with the interior monologue in *Ulysses*, where Stephen closes his eyes to concentrate on the “ineluctable modality of the audible” (episode 3). In *Embers*, Beckett chose a similar setting to give a new, equally experimental shape to the Joycean stream of consciousness, concentrating on the audible in the “‘blind’ radio medium” (Beloborodova and Verhulst 2018, 251).

And there is more going on at the same time. Next to this watery connection to the sea, another element that connects the different concurrent creative projects is fire. In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and later in *Ulysses*, Joyce had made his protagonist refer to Percy Bysshe Shelley’s fading coal as a metaphor for “the mind in creation”: “In the intense instant of imagination, when the mind, Shelley says, is a fading coal” (Joyce 1986, 9.380). The reference highlights only the first part of Shelley’s comparison. In the second part of the famous “Defence of Poetry”, Shelley interestingly suggests a hint of linguistic skepticism, thereby presaging Fritz Mauthner’s *Sprachkritik*, which fascinated both Joyce and Beckett:

the mind in creation is as a fading coal, which some invisible influence, like an inconstant wind, awakens to transitory brightness; this power arises from within, like the colour of a flower which fades and changes as it is developed [...]. Could this influence be durable in its original purity and force, it is impossible to predict the greatness of the results: but when composition begins, inspiration is already on the decline; and the most glorious poetry that has been communicated to the world is probably a feeble shadow of the original conceptions of the poet.

(Shelley 1977, 505)

¹⁰ I use the notion of “intertextuality”, as opposed to “influence” (which only looks at interaction between authors without taking the reader into account), in the sense of Michael Riffaterre’s definition of intertextuality as “the reader’s experience of links” between different works (Riffaterre 1980, 4), with the explicit proviso that this also includes genetically informed readers.

¹¹ Faber had sent him “Joyce’s letters” according to a letter to Barbara Bray (18 September 1957) and a month later he wrote to Thomas MacGreevy that he had been “reading his letters” (Pilling 2016, 137).

The moment of inspiration may awaken the coal's brightness, but as soon as the poet starts putting it into words the coal increasingly transforms into the state of embers and ashes, which suggests a link with Beckett's lifelong fascination with the ineluctable modality of the ineffable. One of the intertextual elements in Beckett's work that illustrate this fascination is his favourite line from Petrarch, which he used to quote by heart: "Chi può dir com' egli arde é in picciol foco" (Atik 2001, 80). In Beckett's own translation: "He who knows he is burning is burning in a small fire"; or in an older translation by John Nott: "Faint is the flame that language can express" (Atik 2001, 80). In other words, if you can still put it into words, it can always get worse. Beckett used these "faint fires" in his translation of *L'Innommable*: "Je ne dois mon existence à personne, ces lueurs ne sont pas de celles qui éclairent ou brûlent" (Beckett 1953, 13) / "I owe my existence to nobody, these faint fires are not of the kind those that illuminate or burn" (BDMP 2, EN, 04r). During the process of translating *L'Innommable*, Beckett worked on the first manuscript version of *Embers* — which on its last page tellingly contains the words "the fire gone" (BDMP 7, HU MS THR 70.3, 20r) — and the first version of *Krapp's Last Tape*, in which the fire (symbolizing creative power) is a key theme. When Beckett discussed the play with the actor for whom he had written it (Patrick Magee) he wrote: "While I think of it a word to be brought out very strong is 'burning' (page 7, line 1), in order that 'fire' at the end may carry all its ambiguity" (Beckett 2014b, 129). Beckett is here referring to a particular typescript, on which he replaced the word "panting" by "burning": "drowned in dreams and ~~panting~~ burning to be gone" (BDMP 3, ET5, 07r). The ambiguity Beckett mentions is the tension between the wish to die (burning to be gone) and the creative fire of the artist Krapp when he was still younger, full of himself and "burning" to write his *magnum opus*. This cluster of meanings was contained in that one line from Petrarch, as Beckett explained in a letter to Con Leventhal shortly after the composition of *Krapp's Last Tape*: after quoting the line from Petrarch, he writes that he understands "arde" not in the sense of ardent lovers' burning desire but "more generally, and less gallantly, than in the Canzoniere":

As thus solicited it can link up with the 3rd proposition (coup de grâce) of Gorgias in his *Nonent*:

1. Nothing is
2. If anything is, it cannot be known.
3. If anything is, and can be known, it cannot be expressed in speech.

(Beckett 2014b, 136)

As this letter indicates, Beckett seems to have had a particular interpretation of Petrarch's line in mind, which focused on linguistic scepticism. Applied to Krapp, the Petrarchan subtext suggests that he who can say he is burning (the middle-aged Krapp on the tape, the artist as a younger man full of himself with "the fire in [him] now," convinced that he is going to write a *magnum opus* worth leaving his love for) is burning in a small fire.

All these faint fires find their place in Beckett's work almost concurrently in the winter of 1957-58, when Beckett is simultaneously working on his translation of *L'Innommable*, his first attempt at writing *Embers*, and *Krapp's Last Tape* (which is then followed by another bout at writing *Embers*, so that *Krapp's Last Tape* can be said to have been written as an *entr'acte* in the genesis of *Embers*). The intratextual connection between the faint fires in these works is triggered by an intertextual link with Petrarch. Beckett had been reading Petrarch as a student: his two-volume edition of *Le Rime del Petrarca* contains numerous marginalia and student notes (indicating for instance the rhyme scheme of some of the sonnets), but remarkably enough, his favourite line is *not* marked (Petrarca 1824). This raises the question why Petrarch suddenly enters the scene at this particular moment in 1958. Most probably, the trigger was actually another author. Beckett's personal library contains a 1958 edition of Michel de Montaigne's *Essais*. In his second essay, *De la Tristesse*, Montaigne quotes precisely this line from Petrarch (Montaigne 1958, 32). In and of itself, this Pléiade edition's publication in 1958 does not necessarily corroborate the potential connection with Beckett's output in the same year. To establish this connection, it may be useful to confront creative *concurrency* with another important force to be reckoned with in genetic criticism: creative *recurrence*.

3. Creative Recurrence

To examine the genesis of one particular work, it is often necessary to zoom out and include the rest of the *œuvre* and the *sous-œuvre*, both backward and forward in time. In *retrograde* direction, as indicated above, Beckett's knowledge of Petrarch dated back to his student days in the 1920s at Trinity College, Dublin, where he studied French and Italian literature. In the 1930s, he made copious notes on philosophy, with a special interest in the Presocratics. Under the heading "GORGIAS OF LEONTINI in Sicily (483-375)" he noted:

Three celebrated propositions –

1. Nothing exists.
2. If it did, it could not be known.
3. If it could be known, it could not be communicated. (In his On Nature, or, The Non-Existent)

All opinions equally false.

(TCD MS 10967/48; qtd in Feldman 2009, 76)

As the above-mentioned letter to Con Leventhal shows, twenty-five years after Beckett noted this down among his Philosophy notes, Gorgias's propositions "had lost little relevance to Beckett" (Feldman 2009, 76).

Looking *forward* in time, Beckett's "Nonent"-related reading of his favourite line brings Petrarch's statement closer to another one of Beckett's favourite lines, this time from Shakespeare's *King Lear*: "The worst is not / So long as one can

say, This is the worst" (qtd. in Van Hulle 2010, UoR MS 2910, 14v). Again the underlying idea is similar: as long as you can still say it, it can always get worse. This line is jotted down in a much later notebook from the 1970s (the so-called "Sottisier" Notebook), and is the starting point for *Worstward Ho*, a work Beckett wrote in the 1980s. In another notebook from the 1980s, he jotted down this reading trace: "Curae leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent (Seneca)" (Light sorrows speak, deeper ones are silent.) (BDMP 1, UoR MS 2934, f. 01r). Seneca is not part of Beckett's personal library in Paris. But there is a noteworthy connection with the same Pléiade edition of Montaigne's *Essais*. The quote from Seneca appears in the same second essay, *De la Tristesse*, on page 33, the page facing the one that contains the quotation from Petrarch. This diachronical axis of recurrent preoccupations meets the synchronic axis of creative concurrence in early 1958, giving us a sense of the various literary projects that were lying on Beckett's desk at the same time, and thus mutually impacted on each other.

4. Conclusion

As mentioned above, now that genetic criticism exists more than fifty years, the time seems propitious to refine de Biasi's model and find a place for both the sociology of writing and creative concurrence/recurrence in genetic criticism. The details of the examples above should not prevent us from seeing the wood for the trees. They provide us with the particulars to remodel the complex relationship between private and public, which has perhaps too easily been oversimplified as a general dichotomy, and which has in that capacity played a central role in genetic criticism for several decades. As in McKenzie's refutation of McKerrow's general statement (quoted above), the details of everyday life in an author's writing practice can transform a valid general statement into an invalid particular statement. As discussed above, in many cases, the text can already become public before the *bon à tirer* moment, for instance through pre-book publications. And social events, such as commissions, can lead to periods of creative concurrence, which is not included in de Biasi's scheme as its implied focus is on single works as items of study, relatively isolated from the rest of the oeuvre.¹²

To some extent, such a work-by-work approach may have been conditioned by the print paradigm, which has had consequences for scholarly editing. Due to the limited space, a printed edition often necessarily presents a literary oeuvre

¹² For instance, he defines the collection of genetic documentation [*dossier de genèse*] as "the whole body of known, classified, and transcribed manuscripts and documents connected with a text whose form has reached, in the opinion of its author, a state of completion or near completion" (Biasi 1996, 31; emphasis added). The "Typology of Genetic Documentation" is presented as "a general table of the stages, phases, and operational functions that enable the classification of different types of manuscripts according to their location and status in the process of a work's production" (Biasi 1996, 32; emphasis added).

as a set of works, represented by a critically edited text and accompanied by annotations and a critical apparatus; and due to the codex format, the individual works are often contained in separate volumes. As a result, the writer's complete works appear as a sum of parts. By means of introductions and annotations, the editor usually has to remedy this by explaining that the oeuvre also constitutes a *Gestalt*, a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. A *Gestalt* however, is not only greater than, but also *different* from, the sum of its parts. As Carroll Pratt writes in the introduction to Wolfgang Köhler's *The Task of Gestalt Psychology*, it is a common error to leave out the word "different" and simply define a *Gestalt* as "the whole is more than the sum of the parts" (Pratt 1969, 9). This definition mistakenly ignores that a *relationship between* the parts is itself something that is not present in the individual parts themselves (Pratt 1969, 10). If all the parts of a bike are laid out on the floor of a bike shop, for instance, they still do not make up the bike. Only when the parts are assembled and come to take up a specific *relation* to each other, do they become something different, that is, a bike. If, in the digital age, we treat the oeuvre as a *Gestalt* to develop a digital complete works edition that is truly *complete*, we need to think inclusively about the entirety of genetic dossiers relating to an author's works, both published and unpublished, providing tools for advanced chronological searches into both the synchrony and the diachrony of the *sous-oeuvre*, in which creative concurrence and recurrence play a significant role.

Bibliography

- ATIK, ANNE, 2001. *How It Was: A Memoir of Samuel Beckett*. London: Faber & Faber.
- BANVILLE, JOHN, December 1989. "Waiting for the Last Word." *The Observer* page 36.
- BECKETT, SAMUEL, 1953. *L'Innommable*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- , 1959. *Krapp's Last Tape and Embers*. London: Faber and Faber.
- , 2009. *Company, Ill Seen Ill Said, Worstward Ho, Stirrings Still*, edited by Dirk Van Hulle. London: Faber and Faber.
- , 2011. *BDMP 1 – Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / what is the word (digital genetic edition), The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, volume 1, edited by Dirk Van Hulle and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp. Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org> (Accessed: 2020-06-17).
- , 2012. *Collected Poems*, edited by Seán Lawlor and John Pilling. London: Faber and Faber.

- , 2014a. *BDMP 2 – L’Innommable / The Unnamable (digital genetic edition)*, *The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, volume 2, edited by Dirk Van Hulle, Vincent Neyt, and Shane Weller. Brussels: University Press Antwerp. Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org> (Accessed: 2020–06–17).
- , 2014b. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett (1957–1965)*, volume 3, edited by George Craig, Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn, and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2015. *BDMP 3 – Krapp’s Last Tape / La Dernière Bande (digital genetic edition)*, *The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, volume 3, edited by Dirk Van Hulle and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp. Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org> (Accessed: 2020–06–17).
- , 2016. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett (1966–1989)*, volume 4, edited by George Craig, Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn, and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2018. *BDMP 7 – Fin de partie / Endgame (digital genetic edition)*, *The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, volume 7, edited by Dirk Van Hulle, Shane Weller, and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp. Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org>.
- , 2020. *BDMP 9 – Company / Compagnie (digital genetic edition)*, *The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, volume 9, edited by Dirk Van Hulle, Vincent Neyt, and Georgina Nugent-Folan. Brussels: University Press Antwerp. Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org> (Accessed: 2020–06–17).
- BELOBORODOVA, OLGA and PIM VERHULST, 2018. “Broadcasting the mind: extended cognition in Beckett’s radio plays.” In *Beckett and Modernism*, edited by Olga Beloborodova, Pim Verhulst, and Dirk Van Hulle, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pages 239–57.
- BENNET, ALAN, 1989–92. “Play scripts for The Madness of George III, 1989–1992.”
- BIASI, PIERRE-MARC DE, 1996. “What is a Literary Draft? Toward a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation.” *Yale French Studies* 89, pages 26–58.
- CARVER, RAYMOND, 2009. *Collected Stories*, edited by William Stull and Maureen Carroll. New York City (NY): Library of America.
- CONNOLLY, THOMAS C., 2018. *Paul Celan’s Unfinished Poetics: Readings in the Sous-CŒuvre*. Cambridge: Legenda.
- CROSBY, CARESS, 1953. *The Passionate Years: An Autobiography*. New York (NY): The Dial Press.
- ELLMANN, RICHARD, 1983. *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, new and revised edition.

- ENGELBERTS, MATTHIJS, 2001. *Défis du récit scénique: Formes et enjeux du mode narratif dans le théâtre de Beckett et Duras*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- FELDMAN, MATTHEW, 2009. *Beckett's Books: A Cultural History of the Interwar Notes*. London: Continuum.
- GILBERT, STUART, 1993. *Reflections on James Joyce: Stuart Gilbert's Paris Journal*, edited by Thomas Staley and Randolph Lewis. Austin (TX): University of Texas Press.
- GRODEN, MICHAEL, 1977. *'Ulysses' in Progress*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- GROENLAND, TIM, 2019. *The Art of Editing: Raymond Carver and David Foster Wallace*. London: Bloomsbury.
- HUTTON, CLARE, 2019. *Serial Encounters: 'Ulysses' and 'The Little Review'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HYTNER, NICHOLAS, 2018. *Balancing Acts: Behind the Scenes at the National Theatre*. London: Vintage.
- JOYCE, JAMES, 1939. *Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber & Faber.
- , 1986. *Ulysses*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppa, and Claus Melchior. London: Vintage.
- LEWIS, WYNDHAM, 1993. *Time and Western Man*, edited by Paul Edwards. Santa Rosa (CA): Black Sparrow Press.
- MARTEL, KAREEN, 2005. "Les notions d'intertextualité et d'intratextualité dans les théories de la réception." *Protée* 33(1), pages 93–102.
- MCGANN, JEROME, 1992. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- McKENZIE, D. F., 1999. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2002. *Making Meaning: 'Printers of the Mind' and Other Essays*, edited by Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez, S. J. Amherst (MA): University of Massachusetts Press.
- MONTAIGNE, MICHEL DE, 1958. *Essais*. Paris: Gallimard Pléiade.
- PETRARCA, FRANCESCO, 1824. *Le Rime del Petrarca*. Milan: Nicolò Bettoni.
- PILLING, JOHN, 2016. *A Samuel Beckett Chronology*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

- POLSGROVE, CAROL, 1995. *It Wasn't Pretty, Folks, But Didn't We Have Fun? Esquire in the Sixties*. New York (NY): W. W. Norton.
- PRATT, CAROLL C., 1969. "Introduction." In *The Task of Gestalt Psychology*, authored by Köhler, Wolfgang, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, pages 3–32.
- REIMAN, DONALD, 1993. *The Study of Modern Manuscripts*. Baltimore (MD): John Hopkins University Press.
- RIFFATERRE, MICHAEL, 1980. "La Trace de l'intertexte." *Pensée* 215, pages 4–18.
- SHELLEY, PERCY BYSSHE, 1977. *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*, edited by Donald H. Reiman and Sharon B. Powers. New York (NY): Norton.
- SULLIVAN, HANNAH, 2013. *The Work of Revision*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- VAN HULLE, DIRK, 1999. "Beckett, Mauthner, Zimmer, Joyce." *Joyce Studies Annual* pages 143–83.
- , 2010. "Beckett and Shakespeare on Nothing, or Whatever Lurks behind the Veil." *Beckett* 1. Available from:
<http://www.limitebeckett.paris-sorbonne.fr/one/vanhulle.html>
 (Accessed: 2020–08–13).
- , 2014. *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing from Darwin to Beckett and Beyond*. London: Bloomsbury.
- , 2015. *The Making of Samuel Beckett's 'Krapp's Last Tape' / 'La Dernière Bande'*. London: Bloomsbury.
- , 2016. *James Joyce's 'Work in Progress': Pre-Book Publications of 'Finnegans Wake' Fragments*. Studies in Publishing History: Manuscript, Print, Digital. New York (NY): Routledge.
- , 2019. "Beckett's Art of the Commonplace: The 'Sottisier' Notebook and mirlitonades Drafts." *Journal of Beckett Studies* 28(1), pages 67–89.
- VAN HULLE, DIRK and MARK NIXON, 2013. *Samuel Beckett's Library*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creators’ Intentions and the Realities of Performance: Some Exemplary Editorial Problems from the Savoy Operas

Ronald Broude

Abstract: When playwrights, composers and choreographers bring scripts, scores, and choreographies to first rehearsals, these are provisional documents that still need to be tested, transformed into audible sounds and visible movements. Works that are successful enough to be revived go through similar processes of testing and adjustment for each new production. In no genre are such adjustments so many or so far reaching as in opera. The Savoy Operas — the collaborations of Gilbert and Sullivan — constitute an excellent repertoire in which to study the dynamics of this process, for their genesis and performing history can be traced in a wealth of documentation. Although performances were controlled for three quarters of a century by the D’Oyly Carte Opera Company, a troupe committed to performing these works exactly as their creators had intended, numerous adjustments were made over the years. Because few good performers will regard any text as altogether binding, editors should supplement their clear texts with enough information, provided in critical commentary and appendices, to enable performers to exercise intelligently the freedom they will almost certainly claim.

THE SCRIPTS, SCORES, AND CHOREOGRAPHIES that playwrights, composers and choreographers bring with them to first rehearsals are necessarily provisional documents.* Those documents represent the creators’ original intentions, but only when those intentions have been tested in rehearsal, transformed into audible sounds and visible movements, can creators know if their conceptions are effective onstage.¹ Invariably, adjustments must be made to meet the realities of performance with specific performers, specific venues and specific audiences, and the creators’ pre-rehearsal intentions are modified accordingly. The process

* *Editors’ Note:* The editors of this issue have exercised their editorial prerogative to redact all racial slurs from this essay. This includes those cases where they were quoted verbatim from the original source text (see page 73 below). These changes have been made with the author’s consent. For a more detailed justification of how and why these redactions took place, please refer to our editorial preface in the current issue (esp. pages viii–x).

¹ For a perceptive discussion of the transformations undergone by a playwright’s script during rehearsals, see Philip Gaskell’s study of the textual changes in Tom Stoppard’s *Travesties* (Gaskell 1978, 245–62).

often extends beyond rehearsals to the days or weeks following opening night; when all adjustments have been made, the work is said to have been “settled” or “frozen”. If a work is successful enough to merit successive productions, the revivals undergo a similar process of revision. Creators sometimes oversee revivals of their works, but often revivals take place without them, either because they are otherwise occupied or because they are dead. In the absence of a work’s creator, new adjustments are made by those involved in the new production. Sometimes, such adjustments become firmly fixed elements of performing traditions, so that even knowledgeable audiences are unable to distinguish them from what was present in the original production.

These aspects of performing works raise for editors a variety of problems not usually present with works meant to be read by their audiences directly off the page, works such as novels, poems and essays.² The Savoy Operas³ — the collaborations of librettist W. S. Gilbert and composer Arthur Sullivan — provide an unusual opportunity to study the dynamics of performing works over a substantial span of time. They were performed at first under the direction of the creators themselves and later, after the creators’ deaths, under the control of a single organization — the D’Oyly Carte Opera Company — committed to performing the works exactly as their creators had intended.⁴ The D’Oyly Carte Opera Company was formed by Gilbert, Sullivan and Richard D’Oyly Carte, the impresario who had brought librettist and composer together and whose diplomatic skills had kept them so, notwithstanding differences in personality and artistic aims. The thirteen works for which both music and libretto survive were composed between 1873 and 1896, and until 1960, when international copyright in them expired, they were maintained in repertory by the D’Oyly

² For a discussion of differences between “page texts” (texts meant to be experienced by audiences reading them directly off the page) and “stage texts” (those of performing works, the texts of which audiences need never see), see Broude 2011, *passim*, but esp. pages 24–25.

³ ‘Savoy Operas’ is the collective name given to the thirteen collaborations of librettist W. S. Gilbert (1836–1911) and composer Arthur Sullivan (1852–1900) for which both music and libretto survive. The thirteen are *Trial by Jury* (1875), *The Sorcerer* (1877), *H. M. S. Pinafore* (1878), *The Pirates of Penzance* (1879), *Patience* (1881), *Iolanthe* (1882), *Princess Ida* (1884), *The Mikado* (1885), *Ruddigore* (1887), *The Yeomen of the Guard* (1888), *The Gondoliers* (1889), *Utopia, Ltd.* (1893), and *The Grand Duke* (1896). The operas take their name from the Savoy Theatre, expressly built in 1882 by Richard D’Oyly Carte to house productions of Gilbert and Sullivan’s operas, which by that time had become an institution. All the operas that opened before 1882 had their premieres at other theatres, although all thirteen were at some time performed at the Savoy. A fourteenth work, Gilbert and Sullivan’s first collaboration, *Thespis* (1871), survives only in part: the libretto was printed and so reaches us in its entirety, but only snatches of the music have been preserved: “Climbing over Rocky Mountain” was later recycled in *Pirates* (1:5). Since Sullivan was frugal with what he composed, it seems likely that other music from *Thespis* may have been recycled. On *Thespis*, see Rees 1964.

⁴ For a history of the D’Oyly Carte Opera Company, see Joseph 1994. The casts of 86 years of D’Oyly Carte productions are catalogued in Rollins and Witts 1962. For a recent memoir of the last years of the Company, see Mackie 2018.

Carte Opera Company, which tightly controlled both its own productions and productions by other organizations to which it rented, under strict licenses, the performing materials needed to stage full-scale productions. The D'Oyly Carte Opera Company was founded in 1879, when London had two competing productions of *H. M. S. Pinafore*, Gilbert and Sullivan's fourth collaboration and first real hit; both then and later (when pirates in America were mounting unauthorized productions), D'Oyly Carte defined itself as the organization that performed the operas exactly as their creators had intended.⁵ Gilbert and Sullivan, both known as sticklers for detail, had shaped the original productions, and the performing traditions that the D'Oyly Carte Company maintained until its unhappy last days in the 1980s therefore went back in an unbroken line to the performances that Gilbert and Sullivan themselves had directed. Yet notwithstanding the efforts to maintain stability, the operas changed over the years.⁶ The following paragraphs are intended to look at some of those changes and to raise some questions that those changes imply.

Until 1958, when Reginal Allen's *First Night Gilbert & Sullivan* appeared, Savoyards' interest in textual problems was lively but unfocused (Allen 1958).⁷ Both performers and Gilbert & Sullivan enthusiasts were aware that there were textual problems, that as the years and decades passed not everything that was being performed had been intended by the creators, but the ability to address these problems was hampered by the inaccessibility of sources. D'Oyly Carte jealously guarded the few full scores in its possession (productions were conducted from vocal scores),⁸ and the unauthorized published full scores in

⁵ On the origins of the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company and its establishment as the organization performing the operas in accordance with the creators' wishes, see Young 2003, Part B, pages 14–15, and Joseph 1994, pages 21–24.

⁶ Opera is a notoriously unstable genre, probably because so many interests figure in productions: there are composers, conductors, singers, instrumentalists, librettists, directors, choreographers, and scene designers — not to mention the producers who look after financial concerns. On the instability of operatic works, written by a scholar concerned with both texts and performance, see Gossett 2006.

⁷ Allen was both an insider — he had secured the confidence of the D'Oyly Carte board, of which he became a member — and something of an outsider: an American collector, with bibliographic interests, and an awareness of the textual problems from which Gilbert's libretti suffered. His attempts to establish the text for the first night of each opera, although not always successful, constituted an important step in addressing the textual instability of the libretti, and the collection of libretti, vocal scores, and other material that he assembled and donated to what is now the Morgan Library and Museum (formerly the Pierpont Morgan Library) has proven an invaluable resource to subsequent editors. On the state of Gilbert & Sullivan textual studies in the 1950s, see Allen's Prologue, pages xvii–xviii. Allen's efforts were confined to the libretti; with the exception of the vocal scores, the musical sources remained largely inaccessible and problematic.

⁸ Full scores give all the notes sung by all the singers (principals and chorus) and played by all the instrumentalists, while vocal scores give all the singers' parts but reduce the orchestral parts to the two staves of a piano score; vocal scores therefore provide much less information than full scores. On the problems posed by the Savoy Opera sources, see Broude 2008.

circulation had been scored up from unreliable band parts; the texts of libretti had been uncritically reproduced for trade editions from a variety of early sources. The publication of a critical edition of the operas (the first volume appeared in 1993) and of Ian Bradley's texts of the libretti, *The Annotated Gilbert & Sullivan*, were historicizing editions in the sense that they sought to present texts corresponding to specific states in which the edited works had existed, and that they were keen to explain to users the processes by which those texts had changed over time.⁹ The implications of the sorts of changes discussed in the following paragraphs extend, of course, beyond the Savoy Operas; every performing genre, whether of drama, dance, or music, responds to forces that are unique to it, but there are also certain similarities in the ways all performing works are created, performed, transmitted, and experienced.

An important category of textual problems presented by the Savoy Operas requires the editor to distinguish between two sorts of adjustments made during first productions. On the one hand, there are compromises made to meet the sorts of unique exigencies that will arise in any production but that are unlikely ever to arise again. On the other hand, there are adjustments made for the larger purpose of improving the work. *Princess Ida*, Gilbert and Sullivan's eighth collaboration, which opened in 1884, provides a good example of a first-production-only problem.

Shortly before *Princess Ida* was to go into rehearsal, the tenor Henry Bracy was signed to sing the part of Prince Hilarion, the male romantic lead in the opera. It is a convention in this class of work that when the male romantic lead is a tenor, as he very often is, his is the highest male part in respect of range. This is the convention upon which Sullivan relied when he composed No. 20, the first to be composed of the three pieces in which Hilarion sings with his friends and confidants Cyril (another tenor) and Florian (a baritone).¹⁰

Hilarion was Bracy's first role in a Savoy Opera, and it would be his last, for it soon became apparent that he did not have the high notes expected of a high tenor. Derward Lely, the Scottish tenor who sang Cyril, did have those high notes, and so, in the ensemble numbers for Hilarion, Cyril, and Florian that Sullivan composed after Bracy's shortcomings had become apparent — Nos. 12 and 13 — Cyril (rather than Hilarion) was given the highest lines. But No. 20, the Finale to Act 2, which Sullivan had composed the previous summer, contained a dramatically important solo passage for Hilarion in which, at measure 95, Bracy was required to hit and hold a B-flat above middle C, a note that a high

⁹ The first volume in the critical edition was *Trial by Jury*, edited by Steven Ledbetter (Gilbert and Sullivan 1993). *The Annotated Gilbert and Sullivan*, cited herein as Bradley 1996, first appeared in two volumes, the first issued in 1982 and the second in 1984; Bradley 1996 combines the contents of the earlier two volumes and provides new material.

¹⁰ References to act, number and measure are to Richard Sher's edition of *Princess Ida*, Gilbert & Sullivan (2021), and to the original vocal score, Gilbert & Sullivan 1883, first edition, second issue (first English issue), which agrees with Sher's edition with respect to act and number but which lacks measure numbers. On these events, see Gilbert and Sullivan 2021.

tenor should have been able to manage with ease. Sullivan, however, lacked confidence in Bracy's ability to sustain that note consistently, and so he rewrote Hilarion's line, lowering the B-flat by a full tone to A-flat, which he trusted Bracy to negotiate. The orchestral accompaniment was adjusted accordingly. The process of revision can be traced in Sullivan's holograph.¹¹ Presumably, the A-Flat is what Bracy sang in the performances in which he participated.

However, in the piano vocal score of *Princess Ida*, which was prepared by George Lowell Tracy and engraved before the B-flat had been lowered to an A-flat, the B-flat remains, unaltered. And that B-Flat is what has been sung by Hilarions down to the present day. Now should an editor preparing a critical edition of *Princess Ida* print the B-flat or the A-flat?

Two approaches supported by familiar (though differing) theories suggest that it is the A-flat that an editor should print. If an editor adheres to the view that his or her edition should represent the composer's latest intentions, then it is the A-flat that clearly represents Sullivan's latest intentions. On the other hand, if an editor takes a social approach, then the A-flat represents the socialization of Sullivan's text, its accommodation to the realities of the institution for which and within which it was created. But this is really not a matter of latest intentions or socialized texts.

In deciding what to print in such a case, a conscientious editor will probably consider several factors. First is what may be called the narrative, i.e.: the sequence of events that has led to the change, including the creator's original intentions, the creator's revision, and the circumstances that led from the former to the latter. Then there is the evidence of the textual and of the performing traditions — two traditions that may not always be in agreement. Finally, there are the relative artistic merits of the original and revised states. In theory, this last is not a factor that should influence a critical editor, who should be concerned not with artistic quality but with what a text was — or was intended to be — at some specific moment in the past. But where the difference in quality seems significant, artistic merit can sometimes influence an editor's decision.

In the present case, the narrative is clear: Sullivan originally intended the B-flat, and changed it only because of a specific singer's limitations. As for the textual tradition, the B-flat was retained in the vocal score, even though it could have been changed (although the degree of Sullivan's involvement in the preparation of the vocal score is uncertain). The performing tradition is that of the B-flat. And, happily, Sullivan's original B-flat is musically superior to the altered line he contrived for Bracy. Richard Sher, the editor of the critical edition of *Princess Ida* (Sher 2021), prints the B-flat, and discusses the history of the readings in his critical apparatus.

But the case of Bracy and Hilarion is quite a simple one. The problem becomes more complicated when the effects of a change made to address the circumstances of a specific production are not just local or when a change seriously compromises the artistic quality of a work as a whole. *H. M. S. Pinafore*, produced

¹¹ See Sullivan 1884, fol. 118^r, the tenth measure on the page.

in 1878, is an opera in which major structural changes made to accommodate a particular performer had unfortunate consequences.

In *Pinafore*, Sir Joseph Porter, the Admiralty's First Lord, has inappropriately fallen in love with the much younger — and socially inferior — Josephine, who is the daughter of a mere captain. Josephine has also fallen in love with someone socially beneath her: a sailor serving aboard the ship her father commands. In the end, when Josephine gets her sailor and all the principals are being paired off, Sir Joseph consents to marry his cousin Hebe. As the published texts stand, his seems a curiously arbitrary decision: Hebe has been a relatively minor character, who, unlike the other principals, has neither solo nor dialogue, and who participates in the Act 1 finale for no apparent dramatic reason.

The role of Cousin Hebe was written for a popular performer, Mrs. Howard Paul. As originally conceived, the part was a rounded, comic role: Cousin Hebe wants to marry Sir Joseph herself, she does everything she can to discourage Sir Joseph's infatuation, and she encourages Josephine to elope with the sailor whom Josephine loves (hence her presence onstage during the Act 1 finale, when plans for the elopement are being laid). The part as originally conceived is to be found in the licensing copy sent to the Lord Chamberlain three weeks before opening night (Gilbert 1878).¹²

Shortly before opening night, however, Mrs. Howard Paul was dismissed, and it was necessary to find a replacement for her. The replacement whom Gilbert and Sullivan chose was Jessie Bond, one of the few performers in London able consistently to get her way with the famously irascible Gilbert. Bond was a singer, not an actress, and she agreed to take the role of Cousin Hebe on such short notice only on the condition that she would have no dialogue to speak; Gilbert accommodated her, and all of Hebe's dialogue was cut. In all the authorized published texts of *Pinafore*, Hebe has no dialogue, nor did Hebe ever have any speaking lines in any production of *Pinafore* mounted by the D'Oyly Carte Company. One other point: *Pinafore* was revived under Gilbert's direction in 1887, and had Gilbert wished, he could have restored Hebe's dialogue for the revival. The role was reprised by Jessie Bond, who by 1887 was in her tenth year with the D'Oyly Carte Company, and who by then had become thoroughly accustomed to roles requiring her to speak dialogue. But Gilbert did not restore the dialogue. He must certainly have understood that his original conception of Hebe, as intended for Mrs. Howard Paul, was sound and that in accommodating a temperamental and manipulative performer, he had weakened his libretto. There is no documentary or anecdotal evidence to suggest why the dialogue was not restored, but one reason, no doubt, was that the opera had been a hit without the suppressed dialogue, and Gilbert was not a librettist to tinker with something that had proven successful.

So we may ask: should an editor preparing a critical edition of *Pinafore* restore

¹² On the dismissal of Mrs. Howard Paul and the adjustments made to accommodate Jessie Bond, see Young 2003, Part B, pages 14–15. These events are also recounted by Jessie Bond in Bond 1930, pages 58–61, though Bond's objectivity may be questioned.

Hebe's dialogue? Suppressing Hebe's dialogue seriously compromises the internal consistency of the action, but both the textual and the performing traditions argue against restoration. Percy Young, the editor of the critical edition of *Pinafore*, opts not to restore the suppressed dialogue in the main body of his edition. He does, however, print all of the relevant passages in an appendix, so that productions using his edition can perform the suppressed dialogue — and several have done so (Gilbert and Sullivan 2003, B:173–77). So here, as with *Princess Ida*, the editor has followed the textual and performing traditions, which are in agreement, and which were clearly in accordance with the creator's latest wishes. But in the case of *Pinafore*, the editor has done so believing that the altered version that he has printed is artistically inferior to what he might have printed.

The dilemma Young faced puts front and center the distinction touched upon above, that between work and performance (or production). According to traditional thinking, a work is a stable and continuing entity, whereas a performance or production is an instantiation of the work. Provided that the creator's conception be practical — provided that he or she asks no more than should be expected of any competent performer — it seems perverse to allow the problems that arise in a particular production to determine forever the shape of the work.

But there is no evidence that Gilbert or Sullivan ever made any distinction between production-specific adjustments and artistic improvements. They seem rarely to have thought any farther than the first run. They were, after all, practical men of the musical theatre, and they do not seem to have regarded their collaborations as immortal works of art. Even when, in 1885, they began reviving their earlier operas (*The Sorcerer*, first produced in 1874, was the first to be revived), they might change the scenery, but they very rarely modified the libretto or the music; they usually admitted changes to the published vocal scores and libretti only to correct errors in earlier states.¹³ This attitude is no doubt typical of many dramatists and composers, who are creators confiding their creations to agencies often beyond their control — to actors, musicians, dancers, directors and producers — and for whom just having seen the piece through to opening night may seem a significant achievement.

Another sort of problem requiring editorial discretion occurs when the creator makes changes in response to censorship, whether explicitly imposed by an agent such as the licensing office of the Lord Chamberlain, or by critics, producers, or audiences, who exert a different but no less coercive force. Such

¹³ Thus, for example, new scenery was created for the revival of *Pinafore* in 1887. In this production the audience sat amidship, looking aft towards the quarterdeck. In the original production, the audience sat abeam, with the quarterdeck to the right and the mainmast to the left. The stage directions, however, were not completely revised to suit the new layout in the revival, an omission which has caused confusion.

One of Gilbert's best known efforts at inserting something topical in a revival occurred with a reference to the Boer War during a 1901 revival of *Iolanthe*; the line was considered inappropriate and likely to arouse strong political emotions, and Gilbert withdrew it.

cases occur in Gilbert & Sullivan's seventh collaboration, *Iolanthe*, which had its premiere on 25 November 1882, and which has more biting social and political commentary than any of the other Savoy Operas. *Iolanthe* deals satirically with the House of Peers, the British legal system, and the English preoccupation with birth, three seriously flawed institutions about which Victorian audiences were understandably sensitive. In this opera, a band of fairies, having been offended by a particularly arrogant peer, punishes the House of Lords by sending into Parliament a protégé, who, backed by the fairies' magical powers, implements legislation that will right certain social wrongs and will deny the Peers many of their ancient and cherished privileges.

Iolanthe had a difficult gestation; Gilbert's sketch-books show that his first ideas were much more inflammatory than the toned-down satire of the opera as we know it.¹⁴ For *Iolanthe*, Gilbert's polishing process involved removing the elements with the sharpest edges. Notwithstanding his reputation as a martinet and his ability to keep performers in terror of him, Gilbert could be indecisive about his libretti, and the rewrites that were invariably required during rehearsals were often quite difficult for him. With *Iolanthe*, even more so than usual, Gilbert was juggling musical numbers and dialogue right up until opening night — and afterwards.

As constituted on opening night, *Iolanthe*'s second act had two particularly bitter political pieces, the original No. 6, known as the "De Belville Song, or The Reward of Merit", and the original No. 9, a song beginning "Fold your flapping wings, soaring Legislature". The "De Belville Song" tells of a gentleman gifted as an artist, writer and inventor, and for whose accomplishments a peerage might have been a suitable reward. But no peerage was forthcoming until the gentleman inherited a safe seat in the House of Commons and began making "inconvenient speeches" there. At this point, a reward was quickly found: he was given a peerage and thereby banished to the House of Lords.¹⁵

After opening night, Gilbert and Sullivan set about to tighten up the second act. There were two rounds of cuts separated by a few days; the alterations can be traced by comparing states of the first English edition of the libretto, the type for which was kept standing so that the text could be easily modified until the settled state was reached.¹⁶ The "De Belville Song" was cut during the first round of revisions. Unfortunately, although the lyric is preserved in

¹⁴ On the genesis of *Iolanthe*, see Perry 2005, and Perry et al. 2017, Part C, pages 2–15.

¹⁵ For the text of the "De Belville Song", see Gilbert and Sullivan 2017, Part C, pages 198–99. On the song's history, see Miller and Perry 2000.

¹⁶ The London opening night is reflected by the first state of the British libretto (L1b in Gerald Hendrie's edition, Gilbert and Sullivan 2017), while the second is reflected in the second state of the British libretto (Hendrie's L1c). (The edition printed by J. M. Stoddart in Philadelphia and run off from plates made from stereotypes sent over from London, is the first published state of the libretto, designated by Hendrie L1a.) See the critical apparatus to Hendrie's edition of the libretto, Gilbert and Sullivan 2017, Part C, pages 19–62. References to act, number and measure or line are to this edition.

the first two issues of the published libretto, all that survives of the music is a violin leader part, which provides just enough information to justify attempting a reconstruction but not enough to support a convincing one, and it is therefore impossible to assess the quality of music-cum-words.¹⁷

"Fold your flapping wings"¹⁸ was a victim of the second round of cuts, but fortunately both its words and music survive. This song contains some of the angriest passages in all the Savoy Operas. Sung by the fairies' reform-minded protégé, now an MP, the song deals uncomfortably with the question of London's underclasses and the system that perpetuates them. One verse reads:

Take a wretched thief,
Through the city sneaking,
Pocket handkerchief,
Ever, ever seeking.
What is he but I
Robbed of all my chances,
Picking pockets by
Force of circumstances.
I might be as bad —
As unlucky, rather —
If I'd only had
Fagin for a father.

The number had been well received — indeed, it had been encored, and several critics had written very favorably of it. But other critics had objected that its subject was too serious for a comic opera.¹⁹ In deciding to cut this number, Gilbert was no doubt responding to the need to compress the second act, but it is impossible not to believe that he also did so because he feared that retaining the number would frighten away some potential ticket buyers. Happily, however, Sullivan was reluctant to see the number cut, and, contrary to his usual practice of putting discarded numbers aside to be recycled when Gilbert presented him with a metrically suitable lyric, he kept the manuscript fascicle containing "Fold Your Flapping Wings" intact and had it bound into the end of his holograph²⁰ —

¹⁷ The number was sung in the New York production, but in the London production, Rutland Barrington, to whom the song had been assigned, was indisposed, and he recited rather than sang the number. A reconstruction has been attempted by Bruce Miller and Helga Perry; see Miller and Perry 2000.

¹⁸ For an edition of the words and music, see Gilbert and Sullivan 2017, Part C, pages 181-90; for the words only, see Part C, pages 202-03.

¹⁹ The anonymous reviewer for *The Sportsman* praised the number, noting that it was "unanimously encored" (Anonymous 1882, 3). On the other hand, William Beatty-Kingston, writing for *The Theatre*, asserts that "it amazes and even startles one, like the fall of a red-hot thunderbolt from a smiling summer sky" (Beatty-Kingston 1883, 22).

²⁰ See Sullivan 1882; in the manuscript's present state, it occupies Vol. 2, pages 161-174.

both lyric and music, therefore, survive.

Should “Fold Your Flapping Wings” be restored in a critical edition of *Iolanthe*? Should a reconstruction of the “De Belville Song” be offered as part of the edition? Gerald Hendrie, who edited *Iolanthe* for the critical edition, does not restore “Fold Your Flapping Wings” — nor any of the other extant material cut either before or after opening night. But in appendices he does give the piece — both words and music — and as much of the other excised material — including the violin leader of the “De Belville” song — as survives. And both these decisions seem to me to be right: the declared aim of the Critical Edition is to establish a text that represents the settled state of each work, the state that Gilbert and Sullivan — perhaps misguidedly — allowed the opera to assume. It is not the business of the editor of an edition with this aim to second guess the creators of the work he is editing and to impose his own views, whether artistic or social, on the edited work. That way lies chaos.

Another sort of problem that confronts editors of performing works is how to manage changes that have been made, with or without the creators’ approval, to replace material that was topical when a work was written but that has since become meaningless — or worse — offensive. Although an editor of a poem or novel would not think of making such changes, they are made in performing works with surprising frequency.²¹ Several examples of such changes occur in *The Mikado*, Gilbert and Sullivan’s ninth and most popular collaboration, produced in 1885.

In the second act of *The Mikado* (lines 470–99), the Mikado, arriving with his royal entourage in the town of Titipu, inquires of the citizens as to the whereabouts of his runaway son, Nanki-Poo.²² Informed that Nanki-Poo has “gone abroad”, he asks for his son’s address. The reply is “Knightsbridge”. A year before *The Mikado* opened there had been a Japanese exhibition in the London neighborhood of Knightsbridge, and the reference would have been understood by *The Mikado*’s first audiences. However, the meaning was lost when the exposition closed and its memory faded, and so it has become traditional for performers responding to the Mikado’s query to substitute for “Knightsbridge” the name of some locale in or near the city in which their production is taking place (for example, for the annual production of a Gilbert & Sullivan opera at Longwood Gardens outside Philadelphia, “Kennett Square”, the town in which Longwood Gardens is located, might stand in for Knightsbridge). The editor of the critical edition of *The Mikado* (who is the author of this article) will print

²¹ With a performing work, there is a reciprocity between a text and its users — the performers — that does not exist with a novel or a poem. The reader of a poem does not alter a passage that might be improved, but a performer not infrequently changes a note or an articulation, and conductors have been known to alter the scoring of orchestral works. One reason that this is so is that the reader of a novel is the novel’s audience, while the reader of a performing text is a performer, mediating between text and audience, and the audience is one remove farther away from the text. Further on this matter, see Broude 2011, 24–33.

²² References to act and line numbers in *The Mikado* libretto are to Bradley 1996.

"Knightsbridge", but will include a footnote explaining the practice of posting Nanki-Poo to locales more relevant to specific productions.

A slightly more complex problem occurs in Act 2, No. 7, in which Ko-Ko, Pitti-Sing, and Poo-Bah describe for the Mikado an execution that is supposed to have taken place. Pitti-Sing tells how, noticing her, the condemned man, who had previously been fearful, pulled himself together:

He shivered and shook as he gave the sign
 For the stroke he didn't deserve;
 When all of a sudden his eye met mine,
 And it seemed to brace his nerve;
 For he nodded his head and he kissed his hand
 And he whistled an air, did he,
 As the saber true
 Cut cleanly through
 His cervical vertebrae!

(lines 427-35)

At the words "he whistled an air", Sullivan inserted in the piccolo part, as a solo, a snatch from a popular song of the day, the "Cotillion Waltz". Presumably, whistling this air would convey to the audience the cavalier attitude of the man about to be beheaded. But the "Cotillion Waltz" soon dropped out of fashion, and since the meaning of inserting it had been to show that the condemned man whistled a well-known tune, it was pointless to retain the waltz. It has long been practice — exactly when the tradition began is not known — for the piccolo to play instead of the "Cotillion Waltz" the opening phrase of "The Girl I left Behind Me", a traditional military marching song dating back to the eighteenth century and familiar to most audiences as such. There is no authority for this except tradition: Sullivan's holograph (Sullivan 1885) has only the "Cotillion Waltz", uncanceled; the published vocal scores do not notice the piccolo insertion at all; and the surviving D'Oyly Carte band parts are too late to be reliable evidence of when this practice started. Yet substituting a traditional tune such as "The Girl I left Behind Me" for a song that has lost its significance makes good sense. For an editor producing a full score, the question is whether to follow the holograph or to draw on what is clearly a longstanding and sensible performing tradition. The critical edition of *The Mikado* will print the "Cotillion Waltz" on the piccolo line, but will also give "The Girl I Left Behind Me" as an *ossia*, printed on a cue-size staff above the piccolo line. A footnote will explain the situation.

More delicate is the problem of Gilbert's use of words acceptable in Victorian England but now regarded as offensive. In *The Mikado*, the n-word occurs twice. The first occurrence is in Act 1, No. 5a, in Koko's little list of people who might be executed without being missed: among them are "The [n—] serenader, and others of his race" (line 252). The second occurrence is in Act 2, No. 6, the

Mikado's song about letting the punishment fit the crime:

The lady who dyes a chemical yellow
 Or stains her face with puce
 Or pinches her figger
 Is blacked like a [n—]
 With permanent walnut juice.

(lines 355–59)

On May 28, 1948, Rupert D'Oyly Carte, then director of the Company, wrote to *The London Times*:

We recently found that in America much objection was taken by coloured persons to a word used twice in the Mikado.... We consulted the witty writer on whose shoulders the lyrical mantle of Gilbert may be said to have fallen [A. P. Herbert]. He made several suggestions, one of which we adopted.

The first occurrence is now sung as "The banjo serenader, and others of his race". The retention of "others of his race" was no doubt motivated by the desire to tamper as little as possible with what Gilbert originally wrote, but not modifying the second half of the line leaves it clear that Gilbert's aversion is a racial matter. The Act 2 occurrence is remedied with these lines by Herbert:

The lady who dyes a chemical yellow
 Or stains her face with puce
 Or pinches her figger
 Is painted with vigour
 And permanent walnut juice.

In his communication to *The Times*, D'Oyly Carte blandly added that "Gilbert would certainly have approved" of Herbert's modifications. This is a highly questionable assumption. Gilbert shared many of the racial and ethnic prejudices of his Victorian contemporaries: the same mind that produced the witty lyrics for which Gilbert is celebrated also entertained many of the assumptions of racial superiority that helped the British to justify their Empire.

The question facing an editor of *The Mikado* is an instance of a larger one that is often raised: should works of the past be rewritten to suppress words or ideas considered offensive or politically incorrect today? Should racial and ethnic slurs be removed, should pronouns be made gender neutral, should history be re-written? The present writer believes that an editor of an historical edition has

an obligation to history and that, distasteful as it may be, what Gilbert wrote must be retained. A compromise in this case is to print Gilbert's words in the text underlaid beneath the music in the full and vocal scores, but also to underlay, as *ossia*, Herbert's alternate versions.²³

The last problem peculiar to performing works to be considered in this essay arises from performing traditions. Performing traditions are the unwritten traditions that a performing work acquires as it passes through time: they include interpretations of characters, readings of individual lines, and bits of business. As time goes by, a work's performing tradition often acquires components that are not authoritative but that audiences familiar with that tradition have come to regard as integral elements of that work.²⁴ Performing traditions are important because they transmit elements that text does not and/or cannot specify. Until the age of electronic recording, such traditions could be passed from performer to performer only by personal contact, with one performer's watching or being instructed by another.²⁵ Knowledgeable audience members are usually familiar with the performing traditions of works they know.

An interesting example of the problems presented by performing traditions occurs in a late Savoy Opera, *The Yeomen of the Guard* (1888), a work that hovers so uncertainly between comedy and tragedy that Gilbert and Sullivan were worried that the first-night audience would take their opera too seriously. In *Yeomen*, we meet Jack Point, a shallow jester who aspires to profundity. Point is in love with and engaged to his protégé, the young and pretty Elsie Maynard. Point, however, has an unattractive penchant for the main chance, and, in return for a small payment, he agrees to allow Elsie to marry Colonel Fairfax, a gallant officer who is shortly to be beheaded on trumped up charges and who wishes to take a wife in order to thwart the heirs who have contrived his death. When Fairfax escapes from custody, woos and wins Elsie, and then is reprieved, Point finds that he has lost Elsie. At the end of *Yeomen*, when the union of Fairfax and Elsie is celebrated, Gilbert's stage direction reads: "FAIRFAX embraces ELSIE as POINT falls insensible at their feet" (Act 2, 1.820).²⁶

The role of Point was created by George Grossmith, who played this final passage for laughs, twitching comically after he had fallen to the ground. This interpretation is consistent with Gilbert's text. Everything about Point points to his being a comic butt: he has aspirations well beyond his merits; he is far too old for Elsie; and his sense of values is distinctly deficient. In short, he should be

²³ One cannot pretend that Gilbert did not write the offensive words or that he was unaware of how offensive they were or might become. No director today retains Gilbert's words, although the revisions proposed by Mr. Herbert — the first reflecting only slightly less prejudice than Gilbert's original — are not usually the preferred alternatives.

²⁴ One of the most familiar examples of a performing tradition unsupported by textual evidence and no doubt contrary to the playwright's intentions is that of portraying Shylock as a sympathetic rather than a comic or devilish character.

²⁵ Further on performing traditions — and how they sometimes find their way into texts — see Broude 2011, pages 33–40.

²⁶ References to act and line number in *Yeomen* are to Bradley 1996.

a thoroughly unsympathetic character whose eventual discomfiture is reason for laughter. Moreover, since Grossmith created the part under Gilbert's direction, and since Gilbert controlled as many details as he could in the realization of his libretti, we must assume that Gilbert conceived Point's end as deserved and comic; had he not, he would never have allowed Grossmith to play the clown as the curtain falls.

However, when *Yeomen* went on tour and performers, freed from Gilbert's watchful eye, felt themselves at liberty to show initiative, two members of D'Oyly Carte touring companies — George Thorne and Henry Lytton — began to play Point for pathos. Instead of having Point writhe on the ground in comic frustration, their new interpretation had him die, presumably of a broken heart (in Lytton's case after having tenderly kissed the hem of Elsie's dress). This innovation adds depth to Point's character and is therefore more dramatically effective than a comic rendering: Point may be an intellectual fraud and an unprincipled rascal, but his love of Elsie is real, and his death results from the depth of his feeling.

At some point, Gilbert became aware of Thorne and Lytton's interpretation, but reports of his response to the innovation differ. Lytton asserts that Gilbert approved the new interpretation, and Rupert D'Oyly Carte, who succeeded to the directorship of the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company a year after Gilbert's death, confirms this. But neither of these accounts can be considered disinterested: Lytton wanted authorization for his interpretation, while D'Oyly Carte would have wanted to protect his company's reputation for preserving the performing traditions established by Gilbert and Sullivan themselves. A more objective witness is J. M. Gordon, stage manager for the 1897 revival of *Yeomen*, who reports that Gilbert refused to say whether Point dies or not: "The fate of Jack Point", Gilbert is supposed to have said, "is in the hands of the audience, who may please themselves whether he lives or dies".²⁷

What is clear is that Gilbert was committed to the stage direction as printed, for he never changed it, although he certainly could have done so in the several published forms of the libretto that postdated the innovation but preceded his death. Significantly, however, he did change several lines in the finale to alter Elsie's attitude towards Point from one of contempt to one of pity; the original lines describe Elsie as:

a merrymaid peerly proud,
Who loved a lord and who laughed aloud
At the moan of the merryman moping mum...

²⁷ For Lytton's version, see Lytton 1922, 174. For a review of responses to Lytton's interpretation, see Bailey 1952, 319–22. Gordon's report remains in manuscript but is quoted in Bradley 1996, 514.

The revised text describes her as:

a mermaid nestling near,
Who loved a lord — but who dropped a tear
At the moan of the merryman moping mum...

(II.811-12)

Gilbert evidently wished to retain the ambiguity of "Point falls insensible", allowing actors the option to interpret the character either way, but he was sensitive enough to the advantages of the pathetic interpretation to revise Elsie's lines. To this day, this passage is played for pathos. Should an editor of *Yeomen* print the earlier or the later version of Elsie's song? Should the final stage direction be emended to something like "POINT dies" or "FAIRFAX embraces ELSIE as POINT expires at their feet?" After all, if Point is to die, something more explicit than "falls insensible" is required: there is a substantial difference between insensibility (he may recover and go on to pursue his career with another protégé) and dying.

In *The Complete Annotated Gilbert and Sullivan*, Bradley prints the revised lines but preserves Gilbert's original stage direction. Bradley's text therefore represents not the settled state of *Yeomen* — the opera was settled before the touring companies were formed and sent on the road — but a revised state. But Bradley's edition is not committed to representing the settled state; quite the contrary, for all the historical background that Bradley provides, his edition follows a long-standing tradition in the publication of dramatic texts: that the edition reflect what is currently being played rather than what was originally written.²⁸ In his notes, Bradley gives the original lines and recounts the circumstances behind the change in those lines and in the interpretation of the stage direction. But no decision that an editor could make in this crux would be neutral: Bradley's decision to print the revised lines rather than the original points towards the pathetic ending; printing the original would favor the comic but would not rule out the pathetic. After all, Thorne and Lytton introduced the pathetic tradition while the original lines were still being sung.

So far we have been talking about creators and editors and editions. An editor of a critical edition of a Savoy Opera makes a sound decision when he or she decides to produce a text that represents the settled state of that opera during its first production. But performers and directors who use that text today are another matter altogether: the job of the editor of a critical edition is to present a text representing (insofar as evidence permits) what existed — or would have existed, had every mechanical slip been caught in proof — at some specific

²⁸ For Bradley's statement of his policy, see Bradley 1996, xii. On this practice, which applies both to opera libretti and to play quartos representing plays "as recently acted by [...]", see Broude 2011, 34–40.

moment in the past, but the job of a producer or director is to make the work effective in the present, and what may have made an effective production at one time and place may not excite an audience in other circumstances. The circumstances under which any revival is mounted are always different from the circumstances of a first production. This is especially the case when a work considered a “classic” is revived: the work is revived because it has already demonstrated that it has audience appeal, and much of the audience may already be familiar with the work. The case is particularly acute with the Savoy Operas, which have a fan base much of which is knowledgeable about minute details. Every good director will take these facts into account.

Gilbert cut Hebe’s dialogue to accommodate Jessie Bond; he cut “Fold Your Flapping Wings” because he wanted to quicken the pace of the second act, and if something had to go, then that something might as well have been a number that might offend some of his audience and thereby reduce ticket sales. But 2021 is not 1878 or 1882. Jessie Bond no longer plays Hebe, and the idea that poverty breeds crime is neither new nor shocking. Nor is pacing an issue with a repertory work like *Iolanthe*, which many members of the audience will know by heart. If anything, today’s audience at a Savoy Opera wants more Gilbert and Sullivan rather than less, and if a director can offer something that is new but that is also in some way authentic, then so much the better. A director who wants to give his production something novel but authentic could ask for nothing better than to restore Hebe’s dialogue or “Fold Your Flapping Wings”.

Operas that are fortunate enough to enjoy extended lives come to exist in multiple states. (And this is as true for performing works of all sorts as it is for the Savoy Operas.) A single text of an opera — which is what the text of a critical edition must be — can represent only one state. People involved with performing works — actors, singers, conductors, directors and producers — all claim considerable freedom in realizing texts, and few good performers will regard any text — the composer’s, the librettist’s, or the editor’s — as altogether binding. An edition of a performing work is not an end in itself but a means to performance, and so regardless of what state of a work an editor decides his or her text should represent, it should be understood that editorial responsibilities include providing, by means of critical apparatus, footnotes and appendices, enough information about the textual and performing traditions of the work to enable those who perform it to exercise intelligently the freedom they will almost certainly claim.

Bibliography

ALLEN, REGINALD, 1958. “Prologue.” In *The First Night Gilbert & Sullivan*, edited by Reginald Allen, New York (NY): The Limited Editions Club & The Heritage Club, pages xi–xxi.

ANONYMOUS, November 1882. “Review of *Iolanthe*.” *The Sportsman* page 3.

