D. C. GREETHAM

Textual Scholarship

TEXTUAL scholarship is practiced informally by many people. Anybody who has detected a misprint in a book is a textual critic, as is anyone who has noticed that a TV or videotape version of a film may be different from the theatrical release or anyone who has played the party game of "telephone." All these forms of transmission—plus music, painting, sculpture, and any other medium in which form carries a message—involve attempts to transmit that message to a receptor. It is the business of textual scholars to determine, scientifically and technically, speculatively and intuitively, how successfully the transmission has been made and then to decide whether to do anything with this information. Will the reader who discovered the misprint not only correct it mentally but also change the reading in the text itself, write to the publisher and complain, or even edit another version of the text? The recent contention between John Kidd and Hans Walter Gabler over Gabler's edition of James Joyce's Ulysses (see Rossman) began with Kidd conducting at first an informal, then a more rigorous, reading of Gabler's text, and has ended with Kidd's reediting Ulysses himself, just as Samuel Johnson reedited Shakespeare in part because of a dissatisfaction with Alexander Pope's edition or as the editors working under the auspices of the MLA's Center for the Editing of American Authors (CEAA) or Center (later Committee) on Scholarly Editions (CSE) reedited American and British literature because of a dissatisfaction with earlier, impressionistic, belletristic editing of that literature. Thus, much textual criticism, that part of textual scholarship concerned with evaluating readings, is founded on a suspicion or "mistrust of texts," as Eugène Vinaver, medievalist and editor of Malory, has put it (352). Textual scholarship is always querulous, interrogative, incredulous, and dissatisfied, and it is perhaps the exemplary discipline for today's "hermeneutics of suspicion."

DEFINING TEXTUAL SCHOLARSHIP

Textual scholarship is more than just "criticism," however, and it is best defined as the general term for all the activities associated with discovering, describing, transcribing, editing, glossing, annotating, and commenting on texts. While literary texts (or, at least, texts composed of words) are the most familiar objects of textual scholarship, the textual scholar may study any means of textual communication—a painting, a sculpture, a novel, a poem, a film, a symphony, a gesture. All these media have meaning or form, and it is in part the textual

scholar's aim to preserve (or, if necessary, to re-create) this meaning or form, in the face of the laws of physical decay. As G. Thomas Tanselle has movingly put it:

> What every artifact displays is the residue of an unequal contest: the effort of a human being to transcend the human, an effort continually thwarted by physical realities. Even a document with a text of the sort not generally regarded as art— a simple message to a friend, for example—illustrates the immutable condition of written statements: in writing down a message, one brings down an abstraction to the concrete, where it is an alien, damaged here and there through the intractabil- ity of the physical. (*Rationale* 64–65)

This articulation of the idealist view of textual scholarship would be chal- lenged by those scholars who believe not that the physical is alien to a text but that it is the text's only condition; however, such idealism is always a useful corrective to the popular assumption that texts and the works they represent are created and sustained in a culture unmediated by the act of transmission. Of course, the relative value given to different types of transmission varies from culture to culture: an extreme example is the *Mahābhārata*'s condemnation to hell of those who commit the Vedic texts to writing, which has inevitably had the result of making such Sanskrit manuscripts very rare (see Rocher, in Greetham, *Scholarly Editing*). Similar distinctions (and similar problems) arise in adopting either the ethnolinguistic model of folk literature transmission (where the lin- guistic features, the words embodying specific performances, are the object of study) or the literary model (which attempts to reconstruct the putative original by examining its variants). Despite these complications, if we perceive that expression—on parchment or paper, in stone or clay, in sound waves or elec- tronic pulses—may in certain circumstances be regarded as only a contigent reduction of the abstract to the inadequacies of the concrete and if we therefore see textual scholarship as the means whereby some of these inadequacies may be temporarily overcome, then the textual scholar has a heavy responsibility. Ontological distinctions may, of course, be made among the various media in which texts are transmitted, for in the plastic arts the concrete form and the ideal work of which it is a manifestation appear to occupy, or at least compete for, the same space—since there is no work other than the plastic representation. Nonetheless, scholars may have different views on how the abstract ideal may best be presented or codified, even in the apparently intractable plastic media. For example, the recent arguments over the damage or improvement sustained by the cleaning of the Sistine Chapel frescoes rest on whether the removal of various upper layers of the frescoes will enhance or destroy our understanding of Michelangelo's intentions. Thus, much recent textual speculation has moved beyond a narrow consideration of the textuality of individual media to attempts at a unified field theory for all texts in whatever mode of transmission. My concerns here are more local—the verbal texts of literature and the possible reconstruction of their abstract forms out of the concrete manifestations—and

I acknowledge that any edition, like any other transmission of the verbal text, can only ever be contingent and temporary.

HISTORY OF TEXTUAL SCHOLARSHIP

Early History

These matters of abstract message and concrete form are serious issues, and textual scholarship has always taken itself seriously. Until comparatively re- cently, the archival, philological, and editorial work associated with textual scholarship was regarded as one of the essential skills of any critic or scholar and was practiced by such diverse figures as Saint Jerome, Erasmus, Alexander Pope, Samuel Johnson, and A. E. Housman, all of whom either produced formal editions or achieved recognition for their analysis of textual cruxes.

Textual scholarship is, moreover, the oldest scholarly activity in the West, attested to by the sixth-century-BC Athenian attempts to arrest the decline of the Homeric texts and by the third-century-BC formation of the two rival scholarly libraries in Alexandria and Pergamum (Sandys, vol. 1, chs. 7–8). In these early years the basic assumptions underlying all subsequent textual scholar- ship were soon established. Thus, when Peisistratus (c. 560–27 BC) had an official copy of Homer compiled for the Panathena festival, he was acknowledg- ing that any act of transmission introduces corruptions in a text, especially in the oral transmission practiced by the rhapsodes who recited the Homeric poems. This acknowledgment was formalized in the twentieth century with the often cited principle of "universal variation," which postulates that even a seemingly innocent act like photocopying produces detectable textual changes. Similarly, when Ptolemy Soter named Zenodotus of Ephesus as the first chief librarian at Alexandria, it was determined that the multiple holdings of the library (eventu- ally about 700,000 rolls) were to be used in "collation"; that is, variant readings in different texts of the same work were to be compared to establish the original, authorial intention—according to the principle of "analogy." In the idealist atmosphere of Alexandria, this principle—the search for form behind the cor- rupt remains of transmission—complemented the Aristotelian empiricism of the linguists and grammarians of the library, reflecting the textual assumption that such a putative ideal version did lie behind the variant "remaniements" of the surviving documents and that this ideal could be speculatively reconstructed by an editor sensitive to genuine, as opposed to spurious, Homeric (or Shakespear- ean or Miltonic or Joycean) usage. This principle motivates both the twentieth- century eclectic, intentionalist movement, with its attempts to reconstruct a single-state "text that never was" (representing the author's final intentions) out of corrupt documentary remains, and the similar bibliographical concept of "ideal copy," the most perfect state of a work as originally intended by its printer or publisher following the completion of all intentional changes, although not

necessarily actualized in any extant copy of the book (Gaskell, *Introduction* 321). In literary traditions where little or nothing remains in the author's hand (the norm until the Renaissance), one can appreciate why this desire to overcome the scribal or compositorial corruptions was seductive. Conversely, when the Pergamanians—rivals to the Alexandrians—invoked "anomaly" rather than analogy as their preferred linguistic and textual ethic, this persuasion was dependent on a Stoic acceptance of the inevitable decadence of all temporal, earthly phenomena as a result of humanity's fallen condition, with the corollary that the Alexandrian construction of the ideal was both impious and impossible. The grammarians and linguists of Pergamum therefore determined that individual performance rather than ideal usage should be the standard for adjudication and commentary. For textual scholars who followed this principle the only honest recourse in editing multiple-text works was to select a document that, on philological or other grounds, seemed best to represent authorial intention and, thereafter, to follow the readings of that document with absolute fidelity. This principle is endorsed in twentieth-century "best text" theory, which has dominated editing in Old French literature for seventy-five years or so, and it is still common in other European vernaculars.

So right at the beginning, the terms of the textual debate were set. Classical scholars asked the same questions still being asked today: How and where do we find our texts, and what system do we use to record what we find? (archival research and enumerative bibliography); How do we compare multiple copies of the same work? (collation and stemmatics, the genealogy of texts); How do we describe the physical embodiment of the text in roll or book? (codicology, descriptive and analytical bibliography); How do we transcribe the writing in the text? (paleography and diplomatics); How do we tell what is genuine and what is spurious? (textual criticism and textual editing); How do we decide what our audience needs to know about the text? (annotation, glossing, and textual commentary). All these matters are components of the general discipline of textual scholarship, and they have all been practiced to one degree or another in the days since the Alexandrians and the Pergamanians.

This early flowering of textual scholarship had two other important results. First, the exegetical, lexicographical, metrical, and grammatical studies produced by these scholars (particularly in Pergamum) for the elucidation of texts began to achieve an independent life. But when published separately, they were usually adorned with *lemmata* (headwords to each note) linking them to the text itself. This cross-referencing helped to preserve the text referred to from further corruption, since the commentary would fit only a particular edition. Today, the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare prints both the act-scene-line numbers of the Globe edition and the "through-line" numbers or continuous lineation of the Norton First Folio facsimile to ensure the same sort of. fit. Second, the Alexandrians and Pergamanians, simply by the attention they brought to certain texts, conferred canonical status on them. (Pergamum, for example, was the first to extend the canon from poetry to prose.) The status of the "big three"

dramatic authors—Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides—and the losses sustained by other authors owe much to the early librarians' decision that there should be x number of tragic poets, y number of lyric poets, and so on and that these authors' texts should be the ones copied and studied. Similarly, in our own time, the MLA has influenced the received canon by promoting editions sponsored or supported by the CEAA and its successor, the CSE, a project that has had canonical results (if only to reinforce a preexisting canon). The first series of editions from CEAA inevitably reflected the scholarly canon of the time (the 1960s), and they were criticized (e.g., by Wilson) precisely for being too "scholarly" and for thus excluding the general reader unable to negotiate the editorial paraphernalia. But another exclusion also resulted from this reflection of contemporary academic taste: the canon included the "great white fathers" of American literature—such as Emerson, Melville, Thoreau, and Whitman—and omitted other authors. To date, the CSE has certified only two volumes by women authors (Woolf and Cather) and nothing by nonwhites. Similarly, the CEAA-CSE seals awarded to "approved" editions can have a canonical effect, although the CSE is careful to emphasize that a seal is given to *an*, rather than *the*, approved edition. Even with this demurral, the CSE and the seals it award were until very recently identified with specific methodologies or ideologies. The concentration on nineteenth-century Anglo-American literature and the set of guidelines issued to inspectors for the adjudication of such matters as copy-text and transcription had the effect (until the more flexible revisions of 1991) of restricting the very type of edition that could be considered for CSE sealing. It is no surprise that the committee, which formerly lacked representative nonanglophone editorial experience and a wider definition of editorial practice, awarded no seal to an edition of pre-Renaissance literature or to an edition in a language other than English in the first two decades of its existence. Thus, the ecumenical language (and hopes) of the CSE's 1977 *Introductory Statement* was not fulfilled during this period, but through the determined cross-disciplinary policies of its current chair, Jo Ann Boydston (who, as editor of the works of the philosopher Dewey, has successfully represented a discipline other than literature), the CSE will doubtless help construct new textual canons—of author, discipline, subject, genre, period, and editorial method.

