

## THE AUTHOR'S HAND

### LITERARY ARCHIVES, CRITICISM, AND EDITION

Roger Chartier (Collège de France)

The starting point of my reflection is the constitution all around Europe of literary archives. The first one was the *Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach* whose project is thus defined : « The archives aims to collect, catalogue and process all kinds of documents connected with modern German literature (from 1750 up to the present day) ». Whence my question: why 1750 ? French and British literary archives, in part inspired by the example of Marbach, do not help directly for answering this question since they have deliberately chosen to focus only on records of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Such is the case with the *Institut Mémoires de l'édition contemporaine* (IMEC) founded in 1988 with the aim « to gather, preserve, and exploit the archives of the different actors involved in publishing and aesthetic creation ». IMEC collections, stored and consulted since 1998 on in the Abbaye d'Ardenne near Caen, consist mainly of two series of records : 66 archives of publishers, the oldest being the archives of Hachette, Hetzel or Flammarion - all publishers of the second half of the nineteenth century - and 238 archives of authors who all lived in the twentieth century.

The same nineteenth and twentieth centuries emphasis characterizes the two collections of « Records of British Publishing and Printing » and « Author's Papers » held in the Special Collections of the Library of the University of Reading, where the most spectacular archive is the « Beckett Collection » with more than 600 manuscripts or typescripts of the author. Following the British and the French cases the answer to my initial question could be a very simple one : the modern literary archives collect and preserve documents that were not previously taken into consideration by traditional archives. They save a precious

patrimony of modern records and papers that was ignored by national or regional archives and preserved instead by publishers or writers.

But the date of 1750 remains intriguing, because it raises another issue : would have been possible to build literary archives for early modern times? Records of publishers and printers of the first three centuries after Gutenberg's invention are really exceptional, as are authors' manuscripts. This absence has worried the « *critique génétique* » or genetic criticism devoted to follow the creative process that leads to the printed text and leaves multiple records : outlines and sketches of the work, notes and documents, series of drafts, corrected proofs. Such a critical approach presupposes that traces of the different stages of the creative process have been kept - and generally by the author himself. But is genetic criticism only possible for the nineteenth or the twentieth century when authors like Flaubet, Zola or Proust left the series of traces that allow critics to go as wrote Pierre-Marc de Biasi, « from the author to the writer, from what has been written to writing, from structure to process, from the work to its genesis »<sup>1</sup> ?

1. Such a question led in first instance to the quest of authors' manuscripts previous to the nineteenth century. For French writers of the eighteenth century findings are not so rare. Autograph drafts with erasures, corrections, alterations or annotations exist for Rousseau's *Nouvelle Héloïse*, Diderot's *La Religieuse*, Choderlos de Laclos' *Les Liaisons dangereuses* and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* (leaving aside the exceptional twelve-meter roll of Sade's *Cent vingt journées de Sodome*). Surviving also is the autograph manuscript of Rousseau's *Dialogues ou Rousseau juge de Jean Jacques* that the author wanted to leave in Notre-Dame's choir immediately after having completed the work, but decided finally, because the gates of the cathedral were closed, to give it to Condillac. Rousseau made three other autograph copies of the *Dialogues* that

---

<sup>1</sup> Pierre-Marc de Biasi, *La Génétique des textes*, Paris, Nathan, 2000.

were published in 1782. French autograph manuscripts exist, thus, but all the examples I have mentioned are posterior to 1750, as are scribal copies corrected by the author – like Voltaire’s *Candide*, or Diderot’s works copied by his scribe Girbal.

Before the mid-eighteenth century, authorial manuscripts are not frequent and were preserved for exceptional reasons. Brantôme left to his heirs the seven volumes of his *Livre des dames* asking them to publish it – this was done only in 1665<sup>2</sup>. Pascal’s fragments for his apology of Christianity were gathered and transcribed, and put into order by the Messieurs de Port-Royal for their edition of the *Pensées* in 1669-70. The Pascal manuscripts leave open until today the question of the relation among the two copies of this transcription (BNF Ms Fr. 9203 and Fr. 12449), the edition said « de Port-Royal » of the *Pensées*, and the autograph texts written by Pascal on large sheets of paper he himself cut up. Pascal put these fragments in different bundles where the slips of paper were attached one to another by a string threaded into a small hole made in each slip. Unfortunately, during the eighteenth century these fragments were reordered and pasted on the folios of a notebook (BNF Ms. Fr. 9202) which makes it difficult to consider them the « original » manuscript of the *Pensées*<sup>3</sup>. A last example is Montaigne: his only autograph literary manuscripts are the annotations he left in some of the printed books he read (now in the Bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux the Bibliothèque nationale de France and the library of Trinity College in Cambridge) and the corrections and additions he wrote in his copy of the luxury quarto 1588 edition of the *Essais* (known today as the « *exemplaire de Bordeaux* ») in which large margins allowed important additions, and additions to the additions<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Brouillons d’écrivains*, Marie-Odile Germain and Danièle Thibault (eds.), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, 2001, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Michèle Sacquin, « Les *Pensées* de Pascal : des manuscrits en quête d’une œuvre », in *Brouillons d’écrivains*, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.