- BAILEY, LESLIE, 1952. *The Gilbert and Sullivan Book*. London: Cassel.
- BEATTY-KINGSTON, WILLIAM, January 1883. "Review of *Iolanthe*." *The Theatre* pages 21–22.
- BOND, JESSIE, 1930. *The Life and Reminiscences of Jessie Bond, the Old Savoyard as Told by Herself to Ethel Macgeorge*. London: John Lane.
- BRADLEY, IAN, 1996. *The Complete Annotated Gilbert & Sullivan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This is a revised, single-volume edition of the two volumes first published as *The Annotated Gilbert & Sullivan*. London & New York (NY): Penguin Books. 1982–84].
- BROUDE, RONALD, 2008. "The Gilbert & Sullivan Critical Edition and the Full Scores that Never Were." *Textual Cultures* 3(2), pages 71–89.
- , 2011. "Performance and the Socialized Text." *Textual Cultures* 6(2), pages 23–47.
- GASKELL, PHILIP, 1978. *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- GILBERT, WILLIAM SCHWENCK, 1878. "[H. M. S. Pinafore licensing copy]."
- GILBERT, WILLIAM SCHWENCK and ARTHUR SULLIVAN, 1884. *Princess Ida, or Castle Adamant*. London: Chappell & Co., Ltd. [First British edition of the vocal score].
- , 1993. *Trial by Jury, Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 1, edited by Steven Ledbetter. New York (NY) & Williamstown: Broude Brothers.
- , 2003. *H. M. S. Pinafore, Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 3, edited by Percy Young. New York (NY) & Williamstown: Broude Brothers.
- , 2017. *Iolanthe, Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 6, edited by Gerald Hendrie. New York (NY) & Williamstown: The Broude Trust.
- , 2021. *Princess Ida, Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 7, edited by Richard Sher. New York (NY) & Williamstown: The Broude Trust. [forthcoming].
- GOSSETT, PHILIP, 2006. *Divas and Scholars: Performing Italian Opera*. Chicago (IL) & London: University of Chicago Press.
- JOSEPH, TONY, 1994. *The D'Oyly Carte Opera Company 1875–1982*. Bristol: Bunthorne Books.
- LYTTON, HENRY, 1922. *The Secrets of a Savoyard*. London: Jarrolds.

- MACKIE, DAVID, 2018. *Nothing Like Work*. Tolworth, Surrey: Grosvenor House.
- MILLER, BRUCE and HELGA PERRY, 2000. "The Reward of Merit? An Examination of the Suppressed 'De Belville' Song in Gilbert and Sullivan's *Iolanthe*." *Sir Arthur Sullivan Society Magazine* 51, Supplement [Autumn], pages 1–17.
- PERRY, HELGA, 2005. *Everything that's Excellent*. Master's thesis, University of Birmingham, Barbour Institute.
- PERRY, HELGA, GERALD HENDRIE, and DINAH BARSHAM, 2017. "Introduction." In *Iolanthe*, authored by Gilbert, William Schwenck and Sullivan, Arthur, *Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 6, edited by Gerald Hendrie, New York (NY) & Williamstown: The Broude Trust, pages 1–17.
- REES, TERRENCE, 1964. *Thespis, A Gilbert and Sullivan Enigma*. London: Dillon.
- ROLLINS, CYRIL and R. JOHN WITTS, 1962. *The Gilbert and Sullivan Operas: A Record of Productions 1875–1961*. Several supplements were issued to bring coverage through 1982; these were issued informally.
- SHER, RICHARD, 2021. "Critical Apparatus." In *Princess Ida*, authored by Gilbert, William Schwenck and Sullivan, Arthur, *Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 7, edited by Richard Sher, New York & Williamstown: The Broude Trust, page n.p. [forthcoming].
- SULLIVAN, ARTHUR, 1882. "Iolanthe." [Autograph manuscript.].
- , 1884. "Princess Ida." [Autograph manuscript.].
- , 1885. "The Mikado." [Autograph manuscript.] A facsimile of this manuscript has been published as *The Mikado. Operetta in Two Acts with Libretto by W. S. Gilbert*. London: Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1968.
- YOUNG, PERCY, 2003. "Introduction." In *H. M. S. Pinafore*, authored by Gilbert, William Schwenck and Sullivan, Arthur, *Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas*, volume 3, edited by Percy Young, New York (NY) & Williamstown: Broude Brothers, pages 3–30.

On the Threshold of Editorship. Or From *Collection* to *Oeuvre*

Paulius V. Subačius

Abstract: The sole collection of verses by Jonas Mačiulis (1862–1932, pen name Maironis), the father of modern Lithuanian poetry, went through five editions in the author’s lifetime. The poet continued to improve the works of his youth until his advanced age, producing hundreds of textual variants. The first published versions of some verses, which are ranked as national classics today, cannot be considered finely crafted works by a long shot. From a retrospective point of view, one is surprised that such lengthy and tedious corrections could have yielded such nice final results, while a prospective approach might incite amazement at how the crude, primary rock of first versions could have concealed the possibility of such poetic gems. Taking a grandmotherly attitude towards his works, the author did not only polish their versification, but also applied different strategies throughout his rewriting process to use new editions to consolidate his own social and cultural position with the changeable standards of bibliographic codes over time. The problem editors of the Maironis’ posthumous editions face is that the authorial editions of his works differ in title, textual variants, and arrangement. As this article argues, both Maironis’ high standing in the Lithuanian cultural landscape and the elusive expectation of stability and comprehensiveness have discouraged editors to plunge into the dynamic nature of Maironis’ authorial manipulations up until today.

THERE ARE VARIOUS STORIES of how prominent works were written and published, but most of them understandably contain common traits.* The first of these would be the fact that most revisions remain unknown to readers until their manuscripts are analysed posthumously — since authors usually try to publish completed versions. The exception to this rule would be when versions printed in periodicals are followed by different versions in book editions, or when authors altered their already successfully circulating works for an edition of their *oeuvre* or *selected works* to summarize their writing careers. While textual instability is regarded as “a fact of life” by contemporary theorists (Shillingsburg 2017, 194), authors have long preferred to conceal this fact, rather than present it as a goal of their authorship.¹

* This research was funded by a grant (No. S-MOD-17-7) from the Research Council of Lithuania.

¹ In fact, we know that authors were even required to withdraw their earlier versions upon publishing of a new version at least since classical antiquity (see Reynolds

Another feature of our common assumptions towards the origins of famous works would be the value we tend to place on them. There is another end to the stick in the teleological approach to the creative process, as has been discussed by genetic critics (see Bushell 2005, 56). If a purposeful relation exists between a work's earliest drafts and its published text, and if the writing and revision processes moving in the direction of a final entity, it is only natural that we also have a look in the reverse direction. In hindsight, a successful result invites the presumption that — at least to a certain degree — the work's creative potential was already inherent in the earliest variants, which are not only endowed with historical value in the process, but also with aesthetic value by omission.

However, reality does not always comply with these presuppositions. How do they reshape our understanding of the way in which literature functions? Do textual critics or editors have any means, not unlike mineralogists, to perceive and reveal polishable crystalline structures that are deeply hidden in immature texts? Or do we perhaps only attribute the status of a "variant" or "source" to a primitive sequence of words once we know how valuable the final result is? How do we represent the entire genesis of a work if the author himself changed his attitude towards the work several times along the way, and applied several different strategies to use it for the consolidation of his social and cultural position? Some of these questions will remain rhetorical throughout this essay, intending to inspire further analysis. If I succeed in revealing the complexity of editorial situations, we may only come some steps closer to devising simplified answers to these questions. Nevertheless, the potential of digital archives when it comes to communicating the wholeness of works with complicated geneses to a contemporary audience makes me optimistic for the future.

In this essay, I will discuss these issues by investigating the case of a Lithuanian writer known under the pseudonym of *Maironis*. Jonas Mačiulis (1862–1932), a priest, professor of theology and historian, used this pen name to sign one of the first publications of his poems in a clandestine periodical (Maironis 1891b). He became an icon of the national revival and was already proclaimed the central figure of modern Lithuanian literature during his lifetime in the early 20th century (Šeina 2016, 54–55). This official assessment of the poet has not changed in the last century (see Kalnačs 2009, 184–87). Shortly after his death, Maironis' house was converted into the national museum of Lithuanian literature. A 20-litas banknote issued by the Bank of Lithuania, which was in circulation from 1993 to 2014 (at which point the national currency was replaced by the Euro), bears his portrait.

Maironis wrote narrative poetry, dramas, and librettos, but it were his poems that won him the status of a classic. Because the tsarist administration forbade the press to use Latin characters in the 1860s in an attempt to introduce the Cyrillic script, Lithuanian newspapers were published abroad and secretly smuggled into the country until 1904. Having published eleven poems in these newspapers, Maironis illegally published a book of his poetry in 1895 (Maironis 1895a).

and Wilson 1991, 24).

To this day, this collection of verses — the name of which (*Pavasario balsai* [*The Voices of Spring*]) symbolized the rebirth of the nation's typical nationalism — remains the most important form for circulating his poetry. At the time of publication, Maironis already had two published books on his record: one a narrative of the history of Lithuania (Maironis 1891a), the other an epic poem with social overtones *Tarp skausmų į garbę* [*Through Pain to Glory*] (Maironis 1895b). However, it was *The Voices of Spring* that paved the way to his role as a national writer. Having realized this, the poet would later cling to the same perfectly recognizable figurative title, and published three more collections of his poems appeared as *The Voices of Spring* in his lifetime (Maironis 1905; 1913; 1920). In addition, a total of 30 posthumous editions of Maironis' poems in Lithuanian were published as *The Voices of Spring* (the latest one only yesteryear: see Maironis 2020).² In this sense, Maironis is a poet who is identified with a sole collection of poems (Daujotytė 1990, 62). None of the classics of national revival in the surrounding countries (Janis Rainis in Latvia, Lydia Koidula in Estonia, Taras Shevchenko in Ukraine) were identified so directly with one title except for Belarusian short-lived Maksim Bahdanovich (1891–1917), whose collection of poems *Vianok* [*A Wreath*] (1914) was his only book of poetry.

It is worth mentioning that when Maironis chose *The Voices of Spring* as a stable brand name (cf. Kučinskienė 2014, 251 and 257), this decision was exclusively of symbolic rather than financial value. The publishers' interests and opinions only played a minimal role here, since the publications were funded by the author himself, and by Catholic societies. Due to the political restrictions of that time, the only thing that the author may have earned from the first edition of his collection of poems was a deportation to Siberia. Later, when the ban on the press in Latin characters was withdrawn, he held well-paid positions of professor of the Theological Academy and rector of the Seminary; thus remuneration for his creative work was not and could not have been a source of income and an underlying motive for this activity.

² The penultimate edition was marked as 28th (Maironis 2012), but for some editions the numbering indicated in their subtitle does not coincide with their actual numbering in the sequence identified by Maironis' bibliographers. In a discussion following my presentation on this collection of poems at the 26th annual SHARP conference "From First to Last: Texts, Creators, Readers, Agents" (Western Sidney University, 2018), Paul Eggert noted that such a large number of re-editions of a poetry book in nine decades is phenomenal, particularly bearing in mind the relatively small Lithuanian readership (of ~3.5 mil persons), and the fact that Maironis was hardly known beyond the national borders. It should be noted that the poet was indeed popular, but that social and political circumstances rather than financial interest played an important role in this process of re-editing his works: the community of Lithuanians in exile in the USA, Germany, and Italy (separated from Lithuania in the cold war) were instrumental in publishing a series of local non-commercial editions to provide teaching materials for Lithuanian courses and Saturday schools. In addition, during Nazi and especially Soviet occupations, the government had to replace the editions with more ideologically appropriate ones, and some of the poems were censored out. That is why, after the change of the regime in 1990, editors aimed to publish more complete collections of Maironis' poetry.

However, *The Voices of Spring* did not remain the only form in which Maironis published his collection of poems. Here we can talk about his secondary initiation: his initiation to the classics. Six years before his death, Maironis edited the first volume of his *Oeuvre* dedicated to verses he chose himself and financed with his own means.³ He did not resume the tradition of *The Voices of Spring* and titled it *Lyrika* [*Lyrics*] (Maironis 1927).⁴ The latter title expressed the idea that Maironis' works could be regarded as a poetic standard for Lithuanian literature in general.

A more intense alteration of the poetry collection rises to the surface when we look at the authorial use of *The Voices of Spring* from the viewpoint suggested by William Stroebel when he reflected on Constantine Cavafy's collections: "not as a one-way communication device broadcasting the poet's final intentions but as a kind of ongoing, open workshop, one that continually suspended the finality of its own production and extended the processes of inscription, assemblage, and re-assemblage" (Stroebel 2018, 280). Extremely important were the transformation of the arrangement of texts and the revisions in the poems themselves. In the case under discussion, *a single collection of poems* does not exactly equal *a collection of the same poems*. *The Voices of Spring* underwent considerable changes in the poet's lifetime. Having gone through five editions, it increased three times from 45 to 131 poems; four poems were once included in the collection, once removed from it by the author's will.

Far more significant were the revisions in the poems themselves. Even in those few poems that underwent relatively few alterations by the author, the spelling was edited and some words or forms were replaced. The poem "Nuo Birutės kalno" [From Birutė Hill],⁵ included in all the editions of the poetry collection, contains the least amount of revisions. In the author's last version it has 16 lines, 106 words and 535 letters (including the title). During thirty-two years of revising, in five versions published by Maironis himself, seven words, eleven morphophonological forms, five punctuation marks, and twenty-eight cases of spelling were changed.⁶ While the latter variants are accidentals, the first ones are undoubtedly substantial.

³ This was not a unique case at that time in Lithuania: by 1927, eight living writers had republished or began to republish their works, specifically under the title *Oeuvre*. Two of them (Juozas Tumas, penname Vaižgantas and Kazimieras Pakalniškis) were friends of Maironis.

⁴ "Sixth edition" is added under the title, thus indicating a direct link to the editions of *The Voices of Spring*. Bibliographically, Vol. 1 of *Oeuvre* should be the fifth edition of Maironis' poetry, but the second edition of *The Voices of Spring* of 1905 was published with a reference that it was the third edition (as the short play *Kame išganymas* (*Where is the Salvation*) included in the book after the poems was indeed published for the third time), and this is how this erroneous sequence became established.

⁵ Here and hereafter I use the traditional titles from the 1927 edition to identify the poems since Maironis had revised them many times.

⁶ From this account were excluded variants that originated as the result of three presumed typographical errors in the 1895 edition, and three typographical errors in the 1927 edition.

What then does the versioning of considerably more revised poems look like? The best poem to illustrate this issue would be “Lietuva brangi” [Dear Lithuania], which has acquired the status of the second, unofficial, anthem of Lithuania, and is widely learned by heart and sung, which makes it one of the most popular and famous works by Maironis. First published in a newspaper, the poem consisted of 16 stanzas and 62 lines (Maironis 1891c), while the author’s last version had 8 stanzas and 32 lines (Maironis 1927, 58–59). It is only from single words or motifs that one can approximately guess which stanzas of the early version were transformed into later variants, as not a single line of the initial text coincides with the revised one. Not even a hint of eight lines of the last version appears in the first publication. In all the other lines both some words and the word order is changed without exception. If we compare the publications revised by the author from a morphophonological point of view, as few as 40, or one-fourth of 160 words of the latest text coincide with the first version of the poem. If we add the differences in punctuation and spelling, we could say that while revising “Dear Lithuania”, the poet left a mere 10% of the text intact.⁷

Many revisions were made to achieve more fluent versification. Historians of literature unanimously assert that Maironis was the first Lithuanian poet to use syllabo-tonic versification perfectly, and achieved a high level of poetical precision. In other words, metric schemes are retained in his poems; moreover, they are not in conflict with the regular accentuation of words and syntactic combinations, which helps to achieve a harmonious sound. These statements hold up when analyzing the latest versions revised by the author — the first stanza of “Dear Lithuania” (Maironis 1927, 58) is an example of a precise iambic foot with a hypercatalectic caesura (Girdzijauskas 1966, 234–5):

ū – ū – ū || ū – ū – ū
 ū – ū – ū || ū – ū – ū
 ū – ū – ū || ū – ū – ū
 ū – ū – ū || ū – ū – ū

In the initial version, by contrast, the first stanza’s metric scheme goes as follows — respecting the natural accents of the words in standard Lithuanian (Maironis 1891b):

– ū ū – ū || – ū ū – ū
 ū – ū – ū || ū ū – ū
 ū – ū ū – || ū – ū – ū
 ū – ū – ū || – ū ū – ū

⁷ I am using statistics not only because it is quite convenient, but also because a much more extensive paper would be needed in order to present adequate translations of the variants and to compare them. For published samples of Maironis’ poetry translations into English, see Maironis 1963 and Maironis 2002.

The irregularity here is quite obvious, and has been eradicated in subsequent versions through careful polishing. In fact, many of Maironis' first publications contained versification errors, which were then successfully avoided in later versions. On the one hand, there is no doubt that Maironis could write much more fluent verses than other contemporary poets right from the start. On the other, a retrospective view of the classical qualities of his poetry found in textbooks and works on the history of literature has a certain inconsistency: the final self-revised versions are quoted as proofs of his poetic elegance, even though the topic of discussion is the young Maironis and the first edition of *The Voices of Spring* in 1895 (Zaborskaitė 1987, 98), which still contains a large number of sharp edges.

By using a uniform title for the collections of poetry, Maironis — perhaps unintentionally — set up the preconditions for his posterior literary critics to paint him as a greater literary pioneer than he really was. This happened because when critics were analyzing the poems Maironis had written in the 1910s, which were included in the fourth edition of *The Voices of Spring*, the newer versions of these poems were mistakenly attributed to the late nineteenth century — when their first edition had been published. Due to very rapid changes that took place in Lithuania, this quarter-of-a-century anachronism was more than enough to make Maironis appear as an example to other writers of the first half of the twentieth century, even though this image was partly based on impressions of poems that were (re)written at the same time or even later than their works. National ambitions spurred the declarations that as early as 1895, Lithuanian literature already had a classical author who wrote poems of refined lyrical form.

When we address another type of Maironis' self-revisions, an even more distinct shadow of anachronism looms over the critics' remarks on the poet's modernity. This is because the four decades over which his career spans also coincide with the period where the most intense formation of the standard Lithuanian language took place. Already after the first publications of his poems in the periodical press, publishers generally came to a final agreement regarding several new letters of the Lithuanian alphabet (*sz*→*š*; *cz*→*č*; *ž*, *ž*→*ž*; *ē*→*ė*; *u*[*u*:]→*ū*/*u*; Venckienė 2006, 38–39). In other words, it was necessary to transliterate the early versions of his poems in subsequent publications. The first edition of *The Voices of Spring* was followed by a textbook of Lithuanian grammar (Jablonskis 1901), which established the principles of selection of prescriptive paradigms from a variety of dialects and their contemporary orthographic rules. In other words, part of the morphophonological forms, spelling and punctuation had to be revised, bit by bit, in each subsequent edition of Maironis' 1895 collection (Venckienė 2012, 204–05). In the last period of Maironis' creative work, after the declaration of independence in 1918, the new state was quick to build a system of general education, and to promote the publishing and other forms of communication in the official Lithuanian language. Therefore, the removal of the dialectal vocabulary and morphological inconsistencies, as well as the

establishment of the standards of accentuation and pronunciation of the language used in a cultured urban milieu, was taking place very rapidly. Although Maironis relied on himself rather than editors even for minor corrections, it is obvious that only the author himself could revise the poems and fully adapt them linguistically to standard modern usage.

In many cases, the rejection of dialectal forms also meant approaching regular standard accentuation — ergo, a more precise metre, and *vice versa*. However, I dare to assert that doubt in the motivation for one or another revision does not deny Maironis' basic tendency to adapt his writings to the changing language standard. These assumptions imply a methodological remark about a prospective genetic digital edition of Maironis' poetry. I suggest that in such an edition it would be important to demonstrate the chronology of the appearance, inclusion, and disappearance or removal from standard use of the linguistic features found in the texts along with the change of variants. In addition, historical sociolinguistic information would be very useful — explaining which lexemes and forms became popular or prestigious, when and in which socio-cultural contexts these changes took place, etc. (cf. Venckienė 2018, 230). It does not occur so frequently that the peak of language standardization would coincide with the period of the creative career of a prominent writer, during which the latter would intensely (and, importantly, successfully) revise his texts in every decade. The main difficulty is that such an undertaking requires detailed data of language history.

Let us take a brief detour into a wider socio-cultural context — the development of the modern Lithuanian national identity. Here, we can again state an important chronological coincidence between important events and different stages of self-revision of Maironis' poetry. The second edition of *The Voices of Spring*, for example, appeared in 1905 — the year of the Russian revolution, when the social atmosphere became considerably freer. And the fourth edition was prepared right after the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. In both cases, new ideological accents can be indicated in the poems. Finally, the last authorial edition of the *Oeuvre* coincided with the abolishing of the state's parliamentary democracy. In the period of the authoritarian rule of the president and ideologist of nationalism Antanas Smetona (1874–1944), which lasted from 1926 to 1940, the exemplary collection of national symbols and the historical narrative promoted in schools acquired its final stable shape.⁸ Reciprocal influence should be borne in mind — Maironis textually reacted to the birth of the national state and, in its turn, his poetry was simultaneously popularized as texts that unified society.

A short remark on a factor that might seem to counteract the drive for authorial revisions: several of Maironis first published poems had already been set to music. At first, they were adapted for folk melodies, and later performed to music

⁸ Due to the Soviet occupation, it remained partially conserved up until 1990, and still has a huge influence on the self-consciousness of the older and middle generations even in our days.

created by professionals. Two of the most prominent Lithuanian composers of that time, Juozas Naujalis (1869–1934) and Česlovas Sasnauskas (1867–1916), composed songs for mixed choirs to twenty-three poems from *The Voices of Spring*. After 1905, when the tsarist administration stopped interfering with public national events, they began to be performed on a massive scale. Songs that were performed during Lithuanian gatherings rapidly became extremely popular. The author himself both cooperated with the composers and took part in these events — an amateur musician himself, who held recitals at his home. On the one hand, more fluent poems that had already been more refined with regard to versification in the early stages of their development were set to music. Such texts were then revised less by the author when he prepared subsequent editions of the collection. On the other hand, this aspect alone can hardly explain the fact that it were especially the poems that had been set to music that Maironis avoided revising. A juxtaposition of the text and its melodic accents reveals that the latter stabilized the text, therefore the idea about the conserving role of music should be borne in mind in this case. The interaction of the melodies and the texts of the early edition, as well as the inertia of performance when choir singers committed the text to memory, along with the motility of singing counteracted the scale of a more radical authorial alteration.

A look at the revisions that Maironis made in order to adapt to the rapidly changing language and society prompts another observation, namely that any attempt to describe his relation with cultural modernization contains an internal contradiction. The well-established statement by literary critics that Maironis brought a modern poetic language into Lithuanian literature (Nyka-Niliūnas 1962, 286) is both correct and misleading. The poet resourcefully used the form of the language that existed at the time of writing, and contributed to its further development along the way. Maironis was modern in each stage of writing and revision: the linguistic expression of his poetry corresponded to the state of the cultural medium for approximately a decade until a subsequent revised edition of *The Voices of Spring* came out. However, from our contemporary perspective the texts of the first publications do not seem to be written in the modern Lithuanian language. On the other hand, since the state of the standard Lithuanian language, which was settled in the late 1920s, did not experience more radical changes in the fields of morphology and accentuation, Maironis' latest self-revised versions do not seem *ancient*, and the texts are read as if they "have lost the vestiges of time" (Žvirgždas 2012, 37). One or two remaining archaisms, mainly lexical, add the sheen of nobility that is characteristic of classical works, but do not impede an easy reading of the works as modern texts. Probably that is why the topic of the development of Maironis' poetry seems strongly overlooked even in the Lithuanian context, where the critics' attention to textual variants and self-revision is extremely scarce in general. They almost seem like intuitive attempts to prevent a wide audience from discovering a *more archaic* Maironis, so as not to tarnish his image as a modern poet.

Another aspect of his image — the halo of solidity, stability, and wholeness

(cf. Slavinskaitė 1987, 15) — contradicts what we know about the numerous revisions of his texts. An *afflatus* would be much more befitting to a poet of overdue Lithuanian Romanticism than the meticulous labour of adjusting their metre to perfection. In Maironis' case a distinct dissonance of reflection was provoked by the fact that when he published his last self-revised versions in 1927, his poetry had not only been an obligatory read, but had also already occupied one of the top positions in schools' curricula for a decade. In other words, a generation of students who knew at least a dozen of Maironis' poems by heart from their school years, experienced having to correct their memory and apparently discard the lines which had stuck in their minds.

In any event, authorized polyvariance has remained a potential aporia of reception. Naive lovers of Maironis' poetry felt quite embarrassed when the early versions of well-known poems were reprinted in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the first edition of *The Voices of Spring* (Maironis 1995). Readers failed to accept an imperfect, unpolished classic. In the meantime, in order to trace the genesis of Maironis' most significant stanzas, one would have to take an even larger step back. It is not difficult to recognize the rudiments of the already mentioned poem-anthem "Dear Lithuania" and several other poems — separate lines, phrases, motifs and models of strophes — in his earliest work "Lietuva" [Lithuania] (Maironis 1888). This descriptive long poem of loose structure, which is more reminiscent of a bundle of verses on the topic of nature and history, was written by Maironis at the age of twenty-six and never published. It was not until the end of the twentieth century that it was included as a supplement to the second volume of *Oeuvre* containing narrative poems (Maironis 1988).

Many writers refrain from publishing their first creative attempts, because they consider them immature. Maironis' "Lithuania", however, is not merely an early attempt at versification: it is an agglomeration of the rudimentary elements of his entire poetics. Maironis was noted for a kind of "economy" of motifs (Speičytė 2012, 81). For the entirety of his literary career, he made use of a limited array of images, which appeared already in his first verses, and with each edition produced an increasingly stronger poetic effect due to the constant refinement of the texts. A few known rough copies testify that even in his mature age, Maironis would start a new work from a very weak version with a chaotic metre and non-matching rhymes, which would significantly improve after several revisions (Maironis 1925). A genetic edition could demonstrate the acting of the agency that transformed a bad poem into several particularly good poetic works. The genetic dossier of Maironis' verses poses a serious challenge to the premises of *afflatus*, which is particularly intriguing bearing in mind the fact that the poet was a priest. The scrutiny of the succession of textual transformations compels us to think that the poet's entire activity was geared towards perfecting his craftsmanship. Still, a reader remains perturbed by occasionally glimmering traces of irreducible creativity.

Eventually, there is a serious dissonance between the two self-editing ten-

dencies that are typical of Maironis: 1) he was never satisfied with the result, intensely reworking his poems for each new publication; and 2) in several cases, he omitted the unsuccessful verses, while never completely discarding even the weakest of his already published works, but rather including all of them in the collections and *Oeuvre*. For example, being unable to deal with the compositional heterogeneity of one of his early poems, “Lietuvos vargas” [Misery of Lithuania] (Maironis 1885), he simply split it up, and included it in *Oeuvre* as two separate works (Maironis 1927, 50–51). As such, the whole remained very diverse, lacking harmony and refinement, and even had several inlays of tastelessness (Sauka 1998, 80). On the one hand, this almost freed Maironis’ subsequent editors from the need to collect the poems that were scattered in periodicals and manuscripts, discarded or forgotten by the author, which the compilers of the posthumous *opera omnia* often confront, and find one way or another to arrange them all into a comprehensive whole.⁹ On the other hand, this was offset by serious complications for his editors, as he left a legacy of two alternative titles of his collected poetry *The Voices of Spring* and *Lyrics*, and kept altering the sequence of their individual poems.

To illustrate this problem, I must describe the process of composing *The Voices of Spring* at length. Despite the difficult circumstances of publishing illegally and abroad, we can already recognize the authorial arrangement of the sequence of poems in the first edition of the collection, which allows us to consider it as a structurally coherent work. Historians of literature assert that Maironis formed thirteen quasi-sections according to the thematic or genre affinity (hymns, sonnets, satires; Speičytė 2019; cf. Pokorska-Iwaniuk 2014). This is merely an interpretative observation, as the poet did not introduce chapter headings (with the exception of the *Sonnets* chapter that appeared in the 1913 and 1920 editions); nor do the first and subsequent editions contain any obvious graphic divisions. However, the grouping is evident and is confirmed by the further development of *The Voices of Spring*. The fact remains that in three subsequent editions, when he added new poems to the collection, Maironis inserted them in the existing groups, consistently following the principle of thematic and genre affinity. With very few exceptions, he did not change the sequence of the already published poems and quasi-sections, but rather expanded the latter every time. This means that the principal structure of the collection of poetry was stable. For a graphical representation, see Figure 1.

While preparing a new edition for print, the poet would make revisions to the already published poems in a personal copy of the previous edition. He would write down additions, or attach them on a separate sheet, and renumber the poems by hand, indicating their sequence for the typesetter. There is a

⁹ Only fifteen of the known poetic works did not make their way to *Oeuvre* of 1927: nine verses written after the compilation of *Oeuvre*, three excerpts of the narrative poem “Mūsų vargai” [Our Hardships] that were included in *The Voices of Spring* of 1920 as separate pieces, and two poems that previously appeared only in the periodicals and one verse published in *The Voices of Spring*.

Figure 1: Composition of the collection *The Voices of Spring* (Speičytė 2019, 133–41) and *Oeuvre*. In this representation, each rectangle, except for the white ones, represents a poem; their colours represent the quasi-sections they belong to; and black rectangles represent new poems in the *Oeuvre*. From left to right, they represent the editions of 1895a (45 poems), 1905 (57 poems), 1913 (78 poems), 1920 (110 poems), and 1927 (131 poems). This graphic shows how each of the quasi-sections grows over time, to be ultimately reshuffled in the 1927 edition.

Figure 2: Authorial additions and revisions in Maironis 1918, pages 10–11.

surviving publisher's copy of *The Voices of Spring* from 1920, which the poet himself produced from a copy of the 1913 edition “with a pair of scissors and glue” (Maironis 1918; see Figure 2), and a copy of *The Voices of Spring* from 1920, from which Maironis prepared a rough copy for *Oeuvre* Maironis 1926 in the same way.

Maironis' *Oeuvre* was supplemented with nineteen new poems; other works were finally adapted to standard Lithuanian as already discussed. Moreover, the author radically changed the former sequence of the poems by disrupting most quasi-sections, thematic groups and the previous framing composition of the beginning and end of the collection based on patriotic accents (see Figure 1). The cyclical nature of *The Voices of Spring* should be realized not only as the thematic grouping of the works. The opening poems of each group provide a certain key to the reading of other works, and the series function as parables. For example, “Jo pirmoji meilė” (“His first love”) that opens the collections signals “the love that the lyrical self feels for Lithuania.” By doing so, several further nature or love poems already imply a national-patriotic statement. In *Oeuvre*, the author disrupted “the cycle of poems with its allegorical structure and its decoding technique” (Kessler 2014, 69), as presumably the key was no longer necessary: the codes of reading the classic Maironis were imposed by the expanding tradition of interpretation, school textbooks, and broadcast songs with his lyrics. This new structure of *Oeuvre* was oriented to literary eternity, and its framing composition consisted of works on universal and existential rather than patriotic themes.

As Peter Shillingsburg suggests, Hershel Parker made a sceptical presumption

in his *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (1983) that “authors lose their authority over a work after a certain period and that revision often not only violates the creativity of the original effort but can end in confusion which might make a text unreadable” (Shillingsburg 1991, 70). In the case of Maironis, this idea would argue against the latest authorial versions of the poems (in which the best versification was achieved). From the point of view of general composition, however, the collection of *The Voices of Spring* was more coherent than the volume of *Oeuvre*. In any case, it should be noted that from an editorial perspective the collection and *Oeuvre* differ both in their use of textual versions, and in the number and especially the arrangement of poems.

In the years of World War II (and soon afterwards) the first eight posthumous editions of Maironis’ poetry were published in Lithuania, and by war refugees and displaced persons in Germany (Meerbeck and Würzburg) under the title *The Voices of Spring*. Three of these editions did not reach their readership: two were suspended and destroyed by Soviet censors, and one perished during the bombing of Weimar. Although each of these eight editions are slightly different,¹⁰ all of them were compiled according to a model that was introduced by a single editor: Juozas Ambrazevičius (1903–1974; known as “Brazaitis” from 1944 onwards). He took the versions of the poems from *Oeuvre*, divided them into eight thematic or genre chapters, and even gave each chapter a heading, unlike any collection published in Maironis’ lifetime (Maironis 1942). Although two groups of poems (i.e. the genre groups *Satires* and *Ballads*) can be detected both in *The Voices of Spring* from 1920 and in *Oeuvre*, in the above-mentioned editions of the 1940s type, the arrangement of poems within the groups did not correspond either to the first or the second authentic sequence as established by Maironis himself.

In the first edition of *The Voices of Spring* that was published in Soviet Lithuania (Maironis 1947), just like in all the other Soviet editions, 35 poems that contained religious motifs were discarded. However, in the context of this paper, I would like to draw attention to the aspects of the selection of versions and the structure of the collections rather than to this blatant act of censorship. In this case, it were the editors who made the structural decision to arrange the poems chronologically, and to divide them into three parts according to the periods of creative work. This way, they concealed their aim to disrupt the original division into quasi-sections that enhanced the manifestative effect of individual texts, and to present Maironis in the shape of historicized publication of literary heritage. Bearing in mind the general atmosphere of Stalin’s regime and the ideological requirements that were imposed on all literature, including that of the past, this could be interpreted as an attempt to push a patriotic poet, albeit watered down, through Communist censorship. The dates written at each poem insistently reminded the readers that it was a thing from the bygone pre-revolutionary era, which should not be regarded as a source of relevant

¹⁰ For example, in some of them several poems about the struggle of Lithuanians with the Teutonic Order were removed in view of Hitler’s censorship.

motifs and ideas. As the poet himself precisely dated only one of his poems, this expansion of the peritext by dating all the poems made a historicizing (rather than aestheticizing) impact on the reading practice.¹¹ Moreover, for the lack of specialized research and reliable bibliography, the sequence of poems based on the first publications was imprecise with regard to the chronology of both writing the poems and their publication.¹² The versions of the texts were mainly taken from *Oeuvre*, but certain single variants from the 1905 and 1920 editions of *The Voices of Spring* were inserted rather eclectically: “in some places the primary version of particular stanzas or particular lines was restored” (Maironis 1947, 222).

A similar eclectic approach was used by the editor of *The Voices of Spring* of 1913 that was published in the emigration milieu in Rome in 1952. Taking the *Oeuvre* version as the basis, Bernardas Brazdžionis (1907–2002), a poet himself, inserted the variants of the 1920 edition in some stanzas and explained, “The restored old words or lines are very ‘familiar’ to us and have found a place in our hearts” (Brazdžionis 1952, 279–80). The phrase “in our hearts” was not just a poetic expression. When preparing the edition, Brazdžionis reverted to a common practice of philologists living the camps of displaced persons (1945–1950), who endeavoured to restore Lithuanian literary textbooks and anthologies without the use of books, by merely counting on what they knew by heart (Naujokaitis 1948, 5).¹³ Ironically enough, in the editor’s commentaries Brazdžionis denounced the above-mentioned Soviet edition of (Maironis 1947), alleging that in this edition the poems “were damaged, edited in a rather peculiar manner [...] of Soviet publications. [...] This kind of editing changes the shape and form of the collection” (Brazdžionis 1952, 294). In the Roman edition, eight chapters were introduced again, albeit different ones, that were arranged in another way than those published in the years of World War II. In addition, the sequence of the poems did not coincide with the structure of any edition prepared by Maironis himself.

An even stranger composition (already the sixth type of composition) appeared in an attempt to publish a semi-scholarly edition of Maironis’ works, which included a discussion of the variants (Maironis 1982). In this edition, the first 36 poems were arranged in the sequence taken from the 1895a edition of *The Voices of Spring*,¹⁴ and then followed the poems that Maironis inserted

¹¹ In the other Soviet editions, dates were also added, in some cases in square brackets (Maironis 1976; Maironis 1986).

¹² For example, the poem “Mergaitė” [Girl] was erroneously dated to 1893 (Maironis 1986, 21), as the editors *de visu* did not check the reference found in bibliographies that it first appeared in *Lietuviszkas Kalendorius metams 1894 turintiems 365 dienas*, Vilniuje: Spauda ir iszdas Jūzapo Zavadzko [counterfactual, should be: Tilžė: J. Šenkės sp.], 1893, p. 21. In fact, the anonymous verse (with identical title) published there should not be related to Maironis, and the above-mentioned poem by the latter was first published two years later (Maironis 1895a, 34–35).

¹³ I would like to thank Jurga Dzikaite, who drew my attention to this fact.

¹⁴ This does not include the satires and texts with religious motifs, a total of nine

in the 1905, 1913 and 1920 editions of *The Voices of Spring*. The 1927 versions of *Oeuvre* were given as the basic text, and the earlier versions were quoted in a fragmentary manner, and discussed in the commentaries.

Although a close analysis shows that the authorial sequence had its unique logic, the subsequent history of publishing Maironis' poetry testifies that the editors created four new structural models of the collection. Due to the frequent reprints of *The Voices of Spring* with large print runs, a socio-cultural image of the collection was formed that was quite different from the authorial image. As such, a contemporary editor of Maironis faces several problematic alternatives, which can be summed up in the following pattern:

1. When publishing the latest authorial version of the poems, they should be arranged in the sequence of the 1927 edition of *Oeuvre*, even though this does not correspond with the dominant, long-standing and meaningful title *The Voices of Spring*, and the readers of Maironis do not recognize the genre title *Lyrics*; moreover, the latter (sub)title correlates with the volume of *Oeuvre* and would be more suitable for a many-volume edition of the Maironis corpus than for a separate collection of poems.¹⁵
2. When publishing the collection of *The Voices of Spring*, it would be appropriate to choose the concept of authorial composition that corresponds to this title (i.e. maintaining the sequence of the 1920 edition), but that would not include nineteen later poems. Furthermore, this sequence has an inner conflict with the latest authorial versions of the poems.
3. When publishing any earlier versions of the poems as the collection *The Voices of Spring* rather than versions of the 1927 *Oeuvre* edition, the author's will would be ignored, the most well-polished variants that have "caught up" with the language modernization would have to be discarded, and a conflict with the long-standing reception of separate poems would arise.

These alternatives would be partly annihilated in a digital edition, which would allow the reader to see and compare any authorial sequence and corresponding versions of the poems, as well as their historical development. However, the transformation of the collection *The Voices of Spring* into *Oeuvre* that plays a different socio-cultural role and has a different bibliographical and linguistic code, performed by the poet himself, is fundamental. Thus it is an inconceivable task to find a model of an edition that minimises the editorial co-authorship that would integrate both the compositional concept of *The Voices of Spring* and the latest versions of the texts, i.e. the versions of *Oeuvre*.

poems, which were censored out by the Soviets.

¹⁵ In the 1952 edition, *Lyrics* was added as a subtitle to *The Voices of Spring*. This created a new combination of a title, subtitle, versions of poems and overall composition of the collection. In one of the more recent editions, this combination of a title, subtitle, and composition was repeated, but the versions of the poems are presented according to the 1927 edition (Maironis 2012). This way, the variety of basic components of the textual and bibliographic code is increased once again.

Another editorial challenge arises from one more editorial perspective that could consider the authorial use of his poetry as a means of revenge. In order to pursue this curious idea, I should first discuss the bibliographical code of *The Voices of Spring* in greater detail.¹⁶ The first publication of the 1895 collection had a rather modest printing quality and a small size, which was understandable because of its clandestine nature (Maironis 1895a). Nevertheless, the edition contained ornate initial letters and several vignettes from the printing house's standard kit. The publication of 1905 boasted even more opulent drawn initials and slightly better paper, but in this case an original visual solution was not offered either. A coloured carton-paper cover with the author's portrait (by the famous artist Antanas Žmuidzinavičius, 1876–1966) and his two other photographs from different periods in inserted plates allow us to interpret the third edition of *The Voices of Spring* as giving particular emphasis on Maironis' person. More abundant vignettes were not created especially for this book, but they are larger and more complex, and the layout is more spacious. Yet, the first three editions of the poetry collection are nothing out of the ordinary in the stylistic and technological context of the design of printed production of the given period and specific printing houses.

The 1920 edition of *The Voices of Spring* has a lot of marked differences from the earlier editions. The extraordinary nature of this edition is enhanced by two historical circumstances. Firstly, unlike in earlier cases, Maironis himself chose and commissioned its visual materials — illustrations and photographs — and took decisions regarding their arrangement (materials prepared by the author preserved in the publisher's copy; see Maironis 1918). Secondly, Maironis' efforts did not go unnoticed — the book's design created a stir in the cultural and religious circles of that time, was criticized in published reviews, and caused private gossip both for aesthetic and moral reasons.

What was it that public opinion was so critical about? A *very colourful* cover blended *art nouveau* elements with neo-romanticist *country* sugariness (see Figure 3). The author of the cover design and some of the illustrations was an amateur artist Kazys Šimonis (1887–1978), whose folksy decorations and forthright symbolism was quite to the taste of the first-generation urban residents of the young national republic. Added to this, elements of Šimonis's graphic art, details of Raphael's paintings, primitive national ornaments, *art nouveau*-style ladies, flowers from greeting cards and photographs, were all mingled together on the book's pages. Moreover, almost every page had a different layout (see Figure 4), and some copies were printed on better quality paper with dark green instead of black ink.

"Neither spit nor swallow. There hasn't been a single book in the Lithuanian

¹⁶ This description is necessary because so far no bibliographic works have been published that analyse (or at least described in detail) the bibliographical code of Maironis' books. There is only one recent article that looks at the design of *Voices of Spring*, but does this for the most part in the context of the Lithuanian imagery of spring (Jankevičiūtė 2019).

Figure 3: Maironis 1920, cover by Kazys Šimonis

Figure 4: Maironis 1920, 18–19

language so lavishly illustrated, so pretentious and so clumsily published” (Sruoga 1920, 120). In his review, the famous Lithuanian writer and theatre figure Balys Sruoga (1896–1947) resented the visual cacophony of the edition. Setting aside all the other oddities of illustrations, I would note that the poem “Ant Neapolio užtakos” [In the Bay of Naples], in which Vesuvius is mentioned, was illustrated with a photograph of a landscape of the Lithuanian plains. Why do I assume that by choosing the superfluous, heterogeneous and kitschy design, the author was taking revenge? And on whom? In 1910, Maironis bought a late Baroque mansion in the very centre of Kaunas, City Hall Square. At the poet’s request, the interior decoration of the first-floor rooms was made by an archaeologist, public figure and creator of symbols of the national state Tadas Daugirdas (1852–1919). On the one hand, the interiors of Maironis’ house, which was much frequented by guests, became a model of national-style decoration for Lithuanian city dwellers. On the other, artists who had studied in the West and intellectuals of the younger generation made ironic remarks about the eclectic *décor* — a mishmash of attributes of noble and peasant culture and pompous neo-romanticist paintings.

Around the same time, the poet’s works were increasingly more often termed as old-fashioned. “Goodnight, Maironis!” (Šmulkštys-Paparonis 1920) — these words summarized a review of an epic work by Maironis that came out in the same period. Likely, by the bibliographic code of the 1920 edition of *The Voices*

Figure 5: Apolonija Petkaitė in Maironis 1920, 94 (left); and in Maironis's private album, Maironis Lithuanian Literature Museum, No. 2264a (right).

of *Spring*, the author seemed to declare that while people might make fun of his work and lifestyle, it was still he who set the trends in Lithuania, and he who would decide what is beautiful. And that just like his poems, the images he had chosen would pave the way for a canon of national aesthetics. As an indirect confirmation of this assumption, I would like to refer to a photo of Maironis' house that was included in the 1920 edition of *The Voices of Spring*.

Furthermore, there is an even spicier feature of this book. Maironis dedicated several of his poems to women with whom he had close contacts in different periods of his life. In the 1920 edition of *The Voices of Spring*, two more dedications of this kind appeared. Admittedly, all these dedications were marked with initials only, or else the names were arranged in acrostics. Contrary to this camouflage, however, this edition contained five women's photographs along with landscape photographs. Two of them can be considered mere illustrations of the national costume accompanying patriotic poems. Yet the other women are easily recognizable — it was to them that the poems were dedicated, and these photographs have survived in Maironis' private archive with ambiguous inscriptions. Moreover, a portrait of one girl is set in a vignette representing a lyre, thus very straightforwardly implying that she was the poet's muse (Maironis 1920, 94; see Figure 5). It is appropriate to recall that Maironis was a Catholic priest, to whom celibacy was obligatory. These illustrations provided an even more fertile ground for the rumours that, out of keeping with his class, Maironis had been having intimate relations with several women and was secretly taking care of an illegitimate child.

One should bear in mind that although Maironis was 58 at the time, Lithuania was a very conservative society in the early twentieth century when it comes to

social customs, and was rather intolerant of romantic affairs — even if they had taken place in the past. So, why did Maironis dare to make this provocation? It would be respectable to tell a noble literary tale of the brave poet's rebellion against the hypocrisy of Victorian morals and a modern individual's declaration of creative and personal freedom. Unfortunately, the reality was most probably much more banal. I would argue that Maironis decided to include photos of real women-muses in the edition after his smouldering hope to be nominated as a bishop had been shattered.¹⁷ Being a prelate and the most famous Lithuanian writer alive, he was not afraid of losing his social status by choosing these illustrations, and could at least in this way take his revenge on the church dignitaries that had disappointed him.

Still, in *Oeuvre* (the design of which was also ordered by the author) Maironis removed both the dedications to his muses, their portraits, and illustrations in general. By the writer's decision, the colourful dynamics of authorial manipulation of the editions of *The Voices of Spring* was weighed down by the classical *Oeuvre* of restrained appearance and temperate composition, which established the image of Maironis' solidity. Ironically, with this turn of circumstances, it was not until recently that the genesis of Maironis' verses and the development of the structure of the collection have been given consistent research attention.

Keeping three main things in mind, that is: 1) the poetic elaboration of the text; 2) the continuous restructuring of the composition of his collections of poetry; and 3) the solutions concerning bibliographical code, Maironis' practice of editing his own works was radically situational. Therefore, any traditional edition may, in the best case, roughly convey only one of those textual constellations. The effort and ability of a poet to change creatively is as important evidence of his talent as the final elaborated version of his poems. Thus, a digital archive that enables a user to encounter every different stage of the development of *The Voices of Spring* (be that edition, or manuscript) as a unique entirety, that presents a genetic sequence of variants would no longer merely present Maironis' poetics as fragmented, and deconstructed. Instead, the author would appear as more appealing to any contemporary reader, and the edition would be representative of the *peripeteias* of the creation of modern culture. The digital archive and genetic edition of *The Voices of Spring* is already prepared and will be publicly available after this article is published.¹⁸ The case of Maironis, in its turn, testifies that the initially perceived stability and continuity of literature may also function in another way, that is, by situational adaptation. In this sense, the sequence of former chameleonic transformations of *The Voices of Spring* extends when they are transposed to the digital medium.

¹⁷ Maironis was particularly hurt by the fact that two prominent nineteenth-century Lithuanian priest writers (Motiejus Valančius and Antanas Baranauskas) had become bishops, just like his younger colleagues, professors at the Theological Academy, the now-Blessed Jurgis Matulaitis and Juozapas Skvireckas, while his own candidacy was rejected several times.

¹⁸ To be hosted online at: <http://www.pb.flf.vu.lt/>.

Bibliography

- BRAZDŽIONIS, BERNARDAS, 1952. "Redakatoriaus žodis." In *Pavasario balsai: Lyrika*, authored by Maironis, edited by Bernardas Brazdžionis, Roma: Mons. Pr. Juras, pages 279–95. 17th edition.
- BUSHELL, SALLY, 2005. "Intention Revisited: Towards an Anglo-American 'Genetic Criticism'." *Text* 17, pages 55–91.
- DAUJOTYTĖ, VIKTORIJA, 1990. "Maironio poetinės programos visuotinumai." In *Maironis, Literatūra ir kalba*, volume 21, Vilnius: Vaga, pages 55–68.
- GIRDZIJAUSKAS, JUOZAS, 1966. *Lietuvių eilėdara: Silabinės-toninės sistemos susiformavimas*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- JABLONSKIS, JONAS, 1901. *Lietuviškos kalbos gramatika. Rašytojams ir skaitytojams vadovėlis. Parašė Petras Kriaušaitis*. Tilžė. [print by O. Mauderodė].
- JANKEVIČIŪTĖ, GIEDRĖ, 2019. "Maironis ir jo Pavasario balsai lietuviškosios pavasario vaizdinijos kontekste." *LKMA Metraštis* 42, pages 127–53.
- KALNAČS, BENEDIKTS, ed., 2009. *300 Baltic Writers: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania: a reference guide to authors and their works*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.
- KESSLER, STEPHAN, 2014. "Maironis' *Pavasario balsai* (1895) and the Question of Its Romanticism." In *Eina garsas: Nauji Maironio skaitymai*, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, pages 66–75.
- KUČINSKIENĖ, AISTĖ, 2014. "Ankstyvasis Maironis literatūros lauke: įsišventinimas, kanonizavimas, pozicijų užėmimas." In *Eina garsas: Nauji Maironio skaitymai*, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, pages 250–65.
- MAIRONIS, 1885. "Lietuvos vargas." *Ausra* 7–8, pages 194–95.
- , 1888. "Lietuva." *Ausra* 7–8, pages 194–95. [Holograph, dedicated to bp. Antanas Baranauskas] Vilnius University Library, Manuscript Department, F1–D68.
- , 1891a. *Apsakymai apie Lietuvos praeigą*. Tilžė: Kasztu Lietuvos mylėtojų. [print by O. Mauderodė].
- , 1891b. "Daina apie senovę." *Žemaičių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga* 5, page 35.
- , 1891c. "Lietuvos gražybė." *Varpas* 11, pages 162–63.

- , 1895a. *Pavasario Balsai*. Tilžėje: Kasztu autoriaus. [print by O. Mauderodė].
- , 1895b. *Terp skausmu į Garbę: Poëma iz dabartiniu laiku*. Tilžėje: Spausta kasztu E. Jagamasto. [print by O. Mauderodė].
- , 1905. *Pavasario Balsai. ir Kur išganymas*. Peterburgas: Išleista Lietuvių Laikraščio kaštais, 3rd edition. [print by Golike and Vilborg].
- , 1913. *Pavasario Balsai ir Kame išganymas*. Kaunas, 4th edition. [print by S. Banaitis].
- , 1918. *Pavasario Balsai ir Kame išganymas*. Kaunas, 4th edition. 1913. [print by S. Banaitis] [authorial copy with revisions – publisher's copy for typesetting of 1920 ed.] Maironis Lithuanian Literature Museum, No. 102103.
- , 1920. *Pavasario Balsai*. Tilžė: Jagomasto sp. Lituania.
- , 1925. *Punės kalnas*. [Holograph, rough copy] Maironis Lithuanian Literature Museum, No. 20040, ff. 1v, 2r, 2v, 3v, 4v.
- , 1926. *Pavasario Balsai*. Tilžė: Jagomasto sp. Lituania. 1920. [Authorial copy with revisions made due preparation of *Maironio raštai*, 1, 1927 ed.] Maironis Lithuanian Literature Museum, No. 4795.
- , 1927. *Maironio raštai*, 1: *Lyrika*, volume 6. Kaunas: Raidės spaustuvė.
- , 1942. *Pavasario balsai*, edited by Juozas Ambrazevičius. Kaunas: Valstybinė leidykla.
- , 1947. *Pavasario balsai*, edited by Liucina Starevičiūtė. Kaunas: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.
- , 1952. *Pavasario balsai: Lyrika*, edited by Bernardas Brazdžionis. Roma: Mons. Pr. Juras, 17th edition.
- , 1963. "Maironis." *Lituanus* 9(1). Available from: http://www.lituanus.org/1963/63_1_03.htm (Accessed: 2021–03–07).
- , 1976. *Pavasario balsai*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- , 1982. *Pavasario balsai*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- , 1986. *Pavasario balsai*, edited by Rimantė Umbrasaitė. Vilnius: Vaga.
- , 1988. *Raštai*, 2: *Poemos*, edited by Irena Slavinskaitė. Vilnius: Vaga.
- , 1995. *Pavasario balsai*, edited by Irena Slavinskaitė. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 27th edition.

- , 2002. "Maironis." *Lituanus* 48(3). Available from: http://www.lituanus.org/2002/02_3_01.htm (Accessed: 2021–03–07).
- , 2012. *Pavasario balsai: Lyrika*, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 28th edition.
- , 2020. *Pavasario balsai*, edited by Deimantė Cibulskienė. Kaunas: Maironio lietuvių literatūros muziejus.
- NAUJOKAITIS, PRANAS, 1948. *Lietuvių literatūra: Trumpas lietuvių literatūros kursas gimnazijai*. Tübingenas: Patria.
- NYKA-NILIŪNAS, ALFONSAS, 1962. "Maironio likimo paraštėje." *Aidai* 7, pages 283–86.
- POKORSKA-IWANIUK, MONIKA, 2014. "Pavasario balsai Maironisa jako cykl poetycki." In *Eina garsas: Nauji Maironio skaitymai*, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, pages 114–31.
- REYNOLDS, L.D. and N.G. WILSON, 1991. *Scribes & Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek & Latin Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3rd edition.
- SAUKA, DONATAS, 1998. "Ein Gedicht von Maironis im Vergleich zum Werk Goethes." *Annaberger Annalen* 6, pages 79–88.
- ŠEINA, VIKTORIJA, 2016. "Maironio kanonizacijos dinamika XX a. I pusės lietuvių literatūros kritikoje." *Colloquia* 37, pages 49–71.
- SHILLINGSBURG, PETER L., 1991. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." *Studies in Bibliography* 44, pages 31–82.
- SHILLINGSBURG, PETER L., 2017. *Textuality and Knowledge: Essays*. University Park (PA): The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- SLAVINSKAITĖ, IRENA, 1987. "Maironis (1862–1932)." In *Raštai, 1: Lyrika*, authored by Maironis, edited by Irena Slavinskaitė, Vilnius: Vaga, pages 8–48.
- ŠMULKŠTYS-PAPARONIS, ANTANAS, 1920. "Del Maironio poemos 'Mūsų vargai'." *Laisvė* 169, page 4.
- SPEIČYTĖ, BRIGITA, 2012. *Anapus ribos: Maironis ir istorinė Lietuva*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.
- , 2019. "Maironio Pavasario balsai: lyrikos rinkinys." In *Maironio balsai: Kūryba, veikla, atmintis*, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, pages 29–141.
- SRUOGA, BALYS, 1920. "Knygoms apginti (Del Maironies Mačiulio 'Pavasario balsų' penktojo leidimo)." *Skaitymai* 1, pages 118–21.

- STROEBEL, WILLIAM, 2018. "Some Assembly Required: Suspending and Extending the Book with Cavafy's Collections." *Book History* 21, pages 278–316.
- VENCKIENĖ, JURGITA, 2006. "Bendrinė kalba: tarmės pasirinkimas ir kodifikacija katalikiškoje ir pasaulietinėje periodikoje (1889–1905)." *Archivum Lithuanicum* 8, pages 191–208.
- , 2012. "Jono Mačiulio-Maironio raštų rašyba ir kalba: Jauniaus sekėjo dinamika." *Archivum Lithuanicum* 14, pages 9–42.
- , 2018. "Maironio Pavasario balsai (1895–1927): kaip kito eilėraščių kalba." *Archivum Lithuanicum* 20, pages 209–34.
- ZABORSKAITĖ, VANDA, 1987. *Maironis*. Vilnius: Vaga, 2nd edition.
- ŽVIRGŽDAS, MANFREDAS, 2012. "Po Maironio ženklų." In *Pavasario balsai: Lyrika*, authored by Maironis, edited by Manfredas Žvirgždas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, pages 7–56. 28th edition.

Does the Editor Know Better? The Editorial Vicissitudes of the 20th Century Polish writers

Dariusz Pachoki

Abstract: The main purpose of this article is to consider the question: Do authors always decide on the final form of their works? To explore the answer, this essay describes relations between authors and editors in chief. To this end, the essay provides some examples of the various forms this activity can take, and reflects on what we can learn about a text's creation after the author regards it as finished. The examples will be derived from the manuscripts of the Polish author Leopold Tyrmand. His literary output was studied by many scholars. So far, however, such analyses of his works were mainly of a literary nature — and only examined rarely from a philological point of view. Nevertheless, it would not be fair to blame the scholars for this lacuna: surely many of them would consider such an inquiry if they did not lack the proper source materials. As a result, in the research of Tyrmand's literary output practically no examination of Tyrmand's creative process, no closer examination of the subsequent phases of the formation of text, and no compilation of its various variants or attribution problems has existed until now.

Any literary message coming from a writer's hand has always been in need of an intermediary who would aid it in reaching the reader. In this function, editors in chief of magazines and publishers are often tempted to introduce changes to the pieces they were about to publish. Some considered it their obvious right — and one that has been awarded to them by means of contractual agreements. However, there have also been those whose interventions ventured far beyond their competence. The examples I am about to present in order to illustrate the discussed issue come from the practice of professionals working at the two largest publishing houses that gathered primarily Polish *émigré* writers. Because freedom of speech was non-existent under the communist regime in Poland after WWII, many Polish writers decided to live as emigrants. Communist Poland's censorship often exercised the power to block every form of public art expression, such as books or films. Censorship in Communist Poland (1945-1989) was performed by the Main Office of Control of Press, Publications and Shows, an institution created in 1946 by the pro-Soviet Provisional Government of National Unity with Stalin's approval and backing. In 1950 a list of prohibited publications and boycotted writers was created and subsequently modified many times by the communist authorities. Articles and books with dozens of cuts might have had a greater impact on the readers' minds. An alternative strategy for writers

was to use the Aesopian language which was less understood by censors. The censorship law was eliminated after the fall of communism in Poland (1990).