Another textual control over the canon occurred, and occurs, during any major change in medium. Just as the move from roll to codex (the familiar folded, stitched book) during the early Christian Era determined the survival of ancient works into the medieval canon, so later the move from script to print and now the similar move from print to electronic publishing has determined, and will determine, what materials are preserved for later study. For example, when printing was introduced into England in the fifteenth century, William Caxton and his successors both reflected and created literary taste. They produced several editions of Chaucer, but William Langland's *Piers Plowman* had to wait a century more, to be published by Protestants because it was thought to be a precursor of the Tudor religious settlement. A third author, Thomas

Hoccleve, was ignored by the printers and thus by critics and most literary historians, even though (by manuscript count of his major work) he had been very popular in his time and in the earlier medium.

This bibliographical control of the canon is demonstrated throughout the early and middle history of textual scholarship, often at the most concrete level. The tenuous survival of the classical heritage is exemplified in the condition of Cicero's De rep. lica, the "lower" text in a palimpsest, a manuscript in which a text is erased and another "upper" text, here a biblical commentary, is super-scribed. The classical, pagan canon had to compete for the same physical space as the new biblical and patristic canon, and the latter usually won. The basic problem for medieval textual scholarship was thus the preservation of the classi-cal inheritance; and despite the efforts of such figures as Lupus of Ferrières (c. 805–62), who tried to use the Alexandrian principle of collation on classical texts, in general the best the Middle Ages could hope for was the accurate transcription, and thus survival, of texts rather than an informed reconstruction. (On canonicity, see also Scholes in this volume.)

Renaissance to Nineteenth Century

A recognizable system of textual scholarship did not begin again until the early Renaissance. This renewed activity is shown in several ways: the success of the Florentine Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) in bringing manuscripts from the Greek East to the Latin West in the fifteenth century; the book-collecting activities of his compatriot Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459); the exposure of forgery by Lorenzo Valla (1407–57), most famously his philological demonstra-tion that the Donation of Constantine, which purportedly gave secular power to the Church, was spurious and his Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum, emend-ing the Vulgate Bible on philological principles; the early formation of a theory of manuscript genealogy by Politian (Angelo Poliziano, 1454–94) in his work on Cicero; and the controversial edition of the New Testament by Erasmus (c. 1466–1536) in 1516, in which he advocated that both biblical and secular texts should be subjected to the same objective editorial treatment. The cumulative contributions of these scholars led eventually to the so-called higher criticism, the study of biblical—and, by extension, vernacular—texts according to the science of philology (derived from the textual research of the lower criticism) rather than the dogmas of theology, codified in the nineteenth century under the term Altertumswissenschaft, the "science of ancient times." The work of Mabillon, Montfaucon, and other seventeenth-century Benedictine paleogra-phers (Kenney 94–95) on the historical progression of scripts helped foster the assumption that texts could be arranged chronologically, on the basis of their linguistic and physical features, and that the manuscript or print transmission of a work could be shown as a genealogy, a family tree of correspondences, whereby shared errors in two or more "witnesses" (surviving documents) of a text would show them to be descended from the same "common ancestor." These

correspondences could eventually enable scholars to reconstruct the "archetype," often an inferential, nonexistent document rather than a surviving witness. The archetype was the earliest stage of the family tree recoverable from this compari-son of errors, but it was not necessarily identifiable with the author's fair copy, which for early texts usually lay in the realms of conjecture. This arrangement of extant and inferred witnesses into a stemma, traditionally associated with the work of Karl Lachmann on Lucretius, was to prove one of the most successful—yet contentious—of the textual ramifications of historical criticism (see Maas). The success of this technique was perhaps one of its problems: because it was based on the transmission of classical texts, its importation into vernacular editing (e.g., in Italian, Vandelli's edition of I reali di Francia, 1892–1900, and Barbi's edition of Dante's La vita nuova, 1907) became too often only a mechani-cal imposition of supposedly scientific principles. The technique was later ques-tioned by, for example, Giorgio Pasquali's Storia della tradizione e critica del testo (1934), where the Lachmannian insistence on the archetype is repudiated and the rule of vertical (and downwardly corrupt) transmission is disputed. Giovanni Vandelli's abandonment of the possibilities of drawing up a single stemma in his edition of Dante's Divine Comedy (1921) exemplifies the theoretical problems discussed by Pasquali. Such questioning was necessary, for the science, or pseudo-science, of stemmatics depends on two assumptions: first, that an error can be recognized as such by the philologist and, second, that errors in   as one moves down the family tree from archetype to later copies. Both these assump-tions rest on an underlying conviction that copyists make mistakes but that, in general, authors do not, and they both reinforce a textual article of faith that it is the business of textual scholarship to reconstruct authorial intention.

Twentieth Century

These assumptions about authors and copyists may initially seem unassailable, but the history of twentieth-century textual scholarship has called both into question in various ways. First, as A. E. Housman noted in his typically acerbic style, Germans like Lachmann seemed to have mistaken textual criticism for mathematics in their reliance on supposedly objective principles (132); he charged that they had frequently given up on criticism in the interests of science and that, despite their aim of restoring the archetype, they had put all their faith on a single extant document, once it could be shown to occupy a relatively high position in the family tree. In other words, the Lachmannians had become Pergamanians—subscribers to a best-text theory—despite themselves. Such a theory was later formally endorsed by Joseph Bédier, the founder of twentieth-century best-text editing in Old French, who was frankly suspicious of the way that stemmatic trees always seemed to resolve themselves into two neat branches and who decided to give up reconstruction of the ideal in favor of strict documen-tary fidelity or "anomaly."

Second, by using error in its mapping of variants and witnesses, stemmatic

gave prominence to the content (or "substantives") of a text rather than to the surface features of its orthography (or "accidentals"). Therefore, until the mid–twentieth century most editors selected their copy-text (the authoritative version used as a standard for comparison with others and the one generally followed unless emendations were introduced) on the basis of its substantives. This practice was challenged in a famous article by W. W. Greg ("Rationale"), who suggested that authorial intention could best be embodied by selecting a copy-text for its accidentals—spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and so on— since subsequent copyings or reprintings would be more likely to change these features than they would the substantives. Later changes in substantives, which the editor could show were made by the author, could be read back into the copy-text to create an "eclectic" text, composed of features of several extant witnesses plus conjectures made by the editor. This method of responding to the claims of intentionality has been the dominant form of Anglo-American editing theory and practice in the last thirty or forty years, in part through the extensive scholarly editing of texts from the Renaissance to the twentieth century (e.g., Dekker, Dryden, Hawthorne, Crane) by its leading proponent Fredson Bowers and the vigorous defense of its principles by both Bowers and Tanselle. While not directly related to the Gregian issue and not motivated by the substantives-accidentals distinction, other efforts indicate that nonanglophone editing is confronting the question of early versus late states of text as copy-text. For example, the monumental editions of nineteenth-century scholars such as Louis Moland (Voltaire) and Charles Marty-Laveaux (Corneille, Ronsard), in which the last edition produced during the author's lifetime was taken as copy-text, can be set against more recent editing by, for example, Milorad R. Margitic (Le Cid) and R. C. Knight and H. T. Barnwell (Andromaque), who select early editions as copy-text.

As already observed, eclecticism is, in its mixing of early and late, thus another form of Alexandrian analogy. It is often associated with the New Bibliography, a conscious reaction against the old aesthetic, nontechnical, or belletristic editing of English and American literature. New Bibliography emphasized the importance of the technical history of a book, its physical makeup, and the creation and transmission of the text contained therein. For example, Charlton Hinman showed that in the Shakespeare First Folio certain verse passages were set as prose to save space and some prose passages were set as verse to waste space (xvi–xviii), on the basis of how accurately the compositor had estimated the amount of print a given page of manuscript copy would produce—called "casting off of copy"—in a folio "in sixes" (i.e., with each gathering made up of three sheets folded in half, to produce six leaves). The technical emphasis of the New Bibliography produced two subcategories of textual scholarship: analytical bibliography, or the study of the technical history of the printed book (how it was manufactured as an artifact), and descriptive bibliography, the formulaic listing of the technical attributes of each "ideal copy" of a book. This combina-

tion of technical sophistication and critical reconstruction of authorial intention gave eclectic editing an understandably forceful role in early- and mid-twentieth-century textual scholarship.

Third, Lachmannian stemmatics, by giving special privilege to the author beyond the archetype (since all extant manuscripts were ultimately derived therefrom), inevitably confirmed the principles of intentionalism, whether eclectic or otherwise. This approach has been challenged on two fronts. On the one hand, the influence of structuralism has favored the production of "genetic" editions in which all variants are listed in a continuous display of variation, rather than in the eclectic or stemmatic privileging of one, originary moment. This genetic tendency can be seen in a primitive state in the chronological ordering of Paul Laumonier, Raymond Lebègue, and Isidore Silver's Ronsard edition (1914–59), which shows the compositional process, and in the work of N. K. Piksanov (editor of Griboedov), who promoted the textual history of the "teleogenetic" approach, as a corrective to the dominant early-twentieth-century Russian reliance on editorial authority in the work of G. Vinokur, B. V. Tomaševskij, and B. Ejxenbaum. The genetic method has since then become virtually the norm in Franco-German editing (e.g., of Flaubert, Proust, Hölderlin, Klopstock and Kafka), beginning with the very influential work of Friedrich Beissner on Friedrich Hölderlin. As Gabler points out, Beissner's premise of "organic growth" does assume "an authorial intention toward perfection" ("Textual Studies" 163), and one could argue that Beissner's problematic assertion has prompted the retreat of some Germanists (e.g., Martens in "Textdynamik und Edition") into the apparent objectivity of simply recording in a synthetic (or synoptic) apparatus the variants of a work rather than then creating a separate reading text supposedly embodying the author's final intentions—as occurs on the recto pages of the famous Gabler edition of Joyce's Ulysses. If intention is present at all in Gunter Martens's model of genetic editing, it is in the changes between texts rather than in any finality to this process, and it is Marten's concern to exploit the theoretical implications of such internal variance (see "Texte ohne Varianten?").

On the other hand, Jerome J. McGann (e.g., in Critique) has challenged the peculiar status given to intention by the eclecticists when he suggests that the author and the originary moment favored by eclecticism should be regarded as only one stage in the text's transmission. McGann's position is thus very similar to that of the enormously influential Soviet textologist Dmitrij Lixačev, for whom the literary text is primarily "a history of its compilers and early readers," although Lixačev does defend the Platonic ideal of text against the imposition of a purely materialist, dialectical view associated with the more pragmatic Aristotelianism of B. Ja. Buxštab (qtd. in Kasinec and Whittaker, in Greetham, Scholarly Editing). McGann's "social textual criticism" (attacked by Howard-Hill and judiciously discussed in Shillingsburg's "Inquiry") therefore insists that all public appearances of a text—as revised and changed by authors,

editors, readers, publishers, friends, and relations—have potentially equal textual significance and that the "bibliographical code" (the various physical forms in which a text appears publicly) is just as much a part of its social meaning as is the "linguistic code" of its verbal content ("Critical Editing" 23). D. F. McKenzie has advanced a similar position, one that treats all remains of a culture as "text" and therefore withdraws some of the privilege traditionally accorded "literature."