<sup>4</sup> George Hoffmann, *Montaigne’s Career*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998, pp. 97-107.

There are some exceptions, however, to this scarcity of autograph manuscripts before 1750. The first one is drama, both for Spain as well as for England. Authorial manuscripts still exist for plays by Calderón, Quevedo, and Lope de Vega whose two autograph plays are present in the collections of Library of the University of Pennsylvania : *Los Benavides*, signed by Lope on June 15, 1600, and *Carlos V en Francia*, signed on November 20, 1604<sup>5</sup>. In the *Biblioteca Nacional* en Madrid are kept 17 autograph manuscripts by Calderón and 24 by Lope, and a total of at least one hundred autograph manuscripts by playwrights of the Golden Age<sup>6</sup>. Such manuscripts confirm that Lope de Vega respected in his writing practices the rules he stated in his normative poetics. For him, the first condition for a « *comedia* » was the acceptable length of the spectacle which dictated the number of « *pliegos* » or sheets of paper the playwright had to write. According to his *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* in 1609 each act must correspond to four « *pliegos* » and since a « *comedia* » is composed of three acts, its manuscript could not exceed twelve « *pliegos* ». The term « *pliego* » must be understood as a sheet of paper folded twice, thus making four leaves for each « *pliego* », sixteen for one act and forty-eight for the entire play. The autograph manuscript of the play *Carlos V en Francia* matches quite almost exactly such a length since the text itself consisted of fifty leaves.<sup>7</sup>

In England also, some authorial manuscripts written by the playwrights themselves survived. One spectacular example is *The Booke of Sir Thomas More*, an undated dramatic manuscript in six hands – or seven with the observations made by the Master of Revels who asked for some cuts or

---

<sup>5</sup> Ignacio Arellano, « La edición de textos teatrales del Siglo de Oro (S. XVII). Notas sueltas sobre el estado de la cuestión (1980-1990), in *La Comedia*, Jean Canavaggio (ed.), Madrid, Collection de la Casa de Velázquez, 1995, p. 36

<sup>6</sup> Margaret Greer, « Early Modern Spanish Theatrical Transmission, Memory, and a Claramonte Play », Paper presented at the Conference *Producing the Renaissance Text*, Duke University, February 3, 2007.

<sup>7</sup> Lope de Vega, *Carlos V en Francia*, Arnold G. Reichenberger (ed.), Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.

rewriting (British Library, MS Harleian 7368). The original play seems to have been written, probably between 1592 and 1595, by Anthony Munday, whose handwriting is identified by a comparison with two of his autograph manuscript plays, *John a Kent* and *John a Cumber* (both at the Huntington Library). Henry Chettle and Thomas Dekker seemed to have collaborated to the original play. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the manuscript was revised and scenes were added by Thomas Heywood and perhaps also by Shakespeare, whose hand would be Hand D of the manuscript according paleographic, orthographic, and stylistic evidences. If this is really the case (as it is now believed in spite of the weakness of paleographic comparisons between the hand of the two passages attributed to Shakespeare and his few and changeable signatures or his possible but not certain holograph will), the folios of this scene added to *Sir Thomas More* would be the only surviving Shakespearean literary manuscript<sup>8</sup>. *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* is not the only Elizabethan or Jacobean autograph dramatic manuscript: among other examples we can mention one of the six manuscripts of *A Game at Chess* entirely or partially in Middleton's hand<sup>9</sup>.

The Italian *Trecento* is another and prior example proving that autograph literary manuscripts are not necessarily absent before the mid-eighteenth century. Petrarch's autographs are numerous and preserve traces of his creative poetic labor<sup>10</sup>. The most spectacular of these manuscripts, studied by Armando Petrucci, are the draft codex of the *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* (Vat. lat. 3196)

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Book of Sir Thomas More*, W.W. Greg (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1911, Scott Mc Millin, *The Elizabethan Theater and 'The Book of Sir Thomas More'*, New York and London, Cornell University Press, 1987, and *Shakespeare's 'Sir Thomas More'. Essays on the Play and its Shakespearean Interest*, T. H. Howard-Hill (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989.