Susan Greenberg has noticed that:

Editing as a distinct activity or role tends to be pushed into the margins of our attention. This is partly because it takes place behind the scenes, more hidden than the work of the bylined author and branded publisher, and partly because it is everywhere and, therefore, nowhere.

(Greenberg 2010, 8)

Indeed, the the negotiations between editors and their writers are rarely made public. Yet they warrant a closer look, since they can shed a new light on the degree of influence editors in chief had on their writer's publications. In addition, the changes they introduced were not always made with noble motives.

Jerzy Giedroyc,¹ who was in charge of the *Kultura* (Maisons-Laffite) journal, and Mieczysław Grydzewski² who was the editor in chief of the London-based *Wiadomości* both created islands of freedom for Polish writers. And although these two varied substantially in their assessment of the events in Poland, they were undoubtedly an important and respected voice of "free Poland".³ As a result, they were quite successful in gathering interesting and vital writers, who had no other choice for a publication venue, if they wished to publish their pieces in Polish as emigrants (Borejsza and Ziemer 2006). Their employers, Giedroyc and Grydzewski, were both competent, expressive and powerful personalities. Both of them were also men of their own specific vision and program which they were successfully executing. Editing the pieces which had been accepted for publication was part of their job.⁴ Writers who were collaborating with them quickly became familiar with their methods, when their texts were subjected to various types of alterations. Frequently, these practices included the implementation of changes that often seriously altered the text's artistic side. Moreover, it happened quite often that changes were introduced without the authors' awareness, or despite their firm protests.

While it is not my aim to suggest that such interventions were common practice, it is nevertheless important to address them and put them in their

¹ Jerzy Władysław Giedroyc (1906–2000) was a Polish writer and political activist, and for many years the editor in chief of the Paris-based periodical *Kultura* (sometimes referred to as "Paris-based Culture"), which was published from 1947 to 2000 by the Literary Institute in Maisons-Laffitte (near Paris). It used to play a significant role in Polish literary life. Its authors published polemics and original articles, including pieces by Nobel laureates Czesław Miłosz and Wisława Szymborska.

² Mieczysław Grydzewski (1894–1970) was a Polish historian, publisher, literary critic, and the editor in chief of *Wiadomości* (referred to as "London-based The News"). The magazine was as a major *émigré* journal from 1946 until 1981.

³ Both *Wiadomości* and *Kultura* were forbidden in Poland.

⁴ Quite often they combined various editorial roles and behaved as editor in chief, developmental editor, copy editor, proofreader or managing editor. For a snapshot of these editorial roles, see Greenberg 2018, 11

temporal context. Before World War II, Jerzy Giedroyc was part of the editorial board of a popular magazine *Polityka*, together with Mieczysław Pruszyński (secretary) and Adolf Bocheński (foreign department). Apart from being in charge of the magazine, Giedroyc was also responsible for Polish internal affairs (Habielski 2006, 26). We do not have a lot of accurate data on Giedroyc's editorial practices from these times, but from the sources that did survive it appears that Giedroyc "held the magazine with an iron hand, that is he interfered in the content of the articles adjusting them to his own purposes" (Habielski 2006, 27).⁵ Adolf Bocheński complained in 1936 that the editor "is being a terrible bully". which meant that he was mercilessly interfering in his press reviews: "as a result, he makes them utterly pointless" wrote Bocheński. "[H]e adds some sort of crops of his own mind and then he prints it all. And some think I'm the one responsible for that. It's awful" (Habielski 2006, 27).

After the war, when Giedroyc took charge of *Kultura*, his editorial habits did not change — one could say that quite the opposite was true. Instead, he felt a strong urge to modify the articles that were published in *Kultura* (as well as the books that were published in the *Biblioteka Kultury* literary series) in discussion with their author. In addition, the editor's private beliefs and his literary taste often gave way to lengthy discussions with his authors on the final form of the works that he would publish.⁶

One writer who had the opportunity to experience Giedroyc's editorial style was Marek Hłasko. In January 1957, Giedroyc initiated a meeting between them by inviting Hłasko to collaborate with him on his journal. In his letter to Andrzej Bobkowski Giedroyc wrote that Hłasko's "legend is completely fake. He is just a boy, hurt and unhappy, who has decided to rebel. Personally, I find him very nice. [...] I have every reason to promote him on an international scale and to think we shall have *poulain* possibly even larger in popularity than Miłosz himself" (Zieliński 1996, 511–12).

The writer felt honoured and agreed to send Giedroyc his short stories. The first two of them *Cmentarze* [*The Graveyard*] and *Następny do raju* [*Next Stop, Paradise*] were published within the *Biblioteka "Kultury"* series in 1958. The issue loomed large in Hłasko's mind, encouraging him to become bolder in his writing, and giving room to certain tensions between the author and his publisher. In a letter dated April 30th 1962 Giedroyc wrote to Hłasko:

Zygmunt told me about your letter, that the next stories you are currently preparing are going to be even more drastic and that you are not going to agree to have anything removed from your pieces. I have a feeling that there has been some ongoing misunderstanding between us. It is not my aversion towards drastic words (which, to be true, I detest) but the rules

⁵ A letter from Adolf Bocheński to Mieczysław Rettinger from December 26th, 1936. Manuscript at Warsaw University Library, no. 1477.

⁶ Is is easy to categorize this as a form of collaboration, but we have to keep in mind that writers basically had the choice between accepting the changes, or not being published anywhere at all.

of censorship. I do not know about the situation in Germany, but I am obliged to obey the French law. One can print various things here, but certain language forms have to be kept. And there is nothing I can do about it, no matter how much I would like to. Please take this into account and decide for yourself if this shall be enough a reason not to publish in *Kultura* in the future.⁷

(Hłasko and Giedroyc 1962–75)

In a reply dated May 5th 1962, Hłasko tried to find a subtle way to explain his reasoning to Giedroyc. Undoubtedly, Hłasko realized that his collaboration with *Kultura* was a chance for him to gain a wider readership:

You mentioned that you are a not a fan of drastic words. It might sound strange to you, but I am personally not a fan of them either. But when writing a short story about castaways bending over backwards to get a slice of bread, I have the right to assume (not referring to even my own experience) that such people do use such words, if a literary piece shall be treated as a synthesis, obviously. I believe this has nothing to do with pornography, if for the sake of depicting a character, when trying to create a language which a man uses, I use several drastic words. Personally, what does infuriate me are the dots [...]. Why am I allowed to use, in a story, such words as *dick*, but not *cunt*? This has nothing to do with respect towards women, if we are allowed to use such words as *bitch*, *son of a bitch*, *whore*, *prostitute* and so on. There is no explanation to that and we should not bow our heads to this [...].

(Hłasko and Giedroyc 1962–75)

Hłasko was also quite surprised that the editor referred to the censorship law in France⁸ to strengthen his position, recalling that it was in France where they “read and publish *Gargantua and Pantagruel*”; that it was in France where Faulkner became popular even though his piece *Light in August* contained words such as “fuck” and “son of a bitch” and “bitch” in such quantities that — as Hłasko argued — “even I would be afraid” (ibid.). Moreover, as he continued, it was in France where *Ulysses* and Henry Miller’s works were first published, and where Marquis de Sade’s books were originally published in English.

In a letter dated on May 26th 1962, Giedroyc replied that his hands were tied and that, as he had previously stated, he had to undertake censoring activities because of the existing law in France. Referring to some particular swear words, he claimed that in the works of Rabelais or Faulkner, “they are acceptable,

⁷ All quotes from the correspondence between Hłasko and Giedroyc the Archive of Literary Institute in Maisons-Laffitte (Hłasko and Giedroyc 1962–75). All these quotations have been translated by the author, who would like to thank the management of the institute for making these resources accessible to him. The topic of the disagreement between Hłasko and Giedroyc was a series of short stories which were to be published in *Kultur* and *Biblioteka Kultury*. See, among others: Hłasko 1962; 1965a,b.

⁸ After WWII the use of swear words in literature was deemed acceptable in France.

because a word like bitch and the like have gained citizenship. Others did not" (Hłasko and Giedroyc 1962–75). As he continued: "It might seem funny that you can write: bitch, son of a bitch, ass, but you cannot write dick or cunt" (ibid.). The reasons for these he saw in the fact that French language has centuries-old tradition of erotic terminology and possesses numerous words and allusive phrases: "Polish language in this sphere did not step beyond Kochanowski and Potocki and is awfully vulgar" (ibid.). Giedroyc strongly suggested that Hłasko would replace the swear words with their initial letters, followed by an ellipsis. To this, Hłasko responded that one cannot replace a vulgar word with a different one, because "it becomes a different word then" (ibid.). It might be crossed out, but in that case "it changes the story" (ibid.). He also pointed out to Giedroyc that the choice of language that is used in a story is motivated by the convention according to which the text is written; by the person who narrates the story (e.g. "a scamp, a blighter, a pimp"), and by what the story is about. In an undated letter (probably from October 1964), the writer mentioned a particular example from the short story that was soon to be published in *Kultura* — a character of the *Drugie zabicie psa* [*Killing the Second Dog*] piece:

I fear that if we change ROBERT when we take his language away — he will turn out a different man, not so strong and full-blooded. Of course, you may cross out the word *cunt*, because it's not pretty — but I only do this not to offend our beloved Zosia [Hertz]; but if we change Robert's sentence:

— To hell with the son-of-a-bitch...
into:

— To hell with the s...

Then it's just not the same.

(Hłasko and Giedroyc 1962–75)

It has to be recognized, though, that in this case the editor did accept Marek Hłasko's points and the original version of this piece was published. However, in other places the debatable words were replaced with dots or completely crossed out (Hłasko 1965a, 81 and 141). In the years that followed new books were published, but the cooperation did not go smoothly. Certain disagreements over financial issues were piled on top of the old tensions over language. The relations between Hłasko and *Kultura* became more loose (Tyrchan 2007), which may be confirmed by the writer's letter (from August 25th, 1967) to the editor of the London-based *Wiadomości*, Juliusz Sakowski, in which he was complaining about the arbitrary decisions made by the editor in chief of *Kultura*:

Thank you, Sir, for your kind words on my reportages from the USA. I am sorry to inform you that there will be no more of them. Jerzy Giedroyc introduces his alterations arbitrarily: not knowing English, he changes names — for example he changed the name DOUGLAS (shortened DOUG) to DOUD which makes no sense whatsoever and puts me in a position of an idiot who seems not to have even the most rudimentary grasp of the country in which I'm living and its language [...]. But Giedroyc, whose

editorial gift I respect a lot, also has a gift to turn even the most faithful people from him.

(Kielanowski 1967, 114)

Hłasko was of course not the only person who had to negotiate the final versions of their works with Giedroyc. Around this time (i.e.: in the mid-1960s) another Polish writer decided to emigrate: Leopold Tyrmand.⁹ His first stop behind the “iron curtain” was the editing office of *Kultura* in Maissons-Laffitte itself. After having finished a tour around Europe, the writer decided to move to the USA. He published a piece in *Kultura* where he burnt all the bridges that linked him to Poland, decided to become an English-language author instead. It has to be noted that he became quite a successful English-language author at that. His columns were published in prestigious magazines such as *The New Yorker*. But the past was not easily forgotten, and Tyrmand — as it later turned out — would reminisce about it until the end. When he left Poland, he took the novel *Życie towarzyskie i uczuciowe* [*A Social and Emotional Life*] with him, the publication of which had been blocked by a censor. He hoped that he would not encounter any such problems when he tried to publish the piece with Giedroyc. The latter seemed interested, but he made his conditions. In a letter dated on May 5th 1967, Giedroyc informed Tyrmand that he finds the book very interesting and brilliant, but also pointed out that it would be necessary to make some cuts in the original, because it contained too many longueurs that impeded the reading, and made it too similar in style to his most popular work, i.e. *Zły* [*The Man With White Eyes*], a crime story. In a letter, Giedroyc proposed the following cuts:

- p. 232 cut from the beginning of the second paragraph “finally he met” to the end of the chapter
- p. 241 the whole of chapter nine
- p. 252-256 shorten the story with Giga as much as possible
- p. 308-325 possibly leave just the thing with Częstochowa. It doesn’t taste that well and it’s too similar to *Zły*.
- 380 in the second paragraph from “Brutus was missing”... until “the whole life to be erased”
- [...]
- 695-695 until the end of the chapter
- 717-719 the whole party at Stefania’s
- 719-726 cut mercilessly.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82)

⁹ Leopold Tyrmand (1920–1985) was a legendary figure as a writer, journalist and jazz connoisseur in Poland. After WWII he returned to Warsaw, where he started to work as a journalist (1946). Tyrmand refused to collaborate with the new regime, and suffered from an unofficial ban on his publications as a result. The years from 1957 until 1965 were a period of a deepening crisis for Tyrmand. His books were banned by the censorship, because the communists considered him uncomfortable and dangerous. He finally left Poland in 1965, and emigrated to the USA in 1966. In English, his works include: *The Man With White Eyes*, *Notebooks of a Dilettante*, *Seven Long Voyages*, *Diary* 1954.

Apart from the suggested cuts, Giedroyc allowed himself to make some comments of more general nature. He drew the writer's attention to the fact that in the book "there was always someone whose back was sticking with sweat". He hoped that the author would accept the comments and take necessary action. It did not take long for Tyrmand to reply, and in a letter dated 17 May 1967 he emphasized that his answer came as a result of deep reflection. He assured Giedroyc that the approach he held towards his own writing was not of a devotional nature, but he also pointed to the fact that the book had already been edited four times by him and what he meant by "edited" was "just cuts and minor changes" (Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82). After having looked into Giedroyc's suggestions he decided that the proposed cuts would be too hard for him to accept. After a series of long debates, the book was finally published in 1967. The final version was around 30% shorter than the original typescript. Some changes were never accepted by Tyrmand. However, he did not decide to have them edited once more.

A year later, the writer presented the editor of *Kultura* a piece which he announced with the following words:

Would you like to have a look at an article (from me, indeed!) entitled *W szponach metafizyki* [*Possessed by Metaphysics*] which is about me, Free Europe, Zionists, *Kultura*, athletics and of course about me?

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 2 July 1968)¹⁰

It was supposed to be a kind of reconciliation after the strife over getting the book ready for publishing. Giedroyc reacted positively to the text. A few weeks later, he replied:

I have received also an article of yours, which I enjoyed and I consider it correct, but which contains several "adjectives" or certain terms which are exaggerated and which I would suggest to omit. Because surely you do have your own copy, I will write down the suggested cuts on a separate sheet for you and I'm looking forward to hearing if you accept them.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 31 July 1968)

This time, Giedroyc's reservations did not — like in Hłasko's case — concern the use of foul language, but rather the words he used to describe Polish communist politicians. Giedroyc claimed that while he was sympathetic with his writers, he could not take the risk of calling a politician an "asslicker", because the magazine's funds depended on people whose views leaned towards the political "Left" (*ibid.*). The magazine was Giedroyc's priority, and he would risk a lot to ensure its survival. Moreover, as he confessed, his own political

¹⁰ All quotes from the correspondence between Tyrmand and Giedroyc the Archive of Literary Institute in Maisons-Laffitte (Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82). All these quotations have been translated by the author, who would like to thank the management of the institute for making these resources accessible to him.

views were closer to the “Left” as well. In response, Tyrmand started looking for compromises and agreed to replace the explicit words with less expressive ones in an attempt to soften his tone:

p. 17 I agree to replace *a chicken-brained leader*. . . with the word *communist* to the long cuts on p. 18 I *cannot*, unfortunately, agree, but, again we can replace *Polish political leader* with *communist politician* (omitting *asslicker*. . .).

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 8 August 1968)

Nevertheless, their reconciliation would not last long. A source of a new conflict was the publication — in *The New York Times* — where Tyrmand renounced his Polish citizenship in order to protest the Warsaw Pact’s invasion of Czechoslovakia. The editor in chief of *Kultura* refused to reprint Tyrmand’s declaration which he considered pointless and futile, due to the writer’s residence in America. Further on, he returned to the controversial article suggesting that Tyrmand’s concessions are insufficient:

I also regret that you do not agree to the changes in your article. This is yet again an exaggerated pushing of a pedal. Where is this inclination of yours coming from? I am afraid that you are very unaware of the reality in Poland due to your stay in the USA and you subconsciously enter the direction dominant in American press. My tactics need to be based on the process of *normalising* the relations and that is a very uncompromising fight against the stupidity of the regime and against the disorders among the society. But articles such as yours are only an unnecessary act of adding fuel to the fire. We are not moving out of Poland, our wish is rather to change it or to have an influence. In this situation I prefer not to publish your article.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 10 September 1968)

To Tyrmand, this response indicated that Giedroyc had broken the negotiated agreement, and had changed rules of the game while it was taking course. In his own response, Tyrmand reminded the editor that he had been warned about the controversial nature of his article, and that he had already agreed to a half of the suggested changes as a result of the editorial negotiation process. He decided that Giedroyc’s actions were unfair and aimed against him personally. Soon after receiving Giedroyc’s letter, he argued his case:

I personally believe that my article is right, justified and useful at the present moment. If the discrepancy between our assessments of this fact is so huge, we should surely expect an unfavourable development of further events [. . .]. Under these conditions, I consider it a natural consequence that I will ask you to release me from my duties of *Kultura*’s correspondent in America and remove my name from the editorial note [. . .]. We have simply not managed to *adjust to each other* as you used to say, we think in a different way about the same, often the most vital issues, we have different

approaches to the whole system of methods and ways of conduct. [...] I am afraid that in my case you have failed to make me believe that you really care about me.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 13 September 1968)

According to Tyrmand, the Polish system was one of Marxist totalitarianism, and constituted an audacious evil that continued to spread with impunity throughout much of the world. Overpowering for many, Tyrmand had no intention to give in to what he considered to be a state that causes moral inertia. Undoubtedly, Tyrmand believed that adopting an attitude such as Giedroyc's would only serve to elevate this evil in a way. Surely, this was not what Tyrmand had expected when he decided to flee to the West. Presumably, he had instead expected to find himself embraced by a brother in arms, fighting for change in the Polish political system — a change that would need to be instigated by condemning the *satus quo*, and educating the people. For Tyrmand, his clash with reality must have constituted a great disillusionment. The lesson he learned from his experience made him decide against writing pieces such as those that were dictated by the interests of the USA's New Left. Instead, Tyrmand made a conscious choice to continue expressing his anti-communist views determinedly and unperturbedly — which eventually led the *The New Yorker* to break off their cooperation with the writer. Had Tyrmand yielded and softened his viewpoint, this would have contradicted the values that he held so dear as a citizen, and as an intellectual. It would have meant denying the cornerstones of his worldview which informed both his particular moral standpoint and his actions. Far from being opportunistic, these values had made sure that the intellectual side of his works was always greatly influenced by experiences from his past. Undoubtedly, these qualities amplified his power of expression in his writings, and legitimized his skills as a publicist.

What really destroyed Tyrmand's final chances on having a good — or at least satisfactory — relationship with Giedroyc, however, was his involvement in the editing of *Kultura's* anthology. Indeed, it was Tyrmand who was supposed to be responsible for preparing this issue for an audience in the USA. Not only was Giedroyc disappointed with the final result, he also believed that Tyrmand had blatantly taken advantage of his position to promote himself. The absolute proof Giedroyc used to support this claim was a huge photograph of Tyrmand that ended up on the issue's fourth page. These misunderstandings caused Tyrmand's turn away from *Kultura*, and to focus instead on his relationship with the editorial board of London-based *Wiadomości*. This magazine published one of his most widely-read pieces: *Dziennik 1954* [*Diary 1954*]. But here too, the story was bound to repeat itself. Stefania Kossowska, who had much influence on the shape of published pieces, introduced a number of changes (that she found to be *necessary*) to parts of the work. These changes included Tyrmand's sharply formulated treatment of living people, and excerpts that she considered erotically too daring for publication. Alongside these changes however, there were other

interventions that Tyrmand failed to understand, but accepted nonetheless. In a letter to *Wiadomości*, Tyrmand wrote:

but of course, we will not quarrel over such details — *a wife that cheats on him* may be replaced with *a wife that disagrees with him*, but the whole case smells of grotesque.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 22 February 1975)

Reluctantly, Tyrmand complied with his editor's conditions, but he was not ready to accept just any changes. In Tyrmand's mind, some of the proposed interventions would distort the whole point of the piece, and destroy the force of statements he expressed in subsequent parts of the diary. He summed up his collaboration with *Wiadomości* in one a letter he sent to Juliusz Sakowski — another editor:

I have to be honest and admit to myself that the relationship between the diary and *Wiadomości* was not a happy one, it did not work out. Ms. Kossowska, in whose good intentions towards me I do believe and I have no reasons to detect any personal hostility in her attitude, did not appreciate the diary somehow [...]. She is not interested in the personal content of the text, she does not enjoy the social side of it, and the assessment of the contemporaries — the most valuable element of the diaries and the sole privilege of the writer — meets her stubborn resistance [...]. As a result, collaboration with *Wiadomości* may be classified as a fiasco.

(Tyrmand and Giedroyc 1966–82, 4 September 1974;
see also Tyrmand 2014, 90)

Much seems to indicate that Mieczysław Grydzewski's colleagues were acting in accordance with the style he had once excelled in himself. Through the eyes of his collaborators, Grydzewski appears as an editor who "detested longueurs and mercilessly castrated articles, claiming that all cuts serve them so well" (Goll 1996, 179), whereas Stefania Kossowska noted that

Grydzewski would accept any text on four conditions: they had to be well-written, "independence-related" (there was no space for compromise here), "socially-oriented", although with a good pinch of liberty, and finally, they could not be anti-religious, because the editor, despite being indifferent to the subject of religion himself, had the biggest respect for all confessions [...]. There was one more rule: Grydzewski would not publish pieces which would be critical towards the pieces of other authors of the journal or the authors themselves.

(Tyrmand 2014, 121)

Theory and practice do not always go hand in hand, however — in fact the two frequently contradicted one another. Aleksander Janta for example — a writer and an antiquarian — had no doubts that his collaboration with Grydzewski was "the school of writing" for him, as their discussions often concerned issues

related to language, style, and even layout. At the same time, Janta hinted towards the fact that Grydzewski had quite a strong personality, as was reflected in the alterations he would make to Janta's text:

you may actually consider those texts sent back to the authors after having been altered and corrected by Grydz his compositions, which a literature professor, concerned about accuracy and quality, partly presents for consideration and partly forces upon his pupils. The tensions and haggling, here over a word, elsewhere over a sentence, somewhere over whole paragraphs were making it all more satisfying, but also it would raise the temperature of a discussion to the point of boiling sometimes.

(Janta 1982, 177)

And further on, Janta remarked that:

Negotiations and ordeals with the editor of *Wiadomości* were usually a consequence of his passionate editorial intervention in the text which had been sent to him. He would manage them in whatever way he wished to [...]. Sometimes I would not recognize my own writing after they had been subjected to Grydzewski's mangle and wringer. It was then that the correspondence-haggling would usually begin over restoring certain fragments or their original shape [...].

(Janta 1982, 199)

Negotiations with Grydzewski were extremely difficult, as he was usually fully convinced of his own infallibility. The fact that Grydzewski had the ambition — not to put too fine a point on it — to exert his control over all the literary pieces that were sent to him was widely known and commented on. Reminiscing on his collaboration with *Wiadomości*, Gustaw Herling-Grudziński would point out that:

Grydzewski had some unprecedented ambitions to interfere in every single text, although usually this would be about minor details. Initially, he also tried to interfere in my reviews and articles, but eventually I won the battle, I managed to convince him.

(Madyda 1995, 164).

Herling-Grudziński belonged to a small group of writers who worked for *Wiadomości* but managed to restrain Grydzewski's controlling nature. Nevertheless, the majority of journalists and writers had to contend with the editor's conviction of his own infallibility, and to try to maintain a decent relationship with him — while at the same time arguing for the right to keep their pieces in their original form.

One of those writers was Józef Mackiewicz, whose bitterness towards *Wiadomości* (and especially its editor-in-chief) would systematically increase. It started small, for example by neglecting to mention that Mackiewicz's book about Katyń,

which had been sent to Grydzewski with the hope of having it mentioned in *Kronika*, had been published in Spanish without his knowledge. Another example would be more or less serious arguments about spelling, like when Grydzewski was in favour of capitalising the word “country”, which Mickiewicz opposed. In his defense, Mickiewicz argued that:

there is no such rule which orders an author to express their respect towards things which they do not respect by writing it with a capital letter [...]. The word “country” is written with small letter and not with a capital one.

(Lewandowski 1995, 92)

Later (18 July 1957), Mackiewicz would attach a letter to one of his submissions that contained a few sentences that would become the beginning of a more serious conflict between the two:

I am sending you an article which disputes with you [...]. Not about this article, of course, but in general, I have to unfortunately declare that I cannot consent any longer to the existing practice of adding changes and alterations to my articles. It is not a threat I would address towards you — rather towards myself [...]. It has been 35 years now since I started writing; I am an author of a sizeable pile of books; my hair is going grey. And my articles are being corrected as if they were some compositions of junior high school pupil. I am obviously not talking about spelling or some ghastly mistakes. Everybody makes them. You also make numerous mistakes and it sometimes gets to the point that I have to correct my own article which you had written anew. I am not of the opinion that your style is poor. But I want to write using my own style.

(Mackiewicz and Topolska 2010, 130–31)

As might be expected, Grydzewski, did not react calmly to this message, and instead firmly denied that he corrected the style of anybody’s literary pieces (Lewandowski 1995, 93). Mackiewicz did not wish to prolong. In his response, he ended his relationship with *Wiadomości*:

Further on you wrote: “you are completely wrong that I correct anyone’s style”. I am not only not wrong, but I claim that not only you correct the style, but you tend to distort it completely. And not only the style, but, by cutting the text in a particular way, you *often* distort my main thought, accents and the force of argumentations of my opinions which you do not share. If I write “the gentlemen of the Home Army” and you change it to “the soldiers of Home Army” (as was the case) then this is obviously not about a language mistake of any sort, but it is an act of reverting the accent and thus the intention of an author. I could enlist a hundred of such examples, but I do not have the time [...].

Of course, I am not going to write articles for *Wiadomości* any longer. I am not going to discuss our qualifications, but I am not of the opinion that you write better than I do. And having to sit and correct allegedly my own article written by you [...] I find equally depressing and ridiculous.

(Mackiewicz and Topolska 2010, 135–36)

Wacław Lewandowski pointed to the fact that Grydzewski would not treat declaration such as these, where his authors would threaten to end their collaboration, too seriously. Instead, he regarded the contents of these letters rather as a list of writers' complaints about petty details (Lewandowski 1995, 94–95). Indeed, Grydzewski was perfectly aware of the fact that emigrated Polish authors had very limited possibilities when it came to publishing their works in their native language.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that some writers allowed the editor a lot of freedom in the editing of their works. One of the people who noticed this was Aleksander Madyda, who wrote about Zygmunt Haupt's cooperation with the London-based *Wiadomości*. From Haupt's letters to Grydzewski, we can deduce that the editor's interventions were primarily meant to reduce the volume of the texts, and to introduce changes on the lexical level. Not all of the editor's changes were fully approved of by the writer. Still, in general Haupt valued Grydzewski's contribution to the final shape of the short stories highly:

Sometimes when a thing I sent you is shortened too much (and in any case, I have authorized you to do this), I feel hurt, but there are also cases when (like with *Meerschäum* for example) you have done me a real favour.

(a letter from December 3rd, 1940; see Madyda 1995, 64)

In any case, the writer did not have much choice in the matter, since he believed that *Wiadomości* was offering him his only chance to publish his works in Polish.

The two main activities which Grydzewski would undertake on the texts which had been sent to him were a) shortening them, and b) interfering with the language. Zygmunt Haupt was also confronted with this process. His texts were quite literary slashed into pieces by means of editorial interventions. The cuts that Haupt's pieces were subjected to often had destructive effects on their structure and sometimes even distorted their meaning, or confused particular narrative threads. Nevertheless, as Aleksander Madyda points out:

cuts were just one of the categories of innovations introduced by Grydzewski. Their advantage was that they did not appear in all texts prepared for publication. However, there wasn't probably a single piece that would not trigger the will to "correct" the language.

(Madyda 2015, 220)

Fortunately, typescripts with Grydzewski's handwritten corrections have survived so that we can look into the nature and extent of the changes he introduced.

To illustrate the issue, I will go on to quote a couple of instances. Haupt’s prose piece entitled *Dzień targowy* [*Market day*], for example, was subjected to an array of various interventions, including over a dozen grammar and stylistic corrections (Madyda 2015, 222).

Aleksander Madyda, who meticulously analysed Grydzewski’s corrections in Haupt’s typescript noticed:

the examples presented here prove the existence of a peculiar — for an editor of a cultural and literary magazine — insensitivity to semantic and aesthetic values of a word used not by himself, which insensitivity could be mischievously classified as stylistic and linguistic hearing impairment.

(Madyda 2015, 226)

After having analysed the manuscripts of Haupt’s works that are kept in the Stanford University Archives and the archives of Polish Literary Institute, Madyda argued that reading these materials may be shocking for a philologist, since, as it turned out:

the editor-in-chief of *Wiadomości* treated Haupt almost as an literary illiterate person, not only not in full command of his native language, but also unable to construct a narrative or built a tension within the plot and so on.

(Madyda 1995, 228)

In the above, Mayda is specifically refering to the type of changes that were introduced in Haupt’s short story *Powrót* [*Return*], such as:

Table 1: Examples of Grydzewski Mieczysław’s changes to Zygmunt Haupt’s *Powrót*.

która jest [<i>which is</i>]	jaką stanowi [<i>that makes</i>]
w latach osiemdziesiątych, kiedy po światowym kryzysie ekonomicznym [<i>in the ‘80s, when after the global economic crisis</i>]	pod koniec ub. w., kiedy po światowym kryzysie gospodarczym [<i>at the end of the previous century, when after the global economic crisis</i>]
byliśmy spóźnieni [<i>we were late</i>]	spóźniliśmy się [<i>we got there late</i>]
nonszalancki [<i>nonchalant</i>]	niedbali [<i>neglectful</i>]

Looking into the subsequent materials may lead the reader to agree that writers who were submitting their works to be published in *Wiadomości* were right to protest against Grydzewski’s interferences, and that their complaints seem very well grounded. The nature and extent of changes Grydzewski introduced has such a large impact on the writing that — as Madyda rightly pointed out — any research into the style of a particular author’s prose as published in *Wiadomości* will be unreliable, because “most probably the style in question is primarily a

reflection of linguistic preferences of the authoritarian publisher" (Madyda 2015, 231).

In addition, Grydzewski's co-workers (such as Michał Chmielowiec, Stefania Kossowska or Juliusz Sakowski) also had significant influence on the final shape of published texts. For example, it was Sakowski who got involved in a dispute with Marek Hłasko that almost ended up in court. The source of their disagreement was — just like in Giedroyc's case — some of the swear words Hłasko wanted to use, and a single sentence that Sakowski considered a blasphemy. In a letter dated 15 May 1967, Hłasko defended his case:

Indeed, the picture of Mother of God dedicated to Grzegorz is a case of blasphemy. But the whole book is a search for God in every moment [...]. Dear Sir, this single blasphemy cannot in any case kill the spirit of this novel which is a story about love: and every story about true love is a story about God.

(Kielanowski 1967, 111)

The writer also referred to the allegation of swearword abuse:

When it comes to the word *pierdolić* [*fuck*], you are writing that women do not use such words. Some do, others don't. My women did use it. This is also what Weronika says when she is drunk. A word or a sentence taken out of its context means nothing. One needs to remember the scene and the time and the circumstances in which it is taking place.

(Kielanowski 1967, 112)

In the end, Hłasko categorically refused to change the dedication:

You are talking about me being sued by the Catholics? I will tell you one thing — praise the Lord, we're going to sell more books. Are Catholics going to turn from me? Can someone show me a true Polish Catholic? Do you really believe that Poles are a catholic nation? And what sort of Catholicism is it? It is Catholicism on the level of a Sunday school: it is not Catholicism in the sense of a world view. [...]

Everything that I have written above has nothing to do with the fact that I am not going to change the dedication and I'd rather not publish the book.

(Kielanowski 1967, 113)

It would appear, however that the publisher did not take the author's words seriously: instead Sakowski unilaterally removed part of the text during the last proofreading, despite Hłasko's strong protests. The excerpt that was removed was linked to a scene where Grzegorz, the protagonist, unpacks a suitcase and takes out a picture of Our Lady on which Uncle Józef, the central character of the story, had written: "To my beloved Grzegorz, in commemoration of the days and nights we have spent together in the Upper Galilee — Mother of God".

Upon seeing the publication, Marek Hłasko protested strongly, and threatened to take the case to court. In addition, he announced that he would publicly

declare that he has nothing to do with the altered text. And he also demanded to have his name removed from the cover of the book, and that the editors would change the book's title as it could not be *Sowa, córka piekarza* [*Owl, the Baker's Daughter*] nor *Pójdź z nim przez dolinę* [*Go with him through the valley*]. Believing that these actions might not have been enough, Hłasko employed an American lawyer, who warned Sakowski in the middle of October 1967 about the consequences of publishing the book in a form which the writer did not accept. After month-long negotiations they finally came to an agreement, where the words "Mother of God" were replaced with the word "Mary". Obviously, the new version was more ambiguous, but it was also definitely less expressive. Satisfied with the change he succeeded in had pushing through, Sakowski failed to notice another part of the text that could also be considered blasphemous:

...and then he thought that Uncle Józef told him once about Christ, who was walking with the cross and did not stop at the stations of his passion and when someone asked him why he did that, he explained that he was a hasty Christ; when I thought about it I started laughing and it sounded like weeping.

A year later, Marek Hłasko died. This meant that he never had an opportunity to publish the original version of the piece without the changes that had been introduced against his will. Because of this, all the editions that available on the publishing market today contain the text in the shape the author opposed.

In contrast, writers such as Haupt, Tyrmand or Mackiewicz, who had an opportunities to republish their works after their original publication in *Wiadomości*, did so without hesitation. Nevertheless, the editors-in-chief of the Paris-based *Kultura* and London-based *Wiadomości* had succeeded in gathering some of the most interesting figures of Polish literature and culture during the years of their activity. As Giedroyc argued: an editor is like a film director, and a director rarely makes a good actor. Maybe this was the reason why the editors could not entirely understand the intensity with which the writers defended their style, particular phrases or even single words. Their editorial work quite often resulted in writers' frustration and resentment and also led to heated arguments, which brought their cooperation to an end. It is difficult to make judgments about these decisions, but the scale of the phenomenon is large enough to provide a subject for analysis — from those connected with text criticism, through stylometric studies, to analyzing the socio-political aspects of certain editorial decisions. It could also be worth considering certain editorial work, and an attempt to return some of the works to their original shape — i.e. the state it was in before all the editorial interventions writers disagreed with were introduced. But that falls beyond the scope of this essay, and would be the subject of a completely separate enquiry.

Bibliography

- BOREJSZA, JERZY W. and KLAUS ZIEMER, 2006. *Totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in Europe*. Oxford and New York (NY): Berghahn Books.
- GOLL, EDMUND, 1996. "Ma pan u mnie piwko! Dywagacje składacza." In *Wiadomości i okolice. Szkice i wspomnienia*, volume 2, edited by Mirosław A. Supruniuk, Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.
- GREENBERG, SUSAN L., 2010. "When the Editor Disappears, Does Editing Disappear?" *Convergence* 16, pages 7–21.
- , 2018. *A Poetics of Editing*. Cham: Springer.
- HABIELSKI, RAFAŁ, 2006. *Dokąd nam iść wypada? Jerzy Giedroyc od "Buntu Młodych" do "Kultury"*. Warsaw: Więź.
- HŁASKO, MAREK, 1962. "W dzień śmierci jego." *Kultura* 5, pages 61–98.
- , 1965a. "Drugie zabicie psa." *Kultura* 1–2, pages 68–155.
- , 1965b. "Wszyscy byli odwrócenii." *Kultura* 1–2, pages 41–64.
- HŁASKO, MAREK and JERZY WŁADYSŁAW GIEDROYC, 1962–75. "KOR RED Hłasko Marek, v. 1–2."
- JANTA, ALEKSANDER, 1982. *Lustra i reflektory*. Warsaw: Czytelnik.
- KIELANOWSKI, LEOPOLD, PREF., 1967. *Kulisy twórczości. Listy 14 pisarzy emigracyjnych do Juliusza Sakowskiego 1945–1977*. Paris: Księgarnia Polska.
- LEWANDOWSKI, WACŁAW, 1995. "Głęboki szacunek i Grydzewskie poprawki. Józef Mackiewicz i Redaktor Wiadomości." In *Wiadomości i okolice. Szkice i wspomnienia*, volume 1, edited by Mirosław A. Supruniuk, Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.
- MACKIEWICZ, JÓZEF and BARBARA TOPOLSKA, 2010. *Listy do redaktorów "Wiadomości"*. London: Kontra.
- MADYDA, ALEKSANDER, 1995. "Krytyka o twórczości Zygmunta Haupta." In *Wiadomości i okolice. Szkice i wspomnienia*, volume 1, edited by Mirosław A. Supruniuk, Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.
- , 2015. *Od filologii do antropologii. Szkice*. Toruń: UMK.
- TYRCHAN, MIKOŁAJ, 2007. "Marek Hłasko i Kultura." *Zeszyty Historyczne* 168, pages 191–99.
- TYRMAND, LEOPOLD, 2014. *Listy do redaktorów "Wiadomości"*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

TYRMAND, LEOPOLD and JERZY WŁADYSŁAW GIEDROYC, 1966–82. "KOR RED Tyrmand L., v. 1–2."

ZIELIŃSKI, JAN, ed., 1996. *J. Giedroyc, A. Bobkowski, Letters 1946–1961*. Warsaw: Czytelnik.

From *Christ the Saviour* to *God the Father*: Adjustments to Forgiveness in Donne's Short Poem, "Wilt thou forgive..."

Anthony Lappin

Abstract: Donne's short religious poem, which begins "Wilt thou forgive..." has undergone numerous changes in its journey through the hands of copyists and into print. The establishment of a stemma and its analysis shows an early, theologically difficult and questioning poem which was progressively altered by different hands, a process which turned the short verses into a devout affirmation of faith, something quite contrary to Donne's initial conception of the poem.

1. Introduction

JOHN DONNE (1572–1631) TRAINED AS A LAWYER, and made something of a name for himself as a coterie poet through well-turned erotic and satirical verse (Marras 1986). He had renounced his familial allegiance to Catholicism following his recusant brother's death in prison, and looked set on a diplomatic career, beginning first in the service of Lord Egerton, keeper of the king's seal. Yet Donne's secret marriage in 1601 to a teenage heiress, Anne More, destroyed his prospects, resulted in her disinheritance, and plunged them into poverty; Anne died during her twelfth lying-in in the summer of 1617. Despite having shown little interest in religious matters other than as an anti-Catholic polemicist, Donne had been forced into the clergy two years earlier and had taken up the only means of preferment then open to him, as one of the royal chaplains, at the insistence of James VI and I (1566–1625), who, one must assume, thought he had more than enough lawyers but a dearth of entertaining clergymen.

Donne's early secular poetic expression and his later assumption of a religious garb — he was made dean of St Paul's in 1621 and became something of a superstar preacher — has caused a certain degree of difficulty for editors, readers and, as we shall see, copyists. In this article, then, I shall consider how assumptions regarding the manner in which religious verse should express itself, and how in particular the dean of St Paul's should have expressed himself, influenced the transmission of one particular poem which, quite self-consciously, escaped from the norms of devotional poetry. Donne preferred most of his writing — and particularly his poetry — to circulate in manuscript. This, of course, granted a degree of control over whom it might reach, and in what form it might reach them. Yet it also allowed a certain *variance* to creep in to the transmission of the

poems, through scribal variants or errors, and scribal rewritings or recomposition. Such interference on the part of a scribe might remain independent of other variant versions, or might, in contrast, be designed to resonate with or correct other incarnations of the poem.

A perfectly licit engagement with textual *variance* is to inquire after what text (be that hypothetical, arrived at by deduction, or real, present in a surviving manuscript) might be closest to the original version — the one, so to speak, issued by the poet, and therefore the one most fully expressing their intentions; and, as a corollary of this activity, to establish whether any variants found in the manuscript tradition might come from a revision by the author of their original text. Of course, if this is one's focus, anything extra-authorial, or even authorial elements that are revised away, should be set aside, as good for little other than to fill an apparatus whose presence is as inexplicable as its contents are unread. In this article, however, I shall use the numerous variants to discuss the evolution of a poem in copyists' hands, and focus on the variant understandings of a poem — variant *instantiations* of a poem — which were generated in different, yet still roughly contemporary, contexts. The poem in question has been usually referred to as "A Hymne to God the Father", following the title provided in the first edition of Donne's poetry, which came to be inscribed in the Stationers' Register a year and a half after his death as "a booke of verses and Poems [...] written by Doctor John Dunn" (13 September 1632: Arber 1877, IV:249). It was published some six months later; the "Hymne" appeared as the final poem of Donne's *oeuvre* (Donne 1633, 350). The poem maintained this position, as the final poem of the final section — that of religious verse — in the revised second edition (Donne 1635, 350), and all subsequent seventeenth-century editions (1639, 388; 1649; 1650; 1654, 368). It was this printed text which, with some small alterations, passed over into Izaak Walton's *Life* of Donne, and so became very much the *textus receptus* for those who wished to sample the poetic lyre of the Anglican divine, as Walton was pleased to present him (see Martin 2003; Novarr 1958; Smith 1983, 116–17; further, Lambert 2012; Cottagnies 1999; Haskin 2007, 11–13).

By the twentieth century, though, some comparison with the variant readings present in manuscripts had taken place, and the *textus receptus* gave way to editorial confluences of disparate readings (see Peabworth 1987, nn. 6–7, at 26–27). This eclecticism has been eschewed by the poem's most recent editor, Robin Robbins (2013, 654–56), who adopts the text as found in Trinity College Dublin, ms. 877, fol. 135r [DT1],¹ an election justified by the observation that the manuscript represents the only witness "free of inferior readings". As an *ecdotic* definition, it is rather wanting, and a side effect of the first part of the present article will be a partial contribution to evaluating this form of editorial connoisseurship.

The article will develop in the following stages: I shall consider previous

¹ When citing manuscripts, I also provide the *sigla* used in the *Donne Variorum* project (1995–), provided in their "Sigla for Textual Sources".

discussion of the poem's textual evolution. I shall then progress to widen my interrogation of the transmission by using variants not previously considered, and will use this variation to reconstruct a hypothetical stemma for the poem. The purpose of this is not solely to identify those copies as close to the archetype as possible, but also to gain a comprehensive vision of the overall *variance* of the poem at the hands of scribes and printers. This overview will then be used to provide a literary analysis of the poem and its variants. I will attempt to reconstruct how the poem has been re-interpreted consistently through its copying history, in relation to various cultural forces.

2. The First Moments of Evolution: Pebworth 1987

Over three decades ago, Ted-Larry Pebworth provided a subtle analysis of the development of the text, tracing its evolution via three significant stages. "Text 1", in his view the earliest, corresponded to the well-established sub-set of Donne manuscripts, known as Group III; "Text 2" to manuscript Group II; and "Text 3" to the printed text of 1633. Although I will argue that the manuscript transmission of this poem is much more complex than Pebworth's analysis allows, and that variants in other witnesses should be taken much more seriously, it is important to emphasize the careful work that Pebworth carried out and upon which depends my own unpicking of an inevitably only partially-preserved web of transmission.

2.1. Text 1

Pebworth's identification of the stages of transmission are distinguished by, amongst other things, their titles. "Christo Saluatori" [To Christ the Saviour] is the title born by, in Pebworth's careful words, "a fairly accurate verbal record of the earliest version of the poem" (1987, 23), and is represented by four manuscripts, two dating to the 1620s:

- B29 London, British Library, Harleian ms. 3910, fol. 50r
- B46 London, British Library, Stowe ms. 961, fol. 109r

and two to the early 1630s:

- H6 Harvard ms. Eng. 966.5, fol. 15v
- C10 Cambridge, University Library, Narcissus Luttrell ms., fol. 93v.

2.2. Text 2

The second, entitled “To Christ”, is described as a “grammatical and aesthetic ‘tidying up’ by either the poet or a copyist” (1987, 21 and 23). The attribution is regrettably imprecise, but Pebworth certainly intended to leave open the possibility that Donne returned to his poem, and carried out a number of changes to improve it.

The manuscripts concerned are, in the main, from the mid-1620s:

B7	London, British Library, Add. ms. 18647, fol. 91v
CT1	Cambridge, Trinity College Cambridge, ms R. 3. 12, p. 200
DT1	Trinity College Dublin ms. 877, fol. 135r
H4	Harvard ms. Eng. 966.3, fol. 113r
H5	Harvard ms. Eng 966.4, fol. 94v

Nevertheless, even with the evidence that Pebworth marshalls, we must observe that the process by which “Text 2” was reached took place in two or three moments: a change in title to the vernacular, but maintenance of the readings of the earlier “Text 1” in just one manuscript, H5, which was then followed by a number of significant changes in the subsequent manuscripts (H4, DT1; B7, CT1).

We may thus present a representation of something close to the original text together with variants brought about through the progressive evolution of the poem: I have adopted a modernized spelling to avoid insignificant orthographical variation.² Superscript words indicate the later variants of the underlined words preceding them.

² The mis-en-page is taken from the majority of witnesses to “Text 1”: B29, B46, H6. In contrast, C10 indents the second, fourth, and fifth lines, but maintains the greater indentation of the sixth. In the later manuscripts, it is even lines (i.e.: 2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 16), which are indented, with a greater indentation for ll. 6, 12, and 18, as they end each stanza.

evident, with the only uncertainty being generated by the single-word subscription or colophon, “*finis*”. The subscription is present in both B29 and B46; yet, from the same “*Christo salvatori*” group, it is missing from H6 and C10. Regrettably, it is not possible to say therefore whether it was contained in the archetype. Any conclusion would be wholly tentative, since we should allow for a degree of scribal latitude in choosing or not to omit something which is not part of the poem proper, but simply a boundary-marker to indicate that the poem had, in fact, already finished. We have something of a Schrödinger’s archetype, then, which requires some further determination we have not yet achieved (an autograph, further evidence for Donne’s own subscriptions for poems, for example). *Finis* is dropped by the first representative of “To Christ”, H6, but it is preserved by H4 and DT1. Thus we may say with confidence that the intermediary sub-archetype which changed the title still kept *finis*, and it was spontaneously voided by the scribe of H6. This may be transformed into a sequence of emendations:

Table 2: Sequence of variation, Texts 1–2

stage	definition	witnesses	variant	further development
χ	text of the archetype	B29 B46		
00		H6 C10	<i>om. finis</i> / <i>add. finis</i> B29 B46	
01	change of title	H5	To Christ	<i>om. finis</i>
02	variants to ll. 2, 5, 7, 15	H4 DT1 B7 CT1	were; <i>add. hast</i> ; <i>add. have</i> ; this	
03	l. 11, order of stanzas	B7 CT1	<i>add. that</i> ; <i>transp. st. II–III</i>	<i>om. finis</i>

3. The Poem in Flux

Given this result, it would be better to speak provisionally of a succession of stages in transmission, rather than Pebworth’s “Text 1” and “Text 2”. These stages may be further refined by taking in a larger spread of manuscripts and the first printed version. Some of these witnesses Pebworth dismissed as being “memorial constructs”, as they were present in commonplace books or multiple-author collections and they escaped from the much tidier pattern he had established. These witnesses are:

B24 British Library, Egerton ms. 2013 [B24], fol. 13v, the setting of the poem by John Hilton

B47 London, British Library, Stowe ms. 962, fol. 220r–v, an anthology of poetry from various authors (*CELM* DnJ 1577)

H9 Harvard, ms. Eng. 1107, folder 15, a copy by Thomas Gell (1595–1667), who was both an MP and member of the Inner Temple, on a single folio leaf (*CELM* DnJ 1584)

HH6 San Marino CA, The Huntingdon Library, ms. HM 41456, fol. 183v, an anthology volume containing only this work from Donne’s oeuvre

O3 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole ms. 38, p. 14; like B47, a multiple-author florilegium (*CELM* DnJ 1578)

1633 *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death.* London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot, p. 350

A full list of variant readings drawn from all witnesses is given in Table 3; references are to the line (e.g. 14), and then (if necessary) the subsequent variants within that line (e.g. 14.ii), and finally the sequence of variants to that point in the text (e.g. 14.ii.b). The manuscripts are ordered according to their presence in the stemma, which is established below, in Table 4, and shown in Figure 1 Where witnesses contain an unexpected variant, according to their overall allegiances within the stemma, this is indicated in italics and commented on subsequently in discussion of the sub-archetypes.

Table 3: List of Variant Readings

<i>line</i>	<i>mss.</i>	<i>reading</i>	<i>variant</i>	<i>mss.</i>
Tit.a	B29 D46 H6 C10	Christo salvatori	To Christ	H5 H9 O3 H4 DT1 B7 CT1
Tit.b			<i>om.</i>	B47 B24
Tit.c			To God Æternall	HH6
Tit.d			A Hymn to God the Father:	1633
1.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	that sin	the sin	H9 B47
1.b			the sins	B24
1.c			those sins	O3

Table 3: List of Variant Readings (continued)

<i>line</i>	<i>mss.</i>	<i>reading</i>	<i>variant</i>	<i>mss.</i>
2.i	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 B47 B24 HH6 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	is my sin	was my sin	H9 O3 1633
2.ii	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47	was	were	B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1
3.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B24 HH6 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	those sins	the sins	B47
3.b			that sin	1633
4.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	them	run	1633
4.b	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	I do	I them	B47
5.i	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	thou hast done	this is done	O3 B47
5.ii	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5	I have	thou hast	H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1
7.i.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B24 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	that sin by	the sin by	B47
7.i.b			those sins with	O3
7.i.c			the sin (<i>om.</i> of)	HH6
7.i.d			that sin (<i>om.</i> of)	1633
7.ii	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47 B24	I won	I have won	HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1

Table 3: List of Variant Readings (continued)

line	mss.	reading	variant	mss.
8.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	made my sin their	made their sin my	O3
8b			their sin ^{was} my	H9
9a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	that sin	the sin	B47
9b			these sins	O3
11.i	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	thou hast	this is	O3 B47
11.ii	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1	done	done that	B7 CT1
12	B29 D46 H6 C10 H9 B24 HH6 1633 H5 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	thou hast	I have	H9 O3 B47
13.i	B29 D46 H6 C10 H5 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	that	least	H9 O3 B47
13.ii	B29 D46 H6 C10 H9 B24 HH6 1633 H5 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	when I have	having	O3 B47
14.i	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	my last thread	<i>om.</i> last	O3
14.ii.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	shall	should	H9 B47
14.ii.b			<i>om.</i>	O3

Table 3: List of Variant Readings (continued)

<i>line</i>	<i>mss.</i>	<i>reading</i>	<i>variant</i>	<i>mss.</i>
14.iii	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	the	this	O3
15.i	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	Swear	But swear	1633
15.ii.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 B47 B24 HH6 1633	thy sun	this sun	O3 H4 DT1 B7 CT1
15.ii.b			the sun	H9
16.i.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 HH6 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	as it	as he	B24 1633
16.i.b			on me	B47
16.ii.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	as heretofore	and heretofore	H9 O3 B24 1633
16.ii.b			or as before	B47
16.iii		–full line –	Shall own my soul and cloth it evermore	HH6
17.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	And having done that	And having done this then	H9
17.b			And having this done	HH6
17.c			And having done	B24
17.d			When this is done then	O3 B47
18.a	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	I have	I ask	O3
18.b			I'll ask	B47
18.c			I need	B24

Table 3: List of Variant Readings (continued)

line	mss.	reading	variant	mss.
18.d			I fear	HH6 1633
st. II–III	B29 B46 H6 C10 H5 H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1	II–III	III–II	B7 CT1
subscr.a	B29 B46 H4 DT1	finis	finis D Donn	O3
subscr.b			J:D:	B47
subscr.c			om.	H6 C10 H5 H9 HH6 1633 B7 CT1
subscr.d			John Hilton	B24

The analysis of this *variance* is given in Table 4, below. In representing the phenomenon of textual flux in a tabular fashion, I have maintained (in the far-left column) the numeration of the stages from Table 2; accompanied by the listing of the archetype, here termed χ (as the first letter of the original title, *Christo*), followed by each sub-archetype (α – λ); in the next column (*justification*) are the references to those variants which justify that archetype’s existence. The fourth column, *witnesses*, lists those manuscripts which share the specific variant. These are prefaced by $\cdot >^n$, where n indicates the number of sub-archetypes, or levels of distance, from the archetypal text. Underneath this listing of manuscripts, aligned to the right, are any witnesses which depend upon the aforementioned sub-archetype, and in the final column, *further development*, any other variants which are solely characteristic of these manuscripts (that is, idiosyncratic or terminal variants, which do not continue down the stemma by a process of direct transmission). The symbol “ $\curvearrowright$ ” indicates that a variant has given rise to a further variant reading; “ $\curvearrowright?$ ” indicates that such a process is a probable explanation for the presence of differing variants. An italicized reference to a variant indicates its non-conformity to the overall picture of transmission. Both supplementary variation and unexpected variants are discussed in the clarificatory notes appended to Table 4.

Table 4: Stages of Transmission

stage	justification	witness	further development
	χ archetype		
00	{α subscr.a (subscr.c)	·> ⁰ B29 B46 ·> ⁰ (H6 C10)	}
01	β title.a(b—d)	·> ¹ H5 H9 O3 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	(om. B24 B47 var. HH6, 1633)
		·> H5	subscr.c
γ	5.ii	·> ² H9 O3 B47 B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	
δ	12, 13.i, 17.a/d (1.a/c, 14.ii.a–b, 16.ii.a–b)	·> ³ H9 O3 B47	17.a ^{H9} ↪ 17.d ^{B47–O3} [see n. (1.) and (2e.), below]; (1.a ^{H9–B47} ? ↪ 1.c ^{O3} ; 14.ii.a ^{H9–B47} ? ↪ 14.ii.b ^{O3 (om.)} ; 16.ii.a ^{H9–O3} ? ↪ 16.ii.b ^{B47} [see nn. 2a–d.])
		·> H9	8.b, 15.ii.b, subscr.c
ε	5.i, 11.i, 13.ii, 17.d, 18.ab	·> ⁴ O3 B47	
		·> O3	1.c, 7.i.b, 8.a, 9.b, 14.i, 14.ii.b, 14.iii, 15.ii.a [see below, n. (5.)], subscr.a
		·> B47	title.b, 3.a, 4.b, 7.i.a, 9.a, 16.i.b, subscr.b
ζ	2.ii	·> ³ B24 HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	
		·> B24	1.b, 16.i.a [see n. (3.) below], 16.ii.a [see n. (2c.)], 18.c, subscr.d
η	7.ii	·> ⁴ HH6 1633 H4 DT1 B7 CT1	
θ	7.i.c–d, 18.d, sub- scr.c	·> ⁵ HH6 1633	
		·> HH6	Tit.c
		·> 1633	Tit.d, 2.i [see below. n. (4.)], 3.b, 4.a, 15.i, 16.i.a [see n. (3.)], 16.ii.a [see n. (2c.)]
02	× 15.ii.a	·> ⁵ H4 DT1 B7 CT1	
		·> H4 DT1	(subscr.a)
03	λ 11.ii, II–III, subscr.c	·> ⁶ B7 CT1	

Clarificatory notes.

- δ – ε
- (1.) 17.a^{H9} “and having done **this then**” ↷ 17.d^{B47-O3} “**When this is done then**”. The initial change in δ but recorded only by H9 (*this then* for *that*, perhaps mistaking the latter word for abbreviated forms of the two words) created an unmetrical line, which was solved in sub-archetype ε by changing the initial words rather than suppressing the addition.
- (2.) The following three variants do not affect the readings that the sub-archetypes would have offered (they do not change), but one manuscript, either O3 or B47 produce a variant built upon the previous:
- (2a.) 1.a^{H9-B47} “the sin” ↷ 1.c^{O3} “those sins” (archetypal reading: *that sin*); the temptation to make the *sin* plural was also felt by B24 (“the sins”), but there is no real reason to suspect contamination.
- (2b.) 14.ii.a^{H9-B47} “I should perish” ↷ 14.ii.b^{O3} “I perish” (i.e. *om.* auxiliary verb; archetypal reading, *I shall perish*). The best one can say about the omission is that it does not contradict the readings one would expect according to the stemma; and so O3 certainly omitted *should* rather than *shall*.
- (2c.) 16.ii.a^{H9-O3} “and heretofore” ↷ 16.ii.b^{B47} “or as before”; the sub-archetypal reading was most probably *and heretofore*, a slight misreading of the archetypal *as heretofore*. The variant was probably caused by the misreading of *af* as an ampersand (&), which is a relatively easy mistake to make owing to the ligatures and the slightly bowed shape often given to the long-s (f): a similar misreading affected both B24 and 1633 at this point.
- (2d.) At 8.a, B47 produces the archetypal reading, “made my sin their door”, which contrasts with “made *their sin my* door” of O3. H9 would seem to support O3’s version, with the scribe writing originally “their sin my door” (*om.* made), with a similar transposition of possessive pronouns as that found in O3. However, the H9 scribe realised that a mistake had been made, and returned to the line to offer a superscript correction: “their sin ^{was} my door”. This is not as easy to disentangle as other variants, although the garbled, and then further garbled, version of the line in H9 would suggest that sub-archetype δ itself bore a confused or confusing reading at this point, which the scribe of H9 was attempting to elucidate; this confusion in δ was passed on to sub-archetype ε, where again the scribes attempted some remedy: B47 guessed correctly; O3 did not. (“(In)correctly” only if the scribe’s purpose was to reproduce the previous manuscript tradition; the “incorrect” reading may have been perfectly purposeful.)