Other influences, too, shape the climate of current texual scholarship: The French school of "l'histoire du livre" associated with Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, emphasizing the cultural rather than the technical history of the book, has been seen in the works of Elizabeth Eisenstein and G. Thomas Tanselle (*History of Books*). As already noted, the influence of the Russian textological school of remaniements (Fennell) and reception theory, and its collateral mid-European branches (see Hay; Zeller), can be observed indirectly in several recent textual propositions and practices: Derek Pearsall's call for a loose-leaf edition of Chaucer ("Editing Medieval Texts"); Gary Taylor's insistence on Shakespeare as inveterate reviser ("Revising Shakespeare"); Steven Urkowitz's promotion of multiple-text interpretations of, for example, *Lear* and *Hamlet* and Michael Warren's edition of the "complete" (i.e., multiple-text) *Lear*; Peter L. Shillingsburg's vision of multiple computer-created texts of nineteenth-century novels ("Limits"); Donald H. Reiman's emphasis on "versioning" rather than final intentions in the editing of the Romantics; Louis Lafuma's and Philippe Sellier's separate editing of the two states (*La première copie* and *La seconde copie*) of Pascal's *Pensées* to overcome the false sense of unity and organicism given in earlier editions by Pascal's nephew Etienne Périer; Aldo Rossi's insistence that there are three authorial versions, not one, of Boccaccio's *Decameron*; Domenico De Robertis's experimental apparatus for recording multiple authorial variants in Ungaretti's poetry; John Miles Foley's computer program HEURO for the continual construction and reconstruction of Yugoslav oral epic poetry, a medium that would otherwise be arrested by editing; Hershel Parker's designation of a "new scholarship," which promises a "full intentionality" drawn from the multiple, and frequently contradictory, states of many nineteenth- and twentieth-century American authors; and Philip Gaskell and Clive Hart's publication of a reader's kit for "repairing the major faults" of *Ulysses* editions, including Gabler's. What all these textual scholars have in common is a reaction against any simplistic imposition of the final-intentions principles of Greg-Bowers eclecticism. Instead of postulating a single, consistent, authorially sponsored text as the purpose of the editorial enterprise, they suggest multiform, fragmentary, even contradictory, texts as the aim of editing, sometimes to be constructed ad hoc by the reader. In general, then, the characteristic feature of textual scholarship in the closing years of this century is its democratic pluralism: there is no longer, in Anglo-American editing at least, any single orthodoxy among textual scholars, although eclectic, intentionalist editions are still being produced more

often than any other form, perhaps because it takes some time for practice to catch up with theory.

COMPONENTS AND PRACTICE

Criticism of Texts

As Tanselle has quite properly insisted, all those involved in the "great enterprise" of textual transmission and preservation are textual critics (*Rationale* 47), and this category therefore includes archivists, librarians, rare-book dealers, and even literary critics. But the fullest embodiment of textual scholarship is usually considered to be the scholarly edition, which involves several important components and can be of several types.

Noncritical Editing

Editing has often been conventionally divided between nontextual or noncritical editing, in which an editor reproduces an established text rather than establishes a new one, and textual or critical editing, in which the scholar creates a text in a form not hitherto available. The first type includes anthologies of previously published materials collected by an "editor," variorum editions using a previously constructed text as the basis for the commentary, representations of single documents (often called diplomatic editions), and, of course, photographic facsimiles.

Obviously, noncritical editions can have a serious purpose behind them: they may provide basic materials for a study of paleography or typography; they may preserve the *textus receptus*, or received text, of an important cultural artifact (the *Beowulf* manuscript or the Shakespeare Quartos or T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land* manuscript); or they may be a device for charting the history of critical responses and annotation (the Chaucer, Shakespeare, or Milton variorums), in the tradition of the "commentaries" in classical or biblical scholarship. But problems, often of definition, do arise: in 1978, A. L. Rowse used a noncritical text of the 1864 Globe edition as the vehicle for his *Annotated Shakespeare*, representing this old text as the most authoritative version of Shakespeare, as if nothing had happened in Shakespearean scholarship in more than a century. But when the terms and distinctions are kept clear, noncritical editions take on important textual value, largely in their claims of fidelity to a document not otherwise easily accessible.

This fidelity is apparently at its greatest in the photographic facsimile, although even here there are noteworthy distinctions. Film often fails to preserve hairline flourishes or textually significant abbreviation marks in manuscripts (especially if these marks are in different inks or different colors), and it cannot, of course, transmit important information about bibliographical materials—parchment, paper, ink, binding, and so on. Following the photographic facsimile in fidelity is the type facsimile, which attempts to reproduce the physical appear-

ance of the original in a different typesetting, by observing such features as the original lineation, typesize, and type family (e.g., roman, italic, gothic). A diplomatic transcript, however, dispenses with such scrupulous fidelity to appearance and concentrates on the textual context, reproducing the exact spelling, punctuation, and capitalization but not necessarily observing the lineation (except in verse) or the typesizes of the original. Both type facsimiles and diplomatic transcripts have been used by historical series such as the Malone Society Reprints in making available to modern scholars the primary texts of Renaissance drama. It is also possible to regard even modernized-spelling, or internally normalized spelling, editions of original documents as noncritical, in the sense that they are not concerned with establishing a new, critically independent text, although the number and type of decisions move the edition away from the claims of pure fidelity.

Critical Editing

Textual or critical editions make such critical interposition the very raison d'être of editing, usually because it is felt that no single document or representation of a single document fully delineates either the author's intention or the historical and social context of the work as, or after, it leaves the author. This critical establishment of a new text may be simply a matter of removing perceived errors from an old one, or it may involve the construction of an eclectic text composed of features of various documents, plus emendations derived from no specific documentary source. The editor of such a critical edition has to decide how to present the textual evidence for reconstruction. The basic choice is between a clear, or reading, text (which gives the evidence for reconstruction in apparatus and notes but leaves the actual text unencumbered with variant readings or signals to the reader that something has been emended) and an inclusive text (which prominently displays editorial symbols and alternative readings on the textual page). A clear text is often most conveniently employed for eclectic editions of published works or works intended for publication, where the author's final intentions to arrive at a definitive, public statement of the text can often be plausibly demonstrated; an inclusive text is usually associated with genetic editing, often of private documents such as letters and journals or of uncompleted works, where no final intention—and certainly not an intention to publish— is involved. As indicated in the above brief discussion of the history of textual scholarship and in the account of the narrative of editing that follows, most contentions in textual scholarship reside in the ideology and practice of critical editing, even though noncritical editions, especially in such matters as transcription, have their embedded ideological problems and involve some critical decisions. Thus, even though all editions are therefore critical and implicitly contentious to some extent and even though they all offer critical decisions of interpretation, the traditional "critical edition," in establishing a text for a scholarly audience from the evidence of multiple witnesses, still presents the

widest range of textual operations and demonstrates to the full the logical narrative of textual scholarship.

Narrative of Editing

Access to the text through research and enumerative bibliography is the first part of this narrative. The editor must find out which primary witnesses to the text are extant. Under intentionalist auspices, *primary* meant any version of the text in which the author's intentions, direct or indirect, might be observed. Under the newer forms of social textual criticism and other remaniement schools, however, virtually all versions, even those constructed long after the author's death, become primary, since they are part of the text's social transmission. Enumerative bibliography arranges these witnesses according to some "systematic bibliography," which can be as obvious as chronological order or as arcane as the taxonomy of typeforms, used, for example, in the bibliography of incunabula, or books printed up till 31 December 1500.

The editor also works to describe the witness technically, using what may appear to the amateur a highly complex system of formulas that reflects the book's physical makeup. This descriptive bibliography involves a consideration of printing techniques, especially of the way a page of type is set up to be inked, and of imposition, the arranging of those pages on sheets to be folded and printed. This technical emphasis forms the backbone of the related disciplines of analytical bibliography (for printed books) and codicology (for manuscripts), which provide the empirical information on which the formulas appearing in descriptive bibliography are based.

Another stage in the editing of works with multiple, often contradictory, texts is the selection of a witness to be used as copy-text. A copy-text is followed whenever there is no convincing reason to cite a rival reading from another text or to construct a reading speculatively if all extant variants are unsatisfactory. Certain famous editions (e.g., the Robinson *Chaucer* and the Gabler *Ulysses*) do not employ any copy-text in the traditional sense but weave a seamless text out of the various extant witnesses, with no recourse to the "indifferent authority" of a specific or consistent copy-text. In such editions, the editor constructs the text word by word (even syllable by syllable), basing each choice on a variety of documents (plus the editor's own ingenuity where all documents appear to be deficient), instead of choosing the single document most likely to preserve authorial intention and then comparing all others with this "control." But most editions of verbal multiple-text works do still use copy-text theory, and most editions of Anglo-American literature appearing in the 1990s will probably still employ a version of Greg's rationale of copy-text described above. In fields relatively untouched by Gregian principles (e.g., medieval studies), the term *base text* may be used instead of *copy-text*. This difference in terminology may also reflect a different ideology of editing, since a base text is typically selected

not for its accidentals but for its substantives, its provenance, or its relative completeness.

To evaluate the likely authority of the witnesses in multiple-text works, editors usually trace the transmission of the text through a genealogy of witnesses. Such genealogies may be very complex in cultures encouraging scribal participation in the construction of texts (e.g., the non-Vedic Sanskrit texts or the Wycliffite sermon industry of the late Middle Ages) or where sectarian strife is represented by the multiplicity of variant readings (e.g., the proliferation of manuscripts of the New Testament) but relatively consistent in other religious traditions (e.g., the early Masoretic "fixing" of the Hebrew Bible). Again, tracing the filiation of witnesses has often become extremely technical, as attested to by the algebraic formulas employed in Greg's *Calculus of Variants*, the "positive concordance apparatus" of Dom Henri Quentin's distributional analysis, and the symbolic logic of Vinton Dearing's "rings" and "rules of parsimony" (*Principles*). In representing readings discovered in the copy-text or other witnesses, the editor must have a consistent theory of transcription—especially for the reading of ancient manuscript texts—involving the skills of paleography. Transcription practices can also be very contentious, as the continuing conflict between old-spelling and modern-spelling factions demonstrates: the publishers of the Oxford Shakespeare, recognizing the contention, simply brought out two editions (plus an electronic version), one for each camp, but most publishers are not as understanding and are likely to demand that the editor make up his or her mind. The decision of most editors of current American historical editions to favor some form of modernization has led to the significant ideological rift between editors of literature (see Tanselle, "Editing"), who support the orthographic intentions of authors, and historians (see R. Taylor), whose views have been institutionalized by the Association for Documentary Editing. Since the historians, with the Jefferson edition as paradigmatic, conceive of the text primarily as a vehicle for meaning rather than form (regarding such meaning as inherent in "words" rather than "spellings") and since they consciously produce their editions with modern readers in mind, they are concerned more about ensuring the reader's convenience than about seeing the edited text as a representation of the document's original orthographic features. Thus, a historical edition typically expands contractions and abbreviations, normalizes or modernizes punctuation and capitalization, and avoids importing readings from other texts of the same work in the eclectic fashion. The historians' concern is with readability for the modern researcher, the literary editors' with the intention of the author. A related contention is the frequent attempt to restore a putative "classical" orthographic form to a text surviving only in other dialectal versions: the classical West Saxon constructed in some Old English editions is an example, as is the classical Middle High German in Lachmann's edition of the *Nibelungenlied* or the accepted normalization of Arabic texts to classical Arabic usage—as compared with M. Mahdi's edition of the Arabian Nights, which unusually preserves colloquial features (see Carter, in Greetham, *Scholarly Editing*).

Furthermore, the editor must know under what circumstances a dissatisfaction with the copy-text or other witnesses necessitates emendation: Is the edition to be generally conservative (whereby, say, the copy-text must be manifestly wrong to justify emendation), or will it be highly conjectural (whereby readings from other witnesses or from the editor's own conception of authorial intention are introduced more willingly and speculatively)? The editor must also decide whether to signal to the reader when an emendation has been made—by a different typeface or some symbol or other—or to adopt a clear text, as mentioned above, listing emendations in a separate apparatus appended to the clear text.

What happens to these other variants of the text, those not regarded as embodying final intention—or whatever other principle the edition supposedly reflects—is another highly contentious issue. In typical electic editions, where final intention is, indeed, the basic rationale, these other readings are usually cited in the textual apparatus, in reduced typeface, at the bottom of the page, at the end of the book, or even in a separate volume. The full "historical collation," which in CEAA/CSE editions is limited to postauthorial textual deterioration but in other editing traditions may include rejected readings arguably made by the author, is similarly excluded from the textual page in the typical eclectic edition. However, genetic editing depends on this variance for its very form, and so it normally includes authorial variants, and sometimes nonauthorial as well, on the textual page. Inevitably, this practice requires a series of special symbols or differing typefaces or other arrangements to distinguish one type of reading from another, and the resulting "barbed wire" has often been attacked by critics such as Lewis Mumford and Edmund Wilson for distancing readers from the text. One way round the problem is to publish both a genetic text and a final-intentions text, although this solution is theoretically a contradiction in terms; Gabler's 1984 *Synoptic Edition* of *Ulysses* gives both types of texts, on facing pages, but the reading text of the 1986 *Corrected Text* does not.

Finally, editors must have some notion of how to mediate between text and audience, as in the question of transcription. They need to have a sense of the threshold of information that the audience possesses, and they sometimes end up making rather arbitrary decisions. For example, a recent edition of Yeats glosses "all specific allusions" (e.g., proper names) but offers no "interpretative commentary" because "firm evidence for many . . . identifications is lacking" and "it is arguable that Yeats did not wish to narrow the meanings" (Finneran 613). Although this distinction might seem logical, it has unfortunate results: Readers learn that the Virgin Mary is the "mother of Christ," that Shakespeare is an "English playwright," and that Hamlet and Ophelia are "characters in William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*" (654, 669), but the edition withholds information on poems addressed to, but not naming, Maud Gonne or Olivia Shakespear. Logic may thus have to yield to common sense, and the editor must ask, What do my readers already know, and what therefore can I tell them without seeming to patronize them or to leave them mystified? This problem is confronted at one

level by the "hard words" issue: at the one extreme, the editor can assume that the audience is as learned as both the author and the editor and needs no glosses; at the other, the editor can gloss everything to produce a lexicon, or glosses, of the work—not an unusual practice in the editing of medieval texts. The problem is the in-between, where the editor must decide, for example, whether to define words still familiar in contemporary usage but bearing a different meaning in the text—say, the Middle English and early modern English use of *sad* to mean "compact" or "dense" or of *wood* to mean "mad," for without an awareness of the double meaning, a reader would find Shakespeare's pun "And here am I wood within this wood" strange indeed (*Midsummer Night's Dream* 2.1.192). The linguistic (as opposed to the allusive) issue is well stated in Edmund Campion's study of the editing of early modern French and the principles of annotation used by Marty-Laveaux: "The premise which Marty-Laveaux and many later textual scholars accepted is that notes in a critical edition are needed whenever a well-educated modern reader would have difficulty understanding a word, an expression, or a structure because of grammatical or semantic differences between modern French and French usage in the works of French writers from earlier centuries" (in Greetham, *Scholarly Editing*). But in some types of work and in the editions representing them, the linguistic is only one of several components requiring separate levels of annotation. Sacred texts often produce such multilayering, as the long traditions of Talmudic commentary and its analogous, patristic commentary on the Bible demonstrate. The Sezgin edition of Qur'anic material, together with interpolated commentary of the patristic type and poetic quotations and other scholarly allusions that have become part of the tradition, illustrates the practical problem of presentation: Sezgin divides each page, placing Qur'anic materials at the top (with serial numbers identifying poetic citations) and two similar tiers of explanatory footnotes at the bottom. As Michael Carter notes, this complexity of levels of annotation is necessary to construct links between reader and text(s), and it is not dissimilar to the multilevel annotation in, for example, the Chaucer and Shakespeare variorum editions.

Editing and Technology

Because the skills textual scholars use to train a text for its public appearance appear highly technical, many literary critics assume that textual scholarship is merely a mechanical production of texts and thus only a preliminary to the real business of criticism. Textual scholars do need an array of technical skills, especially since the entry of the computer into textual editing, and there has always been a seductive appeal in the power of machines or formulas to confer objectivity on textual scholarship and so render it immune from editorial idiosyncrasy. Although the various technical developments that have been used in editing are too numerous to record here, computers have proved most useful in the early stages of editing, especially collation and filiation, and at the very end,

in the preparation of concordances and indexes, with comparatively limited electronic influence on the middle stages of textual criticism or emendation.

For example, no complete record of the fundamental units of a verbal text—its words—will ever again be made without computer assistance. This fact does not disparage the heroic efforts of such preelectronic pioneers as Marty-Laveaux and his *Lexique de la langue de Pierre Corneille* (volumes 11 and 12 of his Corneille edition), a work still employed as a source for seventeenth-century French usage, but acknowledges that electronic production and access have made the construction and manipulation of concordances much more efficient. For such concordances to be of textual value, they should not merely list the words in a work or oeuvre but show a selection from the text in which the words appear. There are basically two ways of making such selections—with KWIC (keyword in context) and KWOC (keyword out of context) concordances. In a KWIC concordance, the keyword (the main entry) is recorded as it appears in a particular lexical position, say, in the middle of a word block with five or ten words on each side—with no reference to how the word appears on the textual page (e.g., at the beginning or end of a line). A KWIC concordance can be instructed to sort the keyword to the left or right of such a block, but a central position is generally more useful for observing how the word is used in its context. The KWIC system is widely used in fluid texts like prose or verse with much enjambment. The KWOC concordance, however, positions the keyword not in a particular lexical context but, rather, as it appears in a specific textual unit (e.g., a metrical line); in such concordances, an editor is more interested in how a word is used in a line than in how it is used in a word block. Thus, a KWIC concordance for the word *impediment* in Shakespeare's sonnets (with the keyword in a central context of five words on either side) would yield an entry "marriage of true minds / Admit *impediment*. Love is not love / Which." A KWOC concordance using the metrical line as its unit would record "Admit *impediment*. Love is not love." Despite the iambic pentameter of the sonnet structure, the KWIC system shows the enjambment better (in part because the sample is larger). Each method has its advantages, and the concordance maker will have to decide which better suits the textual conditions.

Other problems in concordances include homographs (e.g., How does the computer distinguish between *does*, the third-person singular form of the verb *to do*, and *does*, the plural of the female deer?) and lemmatization (How does the computer recognize a word temporarily disguised by, e.g., prefixes or variant spelling: should the computer regard the word *pressure* as having the prefix *pre-*?). Through morphological segmentation subprograms, it may be possible to make these distinctions, especially in texts with typically small lexicons, like Old English, but often the entire text may need to be presorted syntactically and morphemically. On a wider lexical scale—entire languages—a scholar may now do semantic, morphological, or syntactic searches through the parsing facilities of such dictionaries as the second edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the *Dictionary of American Regional English*, the *Dictionary of Old English*,

Trésor de la langue française, and the *Dictionary of the Old Spanish Language.* The forthcoming *New Oxford English Dictionary,* conceived from the beginning as an electronic edition, will be published primarily in electronic form, although there will be periodic publications in conventional print format (see Stubbs and Tompa; Amos). An editor working on a Shakespeare text may determine not only whether a particularly word is ever used by Shakespeare—from the Spevack concordances to the Riverside edition—but also whether this word occurs in any other headnote citations collected in the *New Oxford.* An editor may also discover, say, all words entering the English language from Italian in the sixteenth century or all quotations from Shakespeare, Milton, Keats, or Melville cited in the *New Oxford.*

Another related form of computer assistance is in vocabulary or stylistic studies, which are usually concerned with forming a view of the author's idiolect, the personal imprint on the language choices available. However, one must be both careful to construct this imprint from neutral terms and wary of context. For example, a recent stylometric study of the Pearl poet (qtd. in Pearsall and Cooper 371–72) came up with the surprising results that the author had a high incidence of *I, me, she,* and *her* but a very low incidence of *he, him, they,* and *them,* where a quick look at the context of *Pearl*—a dialogue between a narrator-dreamer and a vision of a young maiden—would immediately determine why this was so. Similarly, *p* is obviously a common alliterative initial in *Pearl, c* a common alliterative initial in *Cleanness,* and so on. Thus, the context may predetermine the results of stylometric studies, which ought therefore to concentrate as much as possible on unconscious selections within the idiolect, not substantive ones.

In collation of witnesses, computers can remove much of the drudgery formally associated with textual scholarship, especially when used with optical scanners such as the Kurzweil machine. However, scanners can be used only on printed texts of the machine-print, post-1800 era that have a chartable degree of uniformity and variance in the physical appearance of typeforms. Such machines are of little help in directly converting manuscripts to machine-readable form, since manuscripts usually still have to be converted to print by keyboard, thereby introducing an additional stage into the textual transmission. The margin of error, often as high as five percent in certain typeforms, also makes scanners of limited usefulness. But once the various witnesses have been scanned or otherwise entered into the collation program, the charting of variants and the mapping of filiation can proceed electronically. The range of collation and filiation programs, already very wide, will no doubt expand in the 1990s. Some programs work line by line, some with blocks of a specific number of words; some can compare only two texts at a time, others up to fifty. The best known at present include R. L. Widmann's program for *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* project OCCULT (ordered computer collation of unprepared literary text), the Margaret Cabaniss program, and COLLATE (see Hockey; Oakman). Ted-Larry Pebworth and Gary Stringer's collation program, based on the Donne Variorum,

is available for personal computers, as is Shillingsburg's CASE (computer-assisted scholarly editing) system, which is based on the Thackeray edition. CASE is particularly useful, since it combines nine interrelated programs that do much more than merely collate. For example, CASE can produce fair copy from a diplomatic transcription, merge variant files into a single comprehensive historical collation, sort lists of selected variants, and turn working lists of variants into files appropriate for producing a textual apparatus. For filiation, Dearing has written several useful programs, including PRELIMDI, ARCHETYP, and MSFAMTRE; he wrote MSFAMTRE using the data from PRELIMDI and then arranged the variants according to theory of probability (Hockey 158–59).