(2e.) H9 is a singleton, but B47 and O3 are both florilegia. Although the sub-archetypes — here, specifically, δ and ϵ — are really best thought of as hypothetical constructs which act as nodes within the stemma, whose existence is merely pending the discovery of further witnesses which may cause them to be further multiplied, and so redefined, or removed, it is very likely that the transmission of these texts passed through other anthologies rather than any collected works of the poet himself. Thus we may point to the likelihood of a common source for B47 and O3 texts in another, earlier florilegium since both exemplars of our poem are found in close vicinity to the Thomas Carew poem, *A flye that flew into my Mistris her eye* (CELM CwT 236; CELM CwT 250), although they bear different titles (O3: “The Amorous Fly”, p. 9; B47: “An Epitaph vppon a Fly”, fol. 221r–v); that titular variation, though, might signify nothing more than that the model bore no title for this particular poem.

$\eta - \varnothing$ (3.) A particular challenge to the stemmatic dependence of witnesses in this section of the apparatus is provided by the variant common to 1633 and B24 at 16.i.a, where the sun is referred to as “he” (against the unanimous third-person neuter pronoun throughout the rest of the manuscript tradition). There may well be strong theological reasons for the change, which were felt by both scribes; alternatively, a reminiscence of Hilton’s setting (which may have been tolerably popular) affected the copyist or printer in setting down the text.

$\delta - \varnothing$ (4.) 2.i: archetypal reading: *is my sin*; variant reading: *was my sin*; the variant reading here is shared between H9, O3 (but not B47) and 1633. Such variation probably reflects a situation in which the sub-archetype originally offered both possibilities, one tense of the verb written as a variant of the other—such as indeed has been preserved in B46, which adopts the reading *was* in the text, yet provides the variant “is” in the scribe’s own hand at the left margin. We may draw a parallel with the subscription, “finis”, which was also maintained by B46 and passed down the chains of transmission to H4 and DT1, and, in modified form, to O3. Thus we probably have the remnants of scribal annotations preserved through sub-archetypes but only occasionally surfacing in the texts that are preserved.

κ – O3 (5.) The common variant between O3 and H4 DT1 B7 CT1 at 15.ii.a, *this sun* is surely an example of polygenesis. O3 originally read “thys”, which probably indicates that its model still read the archetypal “thy”, and that the scribe was misled by a ligature or flourish to the –y. H9, which descends from the sub-archetype above O3’s own sub-archetype, offers “the” (15.ii.b), which suggests that, in this side of the transmission, the reading was uncertain or indistinct, possibly giving rise to two possibilities in the same text. I suggest below that the change may have been attractive as a reaction to an allegorical reading of “sun” as “Son”, Second Person of the Trinity; both *this* and *the* make the reference resolutely this-worldly and so maintain the addressee as Christ.

Figure 1: A Stemma.

The pattern established, of successive changes at different stages of copying, evidently argues against any authorial revision producing a “new version” of the poem, and argues for a branching out of scribal innovations and emendation. Significantly differing versions, taken out of the context of the flow of the manuscript tradition, might well seem to provide a significant leap which would justify the assumption of a coherent, single authorial or scribal intervention to create a second recension, which is essentially what Peabworth produced through his classifications of Texts 1, 2 and 3, and his corresponding exclusion of significant variants. Robbins, in his election of DT1, could hardly have chosen a text further away from the archetype. In contrast to the vast majority of manuscript traditions, where copying only brings about textual decay, incoherence, loss, deturpation, metrical irregularity and, eventually, irremedial chaos, the copying of these short poems saw active, engaged, intrusive copying on the part of the scribes with a sensitivity to metrical and other forms of seeming errors, and a consequent preparedness to correct and emend the texts that they were then themselves partly writing. Robbins’ principle, that of looking for the best text, or the one with fewest obvious errors, was not necessarily a bad one, particularly if one intends to comment upon all of Donne’s poetry and not just dissect less than twenty lines of it; but the principle can be very misleading in a textual tradition where copying is not done by drudges, but by connoisseurs of the poetry itself. As we can see, the attentive, even playful, copying that transmitted this poem did not necessarily produce a degraded text — far from it; the alteration of the sequence of repetitions found in O3, for example, produces a different, but no less effective, set of emphases.

There is now little need to wonder about the earliest state of the text: four or five witnesses give us a coherent and consistent version; there are no indications that there is any subsequent interference by Donne in the manuscript transmission. At most one might argue about the mis-en-page and punctuation of the archetype; but the sequence of words is not in doubt. This confirms Peabworth’s conclusion regarding the authority of the *Christo salvatori*-version of the poem, and it is this — and only this — which should be accepted as Donne’s own work. If the purpose of the article had been to identify those texts which most closely reflected the archetype, and establish Donne’s handiwork, purified from the additions of others, then it might stop here, or proceed to analyse only the archetypal version, that is the *Christo salvatori*-version. Yet this was not the purpose; in a manner similar to my recent analysis of *Valediction: forbidding mourning* (Lappin 2019), I propose to study the *variance* of the poem as a function of scribal presentation and development, in order to provide a global understanding of the text as it was both written and transmitted; this article reinforces the conclusions of its twin.

4. Reading and Writing the Poem

Robbins, noting the similarity in themes to both sermons and poetry which Donne preached and wrote around the time, places the composition of the poem shortly after Anne More's death (Robbins 2013, 654), and there can be little reasonable disagreement with such an estimation. In further support of this, we might observe that the connexion with his wife's demise is particularly strong in a 1620s miscellany volume of poetical works in both English and Latin, B29 (London, British Library, Harleian ms. 3910), where the poem (in the *Christo salvatori*-recension) precedes Donne's own Latin epitaph for Anne More (foll. 50r, 51r), the two works separated only by Richard Cobbet's ironic epigram on Lady Arbella Stuart's burial in 1615 ("Vpon the Lady Arabella" at fol. 50v; see CELM CoR 540).

4.1. The title

The original text of the poem, then, offers us a view of the poet tormented by grief, and addressing a prayer to Christ, the Saviour, *Christo Salvatori*. And although ideas of the salvific power of Christ might be expected to give origin to emotions of tender devotion and gratitude, invocation of Christ *the Saviour* was done with at-times theatrical angst, for it was Christ the Saviour who was to appear also as, at the same moment on the Last Day, Christ the Judge.³

Thus the first line, "Wilt thou forgive [...]" suggests immediately the two aspects of Christ, as saviour and judge: saviour should he offer forgiveness; judge if he withholds it. The vernacular simplification of the title, then, in removing the concept of the *Salvator* from the beginning of the poem subtly shifts the emphasis from a concern with the Last Day to a general prayer to Christ. The change may simply have been motivated by a shift in audience, away from the bilinguals of his inner circle for whom Donne generally wrote, to a more resolutely native, and possibly naïve, readership, for whom it might have been desirable to remove (together with the Latin) a possibly unwelcome Catholic insistence upon the importance and unwelcome uncertainty of that particular *dies illa*.

4.2. Stanza One

The poem begins very much at the beginning, however, since the first request for, or questioning about, forgiveness regards Original Sin, the sin passed down as damnable inheritance from generation to generation, from Adam to John: as Psalm 51:5 memorably expressed the fault, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity;

³ For example, the angst-ridden 126 lines of the second of William Austin's meditations for Good Friday, also entitled "*Christo salvatori*" (Austin 1635, 117–22); St Augustine counselled fearing the Saviour since he will also be the Judge (Augustinus, CCXIII.6).

and in sin did my mother conceive me".⁴ Such an orthodox interpretation is commended in at least one manuscript, CH1:⁵ a marginal annotation adds "Originall" level with these initial verses.

The most important variant in these lines is undoubtedly the verbal tense at 2.i: *is* vs. *was*. The difference between these tenses is not minor. *Was* places the Original Sin as being a sin from and belonging to the past, and invokes the more Catholic and Lutheran understanding of the sacrament as "washing away" Original Sin: after baptism (and Donne had, after all, been baptised a Catholic) that Sin could no longer be his. The present tense, *is*, however, suggests a much more Calvinist understanding of the role of baptism. This was not an outward sign of inward grace, but a promise of forgiveness, to be brought to mind when the faithful yet still regrettably sinful believers had made themselves anxious over the possibility of redemption: working oneself up over the certainty of one's own salvation (or, rather, of its opposite), only to then assuage the tormented mind by a recollection of the divine promise, is a characteristic element of Calvinist mental theatre. "*Is*" must be the primary reading; "*was*" introduced at first as a scribal quibble, rather than as a simple replacement, a quibble brought about by a divergent theological sensibility.

Thus, in a contemporary summation of received opinion — offered by Samuel Ward, master of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge, during the 1620s — baptism was only "conditional and expectative, of which they have no benefit till they believe and repent". Donne's problem, which he will explore throughout the poem, is what happens if one only sort-of believes, and only sort-of repents? And the cause for his half-hearted, or insufficient, repentance may allow us to place Calvinist theology temporarily in the background, and bring the poet's biography to the fore: the sin "where I begun" recalls the same phrase with which he ended his *Valediction: forbidding mourning*, which, even in Izaak Walton's highly sentimentalist reading of the same, was dedicated to Ann More to commemorate one or other parting (Walton 1675, 33–34):⁶ here the echo emphasizes that definitive parting of the grave, and the recollection of "where I begun", the triumphant return of the poet to the beloved in *Valediction*, is applied to *the sin*, his over-attachment to his wife, perhaps, his inability to abandon his love and grief for her, his excessive delight in the physicality of their relationship, or even the guilt he felt for having seduced her in the first place.⁷ She had died

⁴ So the King James; thus the Douay-Rheims: "For behold I was conceived in iniquities; and in sins did my mother conceive me".

⁵ Chester, Chester City Record Office, CR63/2/692/219, fol. 200r.

⁶ Walton entitles the poem *A Valediction, forbidding to Mourn*. For discussion of this poem, see, for example, Smith 1983, 118; McColley, 97–98; Targoff 2008, 75–76. For the biographical inaccuracy of Walton's account, see Walton 1807, 41 note *m*.

⁷ See also Lappin 2019, where I argue that rather than understanding the poem as an expression of marital attachment (which is Walton's presentation of the same), it was written to insist to Anne that she should not give any cause for suspicion before their secret marriage. "Where I begun" is thus a phrase with a particular biographical charge, even with a weight of guilt upon it.

in childbirth, after all, and Donne, despite his many faults, was not an irresponsible sadist. This emphasis on the human, biographical experience of the poet — rather than the theological inheritance from Adam — was emphasized through the shift in two unrelated witnesses to a plurality of sins in the first line (1.b–c: B24, O3), perhaps in part to avoid the doctrinal question of Calvinist sacramentalism.

The second half of the second line picks up this biographical focus, “though it was done before”, with the first inkling of the multiple senses of *done* / Donne, as contemporary orthography did not consistently distinguish the words:⁸ on the one hand, the sin was in the past, done before the *now* of the poem, committed even before the existence of the poet. On the other, the sin itself continues to be his, even though it was much more characteristic of Donne in his youth; and the nominatively deterministic *done* was of course slang, referencing the sexual act.⁹ Although he might have put his youthful enjoyments behind him, they dogged him, even through his name. Robbins adroitly cited an excerpt of one of Donne’s sermons composed four months after his wife’s death: “We may lose him [Christ], by suffering our thoughts to look back with pleasure upon the sins which we have committed” (Robbins 2013, 90; citing Sermon 1.245 on Proverbs 8:17). The shift to the subjunctive mood, “though it *were* done before” (2.i: one of the earliest emendations to the poem in transmission), closes off the concrete, biographical reference, to leave only hypothetical possibility or evocation of the distant, pre- and immediately post-lapsarian past.

The parallel senses, of theology and biography, are brought together in the following lines as the poets’ current state is evoked: in the archetypal text, this is marked by a shift from the previously singular *sin* to plural *sins*, and their shifting multiplicity (“through which I run”), serious not simply in number but also in their commission (“and do them still”). Just as a polyptoton is performed by *is* reappearing as *was* in ll. 1–2, so *done* (l. 2) returns as *do* (l. 4): the sins of the past may no longer characterize him, but that does not mean that he is free of sins. The alteration of “do them” to “do *run*” in 1633 (4.a) allows the pious reader to imagine the late dean of St Paul’s not so much committing sins, but ineffectually fleeing from them, trapped as he cannot but be by the surrounding world, a world, despite his best efforts from the pulpit, of sin.

With Original Sin (or Donne’s original sins) added to his present sins —

⁸ O3, for example, uses *donn* as spelling for both *done* and *Donne*; H6 offers *donne* throughout, which was the scribe’s usual spelling of the past participle; for example: *Sappho to Philaenis* (24: *Sappho*), l. 52, p. 231; *The Sunne Rising* (36: *SunRis*), l. 28, p. 260; *The Triple Fool* (40: *Triple*), l. 12, p. 255; *The Extasy* (63: *Ecst*), ll. 1, 25, p. 302; *The Blossome* (68: *Blossom*), l. 26, p. 284; *Epistles: To M^r R. W.* (122: *RWSlumb*), l. 23, p. 219; *To S^r Henry Wootton at his going Ambassador to Venice* (129: *HWVenice*), l. 24, p. 221; *To M^{rs} M. H.* (133: *MHPaper*), l. 33, p. 239; *To the Countesse of Bedford* (134: *BedfReas*), l. 28, p. 205; idem (136: *BedfHon*), l. 11, p. 191; [*Vpon the death of*] *Mrs Boulstred* (151: *BoulNar*), l. 16, p. 169; no examples of *done* or *donn* were found.

⁹ For example, *Titus Andronicus*, IV.ii.75–76 where the accusation, “Thou hast undone our mother!” is met with the riposte: “Villain, I have *done* thy mother!”

sins unnamed and elusive of identification — one passes to the final verses of the stanza: as the archetypal text has them, “When thou hast done, I have not done / For I have more”. Christ is addressed as “doing” the forgiveness, but in vain, since Donne himself has more sins. The evident allusion to Anne More’s name has only relatively lately been accepted by readers of the poem (Leigh 1978, 90; queried by Novarr 1987, 291–92; reaffirmed by Ahl 1988, 22), no doubt because of the excessive crudity of the paronomasiae: *have*, like *do*, possesses a raw sexual undertone,¹⁰ which — once accepted — flows back into the *thou hast* of the previous line, providing a shocking juxtaposition to Christ, presenting Christ’s forgiveness as a form of sexual possession. Such a conception, though, of himself *vis-à-vis* the divinity was in fact a fixed element of Donne’s own spiritual self-presentation (Challis 2016). And, although it may present a transgressive air within the confines of an expected or normative Protestant religious discourse, it can hardly have been unfamiliar or outlandish to anyone even slightly acquainted with Spanish religious poetry, and Donne’s acquaintance with the poetry of the Spains was hardly slight (see Grierson 1912, II.4; Thompson 1921; Cora 1996; for the tradition of meditation: Roston 2005).

Nevertheless, the archetypal rendition of the line (“When thou hast done, I have not done”) is not followed by most later witnesses (5.ii): “When thou has done, *thou hast* not done”. Since this variant line simply repeats what is found in the second stanza in the same place in the archetypal text (l. 11), it is most likely that this variation was initially the product of eyeskip.¹¹ As a principle, mechanical error is usually a better explanation than purposeful emendation, and so I will assume that this change is a simple error, unmotivated by any intention. Nevertheless, the manuscript in which it occurred provided a bottleneck, and subsequent copies of Donne’s poem flowed from that exemplar.

Yet that is not the only variant at this point. O3 and B47 both provide a confirmation that the allusion to the poet’s own name was an important element for some readers (5.i): “*When this is donn*, thou hast not donn”. *This* does not aid in the extrication of a single meaning, since it generates a number of referents: the word might invoke God’s forgiveness (ll. 1, 3) which has been granted; or might — relying upon the second half of l. 2 (“though *ytt was donn* before”) — point to the completion of his running through sins, his abandonment of his sinful ways; or, in complete contradiction of this second meaning, point directly at the poet himself, and so the phrase would mean “Whilst Donne behaves in a way characteristic to himself, that is sinfully”. All these meanings

¹⁰ For example, Quaife 1979, 53, records the following court deposition: “coming by a chamber door that stood ajar, they thrust him open and stepped into the chamber and there they saw Richard Templeton having Agnes Moore against the bed”. (Agnes was probably no relation to Anne). Further, Patridge 1968, 119; *OED*, s.v. *have*, §14e.

¹¹ It is difficult to be categorically sure, but the transposition across the first and second stanzas of “I have” and “thou hast” in sub-archetype δ may have preceded the adoption of “thou hast” for both lines; alternatively, “thou hast” was the original reading of the copy, subsequently corrected by “I have” at the wrong position, a correction adopted by δ but spurned by ϵ .

flow seamlessly into the second half of the line: "thou hast not done" (finished forgiving, gaining Donne to Himself), with the humorous reversion of roles: Christ is not done, cannot leave off forgiving, precisely because Donne is Donne.

4.3. Stanza Two

The second stanza has suffered least in transmission and offers the fewest number of variants.

Lines 7–8 look for forgiveness from having brought others to commit sins; lines 9–10 turn back to (given the allowed time-span of twenty years), what might be described as the sins of Donne's youth; the language is suitably condemnatory, with *wallowed* (l. 10), the go-to word for moralists wanting to describe a sinful, often illicit, but predominantly sexual, laxity. Thus, in John Taylor's *A Whore* (ll. 35–36), the eponymous sex-worker is described as "A succubus, a damned sinke of sinne, / A mire, where worse than Swine do wallow in" (Taylor 1630, 106); the enthusiasm for the word relies upon II Peter 2:22 and Proverbs 26:11, "A sow that is washed returns to her wallowing in the mud".

Sin, too, gains a new inflexion here: in the previous stanza it denoted at first an inherited disposition (ll. 1–2), and its sense was then broadened to take in individual acts (l. 3), exacerbated by the consciousness of their sinfulness (l. 4), to subsequently refer to a characteristic disposition, a type of behaviour (l. 7); and then, in the present stanza, to epitomize "sinfulness", the sinful life, for which he provided the "door" for others to enter into (l. 8): the orthography of, for example, H6, makes clear that, in the phrase "won / others to Sinne", *sin* is understood as a noun rather than a verb (see Pebworth 1987, 20), and *door* has perhaps a biblical sense of an anti-type to the narrow gate which leads to eternal life (Matthew 7:14). The field of reference is completed by *sin* which is conceived not as a momentary lapse, but as a repeated surrender to a specific temptation (l. 10), in full consciousness of its sinfulness (ll. 9–10, cp. l. 4, "deplore"). All-in-all, an impressive display of *traductio* or *antanaclasis* using the various meanings of "sin".

Through these sets of *foci*, then, we might say that Donne is fulfilling relatively precisely Calvin's own instruction to the pious (*Institutes* III.20.9) on how they should conduct their prayers:

Finally the beginning and also the preparing of praiering rightly, is crauing of pardon, with an humble and plaine confession of fault. [...] For Dauid when he asketh an other thing, saith: Remembre not they sinnes of my youthe, remember me according to thy mercie for thy goodnesses sake O lord. [...] Where we also see that it is not enough, if we euery seuerall day do call our selues accompt for our new sinnes, if we do not also remembre those sinnes which might seeme to haue been long agoe forgotten. For, the same Prophet in an other place, hauing confessed one haynous offense by this occasion returneth euen to his mothers wombe wherein he had gathered the infection: not to make the faulte seme lesse by the corruption of nature, but the heaping together the sinnes of his whole life, how much

more rigorous he ys in condemning himself, so much more easy he maye
finde God to entreate.

(Calvin 1561, 207v)

Following Calvin's suggestion, Donne, in order to set himself aright with God, enumerates the sins of his conception and his youth. The reason for doing this was to make God more likely to grant his prayers, which were for forgiveness; however, if forgiveness is to be gained by individual confession to God, and God is more likely to forgive in proportion to the number of sins dredged up from the past, then asserting that one has more sins to confess makes it more likely they will be forgiven — *ad infinitum*. This is the theological (and rhetorical) conundrum which Donne is exploring in the penultimate and ultimate lines of each stanza. In this second stanza, however, the *Christo salvatori*-text provides a *variatio* to the penultimate line: ll. 5–6 offered "When thou hast done, I have not done / For I have more"; ll. 10–11 inflects to "When thou has done, *thou hast* not done / For I have more". The expectation would be that Christ has not finished forgiving: Donne will confess more sins, which he does. But no longer is it Donne who has not finished sinning (and so needs to list more sins), rather the sin he will confess is of another order. And so Christ here will neither finish forgiving (perhaps He has not even started), nor will He gain Donne to himself, since Donne has something else up his sleeve.

4.4. Stanza Three

What Donne does not do in the first line of this stanza is ask whether he can be forgiven for the sin he will confess to in the third stanza. He breaks the expected rhythm he had established with the anaphoric "Wilt thou forgive [...]" that begin the first two stanzas. Indeed, Christ *has not done*, has not finished His activity, since He is being asked something quite beyond ordinary forgiveness, which in effect contradicts the possibility of ordinary forgiveness. What is being requested — if not demanded — is a personal promise to the poet that he will be numbered amongst the elect. For the Calvinist, there would be a quota even for salvation; those who would be counted amongst that number were already predestined to eternal bliss; therefore, no amount of confession of sins could change the brutal fact of divine election (or divine damnation). As Oliver observed regarding our poem:

The Calvinist doctrine of the limited atonement directly challenged the individual to believe that he or she was among those for whom Christ had died. Hence the speaker's elaborate and ingenious plan to be sure that he is one of those benefited by Christ's death. The logical objection to this is that, if he is among the elect, the merits of Christ's death will already have been "applied" in his case. No amount of wishing for a personal manifestation of their application will make any difference to the divine arrangements: Christ cannot be crucified afresh, except in the imagination. What's more, the elect know that grace is working in them—that the merits

of Christ's death have been applied in their cases.

(Oliver 1997, 90)

Oliver goes on to observe that "The speaker's prayer thus amounts to an entirely self-defeating request to be counted among the elect", although I feel that Donne's bargaining with the divine may be slightly more complex, even slightly more cunning. From a theological point of view, Donne confesses another sin, but one of a different order to the previous enumeration, a theological sin, as it were, one of fear or doubt that he will be saved; essentially, a lack of faith; and, within the Protestant soteriology he had embraced, it was faith alone which justified; without faith, there could be no salvation; the one Really Bad Thing a believer could do, that which would utterly derail their salvation, was doubt that they could be saved. And that is precisely what Donne insists on confessing. Christ cannot forgive a lack of belief, since the forgiveness of sins offered by Christ is predicated upon the individual's believing in that forgiveness (which He gained for mankind through His single sacrifice upon the Cross). It was pointless getting angsty over whether you were going to be one of the lucky few crammed into that ultimate elevator, if you really were unsure you could actually keep your balance on the narrow *tapis roulant* of faith which would take you close to those sliding, pearly doors.

This "sin of fear" is not unrelated to his previous evocation of Original Sin; indeed, it was already there *in semine*. As we have noted, for Calvin, recollection of Original Sin was inseparable from baptism, and the recollection of baptism re-assured the baptised that their sins would be forgiven (although they had not been forgiven through the ritual); forgiveness and salvation were thus postponed to the moment of death and Judgement. Baptism (for the baptised) was thus designed to provide a reassurance (in the imagination) of future salvation. Calvin had opined (*Institutes* VI.15.9):

In the Cloude was a signe of cleansyng. For as then the Lorde couered them with a cloude cast ouer them, and gaue them refreshing colde, least they should faint and pine away with to cruell burning of the sunne: so in Baptisme we acknowledge our selues couered and defended with the blood of Christ, least the seueritie of God, which is in dede an intollerable flame, shoulde lie vpon vs.

(Calvin 1561, 102r)

A christening carried out by recusant Catholics may have had rather less of a consolatory impact upon Donne's imagination than had he been assured that he had received his baptism surrounded by the righteous elders of the true church.

Donne's description of his feared death picks up both Calvinist anxieties: of predestination, and of consequent futility: "when I have spun / my last thread, I shall perish on the shore" (ll. 13–14). The allusion would seem to be to the silkworm, whose cultivation in London had been encouraged by James I and VI after 1607, and had become a long-term success (Peck 2005, 91): after the

completion of its cocoon (its last thread), the caterpillar was killed to gain the silk (*shore*: river-side sewer, where it would be cast; cp. Williams 1994, 387, *s.v.* “common shore”). The grub would die without fulfilling its (biological) destiny of gaining wings; the poet would die without transformation to “become like the angels”, the spiritual destiny of redeemed humanity. However, whatever the possible *telos* of each being, neither was predestined for flight: the cultivated silkworm destined to die as soon as it had begun its process of transformation; the disbelieving poet, (pre)destined to damnation even as he died acknowledging his sins (particularly his sinful lack of belief), his soul perishing on one side without ever reaching the “*ripa ulterior*”, the farthest and last shore.¹²

The solution to this impasse is to seek a solution from the Old Testament: a personal covenant with God: Christ is instructed (via a rather daring imperative) to guarantee, swearing by God, that is, by Himself (l. 15), to guarantee the poet’s salvation. Covenantal theology (reliance upon God’s having bound Himself via an oath or promise) had become an increasingly popular means of expressing God’s relation to the chosen people (that is, themselves) amongst proto-Puritans (Holifield 1974; Von Rohr 2002), and it was probably from this environment that Donne took his inspiration. Obviously, with Donne, the “covenant” could not be just with the people of God to be satisfactory, but must focus on Dr John Donne — but, to be fair, it must focus on Dr John Donne, not because he was especially worthy, but because he was honest enough to face up to how he himself fell through the cracks of the Calvinist-Puritan theology of redemption.

Given the later development of the poem into print, where the poem is addressed to God the Father and the Son that shines is evidently Christ, it is not surprising that “thy sunne” has been elided with *Christus Oriens*, Christ the Rising Sun, by commentators (Pebworth 1987, 22–23; Robbins 2013). It was perhaps to prevent such a leap that, at 15.ii.a, the reading changed to “this sunne” at x, to make clear that an allegorical reading was *not* being sought. Nor, I think, was allegory the aim in the archetypal text: “thy sun”; so not Christ as the sun, but Christ as owner of the sun; the Christ *through whom* all things were created — the *Christus creator* — together with the Christ *through whom* all things are saved — the *Christus salvator* — (see, *inter alia*, Colossians 1:12–20). *Thy sun*, then, undoubtedly just originally meant *the sun* (which is the sensible conclusion of the scribe of H9: 15.ii.b). Donne asks Christ to keep the sun shining, just as the sun has shone up to the present. The biblical comparator is, in part, Genesis 22:16 (“And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son”),¹³ and,

¹² Virgil, *Aeneid* VI.313–16, “Stabant orantes primi transmittere cursum / tendebantque manus *ripae ulterioris* amore. / Navita sed tristis nunc hos nunc accipit illos, / ast alios longe submotos arceat arena” [They stood, begging to be brought on the journey first, holding out their hands for love of that *final shore*. The grave boatman yet takes on board now these, now those, while he drives off others far from the sands].

¹³ The same covenantal promise is recalled at Exodus 32:13, “Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken

more importantly, the commentary on the same provided by St Paul at Hebrews 6:13, "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself". Within such a context, the printer's decision to make the addressee God the Father is particularly understandable.

Yet the promise Donne would see enacted was but a daily phenomenon. How — given his "sin of fear" — was he to know that Christ had sworn anything? Personal assurance was requested: but what certainty could possibly be received? The final lines, in our archetypal recension, do nothing to dispel this clouded vision of salvation: "And having done that, thou hast done / I have no more". The traductio of the final lines to each stanza have been poised between present and future: current forgiveness of sins (or current potential forgiveness of sins), and future definitive forgiveness of sins. The play on the poet's name (and Anne's) remain, but the temporal situation is unclear: does the poet simply assume that Christ has now sworn to save him, or does he defer this resolution to the future, a future when Christ will clearly promise, or a future when Donne will die — at that point, indeed, Donne will cease to have his earthly and sinful attachments: *no more*. The irony — surely not lost on Donne in evoking himself as a silk-work — was that, in contemporary sericulture, the worm was killed whilst still in the chrysalis by exposure to the sun (Bonoeil 1622, 28; further, Staples and Shaw 2013, 159–61; Hatch 1957).

The variant to the final line provided by the O3 and B47 manuscripts (18.a–b, "ask" for *have*) preserves the bathetic suspension; the poem ends as a prayer; B47, by using a future tense (*I'll ask*) also makes clear within its own structuring of the poem that the resolution is cast towards the poet's death. Hilton's variant, *need* (18.c), works in a similar fashion.¹⁴

It is, however, with the intromission of *feare* (18.d) as a variant to the last line that the ending is significantly changed, and this alteration cannot be seen outside the shift in the addressee of the poem: God (the Father) rather than Christ; the latter is now the Son who shall save him at the last, and this recollection (as it should for a devout believer) will cast aside the fear that formed the final, seemingly unreconcilable, sin. This theological emphasis is taken even further in HH6, where the Son does not simply shine down grace upon the dying Donne but will "owne my soule and cloath itt evermore": *owne* absorbing and neutralizing the various verbal plays on *have*; *cloath* draping the heavenly garment of salvation over the thin and final thread of the poet's existence (for the "garments of salvation", see Isaiah 61:10 and Matthew 22:11).

In the hands of these copyists, the poem is thus de-Donnified, turned much more specifically into a "hymne" (as in the title given in the *princeps*), a devo-

of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever". Further Supreme Self-swearing is found at Isaiah 45:22, Jeremiah 22:5; and God's swearing by His own name, at Jeremiah 44:26.

¹⁴ Given the fixation with death in the final stanza, we may pose the question of whether the subscription "finis" (subscr.a) is an authorial or scribal boundary-marker (as suggested above) or is, in fact, an integral part of the poem.

tional song to the first Person of the Trinity. Its underlying intention is to praise the Most High, with the address to God cast within a recognizable theological framework. The structure of the poem thus enacts a crisis, resolved into assurance by a theological reflexion; it evokes anxiety, only to dispel it, and can take the reader (or, indeed, singer) through an imaginary process of repentance, doubt and resolution; the very lack of specificity of the sin or sins mentioned allows the reader-partaker to apply them to her own biography, evoking a personal sense of sinfulness which may be assuaged by a re-affirmed belief in forgiveness. Memory can be briefly reconfigured within a dominant theological paradigm, and emotions, similar to those assumed to have led to the composition of the piece, can be conjured within the reader. Within the hymn-genre, then, the *I*-function of the text is shared between author and performer-worshipper, or rather the process of enunciation is taken over by the devotee, using the author's words to express and suscite devotion through a form of ventriloquism. That the transformation of Donne's own idiosyncratic poem into a genre-following Hymn was not a sudden rewriting, but an example of consistent normalizing pressure on the text exerted as scribes and printers altered it in their copying, shows how important ideological expectations can be in transmission, and how carefully modern editors must tread in discerning how texts may be transmitted and altered, even as they are copied into authoritative manuscript collections.

5. The author and his image

The evolution of our poem, too, doubtless reflects the on-going development of the "author-function" (Wilson 2004; for England, Armstrong 2007) or "author-image" (Amossy 2009) of Dr Donne, famed divine and sermonizer; and displays how expectations from his output also developed in tandem with his increasing absorption into the English church's hierarchy. It is most certainly one thing to read a racy poem about love, sex, grief and doubtful forgiveness by a famed *roué* only recently of the cloth; quite another — indeed, somewhat difficult, perhaps repulsive — to read a racy poem about love, sex, grief and doubtful forgiveness by an aged and venerable divine, celebrated for his learning and his lack of public dalliance.

Yet what is also noticeable, however, is that, despite the canonization of his works in print, and the presentation of a sanitized version of "A Hymne [...]" as the culmination and end of Donne's poetry, some anthologists a few years later still preferred the rawer, less formally devout versions that are included in H9, O3 and B47. I would not want to say that these were acts of resistance to a dominant characterization of Donne; but they do show an interest in Donne's rather more characteristic and less normative religiosity, perhaps a taste, even, for uncertainty, doubt and theological conundra.

Yet even with all the editorial development it underwent, the poem still had the potential to be somewhat disturbing. The copyist of CT1, whom we met earlier with his (or her) identification of the sin of the first lines as being

"originall", placed two widely-known Latin *sententiae* warning against hypocrisy and duplicity in the space left at the bottom of the same page: "Amicis vitia si feras facis tuae" (if you bear your friends' vices, they become your own) and "Simulata sanctitas, duplex iniquitas" (holiness feigned, doubled iniquity). The first originally appeared in a classical assembly of maxims (Duff and Duff 1934, 4); the second was much used, and often attributed to Jerome, or Gregory, or Augustine. It is difficult not to suspect that these Latinate admonishments were criticisms aimed directly at that roué turned venerable divine.

Such visible discomfort with Donne's persona may explain the really quite extraordinary lengths to which Walton went in forging a picture of a devout, upstanding, protestant individual in his successive revisions to his *Life* of Donne. Our poem was included as an example of Donne's devout verse from the very first version of the *Life* (Walton 1640), and was the only poem that made its way into a popular abbreviation of Donne's biography (Winstanley 1687, 120). But the poem was introduced as, explicitly, a hymn written during a bout of serious illness (Walton 1640, fol. 84v; Anne More being long forgotten, and readers certainly diverted from seeing any puns on her name). Such a connexion proved attractive to devout readers, and a future archbishop of Canterbury copied out the poem into his commonplace book, prefacing the verses with "Dr Donne in his former sicknesse" (Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Tanner 466, foll. 4v–5r). Crucially, of course, Donne's doubting that he could be saved was washed away in the version that had made itself into print, and which Walton used; and Walton made doubly sure of this pious inflexion to the poem by adding, after the fallacious setting on a sick-bed, that Donne "wrote this heavenly Hymne, expressing the great joy he then had in the assurance of Gods mercy to him". The theological, biographical and spiritual problem, which gives the poem its force, is simply erased.

This was still not enough, and Walton, in a subsequent return to his biography, bolstered the account with some reported words of Donne "to a friend" (unnamed, of course) after listening to the setting of the hymn: "The words of this Hymne have restored to me the same thoughts of joy that possess my soule in my sicknesse when I composed it" (Walton 1658, 77; Walton 1670, 55; Walton was not one for varying an idea once he had seized upon it). Hilton's setting was thus co-opted to characterize Donne as having a sincere and heartfelt pious sensitivity. And to emphasise that the hymn was meant to express and awaken "joy".

There are thus wider and longer-lived issues at play in understanding the variance of a poem, issues that involve the evolution of Donne's verse over time. Evolution not at the hands of the author, but as it was wrenched from an individual context of a life as it was being lived, to be placed in either an implicit or explicit idealized biography, the *image d'auteur* not only mediating how texts were read, but directly provoking interference in the transmission of those texts themselves. Despite the valiant efforts of the *Digital Donne* project, this process has not been fully rolled back, and much modern criticism of John

Donne has been built upon texts which do not reflect the real Donne, but rather an amenable construct created, in the main, post mortem. When it comes to seizing “Donne” (*image d’auteur, fonction-auteur, man*), we have most definitely not done. Finis.

Bibliography

- AHL, FREDERICK, 1988. “Ars Est Caelare Artem (Art in Puns and Anagrams Engraved).” In *On Puns: the foundation of letters*, edited by Jonathan Culler, Blackwell, pages 17–43.
- AMOSSY, RUTH, 2009. “La double nature de l’image de l’auteur.” *Argumentation et analyse du discours* 3. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/aad.662>.
- ARBER, EDWARD, 1877. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640*. London: Edward Arber.
- ARMSTRONG, GUYDA, 2007. “Paratexts and their Functions in Seventeenth-Century English ‘Decamerons’.” *The Modern Language Review* 102, pages 40–57.
- AUGUSTINUS, AURELIUS HIPPONENSIS, n.d. “Sermones de tempore.” Available from: <http://www.augustinus.it/latino/discorsi/index2.htm> (Accessed: 2020–10–12).
- AUSTIN, WILLIAM, 1635. *Devotionis augustinianae flamma, or, Certaine Devout, Godly, and Learned Meditations written by the Excellently-accomplisht Gentleman, William Austin, of Lincolnes-Inne, Esquire*. London: John Legat and Ralph Mab.
- BONOEIL, JOHN, 1622. *His Maiesties gracious letter to the Earle of South-Hampton, treasurer, and to the Councell and Company of Virginia heere commanding the present setting vp of silke works, Also a treatise of the art of making silke*. London: Felix Kyngston.
- CALVIN, JOHN, 1561. *The Institution of the Christian Religion*. London: Reinolde Wolf and Richarde Harrison.
- CELM, 2013a. “CoR 540.” Available from: http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/corbettrichard.html#british-library-harley-3000_id352097 (Accessed: 2020–0–06).
- , 2013b. “CwT 236.” Available from: http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/carewthomas.html#bodleian-ashmole_id424111 (Accessed: 2020–08–06).

- , 2013c. "Cwt 250." Available from: http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/carewthomas.html#british-library-B47_id676262#british-library-B47_id676262 (Accessed: 2020-08-06).
- , 2013d. "DnJ 1577." Available from: https://celm-ms.org.uk/repositories/british-library-stowe.html#british-library-stowe_id676186 (Accessed: 2020-08-06).
- , 2013e. "DnJ 1578." Available from: http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/repositories/bodleian-ashmole.html#bodleian-ashmole_id441623 (Accessed: 2020-08-06).
- , 2013f. "DnJ 1584." Available from: http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/donnejohn.html#harvard_id670058 (Accessed: 2020-08-06).
- CHALLIS, ANNETTE, 2016. "Conflicting Role of the Speaker and the Divine in the Holy Sonnets." *Criterion* 9(1), pages 88–100.
- CORA, JESÚS, 1996. "The Institution of the Christian Religion." *Sociedad Española de Estudios Renacentistas Ingleses* 6, pages 21–28.
- COTTEGNIES, LINE, 1999. "Autour d'Izaak Walton et sa Life of Donne (1640): l'essor de la biographie au XVIIe siècle." In *La Biographie littéraire en Angleterre (XVIIe–XXe siècles)*, edited by F. Regard, St-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, pages 31–44.
- DONNE, JOHN, 1633. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.
- , 1635. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.
- , 1639. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.
- , 1649. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.
- , 1650. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death. To which is added Divers Copies under his own Hand never before in Print*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.
- , 1654. *Poems, by J. D. With Elegies on the Authors Death. To which is added Divers Copies under his own Hand never before in Print*. London: M[iles] F[lesher] for Iohn Marriot.

- DUFF, J. WIGHT and ARNOLD M. DUFF, 1934. *Minor Latin Poets*. London: Wiliam Heinemann.
- GRIERSON, HERBERT J. C., ed., 1912. *The Poems of John Donne: Edited from the Old Editions and Numerous Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- HASKIN, DAYTON, 2007. *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HATCH, CHARLES E., JR., 1957. "The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 67(1), pages 3–61.
- HOLIFIELD, E. BROOKS, 1974. *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570–1720*. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press.
- LAMBERT, VIOLANE, 2012. "Du modèle hagiographique à la biographie: filiations génériques dans The Life of John Donne d'Izaak Walton." *Shakespeare en devenir - Les Cahiers de La Licorne* 9. Available from: <http://09.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/shakespeare/index/lodel/players/lodel/index.php?id=618> (Accessed: 2018–06–11).
- LAPPIN, ANTHONY JOHN, 2019. "Baroquely Valedicting: Donne forbidding mourning. Date, purpose, and repurposing." *Studia Neophilologica* 92(1), pages 1–38. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393274.2019.1661013>.
- LEIGH, DAVID, 1978. "Donne's 'A Hymne to God the Father': New Dimensions." *Studies in Philology* 75, pages 84–91.
- MARTIN, JESSICA, 2003. "Izaak Walton and the 'Re-Inanimation' of Dr Donne." In *John Donne's Professional Lives*, edited by D. Colclough, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, pages 249–59.
- MCCOLLEY, DIANE KELSEY, n.d. *Poetry and Music in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NOVARR, DAVID, 1958. *The Making of Walton's Lives*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- , 1987. "Amor Vincit Omnia: Donne and the Limits of Ambiguity." *Modern Language Review* 82, pages 286–92.
- OLIVER, P. M., 1997. *Donne's Religious Writing: a discourse of feigned devotion*. London: Longman.
- PATRIDGE, ERIC, 1968. *Shakespeare's Bawdy: A Literary and Psychological Essay and a Comprehensive Glossary*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2nd edition.

- PEBWORTH, TED-LARRY, 1987. "The Editor, the Critic, and the Multiple Texts of Donne's 'A Hymne to God the Father'." *South Central Review* 4(2), pages 16–34.
- QUAIFE, GEOFFREY ROBERT, 1979. *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasants and Illicit Sex in Early Seventeenth-Century England*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- ROBBINS, ROBBIN, ed., 2013. *The Complete Poems of John Donne*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- ROSTON, MYRRAY, 2005. "Donne and the Meditative Tradition." *Religion and Literature* 37(1), pages 45–68.
- SMITH, A. J., 1983. *John Donne: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- STAPLES, KATHLEEN A. and MADELYN SHAW, 2013. *Clothing throughout American History: the British colonial era*. Santa Barbara (CA): Greenwood.
- TARGOFF, REMIE, 2008. *John Donne, Body and Soul*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.
- TAYLOR, JOHN, 1630. *All the Workes of John Taylor, the Water-Poet*. London: I.B. for James Boler.
- THOMPSON, E. N . S., 1921. "Mysticism in Seventeenth-Century English Literature." *Studies in Philology* 18, pages 170–231.
- VON ROHR, JOHN, 2002. *The Covenant of Grace in Early Puritan Thought*. Eugene (OR): Wipf and Stock.
- WALTON, IZAAK, 1640. *LXXX Sermons preached by the learned and reverend divine, John Donne, Dr. in Divinity, Late Dean of the Cathedrall Church of St Pauls London*. London: for Richard Royston and Richard Marriot.
- , 1658. *The Life of John Donne, Dr. in Divinity, and late Dean of Saint Pauls Church London. The Second Impression corrected and enlarged*. London: J[ohn] G[rismond] for R[ichard] Marriot.
- , 1670. *The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert*. London: Tho[mas] Newcomb for Richard Marriott.
- , 1675. *The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert*. London: Tho[mas] Newcomb for Richard Marriott, 4th edition.
- , 1807. *The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wootton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert, and Dr. Robert Sanderson, with the Notes, and the Life of the Author by Thomas Zouch, D.D. F.L.S. Prebendary of Durham*. York: T. Wilson and R. Spence, 2nd edition.

WILLIAMS, GORDON, 1994. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart England*. London: Athlone Press.

WILSON, ADRIAN, 2004. "Foucault on the 'question of the author': a critical exegesis." *Modern Language Review* 99, pages 339–63.

WINSTANLEY, WILLIAM, 1687. *The lives of the most famous English poets, or, the honour of Parnassus in a brief essay of the works and writings of above two hundred of them, from the time of K. William the Conqueror to the reign of His Present Majesty, King James II.* London: H. Clark for Samuel Manship.

Some Answer Poems and their Manuscript History: Jonson, Herrick, and the Circulation of Verse

Mark Bland

Abstract: This article uses manuscript sources and stemmatics to illuminate the history of the three answer poems that are discussed. The first example from Ben Jonson shows how he repeatedly tinkered with the text of a poem he wrote in answer to Sir William Burlase. The second example demonstrates that "Of Inconstancy" is an exchange between Jonson and Sir Edward Herbert, thereby adding a new poem to Jonson's canon. The third example illustrates how Robert Herrick took a poem by another and then altered it to write a polemic against it. In both the last two cases, the article resolves issues of uncertain authorship.

THE CIRCULATION OF MANUSCRIPT POETRY in the early-mid seventeenth century was closely linked to notions of conviviality and civility; even if, sometimes, a poem might invite a trenchant answer. Hence, the texts in any miscellany reflect both personal taste and an interest in the broader social conversation to which those texts were connected. That sense of engagement with the literary utterance extended to the composition of poems in response to others that were in circulation. Sometimes answers were direct and personal, sometimes they were exercises in wit, and sometimes they were deliberately public responses to a text that was either in circulation or to a text to which the person concerned had had access. All these different kinds of answer poetry are to be found in the examples that are to be discussed presently.

In an important article on answer poetry, Scott Nixon made the point that certain poems invited a direct engagement with their concerns either through the style of their argument, or through the way in which they allowed for debate and even parody (Nixon 1999). Such poems are quite different in tone and intention from those written in more than one voice, such as Jonson's "Epode" (*Forrest* xi) or "A Muscicall Strife" (*Underwood* 3), where the debate is the poem.¹ The obvious corollary to this is that authors usually did not answer their own poems. Nevertheless, there are examples where both the original and

¹ The numbering of the *Epigrammes* and *The Forrest* was established by Jonson, and has been followed by all modern editors; that for *The Underwood* is the accepted convention followed by both Simpson (Oxford: 1925-52) and the Cambridge editors (Bevington et al 2013), as well as for the forthcoming Oxford edition.

the answer poem have been attributed to the same author; and others where a single “text” has merged both the proposition and the answer. In both cases, there are clearly attribution and identity issues to resolve, and it is here that stemmatic analysis may help by providing evidence of the relationship between transmission, revision, and response — and thus issues of origin and authorship.

The point about stemmatic analysis is that maps of transmission do not only establish how specific copies of a text are related and through which networks they passed: they also cumulatively map how miscellanies were pieced together. Thus, it is particularly useful if multiple texts by different authors are collated and analysed as this adds precision and complexity to the study of the social networks within which the texts are located. It is for that reason that scholars have begun to realize that the scribal networks of manuscript circulation in the early modern period are more informative and significant than had been assumed (Bland 2013). Since most of the work that has been done involving manuscript transmission has been concerned with the poetry of Donne, the mapping of textual transmission for other authors such as Jonson, Roe, Beaumont, Herrick, Strode and Randolph could offer further insight into the social networks that a single author study obscures. This is especially so when answer poems are concerned, because they are by their nature multiple author texts. Hence, what was once dismissed as the corrupt residue of literary fashion is now understood as an important by-product of, and witness to, the histories of revision, transmission, and reception. This, in turn, has led to a renewed interest in the miscellanies and their relationship with one another.

The following discussion will turn first to two examples from Jonson, including a previously unattributed poem, and then to one that as been attributed to Herrick but is not by him. Jonson and Herrick are useful counterpoints to Donne as their initial entry into circulation occurs at different stages in the transmission process to each other and, thus, as witnesses to the history of the underlying documents they do not duplicate the patterns of circulation. That broader matter, however, of how multiple authors may be used to interpret a manuscript’s history is beyond the scope of the present article. For now, it will suffice to resolve the more specific issues of authorship and the circulation of these poems and thus lay the foundation for future work.

I

Jonson’s exchange with Sir William Burlase (*Underwood* 52; see Figure 1) is both one of his most appealing poems, and a classic example of the “answer poem” genre. For all its brevity and simplicity, it is beautifully pitched between self-effacing irony and genial praise. Both Burlase and Jonson suggest that their own command of their mistresses, Art and Poetry, are inadequate to do their praise for the other justice. Burlase was a friend of Dudley Carleton and John Chamberlain (a member of parliament), and he painted for pleasure. He modestly suggests that because he had less than “half” of Jonson’s art, he will never be able to truly

capture Jonson's "worth" to his friends and their admiration of him. Jonson answers by drawing on the Senecan notion that true benefits are reciprocal. He mocks his own obesity by suggesting that a "blot" would be quite sufficient to portray him, and laments that as a poet he only has the black and white of the page, and not the full colour palette of the painter. This allows Jonson to open up the distinction between his claim to honesty and the "flatt'ring Colours and false light" of the painter. He ends by returning the ample praise of his friend: conviviality, modesty, and the reciprocation of admiration are the true benefits that are shared in their exchange, and hence the poems epitomize the friendship between the two men.

Jonson clearly identifies Burlase as the author of the poem that he answers, and hence it has been accepted into editions of Jonson's poetry as the contextual material against which the answer ought to be understood. There are eleven manuscript copies of the poem to Burlase, as well as the text in the 1640 *Workes*, the two Benson piracies (the *Execration upon Vulcan* and *Horace his Art of Poetry*, both published in 1640), and another copy in *Parnassus Biceps* (Wing W3686 1656, C7^{r-v}). At no time does Burlase's initial poem circulate separately from Jonson's answer. Two witnesses, Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry MS 142 (ll.1-15) and *Parnassus Biceps*, have Jonson's answer only. These two "answer only" versions descend from different lines within the first state of the poem. Among the other witnesses, Edinburgh University Library MS Dc.7.94 is a manuscript copy of the printed Benson duo-decimo piracy, and Bodleian Library English Poetry MS c.50 is very corrupt and omits the first six lines of Jonson's poem. As elsewhere, the Benson piracies conflate stolen sheets from the 1640 *Workes* with an earlier manuscript version. The sigla used in the stemmatic diagram (see Figure 2) combines the STC location symbol for the library (i.e. L = London), with the first letter(s) of the manuscript series (e.g. A = Additional), and the full manuscript number.

The recent Cambridge Jonson edition (Bevington et al. 2013) did not attempt textual reconstructions of this kind. The stemma demonstrates that Jonson tinkered with the poem and revised it four times. One of the revisions was to line 4 of the poem by Burlase, where "the trier" was altered to "will tire": this alteration must have been made by Jonson around the time of the death of Burlase, as it occurs only in the Newcastle manuscript (LH4955), and the three editions printed in 1640. The same line of recension also alters line 18 of Jonson's text, substituting "form'd" for "drawne". The other principal revisions affect lines 1, 12, 15, 21 and 24 of Jonson's answer, and it is the gradual evolution of these that separates the earlier stages of revision.

The original tradition, as it was circulated, survives through seven witnesses, and has twenty-three small-scale variants that document the history of its reception: of these, one group of three manuscripts reads "What" as the first word of the poem while the rest, through all lines of descent, read "Why". The "What" group includes the fifteen-line Jonson-only fragment, Rawlinson Poetry MS 142. The other two manuscripts (Yale Osborn MS b200, and British Library Harley

A Poëme sent mee by SIR WILLIAM BURLASE.
The Painter to the Poët.

TO paint thy Worth, if rightly I did know it,
 And were but Painter halfe like thee, a Poët;
 BEN, I would show it:
 But in this skill, m'unskillfull pen will tire,
 Thou, and thy worth, will still be found farre higher;
 And I a Lier.
 Then, what a Painter's here? or what an eater
 Of great attempts! when as his skil's no greater,
 And he a Cheater?
 Then what a Poet's here! whom, by Confession
 Of all with me, to paint without Digression
 There's no Expression.

My Answer.
The Poët to the Painter.

WHY? though I seeme of a prodigious wast,
 I am not so voluminous, and vast,
 But there are lines, wherewith I might b'embrac'd.

 'Tis true, as my wombe swells, so my backe stoupes,
 And the whole lumpe growes round, deform'd, and droupes,
 But yet the Tun at *Heidelberg* had houpes.

 You were not tied by any Painters Law
 To square my Circle, I confesse; but draw
 My Superficies: that was all you saw.

 Which if in compasse of no Art it came
 To be described by a *Monogram*,
 With one great blot, yo'had form'd me as I am.

 But whilst you curious were to have it be
 An *Archetipe*, for all the world to see,
 You made it a brave piece, but not like me.

 O, had I now your manner, maistry, might,
 Your Power of handling, shadow, ayre, and spright,
 How I would draw, and take hold, and delight.

 But, you are he can paint; I can but write:
 A Poet hath no more but black and white,
 Ne knowes he flatt'ring Colours, or false light.

 Yet when of friendship I would draw the face,
 A letter'd mind, and a large heart would place
 To all posteritie; I will write BURLASE.

Figure 1: Ben Jonson, "A Poeme sent mee by Sir William Burlase", *Workes* (1640), 2G3^v-4^r.

MS 6931) are united by the variants of “be” for “are” in line 3, “had” for “haue” in line 15 and “I’de” for “I would” in line 24. The Rawlinson manuscript has the correct reading “haue” in line 15 and is further distinguished by reading “wth w^{ch} I am” for “wherewith I may” in line 3. On the other side of this line of descent, Folger V.a.97 and *Parnassus Biceps* are united by “of” for “at” in line 6 and the “but” of “describ’d but by” in line 11, whilst British Library Harley MS 6917 reads “be [...] by which I may” in line 3 and “while” for “whilst” in line 11. The final manuscript, Bodleian MS Eng. Poet c.50 has multiple corrupt readings as well as lacking the first six lines of Jonson’s answer, but it does read both “whilst” and “describ’d by” thereby indicating a further line of transmission within this group.

Jonson’s first revision was to lines 15 and 18, replacing “Y’haue made” with “You made” and the passive “draw, behold, and take delight” with the more active “draw, and take hold, and delight”. This tradition has two extant descendants (British Library Sloane MS 1792 and Additional MS 30892), a sibling of thee latter of which was used to “correct” the stolen sheets of the 1640 *Workes* that were used as copy for the Benson piracies, changing “Yet” to “But” in line 22 and reverting to “I would write” for “I will” in line 24. Both these witnesses have the variant “drawe” for “drawne” in line 12, with the Sloane manuscript reading “bee” for “are” in line 3 and “Yet” in line 22.

Jonson then made three further revisions by the mid-1620s. The first was to alter the fourth word of the first line from “Why? Though I be of a prodigious wast” to “Why? though I seeme [...]”; In line 12 “With one great blot yo’haue drawne me as I am” was altered to “y’had drawne”; and in line 24, “I would write *Burlase*” was rendered absolute with “I will write [...]”. Only Leeds Archives MS MX237 exists in this state. The Newcastle manuscript then alters line 4 of the *Burlase* poem to “will tire” and “Ne” for “Nor” in line 21. The final revision of the poem for the 1640 *Workes* involved a further tweak to line 12 with “drawne” altered to the more physical “form’d”.

The final issue involves the history of the Benson piracies. Here, as elsewhere, the piracies are demonstrably a conflation of stolen sheets of the 1640 *Workes* emended by reference to another manuscript source, in this case a relative of British Library Additional MS 30982. Hence, the Benson texts have the final readings “will tire”, “form’d”, “You made”, “draw, and take hold, and delight”, and “Ne”. combined with “But” in line 22 and “I would” in line 24: a fact indicative of their conflated status. This is recorded by the dotted line that links them with their source.

What this stemma illustrates is the history of an evolving text that is circulated early on and was then revised on multiple occasions with seemingly minor adjustments. Under the circumstances, corruption is only one part of the issue, for the history of the poem is as much horizontal across the tradition as it is vertical within each state. To edit the poem without a sense of this evolution, as the Cambridge edition does, failing to separate revision from error for those variants listed in the commentary, is a dereliction of editorial responsibility.

Figure 2: ‘A Poeme sent me by Sir William Burlase’.

II

If the Burlase exchange is an obvious example of the answer poem, another, "Of Inconstancy", is quite the opposite. It is found in three manuscripts: the siblings British Library Harley MS 4064 and Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry MS 31, and in University of Nottingham Portland MS Pw V37. In the Rawlinson and Harley manuscripts the poem is laid out as a single text; it is only in the Portland manuscript that the stanzas are divided by the subtitle, "The Aunswere, in praise of it". This copy of the poem was not known when it was last discussed in connection with the poems of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury in the early twentieth century (Moore Smith 1923, 119 and 167–68).

Most of the poems of Edward Herbert were printed for the first time some seventeen years after his death, in 1665 (Wing H1508). There exists, as well, an important manuscript of the poems with corrections in Herbert's hand (British Library Additional MS 37157), and there are a number of other poems that survive only in manuscript copies (Beal 1980, II: 167–68). The most recent edition was prepared shortly before the First World War, though it was published in 1923. The editor, Moore-Smith, based it on the 1665 text because, he argued, "the printed book is based on a manuscript which represented Herbert's second thoughts" (Moore Smith 1923, xxvii). Moore Smith's edition is generally a good one, and he certainly knew of Herbert's corrected copy. He also collated some of the more obvious coterie manuscripts, though he did not do so thoroughly. Instead of using British Library Harley MS 4064, he printed several poems that had not been included in 1665 from Bodleian Rawlinson Poetry MS 31, and he treated one of them, "Of Inconstancy" as *dubia*.

In Rawlinson Poetry MS 31, the text is copied on f.36^r with the title, and the attribution, "Sir Edw: Harbert". It reads:

Inconstancy's, the greatest of synns
It neyther endes well, nor beginns
All other ffaultes, wee simplye doe
This 'tis the same ffaulte, and next to:

Inconstancye, noe synn will proue
yf wee consider that wee Love
But the same beautye in another fface
lyke the same Bodye, in another place:/

Moore-Smith did not record the Harley manuscript, or its variants, and must have overlooked it. Instead, he reproduced the above with some minor adjustments, and noted in his commentary that "Perhaps they [the lines] are by two authors — the second stanza being an answer to the former. In this case it is the answer one would assign to Lord Herbert" (Moore Smith 1923, 167). His guess, of course, was to be proved by the Portland manuscript.

The copy of “Of Inconstancy” in Harley 4064 f.259^v is in the hand of the second scribe, who is not particularly careful — although he is less idiosyncratic in his spelling than the Feathery scribe, who prepared Rawlinson Poetry 31 (Beal 1998). On the whole, the second Harley scribe punctuates less heavily, though he does record a comma after “This” in line four, implying that there should be a colon after “doe”, a period after “beginns”, and a semi-colon after “synns”. Other minor adjustments include the reading “too” at the end of line four, the words “loue” (1.6) and “body” (1.8) with an initial lower case, and the absence of the initial double “ff” that is characteristic of Feathery. The most substantial difference is in the first line, which the second Harley scribe reduces to a regular tetrameter at the expense of the meaning of the poem. As well as removing “of”, he introduces a hyphen into “Inconstancy”:

In-constancy the greatest sins
It neither ends well, nor beginns
All other faults wee simply doe
This, tis the sam fault and next too

Inconstancy no sinn will proue
If wee Consider that we loue
But the same bewty in another face
like the same body in another place.