While computers have been used to research, edit, produce, and typeset printed critical editions, fully electronic texts, marketed in computer-readable form and even manipulated by the reader and used to create reader-designed critical editions, are still in the planning stage—although there is little doubt that they will come soon. The very notion of "hypertext," a cumulative electronic storage of all forms and states of text forming that text's history, will assuredly provide the raw and combinatory materials for the production of reader- or, more correctly, viewer-created editions in the near future, as suggested by Shillingsburg ("Limits") and others. In fact, Foley's HEURO I has already shown the way, allowing computer-terminal operators to experiment among the various available forms of motifs arranged in the "object text"—a hypertextual electronic method of letting the receiver handle text transmission, as has always been the method in oral literature (85–89).

Editing and Literary Criticism

Despite all this technical assistance, textual scholarship remains basically suspicious and therefore basically critical. When confronted with the accumulated evidence, the textual scholar must still cast a critical eye over its value and applicability, as in the example of the pronouns in *Pearl.* Even the apparently straightforward skill of transcription requires a judgment every time a letter form, or even a space, in the original document is re-presented in the transcript. Even a simple photographic facsimile of a document or documents necessitates critical decisions. For example, Hinman's facsimile of the Shakespeare First Folio cited earlier is a first edition of *the* First Folio, for until Hinman's 1968 edition no extant version of the Folio represented "ideal copy," and all versions contained uncorrected leaves. By selecting carefully from the extant copies, leaf by leaf, Hinman successfully constructed the First Folio three centuries after its appearance in corrupted form. As both Anne Middleton and Hans Gabler have recently noted, textual annotation and commentary should also be considered as part of an "integrate[d] critical discourse" (Gabler, "Textual Studies" 163). Gabler commends Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor's *Textual Companion* to the Oxford Shakespeare as a particularly fine example of extended "discursive reasoning" that qualifies as both literary criticism and textual criticism; he also quotes Gerhard Seidel's

commentary on the variant texts of a multiform, highly versioned Brecht poem as a case of textual and critical "interpenetration" (164). Middleton, in assessing her role as annotator of George Kane and E. Talbot Donaldson's edition of *Piers Plowman*, discusses a wide range of critical and theoretical models for what she describes as the annotator's "life in the margins." For example, she observes that annotation can be seen as an allegorizing of the text in its "occlud[ing of] the horizontal coherence of the text [its narrative] for the vertical plenitude . . . of information [its referentiality to an outside world]" (170).

Such current speculations on the critical and aesthetic significance of textual work have a long history and range; indeed, textual scholars as diverse as Bowers (e.g., *Textual and Literary Criticism*), Tanselle (e.g., "Textual Scholarship"), Gary Taylor (e.g., "Rhetoric"), and McGann (e.g., "Monks") have frequently observed that textual scholarship and critical evaluation are inextricably linked, even at the most basic bibliographical level, and thus each act of textual scholarship becomes essentially an act of literary criticism. A brief example: When the eclectic editors Kane and Donaldson emend the text of Langland's *Piers Plowman* to produce perfect alliterative lines, even when the cumulative evidence of the surviving manuscripts does not support such perfection (see Fowler's review), and when they use the concept of the *lectio difficilior* 'more difficult reading' to support an unusual or idiosyncratic authorial reading, they are embodying textually several literary-critical principles. First, they suggest that great authors are more original than their copyists, who will either not recognize or not understand this originality and will seek to reduce it to a flat normalcy. Second, they assert that copies are, for this reason and others connected with human and material decay, inevitably corrupt and unreliable. Third, they believe that this unreliability empowers the critical editor to become the author through a phenomenological shift, or psychological "transference," and therefore to re-compose the author's intention despite the documentary evidence. And fourth, they reason that great authors aspire to perfection, which their proxies, the critical editors, must therefore resuscitate. When Kane smilingly announced in conference some years ago that "Chaucer never wrote a nonmetrical line," he meant not only that all manuscript nonmetrical lines were written by Chaucer's scribes rather than by Chaucer but also that he knew what a perfect Chaucerian line was, just as the Alexandrians claimed to know what was the perfect Homeric line. This reasoning is inevitably circular, for the concept of perfection, the belief in the utility of "analogy," is itself based only on the avowedly corrupt remains, which by definition cannot be relied on. Yet, once the standard of perfection has been articulated, an adjudication can be made among these corrupt remains, and they can be arranged in a hierarchy insofar as they support the analogical paradigm. Then, in accordance with copy-text theory, the hierarchy can be invoked at moments of indifferent authority to construct or reflect a putative authorial reading where no adjudication is otherwise possible.

Logical problems do exist in several stages of this typical procedure, but they have not stood in the way of active and interrogative textual scholarship,

nor should they. When Steven Mailloux—one of the few literary theorists to have written on textual scholarship—analyzes the rationale given by the editors of the Northwestern–Newberry Library Melville for having emended *nations* to *matrons* (114–15), he is relying on the reader-critic's mind having been subsumed into the consciousness of the author by phenomenological transference. Mailloux is thus using a literary-critical skill, or intuition, to challenge the literary-critical skills, or intuitions, of the Melville editors; this critical process is based, as was Kane's and Donaldson's for Langland, on *becoming* the author for that moment, in posthumously rewriting Melville's text. All the technical assistance and all the computers in the world finally leave the editor alone, at that moment, to face the task of creating anew the abstract form behind the concrete decay. Making use of both bibliographical and textual information and yet relying on speculative intuition, textual scholarship is thus neither science nor art. Housman came close to the problem when he suggested that textual work involves "the science of discovering errors in texts, and the art of removing them" (131), but today most practicing textual scholars would probably insist that art and science are equally mixed in both parts of Housman's equation.

This brief survey of the mechanics, the how of textual scholarship, assumes the importance of such procedures. But, although textual scholarship was at the center of the literary disciplines a century ago, it is now often regarded as merely introductory, or even subservient, to the real business of criticism—at least in its hermeneutic aspects (even though hermeneutics was itself a product of the higher criticism of biblical and classical texts, considered as textual artifacts). It may even come as a surprise to literary critics that textual scholars regard themselves as "interpreters" of texts (in the act of reconstructing them), but if one must indeed become Langland or Melville (or Shakespeare, Joyce, Woolf, Beethoven, or Michelangelo) in the phenomenology of reconstruction, then clearly textual scholars are making very large claims for themselves, and those claims extend beyond narrow, technical, philological aims. Two examples of the why of textual scholarship—from disciplines other than literature—clarify the significance of these claims.

In 1979, in the first (posthumous) performance of the complete three-act version of Alban Berg's opera *Lulu*, a version based on the textual reconstruction by Friedrich Cerha, the director Patrice Chéreau insisted that Yvonne Minton, playing the role of Countess Geschwitz, sing the word *Verflucht* ("cursed" or "damned") to the "wordless sigh" that Berg had notated in his unedited score in the final bars of the third act. Chéreau argued that since this was the last word in Berg's source, a play by Wedekind, it should thus be incorporated into the operatic as well as the theatrical tradition, even though Berg had not done so. Chéreau's addition of *Verflucht* has since 1979 become accepted into performance practice elsewhere, but without this "interpolation" from another medium and another author, Geschwitz's last word would be *Ewigkeit* ("eternity"—a dying promise to be faithful to her murdered lesbian lover Lulu forever). The two endings—"cursed" or "eternity"—clearly change the entire moral and

psychological meaning of the lesbian affair for an audience (and arguably could even affect the genre of the work), but there is a further textual complexity: the additional final word *Verflucht* does not appear in the published score either in the complete three-act version or in the extract published separately in the *Lulu Suite*. It occurs only in the tradition of performance practice in the opera house since Chéreau's Paris production. Thus, a "reader" of the text of the libretto or score comes away with an impression of the work that is very different from that of a "hearer" of the performed opera, but only a textual scholar aware of both literary and oral transmissions is able to chart the difference and to know that the performance misrepresents the verbal text. One word changes everything (as it does in the variance at the end of D. H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, where the choice is between whether Paul Morel "whimpers" or "whispers" the talismanic word *Mother!*). To demonstrate the cultural, and legal, importance of textual opinions, we can turn to the recent Italian lawsuit in which James Beck, professor of art history at Columbia and one of the dissenting voices to the Sistine Chapel cleaning, has been charged with "malicious slander" by the inventor of a pellet gun used to clean Renaissance statues (see Simons). And the complaint? That by favoring, in somewhat forceful language, the McGannian textual concept of the work existing in its accumulated history (grime and all) rather than in a false "originary" moment that can never be recaptured, Beck is maligning the rival "textual" theory of the cleaners. That Beck could, under Italian law, go to jail for three or four years for his textual opinions, will no doubt be a caution to all textual scholars, and the case demonstrates that a culture may place very high value indeed on "states" of the text. In these two examples, only a full critical edition of both oral and literary transmissions of *Lulu* would make the options clear (and exemplify the value of recording multiple witnesses in such critical editions), but for the Renaissance statues, since "text" and "work" compete for the same space, no critical edition can preserve both textual choices.

TEXTUALITY

Practice and Theory

While the periodic attempts by the technicians, mathematicians, and logicians to make textual scholarship into a science have doubtless enriched the discipline, the inevitable critical component of textual scholarship means that there can be no immunity from the various debates about text and criticism that have characterized recent developments in literary criticism and theory. At one time the empirical emphases of textual scholarship might have led its practitioners to assume that editing a text did not involve theory and that the traditional practices of collation, emendation, and so on, which seemed natural to the successful production of critical editions, did not depend on ontological assump-

tions. But virtually all textual scholars now recognize that, since the textual scholarship of literature is a form of literary criticism or vice versa, textual assumptions and practices both influence and are influenced by the literary contentions. Thus, it was no accident that the critical hegemony of the New Criticism paralleled that of the New Bibliography, with its similar concentration on closed formalistic texts bearing the imprint of a single consciousness and uniform act of composition—a "well-wrought urn" (Greetham, "Textual and Literary Theory" 14–15n4). Nor is it any accident that during the late 1970s and into the 1990s, textual scholarship has moved away from this model toward genetic texts, fragmented texts, versioning texts, social texts, multiple and contradictory texts, even reader-generated texts, through the work of such scholars as Gabler, Pearsall, Reiman, McGann, Parker, and Foley.

Each of these new models can be seen to represent one or more of the current movements in phenomenological, structuralist, poststructuralist, reader-response, feminist, or Marxist criticism. For example, as I have already suggested, an ideological conflict occurs in Gabler's *Synoptic Edition* between the right-hand (reading) pages, which represent "intentionality," and the left-hand (genetic) pages, which embody a formal structuralist approach to recording the text. This conflict arises because each choice that the reader makes on the genetic page consists of an "on" reading (that selected at a given moment) and at least one implied "off" reading (that not selected), without any privilege being permanently accorded to any and with the existence of each dependent on its structuralist "difference" from the others. Similarly, McGann's social textual criticism has been seen both as an "unattributed gloss" on the Marxist Pierre Macherey's dictum that "the work is not *created* by an intention (objective or subjective); it is *produced* under determinate conditions" (Sutherland 581) and as an exemplification of Stanley Fish's "interpretive communities," whereby textual meaning is constructed by a social contract within which the transmitted text operates rather than by an appeal to the intentions of a now absent author (Greetham, "Textual and Literary Theory" 11–12). Another approach is to confront literary theory directly and to interrogate its principles or even co-opt them: these two alternatives can be seen in two deconstruction articles by Tanselle ("Textual Criticism") and D. C. Greetham ("[Textual] Criticism"). An example of co-option in a specific period is Robert S. Sturges's recent article, in the medieval studies journal *Exemplaria*, on textual scholarship as "ideology of literary production," which incidentally demonstrates that textual and literary theory are as much a part of criticism of the early periods as they are of twentieth-century studies. As Tanselle's deconstruction article suggests, even the more traditional intentionalists have taken part in the debate; discussions range from Tanselle's comprehensive study of intention ("Editorial Problem")—drawing mostly on the philosopher Michael Hancher and the literary theorist E. D. Hirsch, Jr.—to James McLaverty's investigation of the ontology of the intentionalist text ("Concept") and his citing of a familiar problem (after Bateson): if the *Mona Lisa* is in the Louvre, where are *Hamlet* or *Lycidas* ("Mode of Existence" 82)?

Future Texts

If current publication plans are fulfilled, it is likely that the 1990s will see further speculation on the interrelation of textual, cultural, and literary theory. For example, Gary Taylor is working on a study of the historical hermeneutics of editing, tentatively entitled *The Matter of Text*; W. Speed Hill on the humanist editing in the vernacular and on the text as scripture; Joseph antecedents of editing in the vernacular and on the text as scripture; Joseph Grigely on textual criticism and the arts; James L. W. West III on a volume entitled *Creating American Authors: The Language of Editing*; and Greetham on the conceptual and ideological matrix of literary and textual theory (*Theories*). The collections of essays on this problem appearing in a special issue of the journal *Critical Exchange*, entitled *Textual Scholarship and Literary Theory*, and in the volume that Philip Cohen has edited (*Devils and Angels*) will doubtless fuel the debate, as will McGann's forthcoming book *The Textual Condition*, George Bornstein's two collections (*Representing Modernist Texts* and *Palimpsest*), Tim Machan's *Medieval Literature*, and Dave Oliphant and Robin Bradford's *New Directions in Textual Studies*, the proceedings of a 1989 Texas conference in which the sociological and materialist aspect of text and textuality is very prominent. Textual scholars are thus confronting many of the critical issues (e.g., race, class, gender, interpretation, textuality) that characterize other parts of the discipline and that this volume addresses elsewhere. Perhaps the most provocative issue to date has been the attempt by some feminist scholars to interrogate not only the patriarchal canon of received texts but also the ideologies embedded in editions—for example, the status of text and apparatus as "center" and "margins" (see Bennett; King; Silver; White). Certainly, more editions bearing a nonintentionalist stamp, following the examples of European geneticism and other schools, will appear in the next few years. Until recently, the technical constraints of letterpress editions lent themselves quite readily to the production of definitive, fixed, permanent editions, both on the page and in time, so that eclectic, final-intentions editions seemed almost natural for the technical medium. But textual scholars can now produce fragmented, spliced, mutilated, multiform, grafted, or deconstructed texts—doubtless embodying the worst nightmares of New Critic and New Bibliographer alike—and most textual scholars now recognize that a natural affinity exists between the computer and the variable discourses of contemporary textual scholarship, as the electronic editions of the Oxford Shakespeare and the *OED* have begun to demonstrate. But counterbalancing these new electronic riches is the realization that composition on word processors or computers may destroy layer after layer of an evolving work, unless hard copies of each stage are made and retained.

As already noted, the new technical sophistication has not yet produced completely electronic editions. Thus, McGann is right ("Contemporary Literary Theory") to be somewhat circumspect about the current possibilities, even with hypertext, for representing electronically the variable "bibliographical code" of a text as well as its equally variable "linguistic code." But this present limitation

is simply the result of an inevitable initial technical concentration on verbal forms, and reproducing the visual and other bibliographical conditions of textual states will probably become possible as computer programs grow more sophisticated. Even now, CD-ROM disks can contain graphic representations of each edition, and desktop editing and publishing will no doubt take advantage of such facilities, with or without modem connecting the editor directly to the printer or publisher.

Interdisciplinary study is another important area of speculation on textuality. This field has been enhanced in two ways: First, cross-disciplinary textual discussion has become institutionalized through such organs as the Association for Documentary Editing and the Society for Textual Scholarship—although the Association for Documentary Editing has gradually become identified primarily with the interests of historians, and it is, to some extent, as concerned with the practical matters of securing funding and employment as it is with being a forum for scholarly debate. The two journals of these bodies, *Documentary Editing* and *Text*, have published much important interdisciplinary work in the last decade, a trend that has been paralleled by an increasing hospitality to theoretical and interdisciplinary study in more traditional journals such as *Studies in Bibliography*, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, and *The Library*. Second, several scholars (e.g., Shillingsburg, "Key Issues" and "Text as Matter"; Tanselle, *Rationale*; and McGann, "Critical Editing") have made significant attempts to define some of the basic concepts of textual scholarship (e.g., *text*, *work*, *critical editing*) and to apply these concepts beyond the familiar verbal texts of literature to the media of film, painting, music, sculpture, and so on. By far the most wide-ranging and convincing of these attempts to date has been Tanselle's *Rationale of Textual Criticism*, which brings the author's encyclopedic knowledge of all aspects of textual scholarship to bear on the primary ontological question of textuality.

Case Study: The Gabler Ulysses

Inevitably, these interdisciplinary studies cannot avoid contention—nor do they seek to do so. Since textual scholarship has always been marked by philosophical as well as methodological disagreements, from the days of the Alexandrians and the Pergamanians, it should not be expected that theoretical and interdisciplinary discussion will achieve consensus. Textual scholars, the dryasdusts of the scholarly world, may seem immune from the personal animus and emotional investment that characterize other critical dispensations, but this immunity is illusory. A particularly pertinent example of the problem, one that exemplifies many of the issues dealt with in this essay (access to documents, copy-text theory, genetic versus eclectic editing, types of apparatus, etc.), occurs in the conflict over the Gabler *Ulysses*.

The text of *Ulysses* has always been problematic: the 1922 first edition includes a note apologizing for the many typographical errors; Random House

set the first American edition (1934) from a corrupt pirated version; and the revised (1961) edition compounds many earlier errors. Because of the estimated four thousand errors in the text of the major novel of the twentieth century, it was inevitable that contemporary textual scholarship would turn to the task of constructing an authoritative edition. The responsibility fell to a team headed by Gabler, a former student of Bowers and a professor of English at the University of Munich. Gabler decided not to bring out a traditional critical edition based on a single copy-text with variants from other texts but instead to produce a genetic, or "synoptic," text showing all stages of the authorial composition of *Ulysses*, complemented by a facing-page reading text of Joyce's supposed final intentions, which were not otherwise embodied in any single document. This synoptic edition, whose principles were articulated in Gabler's "Synchrony" article, was published in 1984, to much acclaim, and it was followed in 1986 by withdrawal of the old Random House edition and the publication of the reading text alone, without the synoptic apparatus. The Gabler edition, in both synoptic and clear-text form, was thus the exclusive text of Joyce's *Ulysses*. In the meantime, however, the activities of Kidd, then a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Virginia, in questioning Gabler's methods and specific readings, led to a reevaluation of the Gabler edition—and to an increasingly contentious debate between Kidd and Gabler and their supporters in conferences, learned journals, and the popular press (see Wilkerson; Treglown). A James Joyce Research Center affiliated with Boston University (with Kidd as its director) was set up, and a special committee was appointed by Random House to adjudicate the matter. However, this committee did not reach a definitive decision before disbanding, and since Random House decided to republish the 1961 edition, readers of *Ulysses* were therefore left as active textual critics, having to judge the texts rather than passively consume them. This choice will be compounded by Kidd's recent appointment as editor of the "Dublin" edition of Joyce's works, to be published by Norton. The *Ulysses* "scandal" was simply a public debate over the critical issues faced by all textual scholars and all critical readers, and it forcefully demonstrated to the academic world and general reader alike, at a time when such truths were perhaps in need of resuscitation, just how crucial is the role of textual scholarship in critically evaluating and re-creating the texts of our culture.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Useful bibliographies for the field occur in G. Thomas Tanselle's "Textual Scholarship" in the first edition of this book, the accounts of research in the CSE and CEAA pamphlets, William Proctor Williams and Craig S. Abbott's *Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies*, Graham Falconer and David H. Sanderson's "Bibliographie des études génétiques littéraires" (which covers much more than strict "genetic editing"), Beth Luey's *Editing Documents and Texts*, and the "Suggested Readings" in Mary-Jo Kline's *Guide to Documentary Editing*. The annual checklists of textual scholarship published in *Studies in Bibliography* have now

been discontinued, but they are still useful for earlier years. See also the bibl na-phies in O M Br l Jr., and Warner Barnes's *Bibliography*, Ronald Gottesman and Scott Bennett's *Art and Error*, and Barnes's "Selective Bibliography." Most of the Tanselle articles cited contain rich documentation in the notes. General surveys of the field of textual scholarship include Tanselle's "Textual Scholarship," Fredson Bowers's "Textual Criticism," and D. C. Greetham's *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. While textual articles occasionally appear in general critical journals, most of the important essays have been published in *The Library*, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, *Studies in Bibliography*, *Documentary Editing*, *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography*, *Text*, or *Editio* (in German); these journals can be supplemented by reference to articles in the various volumes of the annual University of Toronto *Conferences on Editorial Problems*, now published by AMS Press. Textual editions and textual work are frequently reviewed in the journal *Review*. General manuals of editing include Kline's *Guide* and Williams and Abbott's *Introduction*, supplemented by manuals for editing in specific fields (e.g., Foulet and Speer on Old French; Moorman on Middle English). The best introduction to analytical and descriptive bibliography is Philip Gaskell's *New Introduction* (supplemented by Bowers's monumental *Principles*) and to codicology, Barbara Shailor's *Medieval Book* and Bernard Bischoff's *Latin Palaeography*, which (as its title suggests) is also useful for paleography. A practical approach to texts and editing is taken by Gaskell's *From Writer to Reader*, which provides several examples of multiple-witness texts from the Renaissance to modern literature and of various editorial methods to deal with them. General surveys of editing methods occur in Bowers's collection *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing*; Tanselle's collection *Textual Criticism since Greg* (which supplements his earlier collection of essays, *Selected Studies in Bibliography*); Donald H. Reiman's "Four Ages"; Peter L. Shillingsburg's *Scholarly Editing*; John McClelland's "Critical Editing" (for Continental editing); Jerome J. McGann's *Critique*; James Thorpe's *Princples*; George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones's *Literary and Historical Editing*; Dave Oliphant and Robin Bradford's *New Directions* and (for all periods from biblical to modern) Greetham's forthcoming *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research*, especially for further information on nonanglophone references in this present essay (e.g., Mary B. Speer and Edmund Campion on French, Michael Carter on Arabic, Paolo Cherchi on Italian, John Miles Foley on folk literature, Edward Kasinec and Robert Whittaker on Slavic, Bodo Plachta on German, and Ludo Rocher on Sanskrit). Other useful essays for the beginner include R. C. Bald's "Editorial Problems," Bowers's "Method for a Critical Edition," Brack's "Introduction" to the Brack and Barnes *Bibliography*, Lester J. Cappon's "Historian as Editor," Vinton Dearing's "Methods of Textual Editing," Dan H. Laurence's "Bibliographical Novitiate," and John Y. Simon's "Editors and Critics."