The final manuscript unknown to Moore-Smith came from Welbeck Abbey. On the whole, the text of Nottingham MS Pw V37 p.204 is better than that found in the Rawlinson-Harley pair, though too many words have an initial capital. This suggests that there may be a lost intermediary between the answer as it first circulated and the copy that is preserved in this source. In line three, the Portland manuscript has the obviously correct reading “singly” instead of “simply”, as it is found in the other pair; and in line four, it reads “first”, where the other tradition has the weaker “same”; elsewhere, the reading “Inconstancy is”, in the first line, renders the verse as a regular pentameter. Most importantly, the manuscript demonstrates that Moore-Smith’s hunch was correct, and that the two stanzas are separate poems:

Of Inconstancy

Inconstancy is y^e greatest of Sinnes;
Itt neither Ends well, nor beginnes:
All other Faults Wee singly doe,
This is y^e first Fault, and Next too.

The Aunswere, in praise of it

Inconstancy, noe sinne will proue
If wee consider y^t wee loue
But y^e same Beauty in another face
Like y^e same Body, in another place.

This version makes it possible to resolve the problem of attribution, for there is nothing unusual about a poem being circulated with an answer to it in verse miscellanies of the period (Hart 1956; Nixon 1999). With the support, therefore, of Rawlinson Poetry 31, and the judgment of Moore Smith, the "Aunsware" may safely be attributed to Herbert. This leaves the question as to who wrote the other four lines of the text.

On external grounds alone, Jonson would have to be considered a likely candidate as author of the epigram. At the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century, he was obviously closely involved with Herbert: his epigram to Herbert, Herbert's dedication of the satire "Of Travellers" to Jonson, the gift by Herbert to Jonson of a copy of Tertullian, and the manuscript of *Biathanatos*, are all indicative of Herbert having become an intimate part of Jonson's literary circle.² This is re-inforced by the arrangement of Harley 4064 and Rawlinson Poetry 31. In Harley 4064, the poem is part of a sequence that includes Jonson's verse letter to Sir Robert Wroth in praise of a country life, followed by Donne's "Twickenham Garden", followed by the epigram and its answer, followed by Donne, Jonson, and then Herbert on the death of Cecilia Bulstrode. With Rawlinson Poetry 31, the two Donne poems have been removed, leaving the Jonson and Herbert poems as a sequence together.

When "Of Inconstancy" is read against Jonson's other epigrams, style, sentiment, subject matter, and metre, all cohere to identify his hand. The idea of constancy and fortitude as manly virtues that require a Stoic centredness, are to be found throughout the poems. Sir John Roe, for instance, is one who has endured "His often change of clime (though not of mind)" (*Epig.* 32); William Roe is reminded that "Delay is bad, doubt worse, depending worst", and Jonson goes on to add "Each best day of our life escapes vs, first" (*Epig.* 70); Sir Henry Goodyere is complimented for his "wel-made choise of friends, and bookes" (*Epig.* 86); Sir Thomas Roe is told "He that is round within himselfe, and streight, | Need seeke no other strength, no other height" (*Epig.* 98); and Herbert is praised for "Thy standing vpright to thy selfe" (*Epig.* 106). If the theme is insistent, there are other echoes as well that are more subtle, but which show the same turn of mind, whether it be "Th'expeince in odours is a most vaine sinne" (*Epig.* 20), or the structure and rhythm of the final couplet to Sir Henry Savile (*Epig.* 95):

Although to write be lesser then to doo,
It is the next deed, and a great one too.

Even if, on internal evidence alone, one might hesitate (it is, after all, a short poem), what makes the attribution convincing is that the literary judgments about style and substance combine with the evidence from the Portland manuscript that the two stanzas are two poems, and the fact that the Rawlinson-

² The copy of Tertullian's *Opera* (Franeker, 1598) is at Charlecote House, Warwickshire, shelfmark L6-22; the manuscript of *Biathanatos* is Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS e Musaeo 131 (Bland 1998).

Harley pair of manuscripts are so clearly identifiable with the verse of Donne, Jonson, and Herbert. The poem is not by a later imitator, nor is it characteristic of Donne or Sir John Roe, but rather it has much in common with a group of early fragments by Jonson, on “Murder”, “Peace”, and “Riches”, that are to be found in *Englands Parnassus* (STC 378-80 1600, P2^r, Q2^v-3^r, S1^v). It ought not be surprising that from time to time Jonson might sketch out an idea, or that friends might engage in a little literary bandinage.

Hence there are, perhaps, three reasons why Jonson may have chosen not to preserve this poem: first, if Jonson had started early on with the idea of writing epigrams about abstract moral ideas, it is a stage that he developed through, and it is possible he cannibalized much of this material for his *Epigrammes*. Second, the poem and its answer do not particularly fit either the *Epigrammes* or the *Forrest*, and it is evident elsewhere that Jonson did not include a number of his early poems for this reason. Third, Jonson regularly treated of the theme elsewhere, and he may have felt that these four lines were rather a sketch that might be regarded as unfinished. If Jonson had intended a longer meditation on inconstancy, for instance, then the next logical step would have been to turn the poem towards the praise of patience, fortitude, and the golden mean with a specific person in mind (e.g. “Yet you, HERBERT, who understand such things, | And need not my advice when each day brings | New trials to test one’s patience and the will [...]”, and so on — these lines, I should add, are mine, not those of Jonson). It may simply be that Jonson never found the right moment for an extensive meditation on Lipsian notions of constancy and neo-Stoicism.

For present purposes, the broader significance of “Of Inconstancy” and its answer, beyond their inclusion in the forthcoming Oxford edition of Jonson’s *Poems*, is that it is another example of a widespread literary practice. Neither Jonson nor Herbert are any less identifiably themselves for all that they have exchanged poems. On the other hand, neither exists in absolute isolation from the other: they are part of a community of friends, and texts. What stands out about this coterie of the first decade of the seventeenth century is the way in which the people involved record their sociability through the exchange of verse letters, satires, epigrams, and answer poems: Jonson was not always seeking patronage, sometimes his poems are genuine expressions of *amicitias*. This is quite different from the social circulation of verse in Oxford in the 1620s and 1630s which, in many ways, is less intimate.

III

When Herrick was edited in the mid-twentieth century, the first edition of *Hesperides* was taken as the copy-text where possible (Martin 1956), whilst the full extent of Herrick’s circulation in manuscript was not established by the editor. Rather, decisions about copy-text for known manuscript poems were based on the convenience of the Bodleian and British Libraries, rather than a strict analysis of textual traditions. Herrick was not alone in being edited in this

way: Simpson edited Jonson's *The Underwood* from the 1640 *Workes* (Herford et al. 1925) — a decision that was repeated in the recent Cambridge edition; Ayton was edited from a couple of important manuscript collections, with miscellany copies ignored (Gullans 1963); even Henry King (edited by the manuscript scholar Margaret Crum) got the light touch and was primarily edited from the first printed edition (Crum 1966). Similarly, Helen Gardner, who was a formidable manuscript scholar, edited Donne from the 1633 *Poems* and a small group of related manuscripts (Gardner 1965; 1978). Hence the stemmatic analysis of manuscript traditions has been neglected, especially following some poor work by Leishman (1945) and Wolf II (1948).

Something approaching the full extent of the surviving manuscript evidence for Herrick was established by Peter Beal more than thirty years ago (Beal 1987, i: 527–66). What Beal revealed was a Herrick who was deeply involved in the manuscript culture of the 1620s and 1630s, and whose manuscript texts were variant from the printed texts in the *Hesperides* in significant ways. In particular, it became evident that Herrick did not necessarily revise in a straight progression through various stages, but that he might also revise by returning to his original papers and re-editing a poem in a completely different way, altering different lines, and hence creating two or more independent lines of transmission (Cain and Connolly 2011; Connolly 2012). The most recent Oxford edition of Cain and Connolly (2013) has addressed this by mapping the evolution of the poems in manuscript in a second volume, and providing some with stemmatic diagrams (though not all).

What follows is a discussion of the transmission history of a group of manuscripts for a specific problem text called “To his False Mistress” that has been attributed to Herrick, and for which Herrick wrote an answer “Goe perjured man”. It is a poem for which the recent editors provided a stemmatic diagram and copy-text, both of which are at issue here, and in which they acknowledge that “there is no real evidence to suggest that Herrick wrote this poem” although they do observe that “Herrick might well have been involved with tweaking the attributed version” (Cain and Connolly 2013, ii: 59). Nevertheless, their analysis fails to identify that point of transition from an original to an altered version and what those changes involved. As will be shown, although Herrick did not write the poem, he did tweak a total of four words. The rest of the manuscript history is one of scribal transmission where the variants were neither instigated by the original author nor by Herrick. Nevertheless, owing both to their reconstruction of the evidence and their adoption of a specific manuscript as their witness, the copy-text selected by the editors is variant by a further twelve words to the changes that were introduced by Herrick.

As will become evident, the reconstruction of scribal manuscript transmission without the survival of authorial papers poses a particular challenge to editorial practice because error is both endemic to the evidence and particular to the witness. Manuscript is different from print. When an editor selects a printed witness, removing the variants that were identified during stop-press correction,

that choice reflects what several hundred or thousand people first read as the text. When an editor selects a scribal manuscript because there is no other witness, without removing the variants generated via scribal transmission, that text reflects what one person read and, in this instance, what twenty-one did not. The issue is both of philosophical and practical import.

The answer part of the exchange, sometimes known as “The Curse”, is well attested as by Herrick in manuscript and was printed in the 1648 *Hesperides*: it survives in at least 59 manuscript copies (Beal 1987, HeR 49–107). “To his False Mistress”, on the other hand, is not in *Hesperides* and survives in 22 known copies (Beal 1987, HeR 379–400): only eleven of which are copied with “The Curse” directly following. A further five witnesses have both “To his False Mistress” and “The Curse” present in the same miscellany, but at some distance from one another, and hence there stemmatic relationships belong to different traditions. One of the first issues that arises, therefore, is why “To his False Mistress” was excluded from *Hesperides* if it was written by Herrick.

The obvious and logical answer to this question is that Herrick’s poem, “The Curse”, is an answer poem, and that such poems were not usually written by the same person as the one that gave rise to the response. “The Curse” is also self-contained, and it does not require knowledge of the other poem to appreciate its moral stricture. In other words, we are dealing with an example of social verse, similar to Jonson’s answer poems, although it is not as convivial a response as the others. By removing the source poem, Herrick turns the direct trenchancy of the answer into an abstract and distanced comment: the “perjur’d man” could be any man and not simply the complainant of “To his False Mistress”: by removing the cause of *is animus*, Herrick allowed conviviality to be restored.

The stemmatic diagram for “To his False Mistress” (see Figure 3) maps the transmission of the poem: it describes an early version of the text, and then two main lines of descent, and establishes that the attribution to Herrick occurs at the bottom of one line of descent of the revised version, and that both these copies descend from the same source (MS 9). For a valid attribution, an early state of the poem ought to have a clear association, and the further away that attribution is from the original copy, the less confidence we can have in the association (Bland 2013). As can be seen the initial state of the text (MS 1) has no attribution and, while “The Curse” is present in these miscellanies, it does not follow on from “To his False Mistress” — in fact, in both cases, it occurs earlier in the collection as a whole. Those manuscripts that do have “The Curse” immediately following are marked with an asterisk.

Perhaps as useful from a textual point of view is the fact that the only variants between British Library Sloane MS 1446 and West Yorkshire Archives (Leeds) MS 156/237 are differences involving spelling and punctuation, but no substantive disagreements. Further, both copies agree that the poem was first written as three quatrains. As a copy-text, therefore, it represents the poem as Herrick received it (and thus as close as we can establish to the original author’s intention), before Herrick made changes to suit his own purposes. As recorded in

Figure 3: Anon, "To his False Mistress".

the Leeds manuscript, the text of the poem originally read:

Whether are all her false oathes blowne?
Or in what Region doe they liue?
I'me sure no place, where fayth is knowne
Dare any harbor to them giue:

My wither'd hart which loue doth burne
Shall venter one sigh with the winde,
And neuer back againe returne
Till one of her lost vowes it finde.

There may they wrastle in the Skye,
Till they doe both one lightning proue;
Then falling lett it blast her eye,
That was so periur'd in her loue.

When he got hold of the poem, Herrick altered the archaic “doth” in line five to “did”, changing the present into the past; the “lost vowes” in line eight once again became the “false oathes” of line one; and in the final line “so” was altered to “thus”, changing the egregious emphasis with the rhetoric of an argument. Overall, the changes shift the sentiment from one of present suffering to past hurt, more clearly enabling Herrick to level the accusation of insincerity. To argue, as the Oxford editors have implicitly done, that Herrick then made a further twelve changes to such a short poem, none of which are indicative of a more refined intelligence revising it, is difficult to credit as plausible.

The critical reading to determine is “venter” (to sell) in line 6 and its variant “venture” (to invest, put forth): this occurs on both sides of the MS 2 line of descent, at stages independent of one another, and simply reflects the scribal habit of substituting the more familiar word. This is not problematic because it is the logical variant: what is important about “venture” is that once it has occurred there is no way back to “venter”. It would, in other words be much harder to argue that three separate scribes changed “venture” to “venter” than the other way round, which confirms the primacy of “venter” as the original reading. One other manuscript reads “tender”, a variant that would not be repeated independently because it involves a more significant change. There are a couple of other independent agreements that are straightforward in their cause, but for present purposes what matters for reconstructing the stemma is that “venter/venture” is removed from the primary analysis beyond placing “venter” at the top of the tree. When this is done, the line of recension can be established fairly easily.

All stemma involve an element of critical taste in their estimation of the facts: this is particularly true when determining the source and direction of the primary readings before scribal changes took place (Love 1984): for instance, did line 3 first read “I’m sure” or “I know”: the later is both more emphatic and prosaic; to be “sure” means that the possibility of doubt has been entertained and examined before a secure knowledge is asserted; the claim to “know” requires

no such critical assessment of the facts. For that reason, "I'm sure" was preferred as the primary reading as was "which" over "that" in line 5: these decisions subsequently meant that the link between what became the MS 1 group and the source did not depend on any other line of recension, and hence opened up the possibility of that group being the original version. In stemmatic analysis, simplicity is the greatest virtue.

If we begin with the larger group of manuscripts descending from MS 2, the reading "I'm sure" occurs in all the manuscripts on the left side, as well as in Rosenbach MS 239/23 p.156, and all but one of those on the left side read "Dare" in line 4, while the other manuscript reads "Will". George Morley's text in Westminster Abbey MS 41 is variant in both cases, reading "Others" and "Does": the latter an understandable palaeographical misreading of "Dare". What marks off the "Will" manuscript, Rosenbach MS 239/23 p.156, as belonging on the right-hand side is that it shares the readings "that", "skies" and "eyes" with the "I know" manuscripts of MS 4. It is in other respects highly variant and we can only assume that we have lost part of the chain of evidence that generated such variants as "grapple" for "wrestle" in line 9. This was the copy-text chosen by the Oxford editors despite what was so clearly an erroneous reading.

On the left-hand side, descending from MS 3, the equally variant Morley-Westminster manuscript is linked by the shared reading "And" for "Then" in line 11 and to Huntington MS 198 part 1 by the reading "Where" for "Whither" in line 1. Once again the extent of the Morley-Westminster variants suggests that we are missing some intermediary witnesses that might account for how that text became as corrupt as it did: in this particular instance the textual history of "The Curse" might provide some of the missing clues.

Once the two oddities are accounted for, the remaining manuscripts present few difficulties. On the right hand side, descending from MS 4 through MS 7, all the remaining eleven manuscripts are linked by reading "I know" for "I'm sure" in line 3, while expanding "till" to "Vntill" and omitting "false" from "false Oathes" in line 8. Three of these manuscripts, via MS 11, substitute "Loue" for "faith" in line 2: all read "was" in line 12, with one manuscript preserving "was thus", and two reading "was so" via MS 14, two of these witnesses are also in quatrains; five of the other manuscripts are grouped by "is thus" in the final line via MS 12, while the other three retain "was thus" but substitute "Whither" for "Whether" in line 1 via MS 13. Within the "is thus" tradition, the remaining witnesses independently substitute of "Whither" for "Whether" and "venture" for "venter".

The final six manuscripts on the left-hand side, descending from MS 5, also form a coherent group. They are all linked by reading "pierce" for "blast" and "let them" for "may they"; two of the manuscripts read "venture" for "venter" (this is why this reading needed to be excluded from the initial analysis) and two read "with" for "which" in line 5. Of the remaining two manuscripts Yale University Osborn MS b205 has two variants that suggest that again we may be missing an intermediary, whilst Folger MS V.a.96 p.72 turns out to be the best

text of this tradition, and it includes capitalisation and italics.

The most significant other line of descent is MS 9 that has the only two manuscripts that attribute “To his false Mistress” to Herrick: these are linked by the reading “venture”: what is important about this group is that the attribution to Herrick is demonstrably late; it descends from a common source, and it only occurs at this point across the entire stemmatic tradition. Further, there is no other attribution to Herrick on the right-hand side that would suggest the attribution derives from the top of the tree. On the other hand, the manuscripts marked with an asterisk occur on both sides of the stemma, suggesting that “The Curse” was circulated with “To his False Mistress” from the outset.

When the stemma was first drawn the MS 1 group were placed hanging in the middle, between the two more extended groups. What was evident, however, was the unusual nature of two of the variants and by the fact that neither of the manuscripts circulated directly with “The Curse” (although both have it elsewhere in their volumes). This was suggestive. Elsewhere in this analysis, it has implicitly been suggested that the old fashioned variant is probably earlier and the more current word later (Bland 2010, 177–82): hence “venter” is earlier than “venture” and “Whether” (as used) earlier than “Whither”. By the same logic, “doth” ought to be earlier than “did” and it is difficult to see why a later scribe would deliberately introduce an old-fashioned form. Equally, “lost vowels” is an unusual substitution for “false oathes” as it has neither a palaeographical cause nor a memorial one, and it cannot be argued to be the “more common word”. The most likely explanation for such a variant is revision.

The issue is therefore one of direction: while Herrick might have revised “was thus” to “was so”, it is unlikely that he would have revised “did” to “doth”. Further, given the circulation of the MS 2 tradition, it seems unusual that the MS 1 tradition did not circulate as widely. If, on the other hand, the MS 1 readings represent the original version of the poem, then what happened becomes explicable: Herrick received an early version of “To his False Mistress”, tweaked the text, and circulated it with his answer, “The Curse”. When it came to printing *Hesperides*, he simply excluded “To his False Mistress” because he knew he was not the author of that poem, and that “The Curse” could stand without it.

One final comment: it is possible to reconstruct the stemma in another way. The issue is that if “lost vowels” were a sign of revision, then “pierce” for “blast” could be as well. This would involve swinging the left-hand MS 3 side out to the right and up across the top line. To do so, we would have to argue that the poem was revised not once, but twice: first changing “Then” to “And” in line 11, and next changing “may they” to “let them” in line 9 and “blast” to “pierce” in line 11. If this were the case, then Folger MS V.a.96 p.72 would require no modification other than a small adjustment to its punctuation as the final revised copy-text. This is not an option that the Oxford editors discussed. The hesitation about doing so is that we are clearly missing something from the manuscript tradition to account for the witnesses we have. Against this doubt, one has to acknowledge that “pierce” could be a further revision by Herrick.

IV

It was observed at the outset of this article that the conjunction of the textual histories of different authors in a single miscellany could be informative about how and when the various texts were circulating. In the case of MS 156/237 from the West Yorkshire Archive in Leeds, we have a late version of Jonson's "A Poem sent me by Sir William Burlase" and the earliest version of "To his False Mistress". The sequence in which they are found has a great many poems by William Strode and Thomas Carew, a couple by Aurelian Townshend, one by John Grange, a few poems by Donne and a scattering of poems by Jonson written at different stages of his career. The immediate sequence that follows after a copy of Jonson's "Eupheme", written in 1633, involves three poems by Carew, one by Townshend, three more by Carew, then "To his False Mistress" followed by lines from Jonson's "Satyricall Shrub" and the song from Epicoene, and then again Carew. This clearly points to someone in the Jonson-Carew nexus as being responsible for the poem. In British Library Sloane MS 1446, "To His False Mistress" also follows on from three poems by Carew, but of these it is only the last, "To T. H. a Lady resembling my Mistress", that is the same. In other words, the source of the poem is someone associated with Carew.

The Burlase poems do not occur in the Sloane manuscript, and they appear some twelve pages on from "To his False Mistress" in the Leeds material. In between are a medley of poems by Strode, William Herbert, Townshend and Donne. That section clearly involves a different, looser set of underlying papers than those in which "To his False Mistress" is found. For the record, "The Curse" occurs much earlier, at the start of the volume, among a sequence of poems by Henry King and Carew, mixed in with a couple of poems by Donne. There is no Jonson material in that part of the miscellany. The volume was prepared by a cousin of Sir John Reresby of Thribergh Hall.

Although it is evident that "To his False Mistress" is not by Herrick, that does not mean it ought to be excluded from a scholarly edition of his verse. "To his False Mistress" and "The Curse" share a similar, if more detached, relationship as the Burlase-Jonson exchange; the difference is the tone of the answer and the fact that the we do not know the author of the poem that Herrick attacked, although we do know the circle from which it emerged. In that sense "To his False Mistress" joins the massed ranks of anonymous manuscript verse texts of the early seventeenth century (North 2003).

The story, however, does not quite end with the de-attribution of "To his False Mistress" from the canon of Herrick's verse. Herrick was directly or indirectly responsible for the existence of twenty of the twenty-two surviving copies for the poem that only became well known because he circulated it with his answer. Hence, we need to understand "The Curse" from the perspective of both its history as an answer, and as a poem that circulated separately in its own right. As 48 out of 59 copies of "The Curse" exist without direct connection to "To his False Mistress" it is evident that Herrick continued to revise that poem

independently of the poem with which he first circulated it. That is a larger question, summarized but not fully answered by the Oxford editors and, again, it is one that raises further and separate questions as well as editorial issues.

For the present, it is enough to have demonstrated the ways in which stemmatic analysis can be useful in resolving issues of origin and authorship. All stemma are maps of social networks (Bland 2013). Many of the manuscripts discussed have known compilers, and those people were often members of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, or the Inns of Court, and had extended familial relationships. It would take too long here and now to begin to describe and detail all those connections, but what such an analysis does is invite that kind of historical reconstruction. The more we build up maps of such networks, the more subtle our understanding of scribal transmission will become. When we use terms such as scribal networks, community, and conviviality, we need to recognize that they are not abstractions and that the history of specific contexts will leave traces in the textual and archival records that most interest us. Part of the problem is unlocking the information in a way that allows us to understand more acutely what the primary evidence is, and what it represents. Further studies of other texts will no doubt elucidate much that remains unstudied and unclear, especially with regard to the anonymous and doubtfully attributed texts of the period.

Bibliography

- BEAL, PETER, ed., 1980. *Index of English Literary Manuscripts I: 1475-1625*. London: Maunsell.
- , 1987. *Index of English Literary Manuscripts II: 1625-1700*. London: Maunsell.
- , 1998. *In Praise of Scribes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BEVINGTON, DAVID, IAN DONALDSON, and MARTIN BUTLER, eds., 2013. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BLAND, MARK B., 1998. "Jonson, Biathanatos and the Interpretation of Manuscript Evidence." *Studies in Bibliography* 51, pages 154–82.
- , 2010. *A Guide to Early Printed Books and Manuscripts*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- , 2013. "Stemmatics and Society in Early Modern England." *Studia Neophilologica* 85, pages 1–20.
- CAIN, TOM and RUTH CONNOLLY, eds., 2011. *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- , 2013. *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CONNOLLY, RUTH, 2012. "Editing Intention in the Manuscript Poetry of Robert Herrick." *Studies in English Literature* 52, pages 69–84.
- CRUM, MARGARET, ed., 1966. *The Poems of Henry King*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GARDNER, HELEN LOUISE, ed., 1965. *The Elegies and the Songs and Sonnets [of John Donne]*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 1978. *The Divine Poems [of John Donne]*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition.
- GULLANS, CHARLES B., ed., 1963. *The English and Latin Poems of Sir Robert Ayton*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2nd edition.
- HART, E. F., 1956. "The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century." N.S.(7), pages 19–29.
- HERFORD, CHARLES HAROLD, PERCY SIMPSON, and EVELYN SIMPSON, eds., 1925. *Ben Jonson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LEISHMAN, J. B., 1945. "You Meaner Beauties of the Night. A Study in Transmission and Transmogrification." *The Library* IV(26), pages 99–123.
- LOVE, HAROLD, 1984. "The Ranking of Variants in the Analysis of Moderately Contaminated Manuscript Traditions." *Studies in Bibliography* 37, pages 39–57.
- MOORE SMITH, GEORGE CHARLES, 1923. *The Poems English and Latin of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NIXON, SCOTT, 1999. "'Aske me no more' and the Manuscript Verse Miscellany." *English Literary Renaissance* 29, pages 97–130.
- NORTH, MARCY L., 2003. *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.
- WOLF II, EDWIN, 1948. "'If shadows be a picture's excellence': An Experiment in Critical Bibliography." *PMLA* 63, pages 831–57.

Editing for Man and Machine. Digital Scholarly Editions and their Users

Anne Baillot and Anna Busch

Abstract: This article explores ways in which digital scholarly editions can reach new audiences by taking advantage of the computer-readability of their digital content. Based on the development work on the edition *Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin 1800–1830*, we present different Open Access-based options that allow for interlinking datasets and facilitate the development of digital editions that go beyond what print editions can achieve on paper.

DIGITAL SCHOLARLY EDITIONS of manuscripts oftentimes present themselves in the form of a scan of the manuscript on one side of the monitor and a transcription on the other side.¹ By presenting this view of the text, the edition caters to a specific way of reading. But the kind of information it conveys is — in spite of its apparent similarity — not the same as what print facsimile editions enable. Digital editions are compelled to establish the chronology of textual genesis (a linearity in the representation of text production made necessary by the text encoding), while a print facsimile edition is not necessarily bound to produce this kind of analysis. But although the encoding process suggests a more linear and in-depth approach to textual structure on this level, one can observe, on the other hand, a tendency not to render all glyphs and signs with the same precision. The reasons behind such editorial decisions are neither solely due to technical challenges (that would impede the digital reproduction of non-textual elements, for example) nor to a fundamentally lackadaisical consideration of non-textual elements. Instead, the editor starts from the assumption that the reader should be able to make the connection between the scan and the transcription, and cede to the fact that one is not identical to the other. In other words, the reader’s understanding of the editorial setting is fundamental to the conception of all editorial decisions that underlie the edition’s development.

The potential affordances of the digital medium affect our conception of textual structure on different levels. This offers editors of digital scholarly editions the opportunity to break away from the page format (see also the first chapter of Grafton 2012). Still, most editors stick to what they know, be that because of the format of the scans they acquired for the edition, or due to the lack of a

¹ See for example: van Gogh 2009; Schlegel 2014; Ghelardi 2019; or Jung 2015. For a catalog of digital scholarly editions consult Sahle 2008 or Franzini 2016.

persuasive alternative model that would be as easily accessible to readers (in terms of readability) as the familiar page is.

What is more, a digital edition is not just (and perhaps not even primarily) designed for humans to read in a linear way, but also to be browsed through the interface, and navigated by means of hyperlinks. This type of interlinking is another level of reading for which it is difficult to anticipate the reader's behaviour. On that level too, the editor's quest to direct the reader along to their own interpretation of the text can be as empowering as it can be restricting.

Last but not least, digital scholarly editions can also address computers — or at least those editions that provide access to their source code and enable text mining. As such, they facilitate distant reading as well as close reading.

How can we cater to all these different readers and forms of reading? That is the question this article tries to answer by building on its authors' experience with developing a digital edition called *Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin 1800–1830* (Baillot 2010b). This edition was developed in the context of a specific funding program, which meant that the project's funding phase could not exceed five years' time.² This limited time frame and funding resulted in a pragmatic approach to our editorial tasks, and influenced our workflow accordingly. Our primary goal was to aggregate resources that would answer a series of project-specific research questions (Baillot and Busch 2014). But of course, if answering these questions had been our sole aim, there would have been no need to develop a user-friendly interface for the data, nor to make these resources available in the form of an Open Access publication. The edition was hence conceived of as both a research environment for the research group in which it was situated, and as a scholarly edition that offers resources to the community at large. This in turn required to think more about how we would define such a "community at large": Who are the readers of a digital scholarly edition, what are their expectations, and to what extent should we make an effort to meet those expectations?

1. A short tour through the digital edition *Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin 1800–1830*

The research group "Berlin Intellektuelle 1800–1830" at the department of Modern German Literature at the Humboldt-University of Berlin was dedicated to the analysis of intellectual relationships in Berlin around 1800. At that time, the Prussian capital was an eminent place of cultural transfer and knowledge exchange. Form and meaning of the participation of writers, publishers and scholars in public life defined the main research axis. To this end, the communication strategies these agents developed, as well as the close connections they

² The project is described on Baillot et al. n.d.; the scholarly contributions (publications, presentations) are listed in Baillot n.d.. The project lasted from June 2010 to January 2016 and was hosted by the Institute of German Literature of the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

established between circles (such as between universities, academies, literary clubs and salons) were analysed on the basis of unpublished or only partially published manuscripts.

While letters constituted the main part of the edition's corpus, other sorts of texts such as draft manuscripts of literary texts or lecture notes are presented as well — this with the goal of cross-referencing the treatment of particular topics in different genres. The importance of letters in general as both a source of information and as a textual format with an inherent literary nature that adopts complex functions was one of the project's starting points. That is why the edition was called *Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin 1800–1830*.

For the project, the research group designed four key questions to analyse the conditions and developments that were crucial for intellectual communication in Berlin between 1800 and 1830 as they were presented in these handwritten documents: 1) To what extent did the establishment of the Berlin University in 1810 contribute to the intellectual self-conception of scholars and academics who worked as lecturers?; 2) To what extent did the presence of the French in Berlin shape and define the political awareness of intellectuals?; 3) Which communication strategies did male and female writers use to establish themselves in the literary milieu?; and 4) How can we extract political statements from a literary or scholarly corpus?³

A few months into the project, the research team decided to deviate from its initial plan to publish of a series of smaller print editions, and to develop an overarching digital scholarly edition instead. To this end, the team reviewed several digital scholarly editions of letters that could serve as examples to follow. Great inspiration was drawn from “Vincent van Gogh. The Letters” (van Gogh 2009) and “Carl Maria von Weber — Collected Works (WeGA)” (von Weber 2017). In many ways, these editions helped the research group develop and implement their editorial practices. In addition to the best practices that were adopted by these digital editions, the editorial team implemented the standards recommended by the German Research Foundation (DFG), the project's funding agency for scholarly, web-based text publications (DFG 2015).

Not focusing on a single author, as most editions (even digital ones) do, the edition provides several possibilities to approach the manuscripts. This variety of options allows the user to access the edition in different ways, of which the one via the author-guided approach is just one alongside many. As such, the edited letters and texts can be accessed via their genre (letter, drama, novella, reports, lecture notes, etc.) or through a series of topics that are structured according to the team's four core research questions.⁴

The standard view in the editorial interface shows a diplomatic transcription opposite a scan of the manuscript. These two columns on the screen can be

³ The complete list of research results (publications, papers, etc.) of the research group “Berlin Intellektuelle 1800–1830” can be found on Baillot n.d.

⁴ The complete editorial guidelines including all specifications for the different types of text genres can be found in German in Baillot 2010a.

reduced to a single one in just a click. For each column, it is possible to visualize the scan, two versions of the document's transcription (either as a diplomatic transcription of the document, or as an edited reading version of the text), the source code, the metadata, or the identified entities. It is also possible to generate a PDF of each document.

The diplomatic version provides a transcription of the manuscript's text with as little editorial interference as possible. All corrections, deletions and additions that are found in the manuscript are reproduced. Characteristics such as line breaks, the horizontal alignment of paragraphs, or abbreviations are all retained, and missing parts of the text are not reconstructed. Therefore, the diplomatic transcription is suited for textual analysis, interpretation, and investigating the text's genesis.⁵

In contrast to the diplomatic transcription, the reading text focuses on readability. While it still provides a reliable textual basis like the diplomatic transcription does, this version aims to present an easy-to-read view of the transcription that offers a quick point of reference. This is especially helpful when the document in question contains a lot of deletions and additions. In this view, the focus lies solely on the "basic text" in the author's hand — all other hands that might intervene in the manuscript (such as those of editors, recipients, or archivists) are omitted. Corrections, deletions and additions are tacitly integrated into the text, original line breaks are ignored, and abbreviations are written in full. Parts of the text that are missing but that the team was able to reconstruct with a high certainty are supplied in brackets. The text is also supplied with annotations, so as to address different editorial formats: on the one hand, these annotations reflect on the subtleties of the manuscript and the text; on the other, it offers details concerning the document's wider (and especially historical) context.

All six of these HTML views (and their downloadable PDF equivalents) are generated from the same TEI-XML file. Each TEI file contains the transcription of a single letter or manuscript, its markup and annotations, and its metadata. Additional information on various entities (persons, groups, places, and publications) are brought together in one TEI file per entity type, and connected to the text files via project-specific identification numbers. These TEI files are the basis for the metadata view, the listing of entities, and the indexation of entries. Each of these aspects are represented in the encoding of these elements.

All the different formats the project offers to visualize each text are also available to the reader for download and reuse under a CC-BY license. In addition, the reader has access to all of the project's relevant metadata, and to

⁵ Due to the time and funding constraints, the TEI encoding that was used in the project does not follow Critical Apparatus model (Consortium 2020a) — not even in the case of genetic phenomena. Instead, a project-specific encoding was developed that combines a light encoding of genetic phenomena in combination with named entities. A project-specific (not completely TEI-compatible) <hand> element that refers to person entities allowed the team to connect both encoding levels (genetic and entity-based). The complete project-specific TEI encoding guidelines in English can be found in Baillet and Meyer 2016.

the indexed entries: this includes information on senders and addressees (in the case of letters); the manuscript's origin, provenance, and current holding repository; the editors that were involved, etc.

Overall, this edition is not radically different from the major current digital scholarly editions. What may set it apart, though, is that it is not focused on a specific author or genre, but rather on a historical context. Its qualities lie mostly in the presentation of manuscripts that are chosen because they are relevant to specific research questions, and in the combination of a series of features (be they structural, or on the level of the interface) that address these questions. Developed with four target audiences in mind (i.e. the research group itself; a broader scholarly audience; the community at large; and algorithms designed to harvest open data), the edition shows the potential digital scholarly editions have for opening up their data — as well as what some of the limitations of such openness can be. Is it even possible to develop an edition that would be as usable by a knowledgeable scholar as it would be by a computer?

2. Editing for man or for machine?

In general, scholarly (print) editions are developed by scholars, for scholars. This is especially true in the German context in which the *Briefe und Texte* edition was developed. Both the format and the price of such editions make it almost impossible to reach a wider audience. Knowing that one's edition will be primarily (and most of the time, *exclusively*) used by scholars who consult them in libraries, editors tend to design their editorial practices according to their own needs and habits.

Digital scholarly editions, on the other hand, are quite different from most print editions in terms of their accessibility. While some editions are password-protected or hidden behind a paywall, many of them are available in Libre Open Access (Suber 2012). This means that virtually everyone is able to access and use the digital scholarly edition. It does not mean that these editions will automatically have a significantly wider audience, nor that they were even developed with such a wider audience in mind. It *does*, however, change the premise of these editions, in the sense that they may afford editors with the possibility and legitimation to address such a wider audience. But does the simple fact that the editions are available actually make them “accessible” to that wider audience?

It is in fact more difficult to define the expectations of a non-scholarly audience than those of a scholarly audience. Trying to reach a wider audience is a business for which scholars are not properly trained. And what is more: this type of work is often unproductive in terms of career benefits — at least in the German academic context. On the contrary, a higher complexity is usually worth more in terms of academic reputation and capital than a greater accessibility of the research results would be. Hence, the aspiration to address a reader other than the editor's peers remains mostly unsupported by the academic system in terms

of career evaluation, funding, and training.

Our decision to offer the user a reading version that is not presented as hierarchically inferior to any of the other versions represented a major shift for the research team. What especially mattered during the development of this digital edition was that we would make all six visualizations equally easy to reach as the digital image of the manuscript. This included our decision not to transcribe the text at the sign level (e.g. by leaving some glyphs unrepresented), but instead to give readers the freedom to establish the connection between the digital image and the transcription by themselves (as mentioned in the introduction above). The hermeneutical relevance of this decision is obvious when one realizes its implications. It means that each reader can bring their own reading habits to the table. In spite of these varying preconditions, each reader should still be able to make sense of the edition by themselves. This freedom is based on the assumption that the reader activates their own education and a critical thinking in the Kantian sense. In addition, this decision also has more political implications, since the documents that are displayed in the archives are not considered any less important or relevant than the transcriptions the editors (who are scholars) are presenting to the reader. This act of putting archival resources and scholarly interpretations on the same level is in itself already a statement. Finally, these decisions turned out to also have a direct influence on our choice of corpora, since not all archives would allow us to publish high quality digital images of their manuscripts in Libre Open Access.

These hermeneutical and, in a wider sense, political choices allowed us to present our edition as a tool that aims to enable readings of all sorts; to provide a structured space that empowers readers by giving them access to the text, and information to structure themselves. Of course, the reader is still directed, even in this setup — indeed, it would be delusional to think that it is possible to set up a “neutral” edition that allows for all possible readings. However, *Briefe und Texte* tries to offer its readers all the critical tools and elements they need to embark on an autonomous reading. The attempt to offer such an “enabling” edition (meaning: an edition that *enables* the reader to act as the designer of their own readings) is not new, but it does require us to take into account some specific aspects with regard to digital scholarly editions.

As editors we anticipate reading scenarios and use them as the basis for developing the edition’s design, drawing mental maps of pathways that can lead the reader to the text. Here, those might include options such as: searching for a specific author, integrating data for a metadata aggregator, presenting connections as a network of persons,⁶ etc. In the case of this edition, however, funding and time constraints limited our implementation of such reading paths. Taking the conditions in which the edition was produced into account, the result is overall satisfactory. But the edition is still not fully satisfactory when it comes to reader-friendliness. Our commitment to accommodate monitors of different

⁶ This has become the trademark of the Schlegel edition in the German-speaking area since *Briefe und Texte* was developed.

sizes and resolutions, for instance, required us to fix some elements (especially frames) in a way that lacks fluidity. This means that some frame elements appear too dominant on the vast majority of monitors. This problem could not be overcome in this funding period.

The most straight-forward approach that a reader can take to discovering the contents of the edition, namely by finding the homepage and navigating down the tree structure of data from there, is a key area where editors can work on building a rapport with their readers. How do you grab and retain the reader's interest to do so? In general, editors are still in dire need of a set of standards that would give the kind of direction the scholarly book tradition would provide them with. To start, there are still no established (meaning: widely recognized and actually used) names for the different types of digital scholarly editions that exist, and that could contextualize the edition when the reader reaches its homepage. Most editions usually give themselves a name from the point of view of their subject, rather than from that of their method. From the onset, this forms an impediment to establishing a clear reading path for the reader.

But even if editors assumed correctly what the reader's first reaction to the homepage of their edition would be, it remains impossible for them to anticipate exactly how the reader will move on from there in all possible circumstances. It was only after a few years of development and daily usage that the editorial team of *Briefe und Texte* realized how unsuitable the edition's design (with its columns and additional information) is for actually *reading* the text. It is uncomfortable to read text in HTML, and even more uncomfortable when additional information pops up around it. The idea to offer a PDF version alongside the six different HTML displays and the query interface emerged from the diagnosis that the online edition in itself was not an adequate document for extensive reading. After making this realization, the team made sure that the reader could download a PDF version for each individual document, or for a whole corpus. As such, the edition's new PDF generator became a useful way for making the edition more readable.

More could yet be learned about our audience's reading habits through an analysis of the edition's log-files (as organized by Anna-Maria Sichani 2016). Such an analysis can be undertaken to find out how people understand and interact with Open Access policies by investigating, for example, how many users actually use the "Download XML" option that *Briefe und Texte* offers, or how many XML files are downloaded per user during a certain time frame. This research was inspired by Peter Boot's seminal study of the log-files of the Van Gogh edition (Boot 2011). His study mostly confirms well-known reading attitudes: namely that simple queries are used much more often than advanced queries; that links play a major role in the way the reader accesses information; etc. It was not easy, however, to extrapolate useful information from Boot's analysis of the Van Gogh Letters, and translate it into the context of our *Briefe und Texte* edition. In his study, Peter Boot demonstrated for example that the first and last letters that are presented on a web page are those that are consulted

the most. Another major anchor point for the users in the case of the Van Gogh edition is to look for famous paintings. Based on these results, however the question remains how the findings can be used in an edition that does not revolve around a single author, or a single corpus — but that instead decidedly aims to deconstruct canonical approaches to the history of literature? The results of this analysis were certainly still useful, if only because of what it taught us about the possible expectations of the readers in general, and to answer questions such as: To what extent does the structural design of *Briefe und Texte* differ from that of other editions? Are there constants in the way readers approach editions, or does their approach strongly depend on the way the edition is designed, or even on the edited object? Is it possible to distinguish different reader types or reading patterns from one another, and if so, what can they tell us about the interest readers are giving to specific editions, or to editions in general? Although these questions may seem to deal solely with implementation issues, they are in fact representative of a major question regarding the relationship between the edited text and its reader, namely: Which role does the editor of a digital scholarly edition play in guiding the reader's interaction with the text? And how do we balance text with design?

At this point, it is important to reflect on the conceptualization of the relationship that is to be analysed here. "Reading" covers only part of the way text is accessed by the audience of a digital edition. In this case, the term "using" is in many ways more adequate to the multiplicity of approaches made possible by the digital media. Firstly, it can allow us to distinguish between linear reading (reading) and non-linear reading (navigating, for instance scrolling, as a relevant form of use). Secondly, it allows us to take design elements into account without necessarily contrasting them to textual elements. The following section will deploy a series of additional arguments for this approach to a (positive) understanding of the "use" of a digital scholarly edition.

3. Accessing the edition from outside the edition

In a digital scholarly edition such as *Briefe und Texte*, the reader's access to the text is enabled through different entry points (such as genres, authors, etc.), but also by the reader's queries (and their corresponding interfaces), and by the hyperlinks it establishes, both within the edition and outside of it. Each of these ways to access the text questions the concept of the "reader". Specifically in the case of correspondence editions, dedicated digital tools have also been developed to facilitate these different types of access to their text, and to offer readers a new level of user-friendliness.

The accessibility of the edition's data within *Briefe und Texte* — and the way it enables its *use* or *re-use* in terms of interoperability — is ensured by the implementation of authority files and standards such as: the Integrated Authority File (GND) for persons (Deutsche National Bibliothek 2016); GeoHack for places (MediaWiki 2020); XML and TEI for text encoding (Consortium 2020b);

ISO standards (ISO n.d.); and by making the edition's source code available in Open Access.⁷ In addition, it was also crucial to connect the edition with other repositories and editions, which we achieved in a first stage by implementing a GND BEACON (Wikipedia 2020). With this simple file format hosted by Wikipedia, it is possible to link content to one another based on their GND numbers. In the case of *Briefe und Texte*, we used this system to connect with historical agents. When a person appears in *Letters and Texts* (be it in edited texts, annotation, or metadata) that any other BEACON-using project records as well, the system will automatically provide a direct link to the respective page of this resource. In addition, the other way around, other resources using this technology will automatically be linked to our *Briefe und Texte* edition. The German National Library and many regional libraries, archives, biographical and bibliographical projects, and many others use the BEACON format. This makes it an easy way to connect the contents of digital resources with a wide range of scholarly web services.

Another way to access the information in *Briefe und Texte*, is at the document level. On this level, all the documents that are edited in *Briefe und Texte* are also listed in the national German database and national information system for collections of personal papers and handwritten manuscripts from German archives and institutions. This database is named *Kalliope* (<http://kalliope-verbund.info/de/index.html>), and points each of these documents to the corresponding permanent URL in *Briefe und Texte*. This allows a user to browse through the repository of their favourite small archive looking for a specific letter, and from there to be guided to its facsimile, transcription, and annotation in *Letters and Texts* directly from the aggregated metadata in *Kalliope*. In addition, the editorial metadata in *Briefe und Texte* also includes links to *Kalliope* in the other direction, thereby guaranteeing reciprocity in the way the information is connected. Here, the efforts of cultural heritage institutions to catalogue and index data are joined with those of the scholarly editing and research communities, in an attempt to venture beyond the archival connection between image and metadata, and instead to include also edited transcriptions that are accessible straight from the archival catalogue through hyperlinks.

Finally, more advanced forms of access have been developed specifically for letters and correspondence since the start of our work on the *Briefe und Texte* edition. Letters offer particularly interesting opportunities for interconnecting textual data via the digital medium. One of the developers of *Briefe und Texte*, Sabine Seifert, is an active member of the TEI Special Interest Group Correspondence (SIG Correspondence). This group worked especially on correspondence-specific metadata within the TEI's `<teiHeader>` element working to generate more interoperable data, and to open TEI-encoded correspondences up to new,

⁷ The edition is licenced under a CC-BY 3.0 license for the editorial work. Each of the Cultural Heritage Institution that allowed us to reproduce scans of manuscripts specified their re-use conditions, which are mentioned below the relevant image.

automated uses.⁸

With regard to encoding correspondence metadata, the SIG Correspondence proposed a new element called `<correspDesc>` (correspondence description) that contains core correspondence-specific information that is mentioned on letters or any other piece of correspondence. A more restricted form of the `<correspDesc>` element called the Correspondence Metadata Interchange (CMI) format was then developed to serve as the basis for even more standardized metadata exchange. To maximize its interoperability, CMI relies on authority files and standard formats so that it can still meet with the naturally diverse encoding methods of various letter-based editions and projects. The web service *CorrespSearch* harvests metadata of letters that are based on the CMI format and makes the correspondence-specific metadata of different German-language correspondence editions searchable with a single query (Dumont 2020; see also Dumont 2018). For an edition like *Briefe und Texte*, using the CMI framework and being integrated to the *CorrespSearch* platform provided us with an additional entry point at the document and author levels for each letter that is external to the edition itself. This represents one more way to attend and address different methods the user may employ to access the text and its context (metadata, annotation). In addition, it also offers the edition a way of making its contents available to computers, as the edition's standardized metadata become machine-readable. This is especially relevant in the case where integrating the *GND Beacon*, *Kalliope*, and *CorrespSearch* serves as a connection between different digital resources. It is easier to implement such connections on the level of metadata, as it is easier to standardize this type of data than it is to standardize text annotation. In return, these metadata then offer the user access to much deeper information in the form of the fully edited and annotated digital edition.

To conclude, we found that the best way to address the plurality of users is to break the edition down into different levels of granularity and units of text conceived as data and metadata, so as to present the user with a door into the editorial design of each of these levels that users with different interests are likely to open — be they archivists, scholars, avid letter readers, or even computers. The primary architecture designed for the *Briefe und Texte* edition answers a specific set of research questions. But it also leaves room — even taking its limited funding and time into account — for offering additional forms of access to users. So while there is one primary way of reading the text, the edition offers many alternative ways for the user to access it. As such, the *Briefe und Texte* edition offers an experimental step in the process of opening up our editions in a way that helps us to conceive of digital scholarly editions that move beyond the boundaries what print editions have to offer.

Anticipating multiple usability scenarios and implementing them in a digital edition offers us multiple ways to access the text. Of course, not even the edition presented here could perfectly anticipate all user requests, but at least it may

⁸ For the proposal on GitHub, see SIG 2019; in the TEI guidelines, see Consortium n.d.. See also Stadler et al. 2016.

provide users with the necessary information to access the information they need by themselves. As such, the edition gives users something that a print version cannot, namely a user-generated and user-specific presentation of its materials. The resilience of an edition will always depend on how comprehensible its research results are — mainly in terms of the quality of its scans and the transparency of the editorial decisions that were made, but also by providing detailed links embedding the edition in a reliable scientific context. In a digital edition, any editorial uncertainties in the wording and syntactic or genetic classification of the edited material are immediately apparent. While this enables the user to make their own independent decisions while reading the edition, it also transfers a certain level of philological responsibility to the user. This democratization of the edition, facilitated by the digital medium, frees the edition from the ivory tower of philology, where it was allowed to blossom into its most specialized form for so long. Now, it is up to our users to exploit the new possibilities these digital scholarly editions have to offer.

Bibliography

- BAILLOT, ANNE, 2010a. "Berliner Intellektuelle: Editorische Richtlinien." Available from: <https://www.berliner-intellektuelle.eu/about?de> (Accessed: 2020-07-28).
- , 2010b. *Briefe und Texte aus dem intellektuellen Berlin um 1800*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Available from: <https://www.berliner-intellektuelle.eu/> (Accessed: 2020-03-20).
- , n.d. "Emmy Noether- Projekt / Projekt Emmy Noether 'Berliner Intellektuelle 1800–1830' — Page professionnelle." Available from: <http://www.anne-baillot.eu/home-deutsch/forschung-de/intellektuellen> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- BAILLOT, ANNE and ANNA BUSCH, 2014. "'Berliner Intellektuelle um 1800' als Programm. Über Potential und Grenzen digitalen Edierens." Available from: https://literaturkritik.de/public/rezension.php?rez_id=19678 (Accessed: 2020-03-20).
- BAILLOT, ANNE, ANNA BUSCH, SELMA JAHNKE, and SABINE SEIFERT, n.d. "Berliner Intellektuelle 1800–1830 — Institut für deutsche Literatur." Available from: <https://www.literatur.hu-berlin.de/de/berliner-intellektuelle-1800-1830> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- BAILLOT, ANNE and ALEXANDER MEYER, February 2016. "Edition-specific TEI encoding guidelines. Nachwuchsgruppe Berliner Intellektuelle 1800–1830 Digital Edition group." Available from: <https://www.berliner-intellektuelle.eu/encoding-guidelines.pdf> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).

- BOOT, PETER, January 2011. "Reading Van Gogh online?" *Ariadne* (66). Available from: <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue66/boot/> (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- CONSORTIUM, THE TEI, February 2020a. "Critical Apparatus." Available from: <https://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/TC.html> (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- , 2020b. *TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange*. Text Encoding Initiative Consortium. Available from: <https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/Guidelines.pdf> (Accessed: 2020–06–24).
- , n.d. "TEI element correspDesc (correspondence description)." Available from: <https://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/ref-correspDesc.html> (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- DEUTSCHE NATIONAL BIBLIOTHEK, November 2016. "The Integrated Authority File (GND)." Available from: https://www.dnb.de/EN/Professionell/Standardisierung/GND/gnd_node.html (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- DFG, November 2015. "Informationen für Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftler/innen. Förderkriterien für wissenschaftliche Editionen in der Literaturwissenschaft." Available from: https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/grundlagen_dfg_foerderung/informationen_fachwissenschaften/geisteswissenschaften/foerderkriterien_editionen_literaturwissenschaft.pdf (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- DUMONT, STEFAN, 2018. "correspSearch — Connecting Scholarly Editions of Letters." *Journal of the Text Encoding Initiative* (10). doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/jtei.1742>.
- , 2020. "correspSearch — Search scholarly editions of letters." Available from: <https://correspsearch.net/index.xql> (Accessed: 2020–07–28).
- FRANZINI, GRETA, 2016. "Catalogue of Digital Editions." Available from: https://github.com/gfranzini/digEds_cat (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- GHELARDI, MAURIZIO, ed., 2019. *Burckhardtsource*. Available from: <https://burckhardtsource.org/> (Accessed: 2020–03–23).
- VAN GOGH, VINCENT, 2009. *Vincent van Gogh – The Letters*, edited by Leo Jansen, Hans Luijten, and Nienke Bakker. Amsterdam & The Hague: Van Gogh Museum & Huygens ING. Available from: <http://vangoghletters.org> (Accessed: 2020–03–23).

- GRAFTON, ANTHONY, 2012. *La page de l'Antiquité à l'ère du numérique*. Paris: Hazan.
- ISO, n.d. "Standards." Available from:
<https://www.iso.org/standards.html> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- JUNG, JOSEPH, ed., 2015. *Digitale Briefedition Alfred Escher*. Zürich: Alfred Escher-Stiftung. Available from:
<https://briefedition.alfred-escher.ch/> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- MEDIAWIKI, 2020. "GeoHack." Available from:
<https://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/GeoHack> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- SAHLE, PATRICK, 2008. "A Catalog of Digital Scholarly Editions." Available from:
<https://www.digitale-edition.de> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- SCHLEGEL, AUGUST WILHELM, 2014. *August Wilhelm Schlegel: Digitale Edition der Korrespondenz*, edited by Jochen Strobel and Claudia Bamberg. Dresden, Marburg & Trier. Available from: <https://august-wilhelm-schlegel.de> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- SICHANI, ANNA-MARIA, March 2016. "Beyond Open Access: (Re)use, Impact and the Ethos of Openness in Digital Editing." Available from: https://dixit.uni-koeln.de/wp-content/uploads/Sichani_Beyond-Open-Access.pdf (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- SIG, TEI CORRESPONDENCE, April 2019. "correspDesc." Available from:
<https://github.com/TEI-Correspondence-SIG/correspDesc> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- STADLER, PETER, MARCEL ILLETSCHKO, and SABINE SEIFERT, 2016. "Towards a Model for Encoding Correspondence in the TEI: Developing and Implementing <correspDesc>." *Journal of the Text Encoding Initiative* (9).
doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/jtei.1433>.
- SUBER, PETER, 2012. *Open Access*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- VON WEBER, CARL MARIA, 2017. *Carl-Maria-von-Weber-Gesamtausgabe. Digitale Edition*, edited by Gerhard Allroggen. Available from:
<https://weber-gesamtausgabe.de/A070002> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).
- WIKIPEDIA, 2020. "Wikipedia:BEACON." Available from:
<https://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:BEACON&oldid=202294152> (Accessed: 2020-03-23).

Work in Progress

Restricted Translation of Historical Dutch Text

Hugo Maat

Abstract: This article proposes an experimental approach to the diachronic translation of document sources written in historical variants of the Dutch language. It argues that, in order to make textual sources more accessible to read for modern audiences, it is possible to alter grammatical aspects of the text while preserving the lexical aspects of the historical language variant. Because of this restricted translation, this approach is less time consuming compared to a total translation. The article also describes a method for producing such texts, illustrated with examples taken from the sixteenth-century correspondence of William of Orange.

1. Statement of Purpose

This article presents and explains a novel approach to increase the accessibility of textual sources written in historical variants of the Dutch language. This approach was developed as part of a source edition project at the Huygens Institute for Dutch History (Huygens ING) in Amsterdam, in December 2019.¹ The initial purpose was to develop a translation method for lay-oriented versions of historical source texts, specifically concerning the Dutch-language correspondence of William of Orange (1533–1584). Because of the large size of the text corpus, the project looked for an efficient method that would not require too much labour. A well-crafted translation in modern, legible Dutch, of a letter from the corpus in question, could take a translator as much as a full day to produce. The method discussed here, in first estimates, could process a thousand words in forty minutes, by instead rendering a “restricted translation”, only targeting specific aspects of the historical language for the translation. The goal became to produce a text with increased legibility rather than a “total translation” (a translation whereby every aspect of the language in the source text is changed in the translated text), and thereby increase the accessibility of historical text. It requires manual translation, because automated translation would first require training data.

The following example is a transcript from a letter written in 1581 to the Prince of Orange and his council by the *Landraad Beoosten Maas*, one of the

¹ The author worked as a research assistant for E. Dijkhof at the Huygens Institute in Amsterdam from October to December 2019. The project in question, to produce a new digital edition for the correspondence of William of Orange, was in early stages of development. The article was written for a research project for the department of Digital Infrastructure for the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

wartime provisional governing bodies in the Netherlands. The example includes the opening formula to illustrate that the letter contains only commas by way of punctuation. This remains true for the text from beginning to end, and is standard fare for this corpus of documentary sources.

Doerluchtige hoochgeboren furst genadige heer, ende Edele, Erentfeste, hoochgeleerde, wijse seer voorsienige heerene

Wij houden Uwe Furstliche Genade ende Edelen genaede Indachtich vandie deliberatien hier beuorens bij den Staten generall dick ende menichmall gehouden, op het toelaten ofte geheelick verbieden vanden trafficque, commercie ofte toeganck opdie Prouincien ende Steden, die bij onse vianden sijn geoccupeert, welcke deliberatien genoechsam Indien state gebleuen sijn dat geraden waere intselue geheelick mede op grote poenen te verbieden, doch Indien verstande, dat sulx van wegen dien van Franckrijck oick aenpaarlick soude hebben te geschieden Nu Ist sulx dat vermits eenige occurrentien die ons dienthaluen sijn voer gecomen ten aensiene vande Stede van Groeningenn shertogenbosch ende Breda, wesende binnen landtsche Steden ende denwelcken alle toeganck lichtelicker dan van andere souden mogen beleth worden, [...]

(ARAB: Audiëntie 554, f. 179 r-180 v.)

The translation method alters the sentence structure and syntax while leaving most idiomatic elements of the text intact, rendering a version of the text that is not recognizable as present-day Dutch but considerably easier to interpret, in the sense that it requires less effort on the part of the reader.

[...]

Wij houden Uwe Furstliche Genade ende Edelen genaede Indachtich vandie deliberatien, hier beuorens bij den Staten generall dick ende menichmall gehouden, op het toelaten ofte geheelick verbieden vanden trafficque, commercie ofte toeganck opdie Prouincien ende Steden, die bij onse vianden geoccupeert sijn.

Welcke deliberatien sijn genoechsam gebleuen Indien state, dat geraden waere intselue geheelick mede op grote poenen te verbieden, doch Indien verstande, dat sulx van wegen dien van Franckrijck oick aenpaarlick te geschieden soude hebben.

Nu Ist sulx: Eenige occurrentien sijn ons dienthaluen voer gecomen, ten aensiene vande Stede van Groeningenn shertogenbosch ende Breda, wesende binnen landtsche Steden, ende denwelcken alle toeganck lichtelicker dan van andere souden mogen worden beleth.

The initial project intended to produce a translation of the historical textual sources that was accessible to an audience of lay readers, for instance for educational purposes. The proposed method, which was developed as a spin-off, is primarily directed towards making historical texts more legible for scholars and researchers. This restricted translation specifically targets textual structure and grammar in historical language text. These are considered the main challenges because they prevent readers from employing reading strategies based on text

structure, and because reference material is more suitable for resolving lexical elements of the text. A modern reader can relatively easily find the meaning of individual words through online resources such as the *Historische Woordenboeken* (Historical Dictionaries) on the website of the Institute for the Dutch Language (INT). The *Historische Woordenboeken* is an online dictionary that incorporates several historical Dutch dictionaries, accounts for variant spelling, and groups search results by time period.²

The key idea behind this approach to translating historical text is that there is an imaginary “tipping point” for the degree to which a translator alters a text in the process of translation. In a total translation, the text is altered on every level. With the translation of historical text to a rendition in modern language, that covers spelling, vocabulary, grammar, structure and punctuation, and idiomatic elements. The tipping point as part of that design denoted the point at which the translation method would cover so many aspects that there would be no significant difference with a total translation in regard to effort required. A not-insignificant motivation for the development of and research into such a translation method is an interest in cost-effective solutions. Translations, after all, require human labour, and a translation of historical text requires specific additional skills. The question addressed in this article is whether it is possible to improve accessibility of a historical text through restricted translation, and what such a translation method would entail.

This article prefaces the explanation of the translation method with a discussion of intralingual translation, both manual and automatic, and the linguistic concepts used in the design. Intralingual translation is a relatively overlooked topic within translation studies, and textual scholarship tends not to incorporate these disciplines. Editions of historical texts are published in modern language translations, but I have not been able to find theoretical discussions or linguistic analyses of these practices. There are discussions about whether or not such translations are possible or allowed, and discussions about dealing with stylistic textual characteristics, but there is a lack of comprehensive theory for *how* a diachronic translation is produced within textual scholarship. The theoretical basis is therefore the research into intralingual translation practice by Aage Hill-Madsen and automated machine translations, most of which were developed for modern languages. The proposed method in this article is divided into three parts, which are: *parsing* (dividing the original text into component clauses), *clausal shift* (changing clause ranks to create shorter sentences), and *modal shift* (resolving certain forms of grammar specific to historical Dutch). The steps in the method are illustrated with examples from historical Dutch source texts from the William of Orange project.

² See <https://ivdnt.org/onderzoek-a-onderwijs/lexicologie-a-lexicografie/historische-woordenboeken>, last accessed at August 7, 2020.

2. State of the art

2.1. The discussion of intralingual translation in Dutch literary studies

The idea, though not the exact term, of intralingual translation has been a topic for debate amongst literary scholars in the Netherlands. The discussion pertains specifically to modernizing editions and translations of works considered to be part of Dutch literary heritage. From time to time, modernizing translations of Dutch literary works have drawn the ire of literary scholars.³ More often than not, the attitude of literary scholars is cautious or negative towards this practice. An interlingual translation or *hertaling* would after all alter the rhythm and tempo of a text, and because words are embedded in semantic fields it is rarely possible to find perfect equivalents for expressions or lexical words that have gone “out of date”. A historical text remains a historical text in translation because of the customs and mentalities present in the text, which are themselves historical. At times, modern language conflicts with this. One such Dutch critic of translation practices, Marita Mathijssen, advocated that a *hertaling* should provide footnotes for words that lack true equivalents in modern language rather than translating them, and that the norms and structures of the original textual style should be maintained. She described this approach as “bending the knee to a lazy reading public” but also the only way to save historical literature in the Netherlands (Mathijssen 2003, 129). This attitude was met with criticism from other scholars who felt that this did not describe a *hertaling*, but a critical edition of a historical text (van Strien and Koppenol 2004, 247–57).

The approach to translation as presented in this method is not very suitable for literary texts. A literary translation has to account for stylistic elements; it treats both the source text and target text as works of art. By contrast, the method proposed here is concerned with the accessibility of the contents of the text, treating certain stylistic elements as obstructions. Take, for example, the rhythm of the text. A common element in many historical texts, when compared to a modern writing style, is the length of the sentences. In some cases, a 16th century sentence can be the length of a paragraph, or even fill a page. When creating a literary translation, the translator should take into account whether this serves a stylistic function and might even consider authorial intent. This is not meant to say that a literary translator could never edit the structure of the text, because they might and this might be justified. The point here is not to define and prescribe a translation method for literature, but to note the complexity or even impossibility to create hard and fast rules for editing such texts. The proposed method, however, *is* meant as a limited set of hard and fast rules for textual editing. The source text will not be respected as an aesthetic object, and the method should be applied accordingly.

³ See Jansen 2007; Kuipers and Smeets 1996; van Oostendorp 2013. A non-Dutch discussion on a similar topic can be found in Taylor et al. 1996.

2.2. Estimating readability

There are no objective parameters to determine the accessibility or readability of a particular text. Research into textual comprehension in combination with language acquisition or education suggests there are several relevant factors at work, such as complexity and length of individual words, the use of anaphores (a word referring back to a word used earlier in a text to avoid repetition), and the length of sentences (Benjamin 2012, 64). Several of these factors are common-sense observations. There are other, more complex notions, such as intertextual cohesion, whereby the readability of any particular text is connected to the reader's access or familiarity with texts that are semantically similar. Studies suggest that the subjective, individual variation between readers and their assessment of the readability of a particular text. It is also important to incorporate the target audience as a factor into the assessment of readability. The efficacy of formulas used to estimate the readability for any particular text is contested, though quantitative analysis methods are promising (Benjamin 2012, 78). The application of such methods is however difficult for the subject at hand, as they can only measure relative accessibility of a text. "Will a proposed method produce a text that is more readable than the source text?" is not the relevant question; "Is the translated text (sufficiently) readable?" is.

2.3. Automated Text Simplification and Statistical Machine Translation

In recent years there have been promising research projects on diachronic translation through quantitative methods. Several of these specifically used the Dutch language and its historical variants for developing Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) tools for "modernizing" translations (Tjong Kim Sang et al. 2017, 55; Domingo et al. 2017, 299). The reason for this is that there exists a significant corpus of the same texts in different historical variants of the Dutch language, made available through the CLIN27 project for translating historical text. The texts used for these studies were Bible translations from different time periods and Dutch literary classics from the 17th century, which had counterparts in modern Dutch translations. The existence of such a corpus allowed for automated methods to be trained and refined, by having human and machine translators work together.

The projects that develop tools for automated diachronic translation produce clear advantages for translators. The results suggest that this method is quite successful at resolving the spelling variants of historical language variants for individual words and recognizing the words which were no longer part of the modern lexicon (Domingo et al. 2017, 303). The shared tests of the CLIN27 project have however not succeeded in approaching the quality of human translation or of gold standard translation methods in other fields, going by the error margins. Semantic shift over time is also still a challenge quantitative methods cannot yet sufficiently solve (Tjong Kim Sang et al. 2017, 60). Additionally, it

should be noted that these studies were performed with favourable conditions, because of the corpus of historical documents and modern translations thereof. This is usually not possible with historical documents. Finally it is important to recognize the difference between correspondence, for which the proposed method was developed, and texts such as the Bible or literary works, most notably the difference in textual structure. It is unclear whether the techniques developed in the mentioned studies would be applicable, though the research into automated diachronic translation is ongoing.

There has been research into Automated Text Simplification (ATS) on a syntactic level for modern languages, which rely on shortening sentences and resolving complex grammatical structures. The syntactic approach to ATS (lexical and hybrid approaches for text simplification exist as well) has much in common with the proposed translation method for historical text. However, these ATS applications were developed for second language readers or readers with aphasia, and each application is language specific. (Modern) Dutch was in fact one of the early languages for which ATS applications were developed (Shardlow 2014, 63). As with the above examples of SMT, this approach would require annotated corpora of text to train a system, in order to automatically generate rules. In order to take advantage of the progress in automated translation, any diachronic translation will have to invest manual labour.

2.4. Lay-oriented INTRA

Despite being explicitly oriented towards the translation of historical texts, the proposed method does not use a specifically diachronic type of intralingual translation as a foundation. The diastatic or lay-oriented approach is used as the base concept instead. There is definitely a diachronic aspect to the translation method, but the intention and purpose of the target text are those of a diastatic translation. The primary goal of a diachronic translation is to create a text that is contemporary with its audience in the sense of language. The method proposed in this article is not meant to make texts read as if they were modern texts, but to make the source texts more accessible for readers.

A notable advantage of intralingual translation in specific and the linguistic approach to translation in general is the availability of terminology. In order to discuss and develop ways to translate texts it is vital to have a language system that describes this activity. The concepts and terminology used to create this method is that of Aage Hill-Madsen's 2014 dissertation *Derivation and Transformation*, which offers a descriptive linguistic study of translation practice in the language used in the field of commercial pharmaceuticals. Hill-Madsen's study produced a typology of "shifts", the various microstrategies that translators can employ (Hill-Madsen 2014, 134; see also Baker and Saldanha 2009, 269).

To Hill-Madsen's knowledge (and mine) no similar research exists for diachronic intralingual translations. He attributes this to the lack of academic interest in the field of intralingual translation. An additional problem is the lack of data to use for research. It was possible for his study to build a corpus for the

study of lay-oriented translation, because it was being done on a large scale with specific parameters for each individual text. In order to research translation strategies for diachronic translation one would need a corpus of source texts and target texts. Danish translation scholar Karen Zethsen, who incidentally was the supervisor of Hill-Madsen, made a cursory attempt in 2009 on a small scale using several generations of new Bible translations, similar to the CLIN27 project (Zethsen 2009, 797). This was a qualitative study, by far not as broad or thorough as Hill-Madsen's dissertation, meant to provide an example of the kind of research that could be done on intralingual translation.

3. Definitions and concepts

3.1. Types of translation

Within the field of translation studies, the type of translation that this method is designed to create is considered a *diachronic intralingual translation*. This means that it is a translation from a source text (ST) written in one variant of a language to a target text (TT) written in another variant of the same language, and the source language is a historical variant. The distinction between interlingual and intralingual translations is in certain cases open for debate, as the difference between two historical variants of the same language can sometimes be as great as the difference between two different contemporary languages.

In addition it is necessary to make a distinction between what is known as a *total translation* and a *restricted translation*.⁴ In the case of a total translation, the target text is rendered completely in the target language, affecting orthography, which words are used, and the grammar. A targeted or restricted translation only affects a specific level (or multiple specific levels) of language in the source text (Catford 1965, 22). The translation may focus on [X], but leave [Y] intact. For the purpose of this paper, the proposed method for improving the accessibility of the language of historical text will be treated as a restricted intralingual translation.

The concept of intralingual translation was described by Roman Jakobson in his 1959 essay "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". In his essay, Jakobson distinguished three types of translation: he defined intralingual translation as translation to another variant of the same language; interlingual translation as translation to another distinct language; and intersemiotic translation as translation to a different medium (Jakobson 1959, 233–34). The focus here lies on the first category. Since Jakobson there have been a number of subcategories added to intralingual translation. The term dialectical translation is used to denote the process of rendering a text in a different dialect, for instance translating

⁴ The distinction between "total translation" and "restricted translation" is not to be confused with that between a "partial translation" and a "full translation". A partial translation denotes a translation of a fragment of the source text, while a full translation denotes the translation of the source text in its entirety.

from British to American English. Diachronic translation is used for translation between historical variants, though this virtually always means changing the language of the text to the modern variation of that language, while the inverse is generally nonexistent. Interlingual translations of historical texts are usually diachronic. This has led to peculiar situations wherein a historical text has become more accessible in translation, even to native speakers of the language of the original text (Hill-Madsen 2014, 71). Diastratic translation (also sometimes called “paraphrase”) describes the process by which a text is changed from expert-oriented to lay-oriented or vice versa.

Compared to interlingual translation, intralingual translation has been less examined by academia and held in less regard. This began already with Jakobson, who also described interlingual translation as “translation proper” in his seminal essay. Criticism has been leveled at the distinction of these two kinds of translation. For one, the matter of whether two languages are truly distinct or that one is a dialect of the other is arbitrary and can be a contentious subject. When it comes to diachronic translation, a case can be made that some historical variants of a language can be less accessible to a modern user of that language than contemporary versions of other languages. The difference in accessibility between *Althochdeutsch* and contemporary German is at least as great as the differences between modern Danish, Swedish and Norwegian (Schreiber 1993, 25–27). Furthermore, the distinction between intralingual and interlingual is far less relevant to automated machine translations, which treat a language variant no different than the languages that are considered to be languages in their own right, simply as sets of data (Shardlow 2014, 64).

3.2. Intralingual translation outside of TS

The process of rewriting a text to another variant of the same language, specifically for the accessibility of older texts for a contemporary audience, is known by several names depending on field of expertise or language. Within Dutch literary studies it is referred to as “*hertaling*”, a portmanteau of “*vertaling*” (translation) and the prefix “*her-*” (comparable to the English “*re-*” in the sense of “*anew*”). This term does not translate easily. The same phenomenon has several terms in neighbouring language areas. In French, such as in the digital archives of the Sorbonne, the term *actualiser* is used, which has quite a broad meaning. *Traduit en français moderne* is also common. German terms include *Aktualisierung* and *Umformulierung*, of which the former is also used to denote a digital “update” and the latter means as much as “rewording”. In the English language, this type of textual alteration is sometimes called rewording or “modernizing”. In translation science textbooks some of these terms are used to describe intralingual translation or to provide alternative terms for it. There is a great deal of ambiguity, as each of these words have other meanings, which furthermore tend to be the meanings far more commonly used. When the concept “intralingual translation” is used, or its counterparts in the other languages mentioned, which are easily recognizable (*intralinguale Übersetzung*, *intralinguale vertaling*,

or *traduction intralinguale*) it is virtually always within the field of translation science. Exceptions exist, as with the French medievalist and literary historian Michel Zink, who pioneered research into translations of historical variants of French language texts as well as into the medieval practice of similar types of translation (Galderisi and Vincensini 2015, 16).

Another reason to employ terminology derived from translation studies and linguistics is that it enables precise and detailed description of what actually happens in the course of the translation act. In other words, it provided the tools to develop and describe a method. It is important to note that scholars in the fields of translation science and intralingual translation generally work descriptively, rather than prescriptively. The studies used as reference material in the development of the proposed translation method were not written as instruction manuals for translators. Indeed, the reason why the proposed method was developed in the first place is because there is no instruction manual available for the type of textual alteration intended for the Correspondence of William of Orange-project. In some fields, the work of the translator is almost treated as if it were a type of black box, due to its inherently hermeneutic and subjective character. This does not mean that these types of translations are not made, because they are, in different language areas. There is as of yet, however, very little academic attention for this phenomenon. Furthermore, translations of older literary texts are at times carried out by commercial publishers who may not share considerations or practices with academic or scholarly translators. This practice varies in different parts of the world (Berk Albachten 571, 577).

3.3. Structural, grammatical and lexical

A restricted translation as proposed here presupposes that we can distinguish grammatical aspects from lexical ones in the ST. This distinction is made for pragmatic reasons and is arbitrary to a degree when it comes to translating a text. The lexical function or meaning of a word or morpheme can vary depending on the grammatical order of the sentence. These aspects of the text are intertwined in natural language. In the strictest sense, the process of translation cannot affect only the one element and not the other. As such, this method is designed to operate on the level of the grammar of the ST while leaving the lexical elements unchanged, while not assuming that such a distinction can be fully maintained in the translation act. When the adjustments on the grammatical level cause changes on the level of individual words present in the ST, this is acceptable provided that it does not reduce internal consistency of the resulting translation.

Grammar consists of syntax and morphology. The syntax determines which combinations of words form a sentence, while morphology determines how words are formed, and how they function. Within the translation method, the *clausal shift* is a translation strategy concerning syntax, while the *modal shift* concerns morphology. In addition, the *clausal shift* affects punctuation, which is not a grammatical aspect of the text but rather a structural one, operating on a level above the sentence. This is a necessary part of this method of translation

because the historical language variant follows a different logic for the formation and visual representation of sentence structure.

3.4. Shifts

A “shift” in Translation Studies is a change that occurs in a text because of translation. The distinction of shift types in *Derivation and Transformation* serves to create the most granular descriptions of individual types of changes translators make. Hill-Madsen advises as such that the shifts themselves or that level of analysis should not be used for didactic or prescriptive purposes, only for analytical purposes. Hill-Madsen groups the numerous shifts distinguished in the course of his research by two different systems: “species” by frequency and “genera” by function. The genera are then ordered in a cline of “lay-orientedness”. These are *structural reorganization*, *ideational variation*, *clarification*, *concretization*, *de-compacting*, *neutralization* and *personalization* (Hill-Madsen 2014, 262–69).

Conceived as such, these *shifts* each represent a specific microstrategy for translators, used to describe the various small-grained actions as part of a translation act. In this context, the two shifts of this method are used in a prescriptive rather than a descriptive sense, and cover several different textual adjustments. In a descriptive analysis of translation strategies, a shift indicates the smallest and most granular component of a translator’s actions (Hill-Madsen 2014, 3–12). This applies to the prescriptive approach to translation as well, i.e. this method and instructional documents, but the two shifts of this method each have a potential ripple effect. Because of the interconnected nature of aspects of language, altering one aspect for a translation may necessitate further changes to the text. With the *clausal shift*, for instance, changing the class of a clause within a sentence structure may be linked to a change in word order or the inference of a subject. These changes can be described as shifts in their own right, but since they are the result of the initial *clausal* or *modal* shift they are not distinguished as parts of the method in their own right.

4. The translation method

The proposed translation method consists of three steps. The following section provides a summary of the method. The first step is *parsing*, in which the text is broken up into clauses, treating the verb as a point of orientation. The second step is *clausal shift*, in which new (shorter) sentences are formed by changing some of the subordinate clauses into main clauses, adding or altering punctuation to create a visible new structure. The third step is *modal shift*, in which specific conjugations, indicative of historical variants of Dutch, are normalized to their equivalents in modern common use.

The examples used in the following section are drawn from the correspondence of William of Orange. The corpus contains incoming and outgoing letters, and the Dutch language documents within it mostly concern matters of diplo-

macy, law, and warfare (Hoekstra 2007, 117). The texts have been converted from handwritten sources by myself, through the transcription software of Transkribus.⁵ Because of this, the source text has not been normalized in spelling, though the abbreviations in the original text have been resolved. While it is not required for the transcription to be normalized, it is helpful if abbreviations have been resolved as part of the transcription process, as the translation method does not incorporate this element.⁶

4.1. First step: Parsing

The proposed method restructures the ST on the level of clauses, which requires the translator to first identify and distinguish the clauses in the text. In the context of this translation method, this step is called “parsing”. Both historical texts and source language variants contain inconsistent use of punctuation, and certain verb modes that differ from modern Dutch. Because of this, the parsing has to be done manually, at least until sufficient training data is available to develop automated solutions. The translator uses the verb or verb groups to determine the boundaries of each clause. No distinction is to be made between main clauses and subordinate clauses as part of this operation.

4.2. Parsing example

Returning to the excerpt from the introduction, this example shows the transition from the ST to a set of clauses. The source document (a manuscript letter) is only structured in lines of text, with no recognizable start or end of sentences or clauses.

Doerluchtige hoochgeboren furst genadige heer, ende Edele, Erentfeste,
hoochgeleerde, wijze seer voorsienige heere
Wij houden Uwe Furstliche Genade ende Edelen genaede Indachtich
vandie deliberatien hier beuorens bij den Staten generall dick ende menich-
mall gehouden, op het toelaten ofte geheelick verbieden vanden trafficque,
commerce ofte toeganck opdie Prouincien ende Steden, die bij onse
vianden sijn geoccupeert, welcke deliberatien genoechsam Indien state
gebleuen sijn dat geraden waere intselue geheelick mede op grote poenen
te verbieden, doch Indien verstande, dat sulx van wegen dien van Franck-
rijk oick aenpaarlick soude hebben te geschieden Nu Ist sulx dat vermits
eenige occurrentien die ons dienthaluen sijn voer gecomen ten aensiene
vande Stede van Groeningenn shertogenbosch ende Breda, wesende bin-
nen landtsche Steden ende denwelcken alle toeganck lichtelicker dan van
andere soudon mogen belet worden, [...]

(ARAB: Audiëntie 554, f. 179 r-180 v.)

⁵ See <https://transkribus.eu> (accessed on August 7, 2020).

⁶ The William of Orange project at the Huygens Institute uses the transcription software Transkribus, which offers transcribers options to annotate and resolve abbreviations.

Note that the capitalization of words appears to be inconsistent. This is partially because of the transcription process, as there are multiple variations for the same grapheme in a manuscript, which cannot be consistently translated into the binary of upper and lower case. In the parsed version of this excerpt below, the verb groups have been underlined. Note that the line breaks made here do not always coincide with the ST commas.

Doerluchtige hoochgeboren furst genadige heer, ende Edele, Erentfeste,
 hoochgeleerde, wijse seer voorsienige heerene
 /Wij houden Uwe Furstliche Genade ende Edelen genaede Indachtich
 vandie deliberation
 /hier beuorens bij den Staten generall dick ende menichmall gehouden,
 op het *toelaten* offte geheelick *verbieden* vanden trafficque, commercie offte
 toeganck opdie Prouincien ende Steden,
 /die bij onse vianden sijn geoccupeert,
 /welcke deliberation genoechsam Indien state gebleuen sijn
 /dat geraden waere
 /intselue geheelick mede op grote poenen te verbinden,
 /doch Indien verstande, dat sulx van wegen dien van Franckrijck oick
 aenpaarlick soude hebben te geschieden
 /Nu Ist sulx
 /dat vermits eenige occurrentien die ons dienthaluen sijn voer gecomen
 ten aensiene vande Stede van Groeningenn shertogenbosch ende Breda,
 /wesende binnen landtsche Steden
 /ende denwelcken alle toeganck lichtelicker dan van andere
 souden mogen beleth worden, [...]

There are only two main clauses in this ST excerpt. The first starts right after the address, with the SVO structure of “Wij houden Uwe [etc.]”, the second being “Nu Ist sulx”, which would mean as much as “The situation now is:”, which is followed by subclauses. The parsing follows the verbs in the text, as mentioned. There are additional verbs within the third line, set in cursive. These are gerunds or infinitives functioning as nouns. They are not part of the verb group, and therefore not taken into account for the parsing process. On the whole, this step requires only little editing judgement. There is a word group without a verb, “doch Indien verstande”, which could stand on its own (assuming an unwritten but implied verb) or be included in the preceding or following part. Because many clauses are reconnected later on in the translation process, there is no need to be overly cautious with the few uncertain cases.

4.3. Second step: Clausal shift

This part of the translation is based on the shift in clause ranking. The objective of the first two steps in the translation method is for the TT to consist of shorter sentences than the ST. In order to achieve that, the ratio of subordinate clauses to main clauses needs to be changed in favour of main clauses. This means that a number of existing subordinate clauses become main clauses, and that

these are combined with remaining subordinate clauses to form sentences. The sequence of clauses relative to one another in the text is to remain unchanged. “Clausal (ranking) shift” is the descriptor for this change, but in practice such a change requires a number of different actions from the translator caused by the shift in clause rank. Generally it will require a shift in the position of the verb within the clause, towards the subject and the start of the clause. Present-day Dutch favours the subject-verb-object sentence (SVO) structure, which the translator should strive to produce in the TT. The component clauses may rely on anaphora or lack a proper subject entirely, which can be resolved by giving the new sentences grammatical subjects in the form of proper nouns or names. This can be accomplished by repeating the appropriate subject from a previous sentence. Finally, the translator utilizes punctuation to indicate the new sentence structure.

This element of the method is the most susceptible to interpretation and requires a translator to make choices. In these choices, the translator follows the *skopos*-rule, to translate in a way that enables the text to function in the situation or for the people using it (Hill-Madsen 2014, 55). This means that the translator strives to rank the clauses in such a way that the information in the text becomes more accessible. The shortening of sentences affords the reader breaks in the reading process and compartmentalizes information (Shardlow 2014, 62).⁷

4.4. Clausal shift examples

The example from the previous step is used again here to illustrate the restructuring of clausal and sentence structure.

Wij houden Uwe Furstliche Genade ende Edelen genaede Indachtich vandie deliberatien, hier beuorens bij den Staten generall dick ende menichmall gehouden, op het toelaten ofte geheelick verbieden vanden trafficque, commercie ofte toeganck opdie Prouincien ende Steden, die bij onse vianden geoccupeert sijn.

Welcke deliberatien sijn genoechsam gebleuen Indien state, dat geraden waere intselue geheelick mede op grote poenen te verbieden, doch Indien verstande, dat sulx van wegen dien van Franckrijck oick aenpaarlick te geschieden soude hebben.

Nu Ist sulx [dat]: [vermits] Eenige occurrentien sijn ons dienthaluen voer gecomen, ten aensiene vande Stede van Groeningenn shertogenbosch ende Breda, wesende binnen landtsche Steden, ende denwelcken alle toeganck lichtelicker dan van andere soudien mogen worden beleth.

The (new) clausal rank in this excerpt is indicated by moving the relevant verb or verb groups in either of two directions. For the main clauses, to follow standard practice in modern Dutch, the finite verb should be close to the subject. In subclauses, on the other hand, the finite verb is placed at the end of the clause,

⁷ It is beyond the scope of this research to investigate the reason why the historical Dutch writing style employs much longer sentences in comparison to modern use.

including in combined verb phrases. The historical language variant of these documents resembles the German language more than modern Dutch in this regard. Note also that there are transition words that are rendered obsolete by the new structure, in which case they can be removed by the translator. In some cases this may apply to entire short phrases (like “Soo ist dat...”, which translates to “It is thus:”) , which exist to mark transitions in the original text where in modern convention one might use paragraphs or line breaks instead.

The following excerpt, taken from a letter from the Prince’s court from 1573, illustrates how the structural reorganization of the parsed text can require the inference of a new subject in the creation of new main clauses. The inferred subjects can be pronouns or repetitions of appropriate noun groups from earlier in the text. The goal for the translator is to reduce the amount of anaphora, similar to the syntactic approaches within ATS. The following excerpt has already been parsed following the first step of the translation method. It is worth noting that this specific ST does not contain punctuation of any kind, which is an infrequent but existing phenomenon in the corpus of the William of Orange correspondence. Punctuation has been added in the TT to improve the readability of the text.

[...]
 /Ghevende hem Remonstrant macht avthoriteyt ende speciael bevel by
 desen de selven by alle middelen ende wegen volgens de voorschreven
 versoucke
 /by hem remonstrant aen ons gedaen
 /daer toe te constringeren ende bedwingen
 /Ordonneren ende bevelen eerhalve onse admiralen allen onsen Oversten
 Capiteynen hoops ende bevelsluyden
 /Versoucken oock allen gouverneurs Magistraten ende anderen dient aen-
 gaen mach /ende voor wye hy Remonstrant sich addresseren ende dese
 jegenwoirdighe thoonen sal [...]

(KHA: A 11/XIV I/12, f. 261 r-v)

Wij ghevende hem Remonstrant macht avthoriteyt ende speciael bevel by
 desen de selven, by alle middelen ende wegen volgens de voorschreven
 versoucke by hem remonstrant aen ons gedaen, daer toe te constringeren
 ende bedwingen.

Wij Ordonneren ende bevelen eerhalve onse admiralen, allen onsen Over-
 sten, Capiteynen, hoops, ende bevelsluyden. Wij versoucken oock allen
 gouverneurs Magistraten ende anderen dient aengaen mach, ende voor
 wye hy Remonstrant sich sal addresseren ende dese jegenwoirdighe thoo-
 nen sal.

The clausal shift is the most invasive and complex procedure of the entire translation method, as it involves nearly every sentence of the source text. It relies on an effective verb-based parsing in the preceding step. The translator needs to employ judgement in these alterations as syntactic structures often have multiple possible translations. Some examples:

/Voorts dient dese omme uwer F.G. te aduerteren,
/dat aen ons clachtich geweest zijn eenige Landtluden vanden dorpen In
schielandt onder uwer Excellentie protectie ende gouuernemen gheseten,

(KHA: A 11/XIV E/30)

Might be translated as:

1. [...] dat eenige Landtluden vanden dorpen In schielandt, gheseten onder uwer Excellentie protectie ende gouuernemen, aen ons clachtich geweest zijn.
2. [...] dat eenige Landtluden aen ons clachtich zijn geweest, vanden dorpen In schielandt gheseten onder uwer Excellentie protectie ende gouuernemen.
3. Dese dient omme uwer F.G. te aduerteren. Eenige Landtluden vanden dorpen In schielandt, onder uwer Excellentie protectie ende gouuernemen gheseten, zijn aen ons clachtich geweest.

While the following:

[...] /hier toe accerdeerde de toecoempste van deesen Gegenwoirdigen
oirloege
/ter oirsaecke vanden welcken die Rivieren vander Maese Rhyn waele
Lecke hebben haer corresonden opte stadt van dordrecht
/ende (Importeren aldaer het eeniche welvaert ende neeringe)
/geslooten zyn geweest
/ende die negotiatie vanden gehelycken gecesseert heeft Inder vorigen

(RAD: 3 Stadsarchieven, 621)

Might be translated as:

1. De toecoempste van deesen Gegenwoirdigen oirloege accerdeerde hier toe. Ter oirsaecke vanden welcken zyn die Rivieren vander Maese Rhyn waele Lecke, hebben haer corresonden opte stadt van dordrecht, (zij Importeren aldaer het eeniche welvaert ende neeringe) geslooten geweest. Die negotiatie vanden heeft gehelycken gecesseert Inder vorigen.
2. Hier toe accerdeerde de toecoempste van deesen Gegenwoirdigen oirloege, ter oirsaecke vanden welcken die Rivieren vander Maese Rhyn waele Lecke geslooten zyn geweest. Zij hebben haer corresonden opte stadt van dordrecht (ende Importeren aldaer het eeniche welvaert ende neeringe), ende die negotiatie vanden heeft Inder vorigen gehelycken gecesseert.

4.5. Third step: Modal shift

Whereas the previous step was mostly concerned with syntax, the third step is concerned with the morphology of the verb. There are certain verb modes that have either gone out of use in current-day Dutch or are used in a different way. These specific verb modes are easily recognizable and can be changed with only a relatively small impact on the contents of the text. In regards to translating 16th century Dutch, this method is concerned with two forms of verb

conjugation: the subjunctive or conjunctive mood (*aanvoegende wijs*) and the present participle (*onvoltooid deelwoord*) (van den Toorn et al. 1997, 308 and 321).

The subjunctive mode has gone out of use in modern Dutch, beyond a specific set of expressions, which themselves can evoke an antiquated feel. It is used, for instance, in liturgical language (*Uw naam worde geheiligd* — Hallowed be thy name, from the Lord's Prayer) or traditional phrases (*Leve de koning* — Long live the king). Most examples of subjunctive mood in the source texts can be replaced with indicative or imperative forms of the same verb without severely impacting the meaning of the text. No instance of subjunctive mood should be retained in the TT because this grammatical aspect is no longer used productively by Dutch readers.

The present participle is more complicated to deal with in a translation. Contrary to the subjunctive mood, it is a verb type that is still used productively in present-day Dutch. What has changed is that certain applications of the present participle have gone out of use and are difficult to understand for a modern reader (Duinhoven, 97–138). Inversely, this means that some instances of the present participle being used in the ST can be left unchanged in the translation. The distinction is generally left to the judgement of the translator, but some general guidelines can be formulated. First, all instances of present participles based on the verbs *zijn* (to be) and *hebben* (to have), i.e. *zijnde* and *hebbende* are to be considered characteristics of a historical language variant and should be changed. Second, modern Dutch uses present participles as adjectives or adverbs, not in absolute form. An absolute present participle often occurs in subclauses, and can be changed to another verb tense based on the clause rank.

4.6. Modal shift examples

ST: “[Wij] *wesende* nochtans oick well vanden aduise” (ARAB: Audiëntie 554, 554)

TT: Wij zijn nochtans oick well vanden aduise

ST: “*wesende* binnen landtsche Steden,” *ibid.*

TT: Wat binnen landtsche Steden zijn

ST: “[zij] *verzoekende* daeromme aen ons” (KHA: A 11/XIV E/30)

TT: zij verzoeken daeromme aen ons

ST: “Wy ende onse lieve Neve de Grave vanden Marck hadden hem te dien eynde diversche opene missyve verleent ende gegeven, *addresserende* aende voorschreven capiteynen,” (KHA: A 11/XIV E/30)

TT: [...] verleent ende gegeven, geadresseerd aende voorschreven capiteynen,

ST: “sich te transporteren aende bovengemeld capitain Jan claess spiegel

ende anderen [die] de voorschreven Schepe ende goede genomen hebbende," (*ibid.*)

TT: [...] ende anderen die de voorschreven Schepe ende goede genomen hebben,

The translation of verbs from the conjunctive to the indicative mood tends to be rather straightforward. In modern Dutch, an irrealis mood like the conjunctive is usually expressed periphrastically, through the inclusion of some form of the verb *zullen/zouden* (van den Toorn et al. 1997, 304). Interestingly, this particular verb was already in use as an alternative to indicate irrealis (subjunctive or optative, there is no morphological distinction in Dutch grammar) without using the conjunctive mood in the 16th century, as evident in the first example below:

ST: "Zijluden zouden (zoe verre het gebeurde dat den viandt hemluden tot eenighen tijden ouerliepe ende quame iemandt te gecrijghen) hem te beter moghen excuseren," (KHA: A 11/XIV E/30)

TT: Zijluden zouden (zoe verre het zou gebeuren dat den viandt hemluden tot eenighen tijden zou ouerlopen ende iemandt zou komen te gecrijghen) hem te beter moghen excuseren, ST: "dat de vyant overmits zyne macht

ende volck, twelck hy te velde hadde," (HUA: Staten van Utrecht Landsheerlijke Tijd, 38)

TT: [...], twelck hy te velde zou hebben ST: "ten zy hemluiiden tot conservatie der selver stadt voersien werde van behoerlycke gratie" (RAD: 3 Stadsarchieven, 621)

TT: ten zy hemluiiden tot conservatie der selver stadt voersien zouden worden van behoerlycke gratie ST: "datmen die sonder vertreck stelle tot

volcoemen delivrantie" (*ibid.*)

TT: datmen die sonder vertreck tot volcoemen delivrantie zullen stellen

5. Discussion

A deliberately restrictive and prescriptive approach to translation may seem contrary to the nature of the translator's craft. The proposed method however has a different goal when compared to conventional translation. A successful translation in the conventional sense consumes the source text and destroys the source language. The restricted translation described here resembles the work of an editor or a publisher proof-reading a manuscript almost as much as the work of an interpreter. The target text and target language remain historical to an extent and do not obscure the origins or most of the semantics of the source, while becoming significantly more accessible. At the same time, one of the advantages of the digital age and the ease at which textual data can be stored is that the unmodified transcription can be retained for an audience. Both the

method itself and its products may, because of this, provide translation with transparency.

The proposed method has its virtues for use in textual scholarship, though the extent of its applicability will vary depending on the nature of the textual project. The restricted translation requires a limited amount of labour from a translator and requires less expertise in its translator than a total translation would. After all, the method puts the greater focus on morphology over lexical aspects, which are unchanged from the ST. This makes the proposed method advantageous for use in textual scholarship projects with large corpora of historical textual sources. In the case of a historical ST a reader is required to parse and interpret the historical syntax in addition to engaging with other aspects of the historical text. This is the part that can be resolved through the described alterations.

The restricted translation is not without its downsides or challenges. First, there is no escape from the subjectivity of the translator. The proposed method prescribes several operations, but the translator retains a significant amount of responsibility when it comes to interpreting the text and choosing how to implement the prescribed changes. To be fair, this is true of all forms of translation, including machine translations, which reflect the subjectivity of the translators that developed it. At best, the proposed method can offer up an explanation for the nature of the changes and the reasoning behind the choices made in the reader's stead. The primary choice in this regard is the decision to mostly disregard lexical elements and spelling in favour of grammar in the course of translating. Such a question must be resolved through experimentation as restricted translation is at this time a new approach.

6. Closing remarks

In summation, the proposed method prescribes how to turn a text written in a historical variant of Dutch into a restricted translation that follows modern Dutch grammatical and syntactical structure, including such elements as punctuation, while not altering lexical aspects that belong to the historical language variant. This is accomplished by identifying the grammatical clauses in the text, which are not otherwise indicated by punctuation or capitalization (*parsing*), reorganizing them into a sentence structure that reflects modern textual conventions (*clausal shift*) and resolving certain grammatical elements that have fallen into disuse in modern Dutch (*modal shift*). The purpose of this proposed method is to improve the readability of historical source texts while not expending the time and effort required for a total translation. While a total translation would be more readable than a restricted translation, the option to produce total translations may not always be feasible or cost-effective.

This approach to textual editing is connected to the notion that the divide between historical texts and present-day readers goes deeper than historical variants in spelling, lexicon and grammar. Through the application of this method, the texts are given a visual structure that they did not originally have.

Reading the original sources is much like listening to a spoken rendition, and to receive the information, one has to consume the text from beginning to end. Modern readers are accustomed to a visual style of text composition that uses elements like punctuation, sentences, paragraphs, line breaks, headers. All these textual elements benefit an audience that is visually oriented. This enables reading practices such as skimming, which a modern reader cannot apply to the historical text.

There are several opportunities remaining for future research. The first objective would be to explore the effectiveness of the research method and the extent to which the method can be carried out by other translators using the instructions. This will be accomplished by having volunteers make a translation of Dutch historical texts (from the aforementioned corpus) using an instruction document detailing the translation method. These participants are not instructed beforehand about the contents of the method. Multiple rounds of tests have been planned, and the feedback from participants on the clarity of the instructions and the effectiveness of the method are used to improve these tools in between tests. This way, the method and the accompanying instruction document undergo a series of iterative test phases.⁸

Secondly, future research would serve to widen the scope of the translation method. This method was geared towards a historical variant of the Dutch language connected to a specific time period. Further research would endeavour to apply the same principles of diachronic translation to other time periods, or to historical variants of other languages. Efforts in this vein would require collaboration with researchers from applicable fields of expertise, especially concerning other modern languages. Finally, once a certain amount of text has been translated in this way, digital tools like NLP can be developed based on the training data to automate the translation process to some degree. This restricted translation is less hermeneutic than a total translation, and should be expected to be more receptive to machine-learning solutions.

Bibliography

ARAB, ALGEMEEN RIJKSARCHIEF VAN BELGIË, n.d. "Audiëntie 554."

BAKER, MONA and GABRIELA SALDANHA, 2009. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

BENJAMIN, REBEKAH G, 2012. "Reconstructing Readability: Recent Developments and Recommendations in the Analysis of Text Difficulty." *Educational Psychology Review* 24(1), pages 63–88.

⁸ Due to the COVID-19 outbreak and security measures, it was not possible to perform sufficient tests with volunteers in a reliable fashion and controlled environment in time for the submission of this paper.

- BERK ALBACHTEN, ÖZLEM, 571. "Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Berman and Catherine Porter, West Sussex: Wiley & Sons.
- CATFORD, JOHN, 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DOMINGO, MIGUEL, MARA CHINEA-RIOS, and FRANCISCO CASACUBERTA, 2017. "Historical documents modernization." *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 108(1), pages 295–306. Publisher: Sciendo.
- DUINHOVEN, ANTONIUS M, n.d. "De deelwoorden vroeger en nu." *Voortgang: Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* 6, pages 97–138.
- GALDERISI, CLAUDIO and JEAN-JACQUES VINCENSINI, eds., 2015. *De l'ancien français au français moderne: Theories, pratiques et impasses de la traduction intralinguale*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- HILL-MADSEN, AAGE, 2014. *Derivation and transformation: Strategies in lay-oriented intralingual translation*. Aarhus: Department of Business Communication, Aarhus University.
- HOEKSTRA, RIK, 2007. "Correspondentie totaal - patronen en trends in de briefwisseling van Willem van Oranje." In *Uit diverse bronnen gelicht. Rijswijk: Quantes*, edited by Eef Dijkhof and Michel van Gent, pages 117–31.
- HUA, HET UTRECHTS ARCHIEF, n.d. "Staten van Utrecht Landsheerlijke Tijd."
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1959. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *On Translation*, edited by Reuben A Brower, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pages 232–39.
- JANSEN, FRANK, 2007. "Hom of kuit Moeten de Nederlandse klassiekers hertaald worden?" *Onze Taal* 76, page 175. Library Catalog: www.dbnl.org Publisher: DBNL, Available from: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_taa014200701_01/_taa014200701_01_0108.php (Accessed: 2020-07-27).
- KHA, KONINKLIJK HUISARCHIEF DEN HAAG, n.d.a. "A 11/XIV I/12."
- KHA, KONINKLIJK HUISARCHIEF DEN HAAG, n.d.b. "A 11/XIV E/30."
- KUIPERS, MAARTEN and KARIN SMEETS, 1996. "'Die Pinkeltje is zo'n betweter af en toe...' Suzanne Braam over het hertalen van kinderboeken." *Vooy's* 14(2), pages 38–42. Library Catalog: www.dbnl.org Publisher: DBNL, Available from: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_voo013199601_01/_voo013199601_01_0027.php (Accessed: 2020-07-27).

- MATHIJSEN, MARITA, 2003. "Een knieval voor de luie lezer? Hertaling als enig redmiddel voor historische literatuur." *Nederlandse Letterkunde* 8, pages 113–29.
- VAN OOSTENDORP, MARC, May 2013. "Handen af van Louis Couperus!" Library Catalog: www.neerlandistiek.nl, Available from: <https://www.neerlandistiek.nl/2013/05/handen-af-van-louis-couperus/> (Accessed: 2019–11–01).
- RAD, REGIONAAL ARCHIEF DORDRECHT, n.d. "3 Stadsarchieven."
- SCHREIBER, M., 1993. *Übersetzung und Bearbeitung: Zur Differenzierung und Abgrenzung des Übersetzungsbegriff*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- SHARDLOW, MATTHEW, 2014. "A Survey of Automatic Text Simplification." *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, Special Issue on Natural Language Processing, pages 58–70.
- VAN STRIEN, TON and JOHAN KOPPENOL, 2004. "Enig redmiddel?" *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 120, pages 247–57.
- TAYLOR, JANE H. M., E. MCMORRAN, and G. LECLERQ, 1996. *Translation: Here and There Now and Then*. Exeter: Elm Bank Publications.
- TJONG KIM SANG, ERIK, MARCEL BOLLMAN, REMKO BOSCHKER, FRANCISCO CASACUBERTA, F. M. DIETZ, STEFANIE DIPPER, MIGUEL DOMINGO, ROB VAN DER GOOT, J. M. VAN KOPPEN, and NIKOLA LJUBEŠIĆ, 2017. "The CLIN27 shared task: Translating historical text to contemporary language for improving automatic linguistic annotation." *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Journal* 7, pages 53–64.
- VAN DEN TOORN, M. C., J. ARIAN VAN LEUVENSTEIJN, and W. J. J. PIJNENBURG, eds., 1997. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- ZETHSEN, KAREN K., 2009. "Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description." *Meta* 54(4), pages 795–812.

Reflections on Digital Scholarly Editions: From Humanities Computing to Digital Humanities, the Influence of Web 2.0, and the Impact of the Editorial Process

Michelle Doran

Abstract: This essay offers an ongoing process of reflection on the role of the digital medium in creating scholarly editions of medieval Irish texts. What are the relationships between (digital) textual scholarship, (digital) scholarly editing, humanities computing, and Digital Humanities? How have these concepts changed our editorial praxis? The author discusses four different digital scholarly editions of medieval Irish manuscripts and then focuses one specific case: @ChronHib’s “The Poems of Blathmac Tweets”. This Twitter account of the eponymous edition presents a stimulating example of new forms of (user) engagement and the role of editors and audiences in the digital realm.

In 2016, Joris J. Van Zundert wrote of digital scholarly editions (DSEs) that “they are a far cry from what many expected them to be” (Van Zundert 2016b, 899). The reason for this, Van Zundert suggests, is what he labels “paradigmatic regression”, that is “the social shaping of a technological interface such that it can no longer express essential properties of an intended paradigm” (Van Zundert 2016b, 901). The central thesis of Van Zundert’s work is that the successful exploration of the potential of the DSE can only be achieved if we can cease the process of reverting to existing paradigms when attempting to build new models. In a further contribution, he contends that an additional limiting factor is that textual scholars remain deeply entrenched in the “ideal of publishing the definitive edition” (Van Zundert 2018, 5: 12). He continues, “[m]ost editors think of an edition as a complete and finished product — something that should not be tampered with, because it is argued and polished with arduous effort to academic perfection” (ibid.).

In this essay, I follow a similar line of enquiry to Van Zundert, asking if existing definitions of DSEs have similarly served to limit the potential for textual scholars to reimagine scholarly editing in the digital age. To put it another way, are we overly concerned with what these resources should be, rather than what they could be? This is not a new question (see e.g. Prescott 2003, Robinson 2013, 106 and Pierazzo 2014, 210), but I hope to offer a different perspective. This essay takes the position that scholarly editing in its digital format belongs

to the wider area of digital humanities and as such it is shaped not only by the underlying digital medium but also by the social, methodological, and epistemological commitments of the field which has developed to support digital scholarship in the humanities. Despite a history spanning over seventy years, digital humanities is regularly defined as being in a continual state of transition. It follows that the scholarly outputs which result from activities within the field must continue to reflect the nature of the practice as it evolves. Therefore, rather than emphasising the ongoing influence of the print paradigm, I suggest that earlier iterations of digital humanities (generally referred to as humanities computing) may be having an equally delimiting effect on the new models of scholarly editing in the digital format.

To achieve this, the present essay is divided into four main sections. The first part provides some contextual remarks regarding the developmental phases of digital humanities and the influence of Web 2.0 technologies on the field as it is currently conceived. I will then move on to discuss recent debates regarding the concept of the social edition as it manifests in the digital format. In light of this discussion, the third part reviews the recent series of Tweets transcribing and translating the Early Irish poetic text, *The Poems of Blathmac on the Chronologicon Hibernicum* Twitter feed (@ChronHib). Whilst from a technical perspective this work falls far short of the desideratum of a digital edition, it remains an outstanding example of many of the editorial ideologies which underlie them.¹ How, then, should we evaluate the digital output of the *Chronologicon Hibernicum* Twitter feed? Is it necessary at the current time for a digital edition to espouse both the technical and the ideological best practices set forth by the digital editing community? How might our desire to legitimize our work limit its potential? The final section addresses these questions. However, before moving to the main arguments of the essay, some contextual remarks regarding the development of this piece seem appropriate.

This essay is best-described as the result of an unintended iterative research process. It began as a chapter of my doctoral thesis, submitted in early 2015 though written over more years than I care to recount. The primary subjects of this work were the ideological and epistemological perspectives which have

¹ As an example of the discourse regarding the desideratum of a digital edition, we might consider the contribution of Marina Buzzoni 2016. For Buzzoni, the datafication of the scholarly object is key to determining which features should be defined as fundamental to a digital edition. Buzzoni lists five features, or domains, which a digital scholarly edition should present, “regardless of the subtype to which it belongs” (Buzzoni 2016, 61). In other words, regardless of the scholarly purpose of the edition, a digital edition must be structured in accordance with certain digital functionalities and the intention of these functionalities is to fully exploit the digital environment. These domains are listed as: scalability, relationability, interoperability, multimodality and multimodality, and lastly, interactivity. According to Buzzoni, a protocol for digital scholarly editions is a desirable means of testing the editorial product through its core functionalities, “provided that the protocol encompasses the domains in which scholarly digital editions may offer important advantages over paper editions, without being too strict as to orient the editor to follow a specific ecdothic praxis” (Buzzoni 2016, 81).

informed much of the way in which medieval Irish texts are rendered into modern editions and the aim of the chapter in question was to examine the role of the digital medium in the production of editions of medieval Irish texts. Here, I concluded that “[t]o date, the course of digital humanities computing in medieval Irish scholarly editing demonstrates the willingness of certain scholars to engage with the theories, methodologies and technologies of contemporary textual criticism” (Doran 2015, 337). In late 2016, I had the opportunity to revise this chapter as part of my participation in the MA in Digital Humanities at An Foras Feasa, National University Maynooth. Recognising my error in nomenclature, I wrote that “my previous assertion presupposes that Digital Humanities and humanities computing are synonymous [...] this is not the case. The implementation of the tools of humanities computing does not necessitate the implementation of the epistemology of Digital Humanities”. I continued that:

A more accurate assessment of the current state of affairs might read, to date, the course of humanities computing in medieval Irish scholarly editing demonstrates the willingness of certain scholars to engage with the methodologies and technologies of contemporary textual criticism. However, the ideologies of Digital Humanities and the epistemic commitments of the Web 2.0 model have largely been ignored.

(Doran 2016)

In 2018, some of my arguments found a home in the recently published *Digital Technology and the Practices of Humanities Research* (Edmond 2020). Once again, I found myself revising previous conclusions, this time as a result of a series of Tweets translating and transcribing the Early Irish poetic text *The Poems of Blathmac* on the Chronologicon Hibernicum Twitter feed. In this piece, I reversed the gaze of my research and used the @ChronHib Tweets as a means of examining the limitations imposed on the editorial process by the various defining criteria of the digital scholarly edition (DSE), that is, the editorial product. However, as a result of the arrival of my son in May 2019, I was unable to participate in the final tranche of revisions. This current essay combines each of these three pieces, doubtless it will be revisited.

I offer these preliminary remarks because to my mind they highlight much of what is entailed in textual scholarship in the twenty-first century. Firstly, it is an iterative and self-conscious research process, indeed a desire for process-orientated evaluation criteria is coming increasingly to the fore and was a major motivating factor in my reconsideration of the concept of the DSE in light of the @ChronHib Twitter feed which will be discussed in further detail presently. As Elena Pierazzo maintains, “[d]igital editing as research may still produce digital editions, but such editions may be considered just one of the outcomes of the research, the embodiment of a new editorial theory or model, and not its most important outcome” (Pierazzo 2014, 217). Of course, not all contemporary

textual scholarship is concerned with the production of a DSE, but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to deny the extent to which the specific medial changes of new technologies have contributed to changing epistemologies in the wider field of textual scholarship: “we shape our tools, and thereafter our tools shape us” (Pierazzo 2016, 3). Editorial practices are now located along a continuous spectrum of digital, predigital and nondigital scholarship. In this context, tensions emerge from “the multidisciplinary methodological interaction that has arisen to support the theoretical and practical development of the digital scholarly edition over the recent years” (Van Zundert 2016a, 83). This essay is primarily concerned with four such interactions, that of (digital) textual scholarship, humanities computing, digital humanities and Web 2.0 technologies.

I

The developmental stages of digital humanities are broadly conceived as being characterized by two transformative phases, often separated by a discursive shift in identity from humanities computing to digital humanities. Precisely when this transition occurred is difficult to pinpoint. According to correspondence between John Unsworth and Matthew Kirschenbaum reported by the latter (Kirschenbaum 2010, 56–57), the term originates from a conversation held in November 2001 regarding the title of the highly-influential Blackwell 2004 *Companion to Digital Humanities* (Schreibman et al. 2014). By 2009, Patrick Svensson observed that whilst the use of the term humanities computing was still frequent there was an increased use of digital humanities (relative to humanities computing). In the same contribution, Svensson argued that the discursive shift from humanities computing to digital humanities represented more than just a repackaging of the former. He continued that humanities computing, with its focus on “the instrumental, methodological, textual and digitalized”, carries with it a set of epistemic commitments and conventions that are not necessarily compatible with digital humanities as it was and continues to be conceived (Svensson 2009). Interestingly, the tools and platforms of the Web 2.0 model do not play a dominant role in Svensson’s notion of digital humanities.

A decade after Tim Berners-Lee’s initial proposal for the World Wide Web, Darcy DiNucci coined the term “Web 2.0”, a concept which describes the shift from the static webpages of the first iteration of the Web to “the web as platform” model, the emergence of prosumers (a blending of the roles of producers and consumers) and the large scale development of social networking software (DiNucci 1999, 32). In 2008, drawing on the popularized labels Web 1.0 and Web 2.0, Cathy Davidson identified two phases of digital humanities, Humanities 1.0 and Humanities 2.0. Here, Davidson aligns the Humanities 1.0 with the large-scale digitising projects of humanities computing, she continues that “Humanities 2.0 is distinguished from monumental, first-generation, data-based projects not just by its interactivity but also by openness about participation grounded in a

different set of theoretical premises, which decenter knowledge and authority" (Davidson 2008, 711–712). There is a clear assumption of the transformative nature of Web 2.0 epistemologies within the humanities in Davidson's manifesto. The change envisioned extends far beyond how we research and who can research and moves to redefine the humanities more generally: "Additional concepts decentred by Web 2.0 epistemologies include authorship, publication, refereeing, collaboration, participation, customizing, interdisciplinarity, credentialing, expertise, norms, training, mastery, hierarchy, taxonomy, professionalism, rigor, excellence, standards and status" (Davidson 2008, 712). It is also noteworthy that Davidson does not envision an end goal for Humanities 2.0, there is no product, only process.

The differentiation (or lack thereof) between humanities computing and digital humanities may appear at first to be a red herring. However, when one considers the shared history of digital textual scholarship and humanities computing, the assimilation of humanities computing into a big tent digital humanities fundamentally affects the landscape of textual scholarship in the twenty-first century. In the field of digital humanities, there exists a large corpus of research literature that attempts to delineate and define DSEs. However, much of this scholarship was developed prior to the discursive shift from humanities computing to digital humanities and the ubiquity of the Web 2.0 model with which we are now familiar and therefore does not accurately reflect the full range of useful possibilities present for academic engagement and interaction around their research objects. Despite this, these resources of the "pioneer era" of digital scholarly editing remain fundamental to our understanding of what constitutes a DSE (Robinson 2005). When Svensson's observations are considered alongside the Humanities 2.0 model proposed by Davidson tensions arise. In a further contribution on the landscape of digital humanities published in 2010, Svensson writes that humanities computing will not become the Humanities 2.0 envisioned by Davidson, that even those scholars deeply engaged in humanities computing might not identify as "digital humanists". As Svensson points out, there is a risk that different epistemic traditions and goals are conflated in the reading of humanities computing as digital humanities (Svensson 2010). In what follows, I suggest that the editorial products of digital textual scholarship often continue to align with the humanities computing model, whereas the underlying ideological commitments of the social view of digital editing reflect a greater cognisance of the epistemic cultures of digital humanities and Web 2.0.

II

From the perspective of Early and Medieval Irish Studies, there are a number of outstanding examples of the "monumental, first-generation, data-based projects" of humanities computing (Davidson 2008, 711–712). A prominent example would be *Corpus of Electronic Texts* (CELT), "Ireland's longest running Humanities Computing project" (1997–). It currently constitutes the digital text of 1636

documents from the medieval through to the modern period in Irish, Latin, Anglo-Norman French and English. These texts may be read online and are also available in HTML, SGML and XML formats. The SGML/XML files are encoded following the TEI Guidelines (TEI Consortium 2020). Texts are taken from “the best printed editions” and in a method of presentation common at the time the project started, the digital text constitutes the main body of the edition without the critical apparatus.² Consequently, resources such as CELT have been surrounded by debates regarding the appropriateness of the label edition with “project”, “archive”, “thematic research collection”, “database”, “knowledge site”, “digital edition 2.0” and even “arsenal” all being suggested as alternatives.³

Discussions regarding the critical nature of these editions (or the lack thereof) often overlook the arguments regarding text, edition and the role of technology inherent in the means, methods, models and media of presentation. Digital iterations of scholarly editions, in fact, often deliver applications that represent electronic versions of predigital practices, and with these applications the underlying ideologies of the inherited legacies are replicated and consequently redistributed. For example, text encoding and markup are two core components of humanities computing. In 2002, Koenraad de Smedt wrote that “[t]ext encoding seems to create the foundation for almost any use of computers in the humanities” (qtd. in Svensson 2016, 66). His comments regarding the manner in which these technologies are applied, representing an instrumental and uncritical approach to humanities computing are as relevant today as they were in 2002. Regarding the development of SGML into TEI-XML descriptive standard, Van Zundert argues that the scholarly editing community “turned hypertext markup into a descriptive model of the book, and we have produced digital book metaphors ever since” (Van Zundert 2016b).

Resources such as CELT are firmly grounded in the epistemic commitments of humanities computing foregrounding the two fundamentals of the field as articulated by Svensson: “computer as instrumental tool” and “text as object” (2009). As manifestations of humanities computing practice, they may not be compatible with those formulations of the editorial process which emphasize the role of the tools of social networking and social media in blurring the boundaries of the traditional editorial paradigm which reflect a greater cognisance of the epistemic cultures of digital humanities and Web 2.0 technologies. That is not to suggest that they do not constitute DSEs or that DSEs modelled on the epistemic traditions of humanities computing are no longer valid. In fact, I am suggesting that the reverse may be the case. These resources foreground our understanding of what constitutes a DSE and therefore, the risk to digital textual scholarship in conflating these approaches is that the epistemological biases of the humanities

² See the “About Us” page of CELT: <https://celt.ucc.ie/about.html>

³ For a discussion of the terms employed to describe “large-scale text-based electronic scholarship” and of their implications for digital textual scholarship, see Price 2009.

computing model will limit our understanding of how the digital is impacting upon textual scholarship by excluding from the conversation those resources which do not constitute DSEs in accordance with this model.