City University of New York

WORKS CITED

Note: Where a particular style of editing, or the specific contributions of an editor, is the reason for citation, editions are listed under the names of their editors (e.g., Gabler, Robinson, Bowers); otherwise, editions are listed under their authors (e.g., Shakespeare, Milton, Melville, Emerson).

Amos, Ashley Crandell. "Computers and Lexicography: The *Dictionary of Old English*." Butler and Stoneman 45–64.

Bald, R. C. "Editorial Problems: A Preliminary Survey." *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–51): 3–17. Rpt. in Gottesman and Bennett 37–53.

Barbi, Michele, ed. *La vita nuova*. By Dante Alighieri. Florence: Soc. Dantesca Italiana, 1907.

Barnes, Warner. "Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Editorial Problems: A Selective Bibliography." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 62 (1968): 59–67.

Bateson, F. W. "Modern Bibliography and the Literary Artifact." *English Studies Today: Second Series*. Ed. G. A Bonnard. 1961. 66–77.

Bédier, Joseph, "La tradition manuscrite du *Lai du l'ombre*: Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes." *Romania* 54 (1928): 161–96, 321–56. Rpt. as pamphlet, 1970.

Beissner, Friedrich, ed. *Sämtliche Werke*. By Friedrich Hölderlin. Stuttgart: Gr. Stuttgart Ausgabe, 1943.

Bennett, Betty. "Feminism and Editing: The Mary Shelley Letters." Bornstein, *Palimpsest*.

Beowulf: Facsimile. Ed. Norman Davis. 2nd. ed. EETS. London: Oxford UP, 1959.

Bischoff, Bernhard. *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Trans. Dáibhí O Cróinín and David Ganz. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Bornstein, George, ed. *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, forthcoming.

———. *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991.

Bowers, Fredson, ed. *The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. 11 vols. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1962–75.

———, ed. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1953–61.

———. *Essays in Bibliography, Text, and Editing*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1975.

———. "The Method for a Critical Edition." *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania Lib., 1955. 67–101.

———. *Principles of Bibliographical Description*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1949. New York: Russell, 1962.

———. *Textual and Literary Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.

———. "Textual Criticism." *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*. Ed. James Thorpe. 2nd. ed. New York: MLA, 1970. 29–54.

———, ed. *The Works of Stephen Crane*. 10 vols. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1969–75.

Bowers, Fredson, with L. A. Beaurline, eds. *John Dryden: Four Comedies*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1967.

———. *John Dryden: Four Tragedies*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1967.

Brack, O M, Jr., and Warner Barnes, eds. *Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature, 1700 to the Present*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969.

Butler, Sharon, and William P. Stoneman, eds. *Editing, Publishing, and Computer Technology*. New York: AMS, 1988.

Cappon, Lester J. "The Historian as Editor." *In Support of Clio: Essays in Memory of Herbert A. Kellar*. Ed. William B. Hesseltine and Donald R. McNeil. Madison: State Historical Soc. of Wisconsin, 1958. 173–93.

Cather, Willa. *O Pioneers!* Ed. Susan J. Rosowski. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1992.

Center for Editions of American Authors. *Statement of Editorial Principles and Procedures*. Rev. ed. New York: MLA, 1972.

Center/Committee for Scholarly Editions. *An Introductory Statement*. New York: MLA, 1977.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Variorum Chaucer*. Ed. Paul G. Ruggiers. 8 vols. to date. Norman: U of Oklahoma P; Folkestone: Dawson, 1979–.

Cohen, Philip, ed. *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1991.

Dearing, Vinton. "Methods of Textual Editing." *Williams Andrews Clark Memorial Library Seminar Papers* (1962): 1–34. Rpt. in Brack and Barnes 73–101.

———. *Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.

De Robertis, Domenico. "Per l'edizione critica del 'Dolore' di Giuseppi Ungaretti." *Studi di Filologia Italiana* 38 (1980): 309–23.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

Ejxenbaum, B. "O tekstax Lermontova." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*. Vols. 19–21. Moscow: Zurnal'no-gazetnoe ob"edinenie, 1935. 485–501.

Eliot, T. S. *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript*. Ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Harcourt, 1971.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. 4 vols. to date. Ed. Alfred R. Ferguson. Cambridge: Belknap–Harvard UP, 1971–.

Falconer, Graham, and David H. Sanderson. "Bibliographie des études génétiques littéraires." *Texte* 7 (1988): 287–352.

Febvre, Lucien, and Henri-Jean Martin. *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450–1800*. Trans. David Gerard. London: Verso, 1990.

Fennell, John L. I. "Textology as a Key to the Study of Old Russian Literature and History." *Text* 1 (1981): 157–66.

Finneran, Richard J., ed. *The Poems of W. B. Yeats*. New York: Macmillan, 1983.

Flaubert, Gustave. *Corpus flaubertianum*. Ed. Giovanni Bonnacorso, Maria Francesca Davi-Trimarchi, Simonetta Micale, and Eliane Contaz-Sframeli. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1983.

Foley, John Miles. "Editing Yugoslav Epics: Theory and Practice." *Text* 1 (1981): 75–96.

Foulet, Alfred, and Mary Blakeley Speer. *On Editing Old French Texts*. Lawrence: Regents P of Kansas, 1979.

Fowler, David C. "A New Edition of the B Text of *Piers Plowman*." *Yearbook of English Studies* 7 (1977): 23–42.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "A Response to John Kidd, 'Errors of Execution in the 1984 Ulysses.' " Soc. for Textual Scholarship. New York, 26, Apr. 1985. *Studies in the Novel* 22 (1990): 250–56.

———. "The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses.*" *Text* 1 (1981): 305–26.

———. "Textual Studies and Criticism." Oliphant and Bradford 151–66.

———, ed. *Ulysses: Corrected Text.* By James Joyce. New York: Random, 1986.

Gabler, Hans Walter, with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, eds. *Ulysses: A Critical and Synoptic Edition.* By James Joyce. 3 vols. New York: Garland, 1984.

Gaskell, Philip. *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method.* Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1978.

———. *New Introduction to Bibliography.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.

Gaskell, Philip, and Clive Hart, eds. *Ulysses: A Review of Three Texts.* New York: Barnes, 1989.

Gottesman, Ronald, and Scott Bennett, eds. *Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1970.

Greetham, D. C., ed. *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research.* New York: MLA, forthcoming.

———. "Textual and Literary Theory: Redrawing the Matrix." *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 1–24.

———. "[Textual] Criticism and Deconstruction." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 1–30.

———. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction.* New York: Garland, 1991.

———. *Theories of the Text.* Oxford: Oxford UP, forthcoming.

Greg, W. W. *A Calculus of Variants: An Essay on Textual Criticism.* Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1927.

———. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–51): 19–36.

Hancher, Michael. "Three Kinds of Intention." *MLN* 87 (1972): 827–51.

Hay, Louis. "Genetic Editing, Past and Present: A Few Reflections of a User." *Text* 3 (1987): 117–34.

Hinman, Charlton, ed. *The Norton Facsimile: The Shakespeare First Folio.* New York: Norton, 1968.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. *Validity in Interpretation.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1967.

Hockey, Susan. *A Guide to Computer Applications in the Humanities.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke.* Ed. D. E. Sattler. Frankfurt: Roter Stern, 1975.

Housman, A. E. *Selected Prose.* Ed. John Carter. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961.

Howard-Hill, T. H. "Theory and Praxis in the Social Approach to Editing." *Text* 5 (1991): 31–46.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* Ed. Julian P. Boyd, Charles T. Cullen, et al. 24 vols. to date. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1950–.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* Rev. ed. New York: Random, 1961.

Kafka, Franz. *Schriften, Tagebücher, Briefe.* Ed. Jürgen Born, Gerhard Neumann, Malcolm Pasley, and Jost Schillemeit. 6 vols. to date. Frankfurt: Fischer, 1982–.

Kane, George. Discussion. New Chaucer Society Conference. Washington, Apr. 1979.

Kane, George, and E. Talbot Donaldson, eds. Piers Plowman: *The B Version.* London: Athlone, 1975.

Kenney, E. J. *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.

Kidd, John, ed. *Dublin Edition of the Works of James Joyce.* New York: Norton, in preparation.

———. "Errors of Execution in the 1984 *Ulysses.*" Soc. for Textual Scholarship. New York, 26 Apr. 1985. *Studies in the Novel* 22 (1990): 243–49.

———. "An Inquiry into Ulysses: *The Corrected Text.*" *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 82.4 (1988): 411–584.

———. "The Scandal of *Ulysses.*" *New York Review of Books* 30 June 1988: 32–39.

King, Katie. "Bibliography and a Feminist Apparatus for Literary Production." *Text* 5 (1991): 91–104.

Kline, Mary-Jo. *A Guide to Documentary Editing.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.

Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb. *Werke und Briefe.* Ed. Adolf Beck, Karl-Ludwig Schneider, Hermann Tiemann, Horst Gronemeyer, Elisabeth Höpker-Herberg, Klaus Hurlebusch, and Rosa-Maria Hurlebusch. 19 vols. to date. Berlin: Gruyter, 1974–.

Knight, R. C., and H. T. Barnwell, eds. *Andromaque.* By Jean Racine. Geneva: Droz, 1977.

Lachmann, Karl. *Der Nibelunge Noth und die Klage.* 12th ed. Berlin: Reimer, 1901.

Lafuma, Louis, ed. *Œuvres complètes.* By Blaise Pascal. Paris: Seuil, 1963.

Laumonier, Paul, Raymond Lebègue, and Isidore Silver, eds. *Œuvres complètes.* By Pierre de Ronsard. 17 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1914–59.

Laurence, Dan H. "A Bibliographical Novitiate: In Search of Henry James." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 52 (1958): 23–33.

Lixačev, Dmitrij. *Tekstologija russkoj literatury X-XVII vekov.* Leningrad: Nauka, 1983.

Luey, Beth. *Editing Documents and Texts: An Annotated Bibliography.* Madison: Madison, 1990.