An illustrative example of the tensions arising between the different epistemic traditions involved in textual scholarship in the twenty-first century is the concept of the digital social edition. In 2012, Ray Siemens along with several others presented a preliminary model of the social edition in its electronic form as part of a basic typology of the scholarly electronic edition. Here, the authors identify four types of editions based on the approach that the creators of each type take when handling and engaging with the textual materials. First, there is a dynamic text which consists of the edited electronic text plus analytical tools for its readers. Next, the hypertext edition which presents the text together with supporting materials in digital form to aid reader navigation and subsequent analysis. Following this is the dynamic edition, of which the authors note there is not yet an exemplary touchstone. The dynamic edition is an electronic text augmented by dynamic analytical means, hypertextual links to fixed resources together with means of identifying and collaborating with external resources.

The last type, the social edition, remains undefined. However, Siemens et al. identify numerous characteristics of the “definitive social edition”, which will be discussed in greater detail presently. The authors suggest that the order in which these different editions are set forth represents a sort of chronology for the development of digital scholarly editing and they opine that the social edition is representative of the most recent developments in editorial theory (Siemens et al. 2012, 446–48). At the core of the discussion of the social edition are the tools which enable the model: “such tools facilitate a model of textual interaction and intervention that encourage us to see the scholarly text as a process rather than a product, and the initial, primary editor as facilitator, rather than progenitor, of textual knowledge creation” (Siemens et al. 2012, *ibid*). These tools are the new and emerging, scholarly and non-scholarly digital interactive tools of social media and the Web 2.0 model of the World Wide Web with which we are now familiar.

An awareness of the ideas set forth by Davidson and her model of Humanities 2.0 discussed earlier in this essay are crucial to our understanding of the social edition described by Siemens and his collaborators. First, both contributions are predicated on the assimilation of the tools of Web 2.0 by the practitioners of digital textual scholarship. Secondly, the democratization of knowledge and authority envisioned by Davidson is evident in the description of the social edition where it is maintained that the integration of social media tools can push the boundaries of authority, “shifting power from a single editor, who shapes the reading of any given text, to a group of readers comprising a community whose interpretations themselves form a new method of making meaning out of the material” (Siemens et al. 2012, 453). In their estimation, the definitive social edition eschews traditional, hierarchical models of scholarly discourse in favour of a plurality of community-generated authorities. As with Davidson’s model of

Humanities 2.0, the proponents of the social edition privilege process over end result (Siemens et al. 2012, *ibid*). The sequential presentation of both arguments is not unproblematic, the assumption is that there is only one approach feasible at any given time, that the most recent formulation of an academic field supersedes the one that came before it. Accordingly, the Humanities 2.0 model displaces the Humanities 1.0 and the emerging social edition represents the most recent developments in the theories of digital textual scholarship.

The model of the social edition presented by Siemens and his coauthors, is only one characterization of the role of the social view of texts in digital textual criticism. In an article canvassing the multiple meanings of the word “social” as it is applied to editions, editing and texts in the field of digital textual scholarship, Robinson argues that we should be particularly conscious of how we employ the label in each of these specific contexts. Many, if not all, of Robinson’s criticisms of the model are levelled against the Social Edition of the *Devonshire Manuscript* by Siemens and his collaborators and the associated scholarship including their 2012 article. Citing the work of Jerome McGann and Donald McKenzie, which underpins Siemens’ social edition, Robinson remarks that whilst the social view of texts has been influential in many areas, the “social text edition” has not yet come to fruition. He continues that many of the projects which claim to be “social editing” projects are transcription projects which enable editing projects and not editing projects in and of themselves. Here, he observes that many social editing projects continue to uphold the traditional editor-driven model of textual criticism: documentation is selected on the basis of editorial requirements; external contributions are closely monitored by a single editor or more likely a team of editors and contributors are excluded from stages of the project. He posits that the recent enthusiasm surrounding the word “social” in the context of digital textual scholarship has led to “unrealistic expectations invoked by misapplication of the term”. Once again, the juxtaposition of editorial products (social text editions and social editions) and editorial processes (social editing) is evident throughout Robinson’s animadversions of the social edition as set forth by Siemens and his coauthors. The former, he concludes, do not exist. The latter is a misleading misnomer which detracts from the possibilities offered by the digital medium. In his estimation, these possibilities are “in the making of editions that are more inclusive in their making, which achieve a wider impact and create new understandings in expanding circles of readership, whether or not we choose to label these as social” (Robinson 2016b).

Of course, the model set forth by Siemens et al. is not the only formulation of the integration of social technologies into textual scholarship. Other scholars have attempted to create a broader definition. For example, based on his extensive work collecting and cataloging DSEs, Patrick Sahle presents his defining criteria as four questions. In brief, these questions are: 1) Is there a full representation of the subject in question?; 2) Is it critical?; 3) Is the edition of academic quality?; and 4) Does the edition follow a digital paradigm? (Sahle 2016, 38). According to Sahle, “Scholarly digital editions are scholarly editions that are

guided by a digital paradigm in their theory, method and practice" (Sahle 2016, 28). In this context, a scholarly edition is the "critical representation of historic documents" (Sahle 2016, 23). Sahle distinguishes between digitized or scanned print editions which continue to uphold the print paradigm and digital editions, writing that the latter cannot be printed without a significant loss of information and functionality. Undoubtedly, the former may replicate some of the features of DSEs — such as search functions — but they do not themselves constitute such an edition. According to Sahle, the digital paradigm subverts, inverts and reverses many of the processes and assumptions of the traditional editorial paradigm. Though not explicitly referenced, the influence of the concepts of Web 2.0 and Humanities 2.0 as digital humanities is evident throughout Sahle's description of the digital paradigm in editing, key characteristics of which are "multimedia", "hypertexts", "hyperlinks", "fluid publication", "process rather than product", "collaboration", "a strong tendency towards multiple texts", "a pluralistic notion of text" and "transmedialization". Once again, the concept of social editing comes into play with contributions coming from external institutions as well as "communities of the scholarly or even wider interested public" (Sahle 2016, 30).

Although brief, these examples of the discussions surrounding the (digital) social edition highlight many the tensions which can result from "the multidisciplinary methodological interaction that has arisen to support the theoretical and practical development of the digital scholarly edition over the recent years" (Van Zundert 2016a, 83). We see throughout the debate efforts to identify and separate overlapping epistemologies and to articulate what is truly revolutionary about DSEs. Where supporters point to the novelty of the social edition in its digital format, critics respond that the social concept of text was founded in predigital textual scholarship. The challenges expressed here are not necessarily new, nor are they unique to the social edition. Pierazzo makes similar observations about the role of variation in digital editions (Pierazzo 2016, 45–46) and the same has been said about the ability for DSEs to display images of the original document (Robinson 2016a, 181–183). Of course, all of this brings us back to the role of the "book metaphor" in digital textual scholarship as articulated by Van Zundert and the formalization of these practices through the articulation of humanities computing as digital humanities. Recent proponents of the DSE have embraced the current state of affairs, emphasising the impact of the digital editorial process over the digital editorial product. Whilst it is certainly true that the social concept of text has its foundations in predigital editorial theory, the manner in which this is achieved is radically different in digital editorial practice. In a piece discussing variation and the DSE, Pierazzo writes that "The digital environment in its various embodiments may well be a more flexible space in which to seek public engagement with editorial endeavours, if indeed editors are willing to do it" (Pierazzo 2016, 55). I will conclude by considering one such example.

III

Chronologicon Hibernicum – A Probabilistic Chronological Framework for Dating Early Irish Language Developments and Literature (ChronHib) is a research project funded by the European Research Council under the HORIZON 2020 Framework Programme between September 2015 and August 2020. The project which is hosted by National University of Ireland Maynooth, aims to refine the methodology for dating Early Medieval Irish language developments (ca. sixth to mid tenth century AD) and to build a chronological framework of linguistic changes that can then be used to date literary texts within the Early Irish period. This will be achieved through the linguistic profiling of externally dated texts and by using statistical methods for the serialization of data, and for estimating dates using Bayesian inference.

The project maintains an active social media presence with the dual intention of propagating the project results and raising awareness of the Early Irish language and its importance for the intellectual history of Ireland and Europe. As of March 2020, the project's Twitter account (@ChronHib) posted over 11,700 Tweets loosely related to the themes of research on Early Irish language and literature and has almost 2,900 followers. The account administrator, David Stifter, is a professor of Old Irish at National University of Ireland Maynooth and is Principal Investigator on the ChronHib project. In January 2017, Stifter began posting a series of Tweets transcribing and translating the eighth century Old Irish Poems of Blathmac mac Con Brettan maic Conguso do Feraib Rois, "Blathmac, Son of Cú Brettan, son of Congus of the Fir Rois" (The Poems of Blathmac; see Figure 1). The stated intention of the Tweets was to create an outlet for a preliminary version of an edition of the poems and comments were requested from the account's followers.

Figure 1: The Poems of Blathmac Twitter series announcement.*

The work took place from January to October 2017 and constitutes the presentation of 303 four-line stanzas, roughly one stanza per day. In general, the Tweets follow the same format. First, a Tweet containing an image of the relevant section of the manuscript is posted together with the stanza number and a semi-diplomatic transcription of the text, while editorial notes regarding the transcription are added in the comments section (see Figure 2). Next, the translation of the stanza is posted across two Tweets both containing the stanza number and a translation of two lines of the relevant transcription together with modern iconography relating to the translation — again, with editorial notes entered in the comments section (see Figure 3).

Figure 2: @ChronHib tweets regarding “The Poems of Blathmac”, stanza 6: transcription and comments.[†]

The comments section opens up the editorial methodology in a number of ways. Firstly, it allows insight into the decision-making process in a way that traditional print editions, or indeed many DSEs do not. Consider for example

* Twitter thread available via: <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/815837431735943173> (accessed 2 July 2021)

[†] Twitter thread available via: <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/817247306697216000> (accessed 2 July 2021).

(a)

(b)

Figure 3: @ChromHib tweets regarding “The Poems of Blathmac”, stanza 6: translation and comments. Twitter threads respectively available via: a) <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/817249859874865157>; and b) <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/817250468346798081> (accessed 2 July 2021).

the transcription of Stanza 250 (see Figure 4). In three short comments the editor refers to differences in the texts of two previous editions. Further, he supplies the reader with details of the evolution of the editorial process and a justification of the new transcription and translation.

Figure 4: @ChronHib tweets regarding “The Poems of Blathmac”, stanza 250: transcription and comments.[‡]

In addition to editorial explanatory notes, the comments section provides an insight into user interaction. Indeed, the appropriateness of the term “user” in this context is questionable. The editor is often asked to provide explanations for details of the edition (see Figure 3a). Whilst the authority of the editor is taken for granted, the platform promotes a discourse between editor and commentators similar to that of a research seminar. Editing and translating Early Irish text is highly specialized and it is unsurprising that the majority of the non-editorial comments come from members of the scholarly community. In this way commentators are both contributors to and reviewers of the edited text.

[‡] Twitter thread available via: <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/905769726470754304> (accessed 2 July 2021).

Figure 5: Twitter thread regarding images attached to the translation of stanza 253.[§]

From the perspective of the reader (that is, the individual who may want to read and/or research the transcribed and translated stanzas sequentially), the structure of *The Poems of Blathmac Tweets* is far from ideal. Most notably, there is no hashtag categorizing the Tweets, making the series difficult to find and follow. This would be less problematic if the Twitter account were solely dedicated to the subject of the *Poems of Blathmac*. However, as previously observed, the account is extremely active and covers a broadly defined academic area. The absence of a hashtag is not insurmountable and can still be rectified by the creation of Twitter moments linking the Tweets but its current format presents barriers for those who wish to use it as a scholarly resource.

Whilst technically imperfect, *The Poems of Blathmac Tweets* uphold many of the tenets of digital scholarly editing and in particular of Web 2.0 and digital humanities as Humanities 2.0 as described in the previous section. The role of the tools of social media and social networking in the production of the resource is undeniable. The Tweets have attracted and activated the communities of both the scholarly and the wider public. However, the scholarly argument of the resource extends beyond the role of the tools of Web 2.0. They not only examine the historical context of the texts, they also encourage a view of the poems which highlights how modern audiences read and receive them. This is most successfully achieved through the inclusion of sometimes controversial modern iconography in the Tweets containing the translations of the stanzas. These images serve to enrich our reading of the text as the following excerpt from thread defending the decision to include an image of a young drowned

[§] Twitter thread available via: <https://twitter.com/ChronHib/status/906863322150129666> (accessed 2 July 2021).

Syrian boy demonstrates (see Figure 5).

Not only do the Tweets blur the boundaries of many of the concepts of the hierarchical models of authority, such as editor, reader, user, contributor and reviewer, they go one step further, by allowing real-time comment and correction and through linking the contents of the poem to current affairs, they blur the temporal boundaries between then and now.

IV

Despite the functional deficiencies then, is it possible to argue that The Poems of Blathmac Tweets constitute a DSE? To answer this question, let us return to consider Sahle's broad definition of a digital scholarly edition and his differentiation between digitized print editions and digital editions. It is apparent that the series is not a digitized or scanned print edition, it does not represent the mere digitization of printed material, nor is it guided by a print paradigm. The Tweets cannot be printed without a loss of function: in their current form, they are extendable, open to comment and correction. Furthermore, as the preceding section demonstrates, many of the characteristics of the digital paradigm and the principles of social editing are exemplified in the creation of the Twitter series. Thus, at the very least we can assert that the Tweets represent a digital textual resource guided by a digital paradigm. If we continue to ask the four questions set forth by Sahle intended to establish a digital scholarly edition as such, we would find the answer to each question would be largely positive. Despite this, however, the Tweets fall short of Sahle's desideratum, and as such constitute an example of his vaguely described "other phenomena that are also related to the manifold activities in making our cultural heritage accessible" (Sahle 2016, 38).

In this context it is important to note a further aspect of Sahle's definition which is not detailed in the earlier discussion, notably that: "An edition project is not an edition" (Sahle 2016, 35). Here, he draws a line between a preliminary publication and an edition, which theoretically is always the best possible representation of the subject. The stated intention to use the project's Twitter feed as an outlet for a preliminary edition therefore greatly undermines its position as a DSE (see Figure 2). Despite claims that the digital editorial paradigm emphasizes the editorial process over the editorial product, the reality is that our means of assessment and evaluation are still product orientated: "Talking about editions, evaluating editions and cataloguing editions requires their identification by external boundaries and internal constituents" (Sahle 2016, 36). Definitions of DSEs are intended to be as exclusive as they are inclusive and no matter which criteria we apply The Poems of Blathmac Tweets fall short of the mark. To assess an edition there must be an edition, i.e., an editorial product.

In his highly-influential *The Rationale of Hypertext*, Jerome J. McGann wrote: "When we use books to study books, or hard copy texts to analyse other hard copy texts, the scale of the tools seriously limits the possible results" (McGann 2001). More recently Franzini et al. have noted that to date, the work undertaken

by textual scholars to understand the impact of digital technologies on the interpretive study of texts has been generally approached from the perspective of the DSE, “and, as a result, there is no overarching understanding of how digital technologies have been employed across the full range of textual interpretations” (Franzini et al. 2016, 161). As we continue to assess the ideal of edition in the twenty-first century, it is important to consider how a continued emphasis on the edition may ultimately limit our understanding of how the digital medium is influencing textual scholarship. As Pierazzo comments: “At the present time, it seems that placing boundaries around the types of resources that can be produced might not be a productive way to look at the transformations introduced by the digital medium” (Pierazzo 2014, 210).

The Poems of Blathmac Twitter series was not intended as a digital edition, and many of its perceived shortcomings are as a result of this fact. However, to my mind, this is also one of the resource’s strengths: free from the constraints of the label of a DSE, the project was able to explore the potential of social media in the creation of a scholarly edition. Reflecting on the terms we use to describe text-based digital scholarship, Kenneth Price concludes that we do not yet have a satisfactory term to describe this kind of work. Though Price’s comments are concerned with the products of “large-scale” digital projects which have become the basic unit of digital humanities scholarship (Price 2009). A similar argument can be made around the products of small-scale digital textual research outputs. As we move towards a theory of digital scholarly editing which emphasizes process as well as product, we may ultimately have to move away from our product-oriented definitions of digital scholarly editions. This is particularly pertinent when we consider that the editorial products which scholars continue to employ in order to determine what constitutes a DSE may have been established according to a set of epistemologies which are no longer congruent with many of the aspirations of the contemporary editorial process.

Bibliography

- 1997–. “Celt: Corpus of Electronic Texts.” Available from:
<https://celt.ucc.ie> (Accessed: 2021–07–03).
- BUZZONI, MARINA, 2016. “A Protocol for Scholarly Digital Editions? The Italian Point of View.” In *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*, edited by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew James Driscoll, Open Book Publishers, pages 59–82.
- DAVIDSON, CATHY, 2008. “Humanities 2.0: Promises, Perils, Predictions.” *PMLA* 123(3), pages 707–17.
- DiNUCCI, DARCY, 1999. “Fragmented Future.” *Print* 53(4), pages 221–22.
- DORAN, MICHELLE, 2015. *Textual Criticism and Medieval Irish Studies*. DPhil, University College Cork, Cork.

- , 2016. "Reflections on Medieval Studies and the Typology of Digital Scholarly Editions." Unpublished essay.
- EDMOND, JENNIFER, ed., 2020. *Digital Technology and the Practices of Humanities Research*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.11647/0BP.0192>.
- FRANZINI, GRETA, MELISSA TERRAS, and SIMON MAHONY, 2016. "A Catalogue of Digital Editions." In *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*, edited by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew James Driscoll, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, pages 161–82.
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW, 2010. "What Is Digital Humanities and What's It Doing In English Departments?" *Association of Departments of English (ADE) Bulletin* 150. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1632/ade.150.55>.
- McGANN, JEROME, 2001. *The Rationale of Hypertext*, New York (NY): Palgrave MacMillan, pages 53–75.
- PIERAZZO, ELENA, 2014. *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories Models and Methods*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- , 2016. "Modelling Digital Scholarly Editing: From Plato to Heraclitus." In *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*, edited by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew James Driscoll, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, pages 41–58.
- PRESCOTT, ANDREW, 2003. "Riffs on McCarthy." Available from:
<http://digitalriffs.blogspot.com/2013/07/riffs-on-mccarty.html>
(Accessed: 2021–07–02).
- PRICE, KENNETH M., 2009. "Edition, Project, Database, Archive, Thematic Research Collection: What's in a Name?" *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3(3). Available from:
<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol1/3/3/000053/000053.html>
(Accessed: 2021–07–02).
- ROBINSON, PETER, 2005. "Current Issues in Making Digital Editions of Medieval Texts, or Do Electronic Scholarly Editions Have a Future?" *Digital Medievalist* 1. doi: <http://doi.org/10.16995/dm.8>.
- , 2013. "Towards a Theory of Digital Editions." *Variants, The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship* 10, pages 126–27.
- , 2016a. "The Digital Revolution in Scholarly Editing." *Ars Edendi Lecture Series IV* pages 181–207.

- , 2016b. "Social Editions, Social Editing, and Social Texts." *Digital Studies / Le Champ Numérique* 6. Available from: <https://www.digitalstudies.org/articles/10.16995/dscn.6/> (Accessed: 2022-07-02).
- SAHLE, PATRICK, 2016. "What is a Digital Scholarly Edition." In *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*, edited by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew James Driscoll, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, pages 19–40.
- SCHREIBMAN, SUSAN, RAY SIEMENS, and JON UNSWORTH, eds., 2014. *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- SIEMENS, RAY, MEGAN TIMNEY, CARA LEITCH, CORINA KOOLEN, and ALEX GARNETT, 2012. "Toward Modeling the Social Edition: An Approach to Understanding the Electronic Scholarly Edition in the Context of New and Emerging Social Media." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 27, pages 445–61.
- SVENSSON, PATRICK, 2009. "Humanities Computing as Digital Humanities." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3(3). Available from: <https://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/3/3/000065/000065.html> (Accessed: 2021-07-02).
- , 2010. "The Landscape of Digital Humanities." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 4(1). Available from: <http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/4/1/000080/000080.html> (Accessed: 2021-07-02).
- , 2016. *Big Digital Humanities: Imagining a Meeting Place for the Humanities and the Digital*. Ann Arbor (MI: University of Michigan Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv65sx0t.12>.
- TEI CONSORTIUM, 2020. "TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange." Available from: <https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/Guidelines.pdf> (Accessed: 2021-03-02).
- VAN ZUNDERT, JORIS, 2016a. "Barely Beyond the Book?" In *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theories and Practices*, edited by Elena Pierazzo and Matthew James Driscoll, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, pages 83–106.
- , 2016b. "The Case of the Bold Button: Social Shaping of Technology and the Digital Scholarly Edition." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 31(4), pages 898–910. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqw012>.
- , 2018. "On Not Writing a Review about Mirador: Mirador IIIF, and the Epistemological Gains of Distributed Digital Scholarly Resources." *Digital Medievalist* 11, pages 5: 1–48. doi: <http://doi.org/10.16995/dm.78>.

Dynamic Facsimiles: Note on the Transcription of Born-Digital Works for Genetic Criticism

Dirk Van Hulle

Abstract: Born-digital works of literature sometimes present genetic critics with so much data that it becomes possible to analyse not just the microgenesis but even the nanogenesis of small textual units such as sentence versions (textual versions of one single sentence). This ‘work in progress’ essay is a suggestion to visualize these nanogenetic analyses as dynamic facsimiles, a filmic replay of logged keystrokes in parallel with a transcription, by analogy with the popular and effective format of juxtaposing digital facsimiles with their transcription in digital scholarly editions of analogue works.

In 2009, Marita Mathijssen announced the end of genetic editing: “the physical circumstances in which a work comes into being nowadays have changed so much that one can speak of a new era of scholarly editing, and of a radical shift which might well herald the end of the genetic method of editing” (Mathijssen 2009, 234). But while Mathijssen predicted that genetic editing would no longer be possible in the digital age because of the lack of manuscripts, we are now in the situation that — thanks to digital forensic tools (Kirschenbaum 2016; Kirschenbaum and Reside 2013; Lebrave 2011; Ries 2018) or keystroke logging software applied to born-digital works of literature — we have so much material that the biggest challenge is not the gaps in the archival record but the abundance of data. Every single typo, every keystroke, every visit to a website, every move with the cursor, every pause is registered. This note suggests one way of visualising this material in a digital genetic edition.

Extremely Distant and Incredibly Close

In his essay “Conjectures on World Literature” (2000), reprinted in *Distant Reading* (2013), Franco Moretti introduced the notion of distant reading as a form of making use of secondary literature rather than primary literature, arguing that “literary history will become very different from what it is now: it will become ‘second hand’: a patchwork of other people’s research, without a single direct textual reading. Still ambitious, and actually even more so than before [...] but the ambition is now directly proportional to the distance from the text: the more ambitious the project, the greater must the distance be” (Moretti 2013,

48). The ambition is expressed in terms of distance, and implicitly in terms of quantity: “the trouble with close reading (in all of its incarnations, from the new criticism to deconstruction) is that it necessarily depends on an extremely small canon” (Moretti 2000, 57). Moretti regards close reading as “a theological exercise — very solemn treatment of very few texts taken very seriously” (Moretti 2000, 57). The focus on big data, distant reading and macroanalysis in Digital Humanities seems to have the immediate effect that close reading is forced into an antonymous position and non-digital literary studies suddenly look parochial in comparison. But not all traditional forms of literary studies are microscopic or focused on close reading, and vice versa, not all digital forms of literary studies are macroscopic or panoramic. Distant reading can also be reductive in some ways, as it usually limits its “reading” to only one version of texts.

Moretti’s “distant reading” is conceived as a form of “indirect reading”, not unrelated to what Matthew Kirschenbaum (2007) and Kestemont and Herman 2019 refer to as “not-reading”, building on a term coined by Martin Mueller, who emphasizes that this form of reading is not that new:

there are age-old techniques for doing this, some more respectable than others, and they include skimming or eyeballing the text, reading a bibliography or following what somebody else says or writes about it. Knowing how to “not-read” is just as important as knowing how to read.

(Mueller, qtd. in Kirschenbaum 2007, n.p.)

These forms of “indirect” reading indicate that the definition of “distant reading” is quite broad; it only excludes “direct reading”. It would be incorrect to equate reading by means of computers with “indirect” or “distant” reading. In the study of born-digital works of literature (e.g. Bekius 2021; Kirschenbaum 2016; Ries 2018; Van Hulle 2014; Vauthier 2016), digital tools not only enable distant reading but also a form of analysis that is actually “closer” than close reading. By means of keystroke logging software as an “observational tool” it might be possible to collect what can be called nanogenetic data about literary writing processes,¹ including *currente calamo* corrections, without interfering in the writing process itself — at least, that is how writing researchers use it (Miller and Sullivan 2006, 1). As an interdisciplinary experiment, it is interesting to apply this method from cognitive writing process research to genetic criticism, notably to the reconstruction of the writing sequence. After all, chronology is the backbone of the genetic edition.

¹ See also Lamyk Bekius’s contribution to the present issue of *Variants*.

The Writing Sequence in Genetic Editions of Analogue Works

With analogue writing processes, experiments with ways to encode the writing sequence on the level of the sentence have been only partially successful. The main obstacle is the relatively limited amount of data that can be derived from the analogue writing traces. As a consequence, the reconstruction of the writing sequence of complex writing processes involves so much interpretation that if one were to ask ten editors to make their reconstructions, they would probably all differ from each other. Editorial interpretation itself is not the problem; the problem is that, if the sequence is encoded in the markup (e.g. XML-TEI), this may easily create the impression for the reader that the reconstruction is part of what Hans Zeller called the “record” (*Befund*), rather than “interpretation” (*Deutung*) (Zeller 1955).

An example is the digital edition of the Belgian author Willem Elsschot’s *Achter de Schermen* (*Behind the Scene*), a short text in which Elsschot reconstructs the genesis of one of his own texts, the introduction to his novel *Tsjip* (Elsschot 2007). The edition enables readers to study the development of the entire text, or sentence by sentence. On the smallest level of granularity, the numbering of the writing steps within a sentence was encoded as follows in the XML transcription: to every and <add> tag a @layer attribute was added indicating the number of the writing steps, starting from @layer="101" to the last step in the composition of a sentence. The edition offered an option to study the writing sequence step by step, visualising each step as a separate line. In the case of complex writing processes, this sometimes resulted in more than a dozen steps per sentence. In this sentence, for instance, the narrator reprimands himself concerning a vague phrasing, urging him to be more specific, to call a spade a spade, and say *what* his children have done when he came in after a writing session. Originally, he wrote they had pretended or acted (“gedaan”) as if he had never been away. But this “gedaan” is too unspecific, too abstract. The narrator tries to express what this word actually does (or does not) accomplish, by looking for the right metaphor.

Figure 1: Elsschot’s draft version of the sentence “Zeggen kerel, als je kunt” (Elsschot 2007, Letterenhuis E 285 H 5372, f. 3r).

Schrijfproces

1934: Manuscript 'Achter de Schermen' [AdsM1]:

Stap a
Zeggen kerel. Gedaan is een scherm dat je voor je gemak

Stap b
Zeggen kerel- Gedaan is een scherm dat je voor je gemak

Stap c
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je voor je gemak

Stap d
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je voor je gemak

Stap e
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat voor de waarheid staat

Stap f
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat voor de waarheid staat

Stap g
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat daar gezet is om het ware

Stap h
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat daar gezet is om het ware

Stap i
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je gepakt hebt omdat

Stap j
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je gepakt hebt omdat

Stap k
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je gepakt hebt om op te schieten

Stap l
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is een scherm dat je gepakt hebt om op te schieten

Stap m
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is niets.

Stap n
Zeggen kerel want gedaan is niets.

Stap o
Zeggen kerel als je kunt[.]

Resultaat
Zeggen kerel als je kunt[.]

AdsM1

[3]

Figure 2: The writing process of Elsschot's sentence from Figure 1, subdivided into several writing steps.

In several writing steps, he initially compares it to a screen that he has used to release himself from the duty of saying what they have exactly done; a screen that he has put between himself and the truth; to make it easy for himself; to get on. Until he concludes that “gedaan” is “niets” (nothing). And even this “nothing” turns out to be too much. He crosses it out and, after several attempts, he ironically and self-deprecatingly snorts: “Say it, man, if you can.” [“Zeggen kerel, als je kunt.”] (see Figure 1).

We can ask ourselves whether it is worthwhile reconstructing the writing

process in such detail, but it does make one realize how much debris comes with building a story or a novel, how many actions are involved that — retrospectively — turn out to have been seemingly “unnecessary”, but that were necessary nonetheless, otherwise the piece would never have taken shape. This is even more striking when the granularity of data is smaller yet, as in keystroke logging data of writing processes.

The Writing Sequence in Genetic Editions of Born-Digital Works

In and of themselves, many of the nanogenetic variants in born-digital works (often typos and cursor shifts) may seem rather meaningless, but taken together, they can help us reconstruct not just different stages in a writing process, but the actual sequence of words and the order in which they were written, letter by letter, as a process. Evidently, there is an important difference between the *traces* of the writing process (as in the case of Elsschot’s *Achter de Schermen*) and the *record* of writing actions (by a keystroke logger). The traces of born-digital writing are to a large extent recoverable as well, but that operation requires digital forensics. As Thorsten Ries notes, “Digital forensic tools are able to recover deleted draft versions and stages of the writing process from restored files, temporary data, and system files, file structure artifacts and data fragments from archived and preserved storage media” (Ries 2018, 393). The analogue equivalent of keystroke logging software would be rather like a camera that records every pen stroke an author writes on a page, which raises the obvious question to what extent the element of “being watched” has an impact on the writing process.

A good example is Craig M. Taylor’s novel *Staying On* (2018), which he wrote in collaboration with the British Library, documenting the entire four-year writing process with keystroke logging software. What is often seen as an intrusion (the installation of a form of spyware on the writer’s computer) was approached quite differently by Taylor. In his case, he himself was the requesting party. As he explains in a 9 November 2018 British Library blog post (Taylor 2018), he contacted the British Library before starting his book project out of two concerns: the first concern was with the perceived loss of drafts in born-digital works and the second with “the long-haul loneliness of novel writing, a process I considered in my most despairing moment as like wallpapering a dungeon” (Taylor 2018). In an unexpected way, the experiment was thus partly motivated by the sociology of writing. According to the author, “it actually did help me begin again with novel writing”. He even speaks of writing in terms of collaboration: “Somehow the writing felt collaborative, not only because the software was recording me, but also because of the digital curation team who were taking the data” (Taylor 2018).

Apart from the ontological difference between traces and a recording, the types of results are also dependent on the sophistication of keystroke logging

software. Regarding the Spector Pro software, used for the project, Taylor quotes Jonathan Pledge, a curator of contemporary archives at the British Library, noting that Spector Pro was originally designed as spyware for company surveillance of employees, and as a result it is not very sophisticated as keylogging software (cf. Taylor 2018). But keystroke loggers such as Scriptlog, Inputlog or Translog do provide data that can be of interest to the study of writing processes (Bekius 2021; Leijten and Van Waes 2013; Leijten et al. 2014; Van Waes et al. 2011). And even though this type of data is based on a recording rather than on the traces themselves, it can be of help in digital genetic criticism.²

Dynamic Facsimiles

Apart from the question how to analyse the abundance of data provided by keystroke logging software, the question is also: how can we visualize it in such a way that it becomes relevant to users of critical editions? Compared to print editions, digital scholarly editions are still at an early stage of their development. But there is one feature that seems rather constant: the combination of (digital) facsimile with transcription. Combining a “document”-oriented approach with a focus on “text”, this parallel presentation format appears to be an aspect of digital editions that works for most users and editors alike.

This raises the question what the “document” in a digital environment actually is. Building on Blanchette, Drucker, Kirschenbaum and others, Thorsten Ries suggests that it is “odd to still tie the term “document” to the physicality of a text carrier, although obviously the term and concept is historically derived from physical documents and graphical user interfaces are still mimicking the physical document on the screen” (Ries 2018, 397). If we want to take this to heart, I suggest we also need to look for different visualizations of the “document” in scholarly editions of born-digital material, according to the motto that the interface is an integral part of the editorial argument (Andrews and Van Zundert 2018; Bleeker and Kelly 2018; Bleier and Klug 2018; Dillen 2018; Schäuble and Gabler 2018).

Whereas most digital editions nowadays show a static digital facsimile of a scan on one side and a static transcription next to it, the equivalent of a born-digital work’s genesis could present readers with a more dynamic presentation, linked to a static transcription. In this way, a scholarly editor can combine stasis with movement, a transcript of every version and a dynamic (filmic) visualization of all the keystrokes constituting a sentence.

Imagine Jane Austen writing the first sentence of *Pride and Prejudice* on a com-

² See for instance the research project called *Track Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of Digital Literary Writing*, a collaboration between the Huygens ING (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam) and the University of Antwerp (Centre for Manuscript Genetics, University of Antwerp), funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO). Project members include Karina van Dalen-Oskam, Dirk Van Hulle, Luuk Van Waes, Mariëlle Leijten, Vincent Neyt, Lamyk Bekius and Floor Buschenhenke.

Figure 3: An animated rendition of this visualization is available in the online version of this essay. Please visit: <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/1450>.

puter, with keystroke logging software: a (fictitious) first draft (Figure 3) and then a revision campaign (Figure 4). The *static* visualization enables macrogenetic analysis (examining the genesis of the work in its entirety across multiple versions) and microgenetic research (the processing of a particular source text; the revision history of one specific textual instance across versions; revisions within one single version) while the *dynamic* visualization facilitates especially microgenetic and even nanogenetic analysis (relating to revisions on the level of the character, the individual keystroke or mouseclick).

The author may take their time to revise the sentence in many places, but as long as the revisions take place within the boundaries of a particular sentence, this textual unit can be regarded as one “sentence version” (Van Hulle 2019). And whoever is interested in the internal changes within this sentence version can follow this process in the dynamic, filmic visualization. Thus, it becomes possible to work with “writing footage” or a “dynamic facsimile” to study the writing process on the nanolevel. In this context, the “sentence” is broadly defined as a syntactic unit that ends with a full stop, an exclamation mark or a question mark. As soon as the author leaves the boundaries of the sentence to work on another part of the text, the sentence version is complete; as soon as the author returns to this sentence to revise it, the next sentence version begins.³

The combination of scan with transcription is referred to in French genetic criticism as a combination of “donner à voir” and “donner à lire” (Grésillon 2016, 149): the facsimile is an image rather than a text, “made for looking”, whereas the transcription is “made for reading”. With keystroke logging software, we can now offer editions “made for watching” — as in “watching a movie”. This kind of editing comes closer to reconstructing the actual writing sequence including the pauses, and therefore also allowing for the analysis of aspects such as “fluency” or “writer’s block”.

³ In cognitive writing process studies, the two types of changes (respectively shown in examples one and two) are called “pre-contextual” revisions — “revisions made before an externalised context is completed” — and “contextual” revisions — “revisions made within a completed externalised context” (Lindgren and Sullivan 2006, 159).

Figure 4: An animated rendition of this visualization is available in the online version of this essay. Please visit: <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/1450>.

By analogy with the notion of a (static) digital facsimile in a parallel presentation of scan plus transcription in scholarly editions of analogue writing processes, it seems appropriate to call the writing footage a “dynamic facsimile” because it tries to “do like” (*fac simile*) what happens in the digital document. And since, as discussed above, “the term and concept [‘document’] is historically derived from physical documents and graphical user interfaces are still mimicking the physical document on the screen” (Ries 2018, 397), the dynamic facsimile thus mimics this mimicking. This sounds fancier than it is. The resulting interface is easy to use and to read. After all, the purpose of a genetic edition is to make the writing process accessible.

Obviously, the proposed interface is a form of modelling. It inevitably, but also purposefully, reduces the complexity of the writing process in order to try and understand it. One of the aspects it does not capture well is an author’s sudden decision, for instance, to jump from the middle of one sentence back to the beginning of the story to change something in one of the first sentences. This is a challenge we are trying to find solutions for in the “Track Changes” project (see especially the PhD work-in-progress by Lamyk Bekius and Floor Buschenhenke).

If we understand the scholarly edition as an embodied argument *about* the work instead of seeing the edition only as a presentation or representation *of* the work (Eggert 2016), and if we understand the interface as an integral part of the editor’s argument (Andrews and Van Zundert 2018; Dillen 2018), I suppose my proposal to work with dynamic facsimiles embodies the argument that the work of literature cannot be reduced to just a static text. What we read at any given moment is only an instantiation of a dynamic process. And therefore, it is useful to present the instantiations or versions 1) as a dynamic facsimile, 2) in combination with a system that divides this dynamic writing process in snapshots (versions of a textual unit, in this case “sentence versions”) to enable users not only to zoom in on the micro- and nanolevel of the writing sequence, but also to zoom out and compare (collate) various stages of a particular textual unit on a macrolevel and study its development over time.

Very short conclusion for aspiring editors

Do not despair; the end of genetic editing is anything but near. Do not presume; there is a lot of work to be done.

Bibliography

- ANDREWS, TARA L. and JORIS J. VAN ZUNDERT, 2018. "What Are You Trying to Say? The Interface as an Integral Element of Argument." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 3–34. ISBN 978-3-7481-0925-9.
- BEKIUS, LAMYK, 2021. "The reconstruction of the author's movement through the text, or how to encode keystroke logged writing processes in TEI-XML." *Variants* 15–16, pages 3–44.
- BLEEKER, ELLI and AODHÁN KELLY, 2018. "Interfacing Literary Genesis." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 193–218. ISBN 978-3-7481-0925-9.
- BLEIER, ROMAN and HELMUT W. KLUG, 2018. "Discussing Interfaces in Digital Scholarly Editing." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages V–XV. ISBN 978-3-7481-0925-9.
- DILLEN, WOUT, 2018. "The Editor in the Interface: Guiding the User through Texts and Images." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces, Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 35–59. ISBN 978-3-7481-0925-9.
- EGGERT, PAUL, 2016. "The Reader-Oriented Scholarly Edition." *Digital Studies in the Humanities* 31(4), pages 797–810.
- ELSSCHOT, WILLEM, 2007. *Achter de Schermen: Digital Edition*, edited by Peter de Bruijn, Vincent Neyt, and Dirk Van Hulle. Available from: <https://www.beckettarchive.org/ads/Ads.htm>.
- GRÉSILLON, ALMUTH, 2016. *Éléments de critique génétique: Lire les maunscripts modernes*. Paris: CNRS Editions, 2nd edition.

- KESTEMONT, MIKE and LUC HERMAN, 2019. "Kunnen machines (literatuur) lezen?" *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 135(4), pages 316–28.
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW G., 2007. "The Remaking of Reading: Data Mining and the Digital Humanities." In *The National Science Foundation Symposium on Next Generation of Data Mining and Cyber-Enabled Discovery for Innovation*, Baltimore, page n.p. Available from: <https://www.csee.umbc.edu/~hill101/NGDM07/abstracts/talks/MKirschenbaum.pdf>.
- , 2016. *Track Changes: A Literary History of Word Processing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- KIRSCHENBAUM, MATTHEW G. and DOUG RESIDE, 2013. "Tracking the Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of the Born Digital." In *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pages 257–88.
- LEBRAVE, JEAN-LOUIS, 2011. "Computer forensics: la critique génétique et l'écriture numérique." *Genesis* (33), pages 137–47.
- LEIJTEN, MARIËLLE and LUUK VAN WAES, 2013. "Keystroke Logging in Writing Research: Using Inputlog to Analyze and Visualize Writing Processes." *Written Communication* 30(3), pages 358–92.
- LEIJTEN, MARIËLLE, LUUK VAN WAES, KAREN SCHRIEVER, and JOHN R. HAYES, 2014. "Writing in the Workplace: Constructing Documents Using Multiple Digital Sources." *Journal of Writing Research* 5(3), pages 285–337.
- LINDGREN, EVA and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2006. "Analysing Online Revision." In *Computer Keystroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications, Studies in Writing*, volume 18, edited by Eva Lindgren and Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Oxford: Elsevier, pages 157–88. ISBN 978-0-08-044934-0.
- MATHIJSEN, MARITA, 2009. "Genetic textual editing: the end of an era." In *Was ist Textkritik? zur Geschichte und Relevanz eines Zentralbegriffs der Editionswissenschaft*, edited by Gertraud Mitterauer, Werner Maria Bauer, and Sabine Hofer, Tübingen: Niemeyer, number Bd. 28 in Beihefte zu Editio. ISBN 978-3-484-29528-5.
- MILLER, KRISTVAN S and KIRK P.H. SULLIVAN, 2006. "Keystroke Logging: An Introduction." In *Computer Keystroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications, Studies in Writing*, volume 18, edited by Eva Lindgren and Kirk P.H. Sullivan, Oxford: Elsevier, pages 1–9. ISBN 978-0-08-044934-0.
- MORETTI, FRANCO, 2000. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* (1), pages 54–68.
- , 2013. *Distant Reading*. London & New York: Verso.

- RIES, THORSTEN, 2018. "The rationale of the born-digital dossier génétique: digital forensics and the writing process with examples from the Thomas Kling Archive." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 33(2), pages 424–391. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqx049>.
- SCHÄUBLE, JOSHUA and HANS WALTER GABLER, 2018. "Encodings and Visualisations of Text Processes across Document Borders." In *Digital Scholarly Editions as Interfaces*, *Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, volume 12, edited by Roman Bleier, Martina Bürgermeister, Helmut W. Klug, Frederike Neuber, and Gerlinde Schneider, Norderstedt: Books on Demand (BoD), pages 165–91. ISBN 978-3-7481-0925-9.
- TAYLOR, C.M., November 2018. *C M Taylor on 'keystroke logging project' with British Library*. Publication Title: British Library English and Drama Blog, Available from: <https://blogs.bl.uk/english-and-drama/2018/11/c-m-taylor-on-keystroke-logging-project-with-british-library.html> (Accessed: 2020-07-16).
- VAN HULLE, DIRK, 2014. *Modern Manuscripts: The Extended Mind and Creative Undoing from Darwin to Beckett and Beyond*. London: Bloomsbury.
- , 2019. "De logica van de tekstversie in digitaal geschreven literatuur." *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal en letterkunde/Journal of Dutch Linguistics and Literature* 135(4), pages 465–77.
- VAN WAES, LUUK, MARIËLLE LEIJTEN, ÅSA WENGELIN, and EVA LINDGREN, 2011. "Logging Tools to Study Digital Writing Processes." In *Past, Present, and Future Contributions of Cognitive Writing Research to Cognitive Psychology*, edited by Virginia Wise Berninger, New York: Psychology Press, pages 507–34. ISBN 978-1-84872-963-6.
- VAUTHIER, BÉNÉDICTE, 2016. "Genetic Criticism Put to the Test by Digital Technology: Sounding out the (mainly) Digital Genetic File of El Dorado by Robert Juan-Cantavella." *Variants* 12-13, pages 163–86.
- ZELLER, HANS, 1955. "Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing." In *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Pierce, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pages 17–58.

Review Essays

Tracing “Auto(bio)graphy” in “Three Novels” by Samuel Beckett: A Review Essay

Stefano Rosignoli

Review essay of Samuel Beckett, *The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*. Installments 2, 4, and 5 (digital modules and accompanying printed volumes). Directed by Dirk Van Hulle and Mark Nixon. Technical Realisation by Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA); London: Bloomsbury, 2013–17.

Instalment 2: *L'Innommable* / *The Unnamable*

- Samuel Beckett, *L'Innommable* / *The Unnamable: A Digital Genetic Edition*. Eds. Dirk Van Hulle, Shane Weller and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA), 2013
<<http://www.beckettarchive.org>>.
- Dirk Van Hulle and Shane Weller, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's L'Innommable* / *The Unnamable*. Brussels: University Press Antwerp; London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 272 pp. ISBNs: 978–90–5718–181–8 (ASP/UPA); 978–1–4725–2951–0 (Bloomsbury).

Instalment 4: *Molloy*

- Samuel Beckett, *Molloy: A Digital Genetic Edition*. Eds. Édouard Magessa O'Reilly, Dirk Van Hulle, Pim Verhulst and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA), 2016
<<http://www.beckettarchive.org>>.
- Édouard Magessa O'Reilly, Dirk Van Hulle and Pim Verhulst, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Molloy*. Brussels: University Press Antwerp; London: Bloomsbury, 2017. 416 pp. ISBNs: 978–90–5718–536–6 (ASP/UPA); 978–1–4725–3256–5 (Bloomsbury).

Instalment 5: *Malone meurt* / *Malone Dies*

- Samuel Beckett, *Malone meurt* / *Malone Dies: A Digital Genetic Edition*. Eds. Dirk Van Hulle, Pim Verhulst and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA), 2017
<<http://www.beckettarchive.org>>.
- Dirk Van Hulle and Pim Verhulst, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Malone meurt* / *Malone Dies*. Brussels: University Press Antwerp; London: Bloomsbury, 2017. 336 pp. ISBNs: 978–90–5718–537–3 (ASP/UPA); 978–1–4725–2344–0 (Bloomsbury).

I

Between 2014 and 2017, University Press Antwerp and Bloomsbury have gifted the community of Beckett studies with three essential research tools which, as part of the *BDMP* — *Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, examine *Molloy*, *Malone meurt* / *Malone Dies* and *L'Innommable* / *The Unnamable* from the perspective of their textual development. Those readers who are not yet familiar with the *BDMP* might rely on two reviews already published by *Variants* (Bailey 2013; McMullan 2019), but most importantly on the “Series Preface” authored by the co-directors of the project. The *BDMP* is presented there as a collaborative research endeavour in twenty-six instalments which involves the universities of Antwerp, Reading and Texas at Austin, grows out of two genetic or variorum editorial initiatives, and is dedicated to the study of Beckett’s manuscripts in the light of genetic criticism and digital scholarship (Van Hulle and Nixon 2011, 7). Since the publication of its first research output ten years ago (Beckett 2011; Van Hulle 2011), this extensive effort of description and interpretation of archival sources has become the most prominent attempt to trace and address the genesis of Beckett’s original works, with a focus on the *avant-texte* in the digital modules of the project.

While the *BDMP*, as a whole, is the result of two turnings in Beckett scholarship — the archival and the digital — the instalments of the *BDMP* dedicated to his “three novels”, specifically, revolve around the two turnings in Beckett’s literary path which marked his “frenzy of writing” or “siege in the room” in 1946–50 (qtd. in O’Reilly et al. 2017, 309):

1. *The turn from omnipotence to impotence, in the contents expressed*: reacting against James Joyce’s attempt to grasp all existence by endlessly enriching the text, Beckett aimed to express an existential impasse by impoverishing his work in terms of characters, plots and motives (Knowlson 1996, 351–53; see also O’Reilly et al. 2017, 25).
2. *The turn from English to French language, in the form of expression*: Beckett begun to write in French not merely due to his decision to live in France permanently, but also in an attempt to pursue, at stylistic level, the same impoverishment which he strived for in his narratives (Knowlson 1996, 356–58; see also O’Reilly et al. 2017, 25).

An outcome of both turnings, *Molloy*, *Malone meurt* and *L’Innommable* were composed in 1947–50 and first published in the original French in 1951–53, establishing a long-lasting commercial bond with Jérôme Lindon at Les Éditions de Minuit, followed by a set of international publishers which issued Beckett’s work for the remainder of his literary career. Beckett translated *Molloy* in English with Patrick Bowles, but he worked alone on *Malone meurt*, initially deeming the task “child’s play after the Bowles revision” in a letter to Barney Rosset of 18 October 1954 (Beckett 2009–16, 2: 507), and on *L’Innommable*, calling the demanding endeavour an “impossible job” in a letter to Pamela Mitchell of 12

March 1956 (Beckett 2009–16, 2: 606), and he had the three English texts first published in book format in 1955–58. The English translations were collected by Grove Press, Olympia Press and John Calder (Publishers) in 1959–60: a decision which pleased Beckett, who, writing to Judith Schmidt on 5 November 1959, claimed to have “always wanted to see the three together” (qtd. in O’Reilly et al. 2017, 118), although he could also not “bear the thought of word trilogy appearing anywhere”, as reinstated in a letter of 5 May 1959 to Barney Rosset (Beckett 2009–16, 3: 230). Beckett generally referred to the collected edition as “the 3 in 1”, as in the aforementioned letter to Barney Rosset, and at least once as “pseudo-trilogy”, in a letter to Con Leventhal of 26 May 1959 (qtd. in Cohn 2001, 185), but the word “trilogy” eventually slipped into the cover of the Olympia Press edition and the blurb of the Grove and Calder editions (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 81–82; see also Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 107; O’Reilly et al. 2017, 100 and 121). The “three novels”, as the present review essay will call them, borrowing a rather neutral definition occurring as a subtitle and later as a title in Grove’s collected editions (1959 and 1965), also mark Beckett’s turn from coherent storylines to meta-fictional narratives, which has been dated to the watershed between *Malone meurt* and *L’Innommable* or, more precisely, to the watershed between *L’Innommable* and *Textes pour rien* (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 23).

The three instalments of the *BDMP* dedicated to Beckett’s “three novels” offer both a description of the genetic dossiers, partially displayed and transcribed in the digital modules but fully examined in the documentary section of the printed volumes, as well as an interpretation of the genetic dossiers, solely present in the critical section of the printed volumes. “Description” and “interpretation” derive from Hans Zeller’s terms *Befund* [record] and *Deutung* [interpretation], the second of which the *BDMP* borrows with the purpose to shed light on Beckett’s novels as both a product and a process (O’Reilly et al. 2017, 25), which suggests that the *BDMP* also applies editorial theory to a critico-genetic purpose. In Zeller’s essay “Record and Interpretation”, the terms are defined within the boundaries of a methodological enquiry on the reliability of editorial practice in the philology of modern texts, addressing the subjective element which underlies any given edition and exercises a crucial role during the reception of an edited text (Zeller 1995, 18–20). The essay does not recommend to clear textual editing of its subjective element, which means of the individuality of the editor — an unachievable but also unadvisable goal, due to the hermeneutic nature of textual editing itself — but rather to lay that subjectivity out on the page in the wake of Aristarchus’ classical edition of the *Iliad*, structured around a clear division between mechanical *recensio* (objective) and conjectural *emendatio* (subjective) (Zeller 1995, 20–22). While discussing the rationale of editions, the essay endorses a pursuit of the will of the author only as evidenced in the witnesses, prescribing to examine the constitution of texts drawing on authorized versions rather than authorial intention, which requires the collation of printings approved by the author and of “all manuscripts of a work in whose

production the author was involved or that were produced under his instructions" (Zeller 1995, 25–26 and 53n22). If, strictly speaking, the *Befund* [record] is the manuscript itself, then the only aspect of an edition which preserves most of its objectivity is the documentation of the record by utilizing photomechanical reproduction or at least verbal description, whereas all the editorial work aiming to produce a text should be deemed *Deutung* [interpretation] of the manuscript, which preludes to the interpretation of the text offered by literary criticism (Zeller 1995, 42–45). In the *BDMP*, the digital modules and the documentary section of the printed volumes provide photomechanical reproductions of the *avant-textes* and verbal descriptions of the complete genetic dossiers available, respectively, but the same documentary section, which is enriched by a detailed bio-bibliographical element already, is also followed by an interpretive section which conflates editorial and literary interpretation in line with the tradition of genetic criticism. Therefore, in terms of structure the *BDMP* stems from a binary distinction rooted in German *Editionswissenschaft* [editorial studies], but in terms of methodology and purpose it is clearly indebted to French *critique génétique* [genetic criticism]. Consequently, this review essay will address the interaction of the two traditions in the description and interpretation of the genetic dossiers of Beckett's "three novels", offered both in the printed and in the digital sides of the *BDMP*.

II

The description of the genetic dossiers of Beckett's "three novels" does not separate French and English geneses, since the digital modules display the *avant-textes* chronologically as facsimiles with transcriptions and the documentary section of the printed volumes offers verbal descriptions of the entire genetic dossiers organized by type of document examined. The descriptions begin with the French manuscripts, handwritten respectively on four notebooks in Foxrock, Paris and Menton between 2 May and 1 November 1947 (O'Reilly et al. 2017, 33, 37–38, 47 and 51); on two notebooks in Paris between 27 November 1947 and 30 May 1948 (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 47–48); and on two notebooks mostly in Paris and Ussy between 29 March 1949 and an unspecified date in January 1950 (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 32–33). The descriptions then progress towards either the full manuscript or the surviving fragments of the English translations; they gather the extant French and English typescripts, together with the galleys and proofs if available; along with dealing with pre-book publications, French, UK and US editions, and broadcasting scripts almost exclusively in the printed volumes. Speaking of the BBC broadcasts with extracts from the "three novels", I could not readily find a mention of the broadcast from *The Unnamable*, first aired on 19 January 1959, in the corresponding volume of the *BDMP*, whereas the volume dedicated to *Malone Dies* maintains that the recording of the broadcast from the novel, first aired on 18 June 1958, has been lost, and hence no comparison with

the surviving scripts would be possible (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 108 and 116). Although this was certainly true until recent years, I was lucky enough to find the recording in February 2015, thanks to the invaluable assistance of Steven Dryden (Broadcast Recordings Curator, The British Library). Subsequently, the recording has also been digitized by the Sound Conservation Team and made available in the library reading rooms. The documentary section of the printed volumes is consistently marked by two useful features: the quantitative surveys of textual endogenesis, which let us follow the chronology and pace of Beckett’s writing when the autograph is thoroughly dated (as in the case of the French manuscript of *Molloy*), and the comparative surveys of textual epigenesis, which offer either a selection or a complete list of variants between different editions of Beckett’s “three novels”.

The outlined arrangement generates homogeneity throughout the description of the genetic dossiers of Beckett’s “three novels”, which, however, also details the many specificities of each dossier, which can be mentioned here only in passing. *The Making of Samuel Beckett’s Molloy* highlights that the first page of the French manuscript, containing the beginning of the novel, was written on the last day of composition; it suggests that the expunction of the notorious passage on the economy of Ballyba in the French typescript might have been Beckett’s, or a result of his recommendation; it expands on Beckett’s enduring issues with censorship, in the run up to a pre-book publication in the New World Writing series of the New American Library; and it wonders if Beckett had the chance to give his *imprimatur* to any of the first collected editions of his “three novels” in English at all (O’Reilly et al. 2017, 33, 65, 84–86 and 103). *The Making of Samuel Beckett’s Malone meurt / Malone Dies* publishes a detailed collation report of the first notebook of the French manuscript, in an attempt to find the reason of a textual lacuna; it offers a full break-down of the notebook containing the surviving manuscript fragment of the English translation, together with draft letters and prose fragments also pertinent to the genesis of *Foires / Fizzles*; and it speculates on the lost French typescripts, while providing a summary of the discovery of Beckett’s work by Minuit (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 40–43, 50–61 and 62–64). *The Making of Samuel Beckett’s L’Innommable / The Unnamable* shows that the text of the French manuscript closes at the end of the physical manuscript itself, “as if Beckett set himself the task, not so much to write a novel as to fill two notebooks”; it points at Beckett’s unusual decision to write the body of the text on the verso rather than on the recto of the pages in the same manuscript, using the recto rather than the verso for facing-leaf additions, paralinguistics or sparse doodles; and it provides a detailed account of one additional case of censorship suffered by Beckett when Jean Paulhan published a bowdlerized extract from the novel in the second issue of his *NNRF — Nouvelle Nouvelle Revue Française* (February 1953), under the title “Mahood” (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 31, 32–33 and 59–67).

The interpretation of the genetic dossiers of Beckett’s “three novels” in French is strongly interdisciplinary, being rooted in genetic criticism and theory of

literature (or of the visual arts), and is articulated in a paragraph-by-paragraph (or section-by-section) textual analysis, followed by a study of Beckett's authorial translations (or co-translation) in English.

The interpretive section dedicated to *Molloy* in French draws on the definitions of *autograph* (or *holograph*, “écrit de la main de l’auteur” [handwritten by the author]; Grésillon 1994, 241, and Kline 1998, 271), of *autography* (“literally self-life-writing”; Abbott 1996, x) and of *autographic* (said of an artwork, and by extension of its artform, if “the distinction between original and forgery of it is significant”; Goodman 1968, 113) (qtd. in O’Reilly et al. 2017, 25–26). In brief, the analysis of the autographs of *Molloy* in French has the purpose of reconsidering the autographic dimension of literature, in general, and to read Beckett’s novel, in particular, as autography: the study of the genesis of *Molloy*, even more simply, sheds light on the uniqueness of literature and leads to consider *Molloy* as self-writing. And indeed, the autographs of the novel carry meta-fictional passages, omitted or blurred in the published text, which can be read as “auto(bio)graphical” traces, such as scatological imagery symbolizing handwriting, identifications between author and narrator or between narrator and characters, and narrative turns matching the pagination of the physical manuscript or its internal division into paragraphs (O’Reilly et al. 2017, 149–51, 167–68, 185 and 236–37). The textual analysis of the genesis of *Molloy* in French is followed by a thematic analysis of its creative co-translation in English: a full-fledged “re-writing”, conceived as a “writing again” and a “writing anew” (O’Reilly et al. 2017, 338), which grew out of a collaboration which became quite tense, for a while, after the completion of the first half of the translation.

The interpretive section dedicated to *Malone meurt* dwells again on the notions of *autograph*, *autography* and *autographic*, but focuses on the shift from *story* to *discourse* in the “three novels”, read as a transition through a “Coda” in the manuscript rather than as a sudden break along Beckett’s literary path (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 23–24). The analysis characterizes the published *Malone meurt* as “a ‘surface’ text whose particulars are in the manuscript”, going beyond a conception of the novel as a parody of Honoré de Balzac’s realism and tracing in the autographs the decline of the autographical tradition of Jules Renard’s *journal intime* (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 27–29 and 158). The meta-fictional passages, largely introduced in the autographs by way of revision as elsewhere in the “three novels”, are frequently identifications between the author and the narrator, even more often than in *Molloy*, but the peculiarity of *Malone meurt* are the narrator’s comments on his own storytelling, and particularly the expressions of boredom which replace entire sections of the Saposcat/Macmann tale (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 123 and *passim*). The thematic analysis of *Malone Dies*, the first of the “three novels” which Beckett translated alone and which turned out to be a demanding task because of his increasingly hectic schedule, finds an extension of Beckett’s autography again in the continuation of the genesis of the novel as authorial self-translation (Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 275).

The interpretive section dedicated to *L'Innommable* centres on the manifestations of the negative in the novel, addressed as traces of a development towards the “Literatur des Unworts” [literature of the unword/non-word] which Beckett set forth in his “German letter” to Axel Kaun of 9 July 1937 (Beckett 1983, 4 and 173; see also Beckett 2009–16, 1: 515 and 520) and which he pursued under the influence of language scepticism (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 19 and 22). Since this instalment of the *BDMP* was published a few years prior to the other two examined by the present review essay, the analysis here prefigures the aforementioned comparison between *autograph*, *autography* and *autographic*. The meta-fictional passages are deemed to prove “the essential metaphoricity of thought” not only in the contents expressed but also in the style expressing them, especially by way of epanorthosis, or rhetorical self-correction, used elsewhere in the “three novels” but not as extensively as in *L'Innommable* (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 26 and 103). The thematic analysis of *The Unnamable* reads Beckett’s wearying self-translation as a continuation of his “unwording” project: a self-decomposition of language in the aporetic pursuit to express the inexpressible (or “unnamable”) in the morphology, syntax and lexicon of the novel, or by way of rhetorical devices (Van Hulle and Weller 2014, 194–95).

III

The value of the instalments of the *BDMP* dedicated to Beckett’s “three novels” is chiefly a result of their focus on textual evidence, since they aim in the first instance to collate, arrange, display and detail three genetic dossiers. This descriptive effort — summed up in each essential “Genetic Map”, in the printed volumes, or “Manuscript Chronology”, in the digital modules, as well as in the useful pie charts which can be found in the “Statistics” section under “Free Features”, in the digital modules — leads to circulate documents scattered around the globe and at times largely unknown, among which can be found textual fragments expunged along the genesis of the “three novels”. The passage on the economy of Ballyba, in the French manuscript and typescript of *Molloy* (FN3 [HRC, MS SB/4/7], 65r–78r, and FT [HRC, MS SB/17/6], 214r–24r; see also O’Reilly et al. 2017, 49–50, 62–67, 262–76 and 380–87); the excited segments of the Sapocat/Macmann tale, in the French manuscript of *Malone meurt* (FN1 [HRC, MS SB/7/2], 68r–71r, 72r, 76r–82r and *passim*; see also Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 150–56, 157–58, 164–78 and *passim*); and the “Coda” which might well be a prelude to *L'Innommable*, again in the French manuscript of *Malone meurt* (FN2 [HRC, MS SB/7/4], 110v–12r; see also Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 41, 253–56 and 304–07), are all notable examples. The description of the genetic dossiers also summarizes the circumstances of Beckett’s composition and examines Beckett’s practice of composition itself, reinstating, for instance, his habit to leave blank versos (or rectos) for facing-leaf additions, to jot down paralipomena later developed in the body of the text, and to produce typescript

carbon copies. The instalments of the *BDMP* under examination here, however, also acquire value due to their interpretive nature, since they aim to locate the textual scars produced by Beckett's "vaguening" of his work in order to recover the *mémoire du contexte* [contextual memory] of the work itself (Ferrer 2011, 121; see also O'Reilly et al. 2017, 289–90). According to the line of interpretation presented in the *BDMP*, it is logical to argue that only the autographs can unveil that memory, which reveals the autographic dimension of literature and initiates a textual analysis which ultimately leads to read as autography Beckett's non-programmatic *écriture a processus* in his "three novels" (Hay 1986–87). The two-fold nature of the *BDMP*, which this review essay has attempted to examine with specific reference to three of its instalments, makes it essential for consultation and research, leaving space for further enquiries focusing on the exogenesis and epigenesis of Beckett's works, in an attempt, for instance, to fill the lacunae which currently exist in the *avant-textes* of the English *Molloy* and *Malone Dies* (O'Reilly et al. 2017, 55–61; Van Hulle and Verhulst 2017, 56–58).

Bibliography

- ABBOTT, H. PORTER, 1996. *Beckett Writing Beckett: The Author in the Autograph*. Ithaca (NY), London: Cornell University Press.
- BAILEY, IAN, 2013. "Dirk Van Hulle, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / What is the Word* and Samuel Beckett. *Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / What is the Word*. Eds. Dirk Van Hulle and Vincent Neyt." *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship* 10, pages 304–08.
- BECKETT, SAMUEL, 1983. *Disjecta: Miscellaneous Writings and a Dramatic Fragment*, edited by Ruby Cohn. London: John Calder.
- , 2009–16. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*, edited by George Craig, Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn, and Lois More Overbeck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2011. *Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / what is the word: A Digital Genetic Edition*, edited by Dirk Van Hulle and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA). Available from: <http://www.beckettarchive.org/> (Accessed: 2021–04–06).
- COHN, RUBY, 2001. *A Beckett Canon*. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press.
- FERRER, DANIEL, 2011. *Logiques du brouillon. Modèles pour une critique génétique*. Paris: Seuil.
- GOODMAN, NELSON, 1968. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis (IN): The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

- GRÉSILLON, ALMUTH, 1994. *Eléments de critique génétique. Lire les manuscrits modernes*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- HAY, LOUIS, 1986–87. "La troisième dimension de la littérature." *Texte* 5–6, pages 313–28.
- KLINE, MARY-JO, 1998. *A Guide to Documentary Editing*. Baltimore (MD): Johns Hopkins University Press, 2nd edition.
- KNOWLSON, JAMES, 1996. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury.
- McMULLAN, ANNA, 2019. "Dirk Van Hulle, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Krapp's Last Tape / La Dernière Bande*." *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship* 14, pages 197–99.
- O'REILLY, ÉDOUARD MAGESSA, DIRK VAN HULLE, and PIM VERHULST, 2017. *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Molloy*. Brussels and London: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA) and Bloomsbury.
- VAN HULLE, DIRK, 2011. *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / what is the word*. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA).
- VAN HULLE, DIRK and MARK NIXON, 2011. "Series Preface." In *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / what is the word*, Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA), pages 7–8.
- VAN HULLE, DIRK and PIM VERHULST, 2017. *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Malone meurt / Malone Dies*. Brussels and London: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA) and Bloomsbury.
- VAN HULLE, DIRK and SHANE WELLER, 2014. *The Making of Samuel Beckett's L'innommable / The Unnamable*. Brussels and London: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA) and Bloomsbury.
- ZELLER, HANS, 1995. "Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing." In *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, edited by Hans Walter Gabler, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Pierce, Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press, pages 17–58.

Reviews

Review of Thomas Mann, *Joseph und seine Brüder. Text und Kommentar*. 2 vols. in 2 pts. Eds. Jan Assmann, et al. (Vols. 7(1–2) and 8(1–2) of *Große kommentierte Frankfurter Ausgabe. Werke — Briefe — Tagebücher*. Eds. Heinrich Detering, et al.) Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2018. 1923 pp. (vols. 7(1)–8(1), continuously paginated) and 2091 pp. (vols. 7(2)–8(2), continuously paginated). ISBN 978–3–10–048330–0 (vol. 7) and 978–3–10–048333–1 (vol. 8).

The *Große kommentierte Frankfurter Ausgabe* [Large Annotated Frankfurt Edition] of Thomas Mann’s collected writings is a monumental editorial project. Having started in 2001 with the publication of *Buddenbrooks*, the complete edition is projected to encompass thirty-eight volumes of critical texts including literary works, essays, letters, and diaries. Each of these volumes also contains an extensive commentary, annotations, and selected materials. In the case of *Joseph und seine Brüder* [Joseph and His Brothers], these materials include excerpts from Thomas Mann’s work notes, the Joseph story (*Gen.* 27–50) from Mann’s family bible complete with marginalia, and a selection of letters from experts advising the author on relevant topics. The volumes are curated and edited by renowned Thomas Mann expert Dieter Borchmeyer, Egyptologist and religious study scholar Jan Assmann, and Stephan Stachorski, who previously co-edited with Hermann Kurzke the six-volume edition of Mann’s *Essays* (1993–97).

Thomas Mann’s *opus maximum*, the biblical tetralogy *Joseph und seine Brüder*, is the most recent addition to the Frankfurt annotated editorial project. The editors sensibly decided to divide the two-thousand-page novel into two volumes, with *Die Geschichten Jaakobs* [The Stories of Jacob] (1933) and *Der junge Joseph* [Young Joseph] (1934) comprising volume 7(1), while volume 8(1) includes *Joseph in Ägypten* [Joseph in Egypt] (1936) and *Joseph der Ernährer* [Joseph the Provider] (1943). This seemingly obvious distribution already constitutes a significant improvement over the *Gesammelte Werke in dreizehn Bänden* [Collected Works in Thirteen Volumes] (1974): in this earlier authoritative edition, the biblical novel is similarly split between volumes IV and V, but for some incomprehensible reason volume IV randomly ends with Part Four of *Joseph in Ägypten*.

In the Frankfurt edition of *Joseph und seine Brüder*, the critical text is based on the first printed edition of the novel rather than on the manuscripts. The textual emendations to previous editions, while numerous, are mostly inconspicuous,

if frequently amusing: in *Der junge Joseph*, for example, the editors correct the blunder of one of Thomas Mann's more infamous secretaries, who had mistakenly transcribed the phrase "Verkehrstrubel der Reisestraße" [bustling traffic on Egypt's highway (Mann 2005, 1055)] as "Reisetrubel der Verkehrsstraße" [bustling crowd on Egypt's traffic way] (Mann 2018, 7(2): 213). There are, however, two notable exceptions: for the first time since the very first edition, the *Vorspiel: Höllenfahrt* [Prelude: Descent into Hell], preceding *Die Geschichten Jaakobs*, is separately paginated in Roman numerals. Secondly, a single comma was deliberately deleted in the title of the fourth and final novel, changing it from *Joseph, der Ernährer* to *Joseph der Ernährer* — a significant difference according to the editors, since it turns a nominal attribute into a part of a proper name, following the style of rulers such as William the Conqueror (see 7(2): 211).

The overall sparseness of significant textual corrections is all the more notable if one takes into account the work's rather turbulent genesis in the years between 1926 and 1943. On a personal level, this period saw Mann's decision to not return to Germany in 1933, the loss of his German citizenship in 1936, and his life in exile, first in Switzerland and then in the U.S. Considering these circumstances, it is surprising that the first two volumes of the novel could still be published in Berlin in 1933 and 1934, while the third and fourth volume had to be published in Vienna in 1936 and Stockholm in 1943 respectively after the forced relocation of Thomas Mann's Jewish publisher Gottfried Bermann Fischer.

More complex even than the publication process was the tetralogy's reception. As the Frankfurt Edition documents it extensively, it organizes the material geographically while also considering the reviewers' socio-political or ideological backgrounds: domestic criticism is kept separate from the reactions of the German exile press, which in turn is distinguished from the reception in German-speaking countries as well as in the rest of Europe and in the U.S. Simultaneously, the editors quote bourgeois-conservative reviewers next to right-wing polemicists and Catholic critics, contrasting their opinions with the overwhelmingly positive reactions from Jewish intellectuals to *Die Geschichten Jaakobs* — reactions that, surprisingly, could still be voiced in Germany in 1933.

This edition's most important contribution to Thomas Mann scholarship, however, lies in the extensive annotations that constitute the core of the commentary in each volume: a total of almost one thousand pages of detailed explanations of words, concepts and circumstances related to (among countless other topics) the biblical source material and its variations in the Islamic tradition; Thomas Mann's archaic use of language; his eclectic research on Ancient Egypt, the religions of the Middle East, and the gnosis; as well as the influence of Richard Wagner, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and Franklin D. Roosevelt on Mann's epic re-imagining of the Joseph story. The depth and variety of these elucidations are especially apparent when juxtaposed with the previously authoritative reference work, Bernd-Jürgen Fischer's *Handbuch zu Thomas Manns "Josephsromanen"* [Handbook of Thomas Mann's "Joseph Novels"] (2002). This comparison is not, in any way, intended as a criticism of Fischer's work: his compilation is a valuable

resource, at the same time clearly illustrating that no single scholar is able to do justice to all the topics, motives and interwoven references constituting the fictional world of *Joseph und seine Brüder* — a task which Assmann, Borchmeyer and Stachorski accomplish with erudition and diligence.

The new edition of Thomas Mann's biblical tetralogy upholds in every way the high editorial standards that have distinguished the *Große kommentierte Frankfurter Ausgabe* since its inception in 2002. With its well-structured abundance of factual knowledge, interpretative insights and selected materials, it is a treasure trove for any Thomas Mann enthusiast, and an invaluable resource for all future scholarship on *Joseph und seine Brüder*.

Bibliography

FISCHER, BERND-JÜRGEN, 2002. *Handbuch zu Thomas Manns "Josephsromanen"*. Tübingen, Basel: A. Francke Verlag.

MANN, THOMAS, 1974. *Gesammelte Werke in dreizehn Bänden*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2nd edition.

———, 1993–97. *Essays*, edited by Hermann Kurzke and Stephan Stachorski. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag.

———, 2005. *Joseph and His Brothers: The Stories of Jacob, Young Joseph, Joseph in Egypt, Joseph the Provider*. New York, London, Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf.

Christian Baier

Review of Carlo Emilio Gadda, *Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana*. Ed. Giorgio Pinotti. Milano: Adelphi, 2018. 370 pp. ISBN: 978–8–84–593306–6.

Giorgio Pinotti, a refined connoisseur of Carlo Emilio Gadda, offers again in the new edition of the works of the Milanese writer, which Adelphi has been publishing for a few years, a text of *Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana* [That Awful Mess on Via Merulana] which is identical to the text which we are already familiar with, being based on the second reprint, revised and amended by the author, issued as a volume-publication in September 1957, soon after the first one, available from the end of July of that same year.

In the absence of textual variants suited to entice Pinotti’s philological talent, he still gifts us a useful “Nota al testo” [Note on the Text] of approximately fifty pages, where he revisits the troubled composition of the novel, beginning with the 1945 Roman crime news that inspired Gadda to pen the novel, up until the present edition.

As Pinotti unravels the textual history for us (a sort of novel within the novel, one might say) in an impeccable chronological order, abounding in dramatic twists, he shares several novelties consisting in a few flashes from documents rich in sketches and working notes, recently unearthed among the Gadda papers preserved at the Archivio Liberati in Villafranca di Verona. Among the most significant, we recommend four photographs in the *Ager Romanus* by Gadda himself (1953), while he was exploring the Latian countryside in order to achieve a more mimetic representation of the territory. A curiously suggestive “finale ‘imperfetto’” [“imperfect” ending] (Pinotti 2018, 322; quoting Gadda), handwritten on a squared sheet, is another find. It was most likely intended to seal a hypothetical second volume of the novel which, as we know, Gadda never authored, hence disappointing the expectations of his insistent and impatient publisher Livio Garzanti. A “splendido brano” [magnificent passage] of high lyrical tone, a single printed page long, whose reading we strongly recommend (Pinotti 2018, 323).

From the papers now resurfaced, attentively quoted but not exhibited by Pinotti, emerges the confirmation that Gadda strived to overcome structural concerns and imagine solutions regarding the ending not just of the never

released second volume but of even that one, the only one, we are familiar with. However, Gadda's adumbrated hypotheses and his cherished solutions (honestly, not many) were, as a matter of fact, set aside and the *Pasticciaccio*, among short schemas and early drafts, pursuits of connections, completions and mends, ended up being left untouched as it is, with a conclusion that might seem provisional, but which Gadda decided, with unambiguous authority, to make definitive.

To tell the truth, upon examining the documentary fragments produced by Pinotti, we are rather confirmed in our belief that Gadda had no intention to send a sequel to press. Ready to make any pledge to his publishers as long as he could break free from their pressing demands and injunctions, the writer did not feel, like Garzanti, the necessity to repeat the commercial success of the novel. Pinotti, one of the few interpreters of the *Pasticciaccio* who, once again, believes that Gadda intended to end his crime fiction novel by revealing the culprit, as already argued in his annotated edition of the correspondence between Gadda and Pietro Citati (Gadda 2013), insists here that the auto-exegetic pronouncements which Gadda offered through the years, aiming to defend his choice not to close the book, are pretextuous. Pinotti, therefore, confirms that in his opinion the author's explanations should be construed as misleading statements, as attempts to ascribe, from the sixties onwards, a narrative *défaillance* "a un meditato disegno, trasformando così la resa in vittoria" [to a pondered design, in order to turn surrender into victory] (Pinotti 2018, 347). However, Pinotti later admits, with delightful acrobatics, that the authorial statements are justified by the fearless solution which Gadda devised for the ending, and recovers, surprisingly, a famous pronouncement by Giancarlo Roscioni — who, for that matter, was hardly *flatteur* towards a narrator of so travelled craftiness such as Gadda — according to whom the unfinished nature of the work should be ascribed to the fatigue of the chess player who, "dopo aver cercato di prevedere il maggior numero possibile di mosse [...], spostò la prima pedina che lo liberi dal compito di ulteriormente riflettere e decidere" [having attempted to envisage the highest number of moves [...], opts for the first piece which can free him from the task of thinking and deciding any further] (Roscioni 1975, 91–92; see Pinotti 2018, 347). But is it really likely that Gadda put so much effort retrospectively in fabricating and then disseminating nothing more than a captivating meta-textual tale in order to cover up a creative defeat and avoid the admission of guilt? As a matter of fact, the conveyor of the most plausible answer to this question is still Gianfranco Contini, who suggested taking authorial intention duly into account, observing the following:

Tutti sanno che il *Pasticciaccio* è, anche nell'ultima edizione, un libro incompiuto; ma, precisazione ben più importante, un libro, se non proprio così impostato intenzionalmente, accettato deliberatamente come incompiuto. Se la fine sia stata soltanto abbozzata o non abbia proceduto oltre la concezione mentale, è cosa del tutto secondaria di fronte a quest'accettazione, che Gadda difese (per la verità senza troppa fatica) contro le insistenze editoriali.

[Everybody knows that the *Pasticciaccio* is, even in its last edition, an unfinished book; but, as it is far more important to clarify, a book which was, if not quite intentionally so configured, still deliberately accepted as unfinished. Whether the ending was only outlined or it never progressed beyond the mental conception, is definitely of secondary importance *vis-à-vis* such acceptance, which Gadda defended (as a matter of fact without too much effort), against the insistence of his publisher.]

(Contini 1989, 45–46)

Ultimately, it is not surprising that the great scholar's assessment radically differs from that of great editors such as Citati (in the past) and Pinotti (nowadays): exactly like the great publishing houses which employ them, they ardently desire to unearth abundant unpublished materials to be sent to press, to the extent of always hoping that a manuscript perhaps vaguely promised one day materializes as a substantial rediscovered autograph. Contini instead assessed Gadda's discourse around the novel for what it is: perhaps just an act, but an authorial act, more assertive than evasive. And indeed, if one considers Gadda's statements about his novel, it definitely does not look like his thoughts on the conclusion of the *Pasticciaccio* tended towards the digression or the misdirection, nor even towards the *pis-aller* of the drained chess player. On the contrary, one might argue that Gadda attempted to rigorously support the reasons for an originality not suffered and far from casual. And in any case, Pinotti himself, for the sake of transparency, reminds us that since as early as 1958 Gadda wrote to his cousin Piero Gadda Conti that he did not wish to hear ever again of the *Pasticciaccio*, also acknowledging: "resterà dunque una chimera la continuazione-fine auspicata dall'editore" [the continuation-ending yearned for by the publisher will therefore remain a chimera] (Gadda Conti 1974, 161; see Pinotti 2018, 346).

It is not necessary to eulogize Gadda's Roman novel yet again, since it has already been widely reviewed through the decades and has been the object of numerous critical studies produced by specialists and mostly meant for them. To those who intend to approach this indispensable classic of European literature for the first time — a work which has come back to the fore precisely due to Adelphi's well-timed new edition, but which remains arduously decipherable for the reader not accustomed to Gadda's extremely difficult prose — it may be suggested to draw on tools which, together with the already quoted "Nota al testo", can further the understanding of the novel. In the first instance the sturdy and valuable *Commento* [Commentary] of the *Pasticciaccio*, an impressive work (2 vols., 1184 pp.) coordinated by Maria Antonietta Terzoli (2015), which eviscerates the text line by line, with glosses of various length and intensity: a useful encyclopaedia that may be consulted to escape doubts and uncertainties, but also, if one wishes to go further in-depth, in order to discover extraordinary layerings of meaning not immediately perceptible. Whoever wishes to tackle the novel using more manageable aids will instead have the chance to draw on two additional volumes, prepared again by Terzoli together with the pupils attending her Romanisches Seminar at the University of Basel: to the first one, *Un*

meraviglioso ordigno. Paradigmi e modelli nel Pasticciaccio di Gadda [A Marvelous Device: Paradigms and Models in Gadda's *Pasticciaccio*] (2013), is entrusted a broad and new critical analysis, involving multiple voices, which preludes to the publication of the *Commento*; the second one, *Gadda: guida al Pasticciaccio* [Gadda: A Guide to the *Pasticciaccio*] (2016), suggests a first approach to the novel, offering a chapter-by-chapter reading which allows even the most inexperienced to find their way through the maze-like plot and the equally maze-like nooks and crannies of the Latian countryside and of the tenement in Via Merulana where the narrative yarn tangles into an awful mess.

Bibliography

CONTINI, GIANFRANCO, 1989. *Quarant'anni d'amicizia. Scritti su Carlo Emilio Gadda (1934–1988)*. Torino: Einaudi.

GADDA, CARLO EMILIO, 2013. *Un gomitolo di concause. Lettere a Pietro Citati (1957–1969)*, edited by Giorgio Pinotti. Milano: Adelphi.

GADDA CONTI, PIERO, 1974. *Le Confessioni di Carlo Emilio Gadda*. Milano: Pan.

PINOTTI, GIORGIO, 2018. "Nota al testo." In *Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana*, authored by Gadda, Carlo Emilio, edited by Giorgio Pinotti, Milano: Adelphi, pages 309–55.

ROSCIONI, GIAN CARLO, 1975. *La disarmonia prestabilita. Studio su Gadda*. Torino: Einaudi.

TERZOLI, MARIA ANTONIETTA, ed., 2015. *Commento a Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana di Carlo Emilio Gadda*. Roma: Carocci.

———, 2016. *Gadda: guida al "Pasticciaccio"*. Roma: Carocci.

TERZOLI, MARIA ANTONIETTA, COSETTA VERONESE, and VINCENZO VITALE, eds., 2013. *Un meraviglioso ordigno. Paradigmi e modelli nel "Pasticciaccio" di Gadda*. Roma: Carocci.

Manuela Bertone

Review of Walter Benjamin, *Berliner Chronik / Berliner Kindheit um neunzehnhundert*. 2 vols. Eds. Burkhardt Lindner and Nadine Werner. (Vol. 11(1–2) of *Werke und Nachlaß. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Eds. Christoph GÖdde and Henri Lonitz.) Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2019. 652 and 466 pp. ISBN: 978–3–518–58728–7.

Presented as a “complete critical edition”, Walter Benjamin’s *Werke und Nachlaß* [Writings and Literary Estate], published by Suhrkamp since 2008, has opened a new phase in the convoluted reception history of this seminal thinker’s work, suggesting that a definitive edition might have finally arrived after decades of belated discoveries of unpublished texts. On behalf of the Hamburger Stiftung zur Förderung von Wissenschaft und Kultur and under the general editorship of Christoph GÖdde and Henri Lonitz, as well as in cooperation with the Walter Benjamin Archiv, ten volumes have been published thus far, with eleven still to come. The volume under review here, *Berliner Chronik / Berliner Kindheit um neunzehnhundert* [A Berlin Chronicle / Berlin Childhood around 1900], published in 2019, gathers an impressive and remarkably useful range of contents: not only all the extant versions of Benjamin’s collection of autobiographical vignettes — manuscripts, typescripts, and published versions — but also a lengthy and thorough account of its genesis and publication history — more than a hundred pages of relevant letters, charts establishing meticulous comparisons between texts, and copious annotations. This volume constitutes a crucial test case for the editorial principles of the complete critical edition published by Suhrkamp, for two main reasons: on the one hand, *Berlin Childhood* occupies a privileged place in the history of German editions of Benjamin’s works. It was the first book published in post-war Germany (1950, ed. Theodor W. Adorno) and thus marked the beginning of Benjamin’s return to scholarly and public discourse. On the other hand, and more importantly, *Berlin Childhood* is concerned with two central matters, both of which directly relate to editorial principles and textual scholarship at large: a theory of language (in particular of *Schrift* [writing]) and a theory of memory and tradition, as it comes to bear on the transmission of texts.

The following passage crystallizes Benjamin’s understanding of memory and simultaneously sheds light on the value of the critical edition of *Berlin Childhood*:

Wer sich der eignen verschütteten Vergangenheit zu nähern trachtet, muß sich verhalten wie ein Mann, der gräbt. Vor allem darf er sich nicht scheuen, immer wieder auf einen und denselben Sachverhalt zurückzukommen — ihn auszustreuen wie man Erde ausstreut, ihn umzuwühlen, wie man Erdreich umwühlt.

[Whoever desires to approach his own buried past must behave like a man who digs. Above all he must not shy away from returning again and again to the same state of affairs — disseminating it like one disseminates earth, turning it over like one turns over soil.]

(1: 367)

Benjamin conceived the work of memory in archaeological terms: a repeated digging up, rummaging through layered memories, and a subsequent dispersal of what has been dug up. The critical edition of *Berlin Childhood* enables the reader to perform a similar archaeological search, as far as the textual development of Benjamin's collection is concerned: it displays the various layers of the collection's "soil", allowing the reader to rummage through them. The layering of textual variants and their reoccurrence demystify the idea of a stable transmission of an unaltered text and instead presents the texts as loose amalgamations — still rigorously structured and clearly formed, at times — inviting the reader to delve into them. In short, the editorial principles of the critical edition line up closely and productively with the theory of memory in the collection, specifically with the definition of the relationship which we entertain with our past and of the strategies to recover that past in our present.

More can also be said about the consistency between Benjamin's theory of writing and the editorial principles of the critical edition of *Berlin Childhood*. Instead of relegating to an apparatus the textual variants which Benjamin produced during almost an entire decade, the critical edition displays in the main text all its emendations and insertions, using symbols, changing fonts, and adding marginalia in order to replicate the visual appearance of the original document. Through these visual disruptions of the reader's gaze, attention is drawn to the materiality of language as an obstacle, suggesting that reading is not a straightforward process of semantic extraction of meaning from a text. This is precisely what Benjamin presents as the heart of his theory of language, in *Berlin Childhood*. For a child, it is above all the graphic and phonetic appearance of words that matters, not necessarily to the exclusion of meaning, but as a diverging, alternative access to language. In one episode recounted by the narrator, for instance, the child encounters potboilers in his school's library and loses himself in the "Gestöber der Lettern" [flurry of letters] (1: 514). This flurry of letters offers the child — and by extension the reader — the opportunity to envelop themselves in words: "Beizeiten lernte ich es, in die Worte, die eigentlich Wolken waren, mich zu mummen" [In good time, I learned how to wrap myself into the words that were actually clouds] (1: 538). Words become nebulous, enveloping clouds: it is this unsettling of the text, brought out by the editorial principles of the critical edition, that forecloses the text from being read as a

charming, nostalgic reminiscence which merely entertains or delights the reader with its style. Instead, the reader is forced to engage with Benjamin's theory of language through the very encounter with Benjamin's own language.

The importance attributed to the materiality of Benjamin's writing reaches a highpoint in one of the most impressive aspects of the editorial project published by Suhrkamp: the accompanying online digital database *Walter Benjamin Digital* (2016–). This resource is set to pair the publication of volumes 17, 18, and 20 as well — that is, the volumes gathering the unfinished late works — and the advantages which it offers partially counterweight the almost prohibitive retail price of the printed volumes. The range of features of the online digital database combines practicality with the possibility to wrap oneself into the text as if it were a nebulous cloud: the manuscripts are displayed as digital facsimiles overlaid with diplomatic transcriptions which can be smoothly crossfaded. A search tool allows us to trace individual words or sentences and to arrange the texts according to their edition, their repository, or the project to which they belong. The search tool is supplemented by bookmark and download tools as well as by a trilingual (German, English, French) description. While there certainly exists the danger of a fetishization of the “original” text in the form of the facsimile, this online resource is not only extremely useful to the reader, but also helps to counteract the occasional resurfacing of hagiographic reverence in Benjamin studies by presenting texts as mobile creations which exist to be rummaged through, dug up, and disseminated.

Bibliography

HAMBURGER STIFTUNG ZUR FÖRDERUNG VON WISSENSCHAFT UND KULTUR, 2016–.

Walter Benjamin Digital. Available from:

<https://www.walter-benjamin.online/> (Accessed: 2021-06-24).

Jonas Rosenbrück

Review of Peter Shillingsburg, *Textuality and Knowledge: Essays*. University Park (PA): Pennsylvania State University Press, 2017. 240 pp. ISBN: 978-0-271-07850-2.

In "Some Functions of Textual Criticism", Peter Shillingsburg comments the homogenising effect of the poetry anthology. By effacing the social and material contexts in which its poems were first produced, and by reproducing them all "in the same type font with approximately the same margins and spaces between the lines" (60) they belie the individuality of each individual poem. The same observation can be made of an essay collection. The thirteen essays contained in *Textuality and Knowledge* started life in a number of formats for different audiences, including journal articles ("Textual Criticism, the Humanities, and J.M. Coetzee", 13–27; "Convenient Scholarly Editions", 134–44), conference papers ("Responsibility for Textual Changes in Long-Distance Revisions", 64–82; "Text as Communication", 83–93), and keynote speeches ("The Semiotics of Bibliography", 28–47; "Some Functions of Textual Criticism", 48–63). According to the book jacket, as collated in a single volume these essays distil "decades of [...] thought on literary history and criticism" from one of the most experienced and well-travelled textual editors in the business.

Some of the texts have been revised, and some melded from more than one earlier iteration for this collection. Were Shillingsburg not a textual editor, it might not occur to a reader to ask exactly where such revisions have been made. However, remarks such as "We have had enough of electronic editions and archives created as look-don't-touch products [...] ultimately abandoned" (192) read differently from the rival viewpoints of 2007, 2010 and 2017. Shillingsburg making this observation in 2007 is a Cassandra; in 2017, he is underlining the overdue need for a sea-change in the ways in which electronic editions are planned, funded and executed. Similarly, the hope that "If we cannot police ourselves, perhaps the public will" as voiced in a pre-Brexit, pre-Trump era now carries a weight of dramatic irony that does not apply if it is, in fact, a contemporary revision. The sociology of critical texts matters as much as that of the literature they critique.

It would be facile to weigh the rival "importance" of such diverse outputs. However, the manner of their grouping can make for uneven reading. Shillings-

burg's inaugural professorial lecture given at De Montfort University, for example, is directed at a lay audience and argues the case for textual criticism with passion and concision. This eminently accessible piece succeeds "The Semiotics of Bibliography", an involved and detailed argument for the re-evaluation of authorial intention after its almost wholesale disavowal by D.F. McKenzie, reviewing the 20th century history of textual criticism controversies as it goes along. Shillingsburg's view of authorial intent here is closely allied to his Platonic concept of the "work", which runs throughout the collection but is delineated in most detail in "How Literary Works Exist" (115–33).

These theoretical enquiries are applied to case studies in "Some Functions of Textual Criticism" and "Responsibility for Textual Changes in Long-Distance Revisions". In particular, Shillingsburg's discussion (originally presented to an audience at Loyola University Chicago) of a "lost" two-and-a-half pages of *To the Lighthouse* (1927) cut immediately prior to publication raises multiple questions related to authorial intent. These two-and-a-half pages were, Shillingsburg tells us, cut by Woolf herself. They were not, however, omitted primarily for aesthetic concerns but because the last signature of printed pages was simply too long for the format in which the book was to be bound. That in itself makes Shillingsburg ask whether the longer or the cut version of the text is closer to that Woolf thought best (71). Furthermore, if the cut is accepted, then subsequent editorial difficulties arise from the fact that there are more than one set of "cut" proofs in existence. These are not identical, and carry a number of parallel, smaller emendations. Shillingsburg's enquiry as read here is mostly pragmatic: if one is engaged in producing an eclectic text of *To the Lighthouse* then which if any of these emendations, large and small, should be adopted — and from which text(s)?

The practical conundrums of this scenario notwithstanding, for literary biographers it is perhaps more revealing as a study in the *process* of authorial decision-making. Authors revise and emend their texts for a whole range of reasons, which might span from "purely aesthetic" to "purely practical" on one axis and "wholly conscious" to "wholly unconscious" on another. Frequently, authors are less precious about the contours of their "work" than their readers and critics: witness Woolf's apparent willingness to cut those two-and-a-half pages for convenience of printing. That is a conscious, pragmatic decision. Less consciously, but equally pragmatically, authors might cut a description short or revise less than usual because they are getting a headache, running low on paper or need to put the bins out. Such decisions leave no trace. Divining "intent" in this network of influences foxes behavioural psychologists, let alone literary critics. Shillingsburg, particularly perhaps the younger Shillingsburg, might tell us it's cowardice not to try. But to those editors inclined to what Shillingsburg characterizes as "critical archiving", that is presenting historically intact versions of text with the minimum of editorial intervention, organising editorial practice around perceived authorial motivation remains a precarious and tangled exercise.

However, there is more at stake in this collection than the (admittedly fraught)

questions of whether to restore this or that reading, correct that spelling or insert that comma in a critical edition. Throughout the essays, Shillingsburg asks two key questions about the acquisition of knowledge: “where does that come from?” and “how do you know?”. These two questions override any in-fighting between specific groups of textual editors, and Shillingsburg deploys them time and again to demonstrate how textual criticism must be the bedrock of the humanities. In “Publishers’ Records and the History of Book Production” (178–92), Shillingsburg shows that, as early as 1805, American presidents were denigrating the scourge of “false facts” (191–92). The term finds its corollary in our contemporary battle with “fake news”. Shillingsburg’s insistence that *we* insist on the importance of provenance in our classrooms and editions is timely, urgent and — as we would expect — supported by the soundest available textual evidence.

Barbara Cooke

Review of Paul Eggert, *The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies: Scholarly Editing and Book History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 242 pp. ISBN: 978-1-10-864101-2.

Which academy, one wonders, would venture a summer school or sabbatical-term training camp for experienced textual scholars together with early-career hands-on (analogue) and "keys-on" (digital) editors for the purpose of exchanging practical experience from their variegated individual tasks and projects in the scholarly editing and digital exploration of texts and works of literature? The circle of participants should be international, representing distinctly different schools of expertise. It should also, for an essential backgrounding of theoretical conceptions and methodological reflections, comprise the literary and literary-genetic critic, as well as the interdisciplinary digital humanist. An assembly on such scale would convene the competence for searching dynamic investigations of the literary foundations of our cultural heritage and their future, as well as past, medial unlocking. It would be well served with Paul Eggert's monograph of 2019 from Cambridge University Press, *The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies* to kick it off, and from there to develop exchanges to exemplify and counter-exemplify, substantiate, modify, or critique the tenets, positions, and systematizations the book offers.

The Introduction towards laying out in manifold detail that "[t]he present book [...] centres itself around the much overlooked concept of the work" (9) is first a warmly personal, then a stimulatingly sweeping appetizer to the book's perspectives and argument. Before anatomising the centre, the second chapter, in a rhetorical sweep typical of Paul Eggert, "revives the work concept" triadically via music, literature, and historic buildings. The work concept is so at once holistically modelled on the art form of music in a "continuity from composer to score to performers to audience" (22). The third chapter draws us fully into the book's core area of expertise, that of textual criticism and scholarly editing. As guided, though, by a seasoned practitioner and theorist of Anglo-American textual criticism, we are taken on a route of proper schooling in the template of that discipline, Shakespeare editing in printed scholarly editions. Once more, the rhetorical strategy is thus delightfully oblique ("By indirections

find directions out”, as Polonius in *Hamlet*, II.i.65, phrased it). Eggert’s opening gambit for this chapter is to imagine a digital native’s first encounter with that dinosaur from analogue times, the editing of Shakespeare, touchstone for principles and practice of editing in the Anglo-American environment. In a crash-course manner, the chapter climbs rapidly to the book’s full professional heights. It culminates in analytics suited to enlighten, even redirect Shakespeare editing itself — and so unashamedly leaves the digital neophyte well behind.

In its two subsequent chapters, under the headings “The Reader-Oriented Scholarly Edition” (4) and “Digital Editions: The Archival Impulse and the Editorial Impulse” (5), the book reaches its core systematics. Significantly, the “reader-orientation”, essential as it is for Eggert’s overall triadic conception encapsulated in the book’s title, is established and argued first in Chapter 4. This sets out from the definition that editions are arguments, and that they are transactional (64). While Eggert concedes that “editions may have succeeded brilliantly in their presentational role”, he also emphasises that “they have failed, or at least partially failed, in their transactional one” (67). The vision therefore “is a more reader-oriented scholarly edition than has been feasible in print” (76). The sights are thus directed on support from the digital medium. Chapter 5, “Digital Editions”, builds up to devise design and format for digital editing and digital editions of the present and for the future. To order theoretically and pragmatically what in documents and transmissions editors encounter and what, in combination, their preservational, presentational and transactional responsibilities should comprise, Eggert models the editorial and interpretatively critical, and thus always readerly, trajectory of engagement with text, work, and reading onto a sliding scale between an archival and an editorial impulse. The slider is, at one level, theory visualised. It brings into an, as it were, living image a coherent conception of the centrality that textual criticism and scholarly editing occupy, or should occupy, for literary studies. At another level, essential for the book’s developing argument, it positively models our present and future commitment to scholarly editing into the digital medium. Eggert recognises “an expanded remit for scholarly editors in the digital medium, one that might begin to resolve, through practice, the old stand-off between literary scholarship and literary criticism” (80). The model and device of the slider becomes the template for situating the book’s work concept in literary studies, pivoted on the editor:

If the edition is to be seen as an argument then it is necessarily one that is addressed to an audience *in respect of* the documents gathered and analysed for the editorial project, usually documents deemed to witness the textual transmission. If the edition is an argument addressed to a readership then it must anticipate the needs of that readership. This transactional view of things places the editor in a medial or Janus-faced position, looking in one direction towards the relevant documents and looking in the other towards the audience.

The four chapters to follow are pragmatic in their main orientation. They live from Paul Eggert's stunningly rich and variegated practical experience of editing and from his capacity to differentiate, generalise and theorise from it. From his intense work of conceptual and editorial cooperation on the Australian *Charles Harpur Critical Archive* (2019), he refines, in Chapter 6, the book's "work concept" through introducing its sub-granularity "version". The version is fore-grounded as a significant element in an edition's work-directed argument. Chapters 7 and 8 address "Book History and Literary Study" in an increasingly urgent plea for the transactional dimension of the "work edition" of the future. At the present moment in the field of literary studies, as well as in its foundational sub-disciplines of textual criticism and editorial scholarship, it is indeed urgent to establish, or re-establish, book history as a main tributary to knowledge and historical insight. Book history today is no longer the positivistic discipline that it once was. Drawing it in as a main factor in his pragmatic concerns, Eggert decisively strengthens its relevance to literary studies, and consequently to scholarly editing, in comprehensive commitment to the reader. Chapter 7 on such terms works out the commercial and ultimately cultural relevance both "at home in the colony" and "far away in England" of the Australian writer Rolf Boldrewood. Chapter 8 addresses the literary creativity of Joseph Conrad and D.H. Lawrence, once more in terms of book history. We partake again of Paul Eggert's first-hand editorial experience from co-operating in these editions, conceptually refined now in terms of his monograph's lode-stars of a version-refined work concept and the transactional commitment postulated for the editorial enterprise. To cap this pursuit, Chapter 9 engages with adaptations. The description of the manifold variations of the "Ned Kelly Story" under a Robin Hood template easily persuades that this chapter belongs and is indeed a logical follow-up of the book's over-all argument. Adaptation, accordingly, is a mode of reception engendering new production, "but the new production will be subject to the different cultural valencies of its time and place, when and where it must establish its own readership or audience or participatory user base" (157). The literary historian will easily appreciate that this is a constant in cultural history and applies for instance to medieval epics, Shakespearean plays, or Dickensian novels alike.

The Conclusion stringently draws together the perspectives, lines of argument and postulates the book has developed. What I was yet unaware of when I volunteered to review it for *Variants* was that a series of articles I had written since 2006 would serve Paul Eggert's monograph as springboard for giving the book's tenets their final edge and profile. I greatly appreciate that I should have in effect moulded an echo chamber for them. The overtones of resonance between us in that chamber will and should be heard by the community of fellow researchers at large — and they should, moreover, of necessity come from the entire ranges of different schools of criticism, genetic criticism, textual criticism, scholarly editing, genetic editing, and digital editing, both scholarly-at-large and genetic. Preliminarily to establishing a common platform of understanding, some basic

terms would need to be reflected and their definitional differences in the several disciplines be laid open. Paul Eggert, for example, while aware of such differences (sometimes more, sometimes less) still operates with terms such as “document”, “witness”, “version”, “intention”, much on an Anglo-American system of coordinates. This serves his case, the set of his cases, well, and is not detrimental. Yet some conclusions drawn in the course of the book would be re-accentuated were other basic definitions and co-ordinations within the frameworks of the disciplines concerned admitted or considered. To admit to the full the notion that “text” is logically separable from “document”, for example, would re-calibrate the systemic relationship between document and text; it might moreover, render “witness” obsolete. For the concept of the “version”, so rightly essential to Eggert’s case, it would be important to pursue the implications of the circumstance that Eggert from the Anglo-American angle can perceive it as largely intrinsic to a work’s progression, while its definitional frame in German editorial scholarship is essentially extrinsic: what is a “version” is there due less to the work’s progression than to the editor’s decision to single out a given so-declared version on grounds of external circumstances of transmission and reception. Above all: the reviewer of *The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies* is — that is, I am, and remain to the end, deeply puzzled that Paul Eggert throughout staunchly sticks to the notion and over-all concept of “intention” very much still in its Anglo-American application. His deeply perceptive discussion of Joseph Conrad’s mind- and health-racking struggle to achieve *Under Western Eyes* (1911; see also Conrad 2013) should have rendered inescapable the conclusion that the sense and significance of “intention” needs a thorough overhaul. None of Eggert’s examples more than that of Conrad’s *Under Western Eyes* cries out for a genetic approach. This, Eggert acknowledges. But to adhere, at the same time, to the notion of “intention” locks the genetic progression within a teleological framework that the progressive writing and especially the over-and-over re-reading, re-thinking and revising of that writing thoroughly countermands. Eggert establishes, in his monograph, that the future of scholarly editing, transactionally aimed comprehensively at literary studies, lies in the digital medium and through it in the digital edition. His discussion of Joseph Conrad’s *Under Western Eyes* constitutes his best case that the digital edition requires the genetic dimension. The book does not resolve how it is to be attained. The genetic digital edition in full potential yet stands to be modelled. It is where Paul Eggert’s notion of an “editing on the level of the work” should become realisable. This is a task yet ahead of us all.

To conclude, then: *The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies* is the most substantial book I am aware of today to lay out the land of literary study on foundations of documented transmission of works of literature: works and the texts that adumbrate them, written and re-written, read and re-read, and ever safeguarded by the manifold agencies of authors, scribes, typists and typesetters, digital key-strokers, publisher’s editors, book historians, commercial or scholarly editors, and ever and ever again readers. In scope, the book unfolds

on its choice of soundly reflected theoretical foundations an amazingly encompassing pragmatics of literary study in its specifics of textual criticism, editorial scholarship and richly variegated experience in mind-on and hands-on editing. It is a book indeed over which literary critics, textual critics and editors with long experience of their own, as well as early researchers, should ideally get together to pick up on its multitude of definitions, reflections and lines of argument. The historical moment is opportune: we are on the threshold or indeed in the very throes of the medial shift from the materially analogue to the binary digital curation both of our literary heritage and our culture's literary future. The disciplines we term today literary study, textual criticism, scholarly editing, digital humanities should feel called upon to de-compartmentalise themselves — also de-nationalise themselves — and unite in sustained debates to shoulder their united responsibility for reassessment and renewal. *The Work and the Reader in Literary Studies* forms an important point of entry to re-conceptualisings of literary study.

Bibliography

CONRAD, JOSEPH, 2013. *Under Western Eyes*, edited by Roger Osborne and Paul Eggert. (*The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad*. J.H. Stape and Alan Simmons, eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HARPUR, CHARLES, 2019. *The Charles Harpur Critical Archive*, edited by Paul Eggert. Sydney: Sydney University Press. Available from: <https://charles-harpur.org/Home/Site/> (Accessed: 2020-06-15).

Hans Walter Gabler

Contributors

Christian Baier is an Associate Professor in the Department of German Language and Literature at Seoul National University. He received his PhD from the University of Bamberg, Germany, in 2011. In his dissertation he analysed the concepts of genius in three major novels by Thomas Mann, after which he published several articles on both the works of Mann and the aesthetics of genius. Other research interests are the theories of fictionality and narration, German Romanticism and the works of Franz Kafka and Günter Grass. His current research focuses on the concept of narrative, especially in its non-textual, discursive variations.

Anne Baillot is a full professor in German Studies at Le Mans Université (France). She teaches Literary Studies, History of Ideas and Digital Humanities. Her research focuses on Enlightenment, German Romanticism, Cultural Heritage Studies and Open Access. She is the main editor of the digital edition *Letters and texts: Intellectual Berlin around 1800*.

Lamyk Bekius is a PhD candidate in the project ‘Track Changes: Textual Scholarship and the Challenge of Digital Literary Writing’, which is a collaboration between the University of Antwerp and the Huygens ING, a research institute of The Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) in Amsterdam. Her research focuses on how genetic criticism can be applied to born-digital material, and specifically to keystroke logging data. Since June 2021 she is also the coordinator of the University of Antwerp’s division of the CLARIAH-VL consortium, as well as that of the platformDH.

Manuela Bertone is Professor of Italian Studies at the Université Côte d’Azur, Nice. She is the author of *Il romanzo come sistema: Molteplicità e differenza in C.E. Gadda* (1993). With Robert S. Dombroski she edited the collection of essays *Carlo Emilio Gadda: Contemporary Perspectives* (1997). She also published *Gadda’s I Littoriali del lavoro e altri scritti giornalistici 1932-1941* (2005). She has written extensively on Gadda for scholarly journals. She is a member of the board of editors of *Cahiers de Narratologie*, *Cahiers d’études italiennes*, and *The Edinburgh Journal of Gadda Studies*.

Elli Bleeker is a researcher at the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands. She specializes in digital scholarly editing and computational philology, with a focus on modern manuscripts and genetic criticism. Elli completed her PhD in 2017 at the University of Antwerp on the role of the scholarly

editor in the digital environment. During her Early Stage Research Fellowship in the Marie Skłodowska-Curie funded Digital Scholarly Editions Initial Training Network (DiXiT ITN, 2014–2017), she received advanced training in manuscript studies, text modeling, and XML technologies. She has participated in the organization and teaching of workshops on scholarly editing with a focus on knowledge transfer and the application of computational methods in a humanities environment. She is also the Associate Editor of *Variants* from this issue onwards.

Mark Bland is an independent bibliographical scholar specialising on the London book-trade 1560–1640 and the circulation of manuscript poetry in that period. He is the author of *A Guide to Early Printed Books and Manuscripts* and numerous articles on paper, the book-trade, and manuscript studies as well as Ben Jonson. He is the Oxford editor of a new edition of *The Poems of Ben Jonson* and is presently finishing a monograph on *The World of Simon Waterson, Stationer*.

Ronald Broude is principal of the music publisher Broude Brothers Limited and Founding Trustee of The Broude Trust for the Publication of Musicological Editions, a non-profit publisher of scholarly editions of music. His research has appeared in musicological journals such as *Early Music*, *Notes*, and *The Musical Times*, and text-critical periodicals such as *Textual Cultures* and *Scholarly Editing*. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Society for Textual Scholarship, and he served as the Executive Director of that organization from 2004 to 2005. In 2009, his paper on the sources of the Savoy Operas was awarded the Association for Documentary Editing's Boydston Prize.

Anna Busch is a postdoctoral researcher at the Theodor-Fontane-Archive at the University of Potsdam. She manages the digital projects of the archive and is responsible for the digital presentation and analysis of the collections. She works on digital editions, collation tools, visualizations of text geneses and cultural heritage data. She is an editor for the digital edition *Letters and texts: Intellectual Berlin around 1800*.

Barbara Cooke is Co-Executive Editor of the Oxford University Press's *Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh*. She has co-edited Waugh's autobiography *A Little Learning* (1964) for the edition, and is at work on the semi-autobiographical novel *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* (1957). Her chapter on "Organising a Large Edition" is published in *A Handbook of Editing Early Modern Texts* (2017). She is a lecturer in English at Loughborough University, where she leads on research strategy for Textual Editing and Interpretation.

Wout Dillen is a Senior Lecturer in Library and Information Science at the University of Borås, Sweden. In 2015, he defended his PhD in Literature on "Digital Scholarly Editing for the Genetic Orientation" at the the University of

Antwerp. As part of his PhD project, Wout also developed the Lexicon for Scholarly Editing (<https://lexiconse.uantwerpen.be>). From 2016 to 2017, Wout held a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Experienced Research Fellowship in the Digital Scholarly Editions Initial Training Network (DiXiT ITN) at the University of Borås. From 2016 to 2021, he was the Antwerp Coordinator of CLARIAH-VL, a Flemish digital research infrastructure project that contributes to DARIAH and CLARIN. Wout currently serves as the Secretary of the European Society of Textual Scholarship (ESTS), and as a member of the Executive Committee of the DH Benelux. Wout was an Associate Editor of *Variants* 14, and is the General Editor from the current issue onwards. Besides these, he is also on the editorial boards of the Review Journal for Digital Editions and Resources (RIDE) and the Journal of the DH Benelux.

Michelle Doran is a postdoctoral Research Fellow at Trinity Long Room Hub and Project Officer for the Trinity Centre of Digital Humanities. She holds a PhD in Medieval Irish Studies, and her principal research interests lie in the field of (digital) humanities research and the underlying epistemological and ideological premises. She is module coordinator of the Digital Scholarship and Skills workshop series hosted by the Trinity Long Room Hub and facilitates a number of workshops on the subjects of Digital Humanities, Data Management Planning and Digital Scholarly Editing.

Hans Walter Gabler is Professor of English Literature (retired) at the University of Munich, Germany, Senior Research Fellow of the Institute of English Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, and Doctor of Literature, *honoris causa*, from the National University of Ireland, Maynooth. From 1996 to 2002 in Munich, he directed an interdisciplinary graduate programme on “Textual Criticism as Foundation and Method of the Historical Disciplines”. He is editor-in-chief of the critical editions of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1984/86), *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Dubliners* (both 1993). His present research continues to be directed towards the writing processes in draft manuscripts and their representation in the digital medium. Editorial theory, digital editing and genetic criticism have become the main focus of his professional writing.

Laura Esteban-Segura is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of English, French and German Philology of the University of Málaga (Spain). She holds a Master of Letters in English Language and English Linguistics awarded by the University of Glasgow and a PhD in English Philology by the University of Málaga. From 2008 to 2015 she was based at the University of Murcia (Spain). She has been a Visiting Researcher at the Department of English Language of the University of Glasgow on several occasions, at the Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English (University of Helsinki), and at the Department of Cultural Studies and Languages of the University of Stavanger. She has been a member of the board of SELIM (the Spanish Society for Mediaeval English

Language and Literature) (2012-2016) and Managing Editor of *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies* (2015-2018). Her research interests are English Historical Linguistics, Manuscript Studies and Textual Editing. She is a member of several research projects devoted to the electronic editing of Late Middle, Early Modern and Late Modern English *Fachprosa*.

Anthony John Lappin was born 1968 in Liverpool, gained his doctorate at the University of Oxford, and has taught in universities in the UK, Ireland and latterly Sweden, where he currently lives. He has also published a long article on the transmission of *Donne's Valediction: forbidding mourning* in *Studia Neophilologica* (2020).

Hugo Maat is a guest researcher in the Research and Development Team at the Humanities Cluster, part of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. He specializes in Early Modern Cultural History and completed his MA in 2020.

Dariusz Pachocki is a professor at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, and the author of academic works and articles in text criticism, literary criticism, and literary studies. He edited the works by Edward Stachura, Józef Czechowicz, Bolesław Leśmian, Stanisław Czycz, Władysław Broniewski, and Leopold Tyrmand. He received the Feniks award from the Association of Catholic Publishers twice for his editorial work, and a medal of President of the City of Lublin. He received scholarships from: Foundation for Polish Science, the Minister of Culture and National Heritage, the Kosciuszko Foundation, Harry Ransom Center (Austin, USA), Hoover Institution (Stanford, USA).

Jonas Rosenbrück is currently a Postdoctoral Fellow in Comparative Literary Studies at Northwestern University (Evanston, USA). His work on German, French, and Anglophone literatures, aesthetics, and poetics has appeared or is forthcoming in *Comparative Literature*, *CR: The New Centennial Review*, and *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*. His current book project is titled *A Revolution of the Senses: Odor and Modern Poetry*. Until recently, Rosenbrück has served as Director of Volunteer Development for the Northwestern Prison Education Program.

Stefano Rosignoli received an MA in Modern Literature (2006) and an MPhil in Publishing Studies (2008) from the University of Bologna. From 2008 to 2015 he focused on trade publishing in Italy and the UK while taking the first steps towards his PhD in English, which he is completing at Trinity College Dublin. Stefano's academic education is grounded in textual studies at large, from philology to genetic criticism, balanced by formalism, structuralism and the semiotics of texts, and his research examines the philosophical exogenesis of Irish literature in English. He has recent or forthcoming publications on Samuel

Beckett, T. S. Eliot and James Joyce; he teaches modern literature and theory at Trinity College and University College, in Dublin; and serves as Review Editor for *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship*. In 2018, he has been a James Joyce Visiting Fellow and J-1 Short-Term Scholar at the Humanities Institute, State University of New York at Buffalo, and a visiting research scholar at Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Cornell University.

Paulius V. Subačius is a professor at Vilnius University, born in Lithuania, in 1968. He studied Lithuanian language and literature and defended a doctoral thesis in 1996. As a participant in the European Society for Textual Scholarship (from 2003 onwards), he has presented papers at thirteen of its last conferences. He is the author or editor of sixteen books (incl. *Textual Criticism: Guidelines of Theory and Practice*, 2001; *Antanas Baranauskas: The Text of Life and the Lives of Texts*, 2010; *Twenty-five Years of Religious Freedom*, 2016; and several critical editions of Lithuanian authors, all in Lithuanian). He has also published multiple articles in English in *Variants*, *Editio*, *Textual Cultures*, *Filologia XXI*.

Dirk Van Hulle is Professor of Bibliography and Modern Book History at the University of Oxford and director of the Centre for Manuscript Genetics at the University of Antwerp. With Mark Nixon, he is co-director of the Beckett Digital Manuscript Project (www.beckettarchive.org), series editor of the Cambridge UP series 'Elements in Beckett Studies' and editor of the *Journal of Beckett Studies*. His publications include *Textual Awareness* (2004), *Modern Manuscripts* (2014), *Samuel Beckett's Library* (2013, with Mark Nixon), *The New Cambridge Companion to Samuel Beckett* (2015), *James Joyce's Work in Progress* (2016), the *Beckett Digital Library* and a number of volumes in the 'Making of' series (Bloomsbury) and genetic editions in the *Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, which won the 2019 Prize for a Bibliography, Archive or Digital Project of the Modern Language Association (MLA).

Peer Reviewers

The editors of *Variants* would like to offer a special word of thanks to all the people who have volunteered their time to peer review the essays in this issue. Their invaluable efforts directly contribute to the high quality standards our journal aims to for the research our journal aims to provide. They include:

- **Mateusz Antoniuk** (Jagiellonian University, Poland)
- **Peter Boot** (Huygens Institute, the Netherlands)
- **José Camões** (University of Lisbon, Portugal)
- **Edith Cassiers** (University of Antwerp, Royal Conservatoire Antwerp and Royal Academy of Fine Arts Antwerp, Belgium)
- **Mats Dahlström** (University of Borås, Sweden)
- **Paul Eggert** (Loyola University Chicago, USA; University of New South Wales, Australia)
- **Franz Fischer** (Università Ca' Foscari, Italy)
- **Hans Walter Gabler** (Munich University, Germany; London University, UK)
- **Jan Gielkens** (Huygens Institute, the Netherlands)
- **Rik Hoekstra** (KNAW Humanities Cluster, the Netherlands)
- **Sara Norja** (University of Turku, Finland)
- **Martina Scholger** (University of Graz, Austria)
- **Elisabeth R. Williamson** (University of Exeter, UK)
- **Manfredas Žvirgždas** (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Lithuania)