Maas, Paul. *Textual Criticism.* Trans. Barbara Flower. Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1958.

Machan, Tim W., ed. *Medieval Literature: Texts and Interpretation.* Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1990.

Mahdi, M., ed. *The Thousand and One Nights . . . from the Earliest Known Sources.* 2 vols. to date. Leiden: Brill, 1984–.

Mailloux, Steven. *Interpretive Conventions: The Reader in the Study of American Fiction.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.

Margitic, Milorad R., ed. *Le Cid.* By Pierre Corneille. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1989.

Martens, Gunter. "Textdynamik und Edition." *Texte und Varianten: Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation.* Ed. Hans Zeller and Gunter Martens. Munich: Beck, 1971. 165–201.

————. "Texte ohne Varianten?" *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 101 (1982): 43–64.

Marty-Laveaux, Charles, ed. *Œuvres complètes*. By Pierre Corneille. 12 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1862–93.

————, ed. *Œuvres complètes*. By Pierre de Ronsard. 6 vols. Paris: Lemerre, 1887–93.

McClelland, John. "Critical Editing in the Modern Languages." *Text* 1 (1981): 201–16.

McGann, Jerome J. "Contemporary Literary Theory and Textual Criticism." Soc. for Textual Scholarship. New York, 7 Apr. 1989.

————. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

————. "The Monks and the Giants: Textual and Bibliographical Studies and the Interpretation of Literary Works." McGann, *Textual Criticism* 180–99.

————. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

————, ed. *Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985.

————. "What Is Critical Editing?" *Text* 5 (1991): 15–30.

McKenzie, D. F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: British Lib., 1986.

McLaverty, James. "The Concept of Authorial Intention in Textual Criticism." *Library* 6 (June 1984): 121–38.

————. "The Mode of Existence of Literary Works of Art: The Case of the *Dunciad Variorum*." *Studies in Bibliography* 37 (1984): 82–105.

Melville, Herman. *The Writings of Herman Melville*. Ed. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle. 12 vols. to date. Evanston: Northwestern UP; Chicago: Newberry Lib., 1968–.

Middleton, Anne. "Life in the Margins; or, What's an Annotator to Do?" Oliphant and Bradford 167–83.

Milton, John. *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes et al. 6 vols. New York: Columbia UP, 1970–75.

Moland, Louis, ed. *Œuvres complètes*. By Voltaire. 52 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1877–85.

Moorman, Charles. *Editing the Middle English Manuscript*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1975.

Mumford, Lewis. "Emerson behind Barbed Wire." *New York Review of Books* 18 Jan. 1968: 3–5.

Oakman, Robert. *Computer Methods for Literary Research*. Rev. ed. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1984.

Oliphant, Dave, and Robin Bradford, eds. *New Directions in Textual Studies*. Austin: Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, U of Texas P, 1990.

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

————. " 'The New Scholarship': Textual Evidence and Its Implication for Criticism, Literary Theory, and Aesthetics." *Studies in American Fiction* 9 (1984): 181–97.

Pasquali, Giorgio. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. Florence: Monnier, 1934.

Pearsall, Derek. "Editing Medieval Texts." McGann, *Textual Criticism* 92–106.

Pearsall, Derek, and R. A. Cooper. "The *Gawain* Poems: A Statistical Approach to the Question of Common Authorship." *Review of English Studies* 39 (1988): 365–85.

Pebworth, Ted-Larry, and Gary A. Stringer. *Scholarly Editing on the Microcomputer*. In preparation.

Piksanov, N. K. "Novyj put' literanoj nauki. Izučenie tvorčeskoj istoriii šedevra. (Principy i metody)." *Iskusstvo* (1923): 94–113.

Proust, Marcel. *Matinée chez la princesse de Guermantes, Cahiers du temps retrouvé*. Ed. Henri Bonnet and Bernard Brun. Paris: Gallimard, 1972.

Quentin, Dom Henri. *Essai de critique textuelle*. Paris: Picard, 1926.

Reiman, Donald H. "The Four Ages of Editing and the English Romantics." *Text* 1 (1984): 231–55. Rpt. in Reiman, *Romantic Texts* 17–32.

————. *Romantic Texts and Contexts*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1987.

————. " 'Versioning': The Presentation of Multiple Texts." Reiman, *Romantic Texts* 167–80.

Robinson, F. N., ed. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton; London: Oxford UP, 1957.

Rossi, Aldo, ed. *Il Decameron*. By Giovanni Boccaccio. Bologna: Capelli, 1977.

Rossman, Charles. "The Critical Reception of the Gabler *Ulysses*; or, Gabler's *Ulysses* Kidd-Napped." *Studies in the Novel* 21 (1989): 154–81.

————. "The New *Ulysses*: The Hidden Controversy." *New York Review of Books* 8 Dec. 1988: 53–58.

Rowse, A. L., ed. *The Annotated Shakespeare*. New York: Potter, 1978.

Sandys, J. E. W. *A History of Classical Scholarship*. 1906–08. 3 vols. New York: Hafner, 1964.

Seidel, Gerhard. "Intentionswandel in der Entstehungsgeschichte. Ein Gedicht Bertolt Brechts über Karl Kraus historisch-kritisch ediert." *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 101 (1982): 163–88.

Sellier, Philippe, ed. *Pensées*. By Blaise Pascal. Paris: Mercure, 1976.

Sezgin, F., ed. *Majāz al-Qur'ān*. 2 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Kheanji, 1954–62.

Shailor, Barbara. *The Medieval Book*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1986.

————. *The Complete Works: Electronic Edition*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

————. *The Complete Works: Original-Spelling Edition*. Ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1986.

————. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*. Ed. H. H. Furness, et al. 1871–. New and rev. eds. Ed. Robert. K. Turner, Richard Knowles, et al. New York: MLA, 1977–.

————. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. Gwynne Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton, 1974.

————. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*. Ed. Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

————. *The Works: Globe Edition*. Ed. William G. Clark and W. Aldis Wright. London: Macmillan, 1864. Rev. ed. with John Glover. 9 vols. London: Macmillan, 1863–66; further rev. 1891–95.

Shillingsburg, Peter L. "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism." *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 55–79.

———. "Key Issues in Editorial Theory." *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 6 (1982): 3–16.

———. "The Limits of the Editor's Responsibility." Soc. for Textual Scholarship. New York, 11 Apr. 1987.

———. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Lectures in Theory and Practice.* U of New South Wales Dept. of English Occasional Papers 3, 1984. Rev. ed. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1986.

———. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 31–82.

Silver, Brenda R. "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice; or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf, Part II." Bornstein, *Representing Modernist Texts* 193–222.

Simon, John Y. "Editors and Critics." *Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing* 3 (Dec. 1981): 1–4.

Simons, Marlise. "A Restoration Becomes a Criminal Case in Italy." *New York Times* 25 May 1991: B13–14.

Spevack, Marvin. *Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare.* 6 vols. Hildesheim: Ohms, 1968–70.

———. *The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Belknap–Harvard UP, 1973.

Stubbs, John, and Frank W. Tompa. "Waterloo and the *New Oxford English Dictionary.*" Butler and Stoneman 19–44.

Sturges, Robert S. "Textual Scholarship: Ideologies of Literary Production." *Exemplaria* 3 (1991): 109–31.

Sutherland, John. "Publishing History: A Hole at the Centre of Literary Sociology." *Critical Inquiry* 14 (1988): 574–89.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "The Editing of Historical Documents." *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 1–56.

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

———. *The History of Books as a Field of Study.* Second Hanes Lecture, Hanes Foundation. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, 1981.

———. *A Rationale of Textual Criticism.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1989.

———. *Selected Studies in Bibliography.* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1979.

———. "Textual Criticism and Deconstruction." *Studies in Bibliography* 43 (1990): 1–33.

———. *Textual Criticism since Greg: A Chronicle, 1950–1985.* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1988.

———. "Textual Scholarship." *Introduction to Scholarship in the Modern Languages and Literatures.* Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: MLA, 1981. 29–52.

Taylor, Gary. "Revising Shakespeare." *Text* 3 (1987): 285–304.

———. "The Rhetoric of Textual Criticism." *Text* 4 (1988): 39–56.

Taylor, Gary, and Michael Warren, eds. *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of King Lear.* Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1983.

Taylor, Robert. "Editorial Practices: An Historian's View." *Newsletter of the Association for Documentary Editing* 3.1 (1981): 4–8.

Textual Scholarship and Literary Theory. Spec. issue of *Critical Exchange* 24 (Fall 1989).

Thackeray, William. *The Thackery Edition Project.* Ed. Peter L. Shillingsburg et al. 4 vols. to date. New York: Garland, 1989–.

Thoreau, Henry D. *The Writings of Henry D. Thoreau.* Ed. William L. Howarth et al. 10 vols. to date. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969–.

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

Tomaševskij, B. V. "Novoe o Puškine." *Literaturnaja mysl'. Al'manax.* 1 (1922): 171–86.

Treglown, Jeremy. "Editors Vary." *Times Literary Supplement* 10 May 1985: 520.

Urkowitz, Steven. *Shakespeare's Revision of* King Lear. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

———. " 'Well Said, Old Mole': Burying Three *Hamlets* in Modern Editions." *Shakespeare Study Today.* Ed. Georgiana Ziegler. New York: AMS, 1986. 37–70.

Vandelli, Giovanni, ed. *I reali di Francia.* By Andrea da Barberino. Bologna: Romagnoli, 1892–1900.

———, ed. *La divina commedia.* By Dante Alighieri. *Le opere di Dante: Testo critico della Società Dantesca Italiana.* Ed. M. Barbi et al. Florence: Bemporad, 1921.

Vinaver, Eugène. "Principles of Textual Emendation." *Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature Presented to Professor M. K. Pope.* Manchester: U of Manchester P, 1930. 351–69.

Vinokur, G. *Kritika poètičeskogo teksta.* Gos. Akad. xudož. nauk. Istorija i teorija iskusstv 10. Moscow, 1927.

Vogt, George L., and John Bush Jones, eds. *Literary and Historical Editing.* Lawrence: U of Kansas Libs., 1981.

Warren, Michael, ed. *The Complete* King Lear. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery, eds. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion.* Oxford: Clarendon–Oxford UP, 1987.

West, James L. W., III. *Creating American Authors: The Language of Scholarly Editing.* Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, forthcoming.

White, Patricia S. "Black and White and Read All Over: A Meditation On Footnotes." *Text* 5 (1991): 81–90.

Whitman, Walt. *The Collected Writings of Walt Whitman.* Ed. Gay Wilson Allen, Sculley Bradley, et al. 22 vols. to date. New York: New York UP, 1961–.

Wilkerson, Isabel. "Textual Scholars Make Points about Points." *New York Times* 29 Apr., 1985: B2.

Williams, William Proctor, and Craig S. Abbott. *An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies.* 2nd ed. New York: MLA, 1989.

Wilson, Edmund. *The Fruits of the MLA.* New York: New York Rev. of Books, 1968.

Woolf, Virginia. *Melymbrosia: An Early Version of* The Voyage Out. Ed. Louise DeSalvo. New York: New York Public Lib., 1982.

Zeller, Hans. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts." *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–63.