<sup>9</sup> *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture. A Companion to The Collected Works*, Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (eds.), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2007, « A Game at Chess : General Textual Introduction », pp. 712-873.

<sup>10</sup> For a provisional list of Petrarca's autographs, see Armando Petrucci, *La scrittura de Francesco Petrarca*, Studi e testi (Biblioteca apostolica vaticana) 248, Città del Vaticano, 1967.

and the so-called « *Canzonere* original » (Vat. lat. 3195)<sup>11</sup>. The first manuscript binds together nine folios and two loose sheets coming from Petrarch's paper archive. It contains sketches, first drafts, corrections, additions and crossouts but also, in the margins, precise chronological references to the successive stages of drafting individual texts. The second manuscript, the *Canzonere*, is an « author's book » in which Giovanni Malpaghini, Petrarch's scribe and disciple, copied the opening sections of the first and second parts of the collection, which Petrarch continued himself in a patient work of copying, additions, corrections, and reordering from 1368 to 1373. This manuscript illustrates Petrarch's attempts to reform the system of book production and guarantee the author's control on his works by protecting them against what he perceived as the faulty copying of professional scribes. Thus with the multiplication of autograph manuscripts a more direct and authentic relation could be instituted between the author and his readers because, as Petrucci indicates, « a perfect textuality, a direct emanation from the author validated by his autograph writing, was (and forever remained) a guarantee of absolute readability for the reader »<sup>12</sup>.

The draft codex of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* belongs to another world and shows how writing habits of the vernacular poets were dependent upon contemporary notarial practices. Both notarial minutes and poetic autograph manuscripts shared the same practices : sketches written in an extremely rapid flowing hand on paper leaves, notes in the margins witnessing the various phases of elaboration of the text, or the crossing out with great oblique strokes of fragments of the text transcribed elsewhere. Such an observation reminds us in first instance that many poets were members of families of notaries : Petrarch was himself a notary's son and grandson and

---

<sup>11</sup> Armando Petrucci, « Minute, Autograph, Author's Book », in Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*. Studies in the History of Written Culture, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995, pp. 145-168.

<sup>12</sup> Armando Petrucci, « Il libro manoscritto », in *Letteratura italiana*, Asor Rosa (ed.), Torino, Einaudi, 1984, Vol. 2, pp. 516-517.

Francesco da Barberino, whose partially autograph manuscript of his *Documenti d'amore* in vernacular verse shows the same characteristics as Petrarch's draft codex, (Vat., Barb. Lat. 4076), was not only the son and grandson of notaries but also a notary himself.

The proximity between notarial writing and poetic drafting in the Italian *Trecento* indicates also that many autograph manuscripts of the early modern period must not be considered as equivalents to the literary sketches and drafts of nineteenth century authors. Often, their authors were acting as scribes for themselves and wrote in their own hand presentation copies offered to their patrons. Consequently their manuscripts must be situated – paradoxically perhaps - within the corpus of the scribal copies that constitute the majority of the literary manuscripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. It is the case, for example, for Middleton's plays : five out of the six manuscripts of the *Game at Chess* and the manuscripts of *The Witch*, *Hengist, King of Kent*, or *The Lady's Tragedy* are scribal copies – and five of them were copied by the same scrivener, Ralph Crane, also employed by Shakespeare's Company. It is the case also for the scribal dramatic manuscripts held in the Biblioteca del Palacio in Madrid of eighty plays previous to 1600 that were collected by the Conde de Gondomar in his library in Valladolid<sup>13</sup>.

The proximity between scribal copies and autograph manuscripts is shown by the coexistence in the same manuscript of both authorial and scribal hands – Hand C in *The Booke of Sir Thomas More* is a copyist's hand – and also by the confusion denounced by Ben Jonson in the epistle that opened the edition of *Volpone* in 1607 in which he stigmatized at the same time corrupted poets and dishonest scribes. For him « the writers of these days » are no more « the interpreter of nature, a teacher of things divine no less than human, a master in manners » because « not only their manners, but their nature, are inverted, and

---

<sup>13</sup> Stefano Arata, *Los manuscritos teatrales (siglo XVI y XVII) de la Biblioteca del Palacio*, Pisa, Giardini, 1989.

nothing remaining with them of the dignity of poet but the abused name, *which every scribe usurps* »<sup>14</sup>. In this sense autograph dramatic manuscripts must be located within the multiple productions of the professional scribes who transformed « foul papers » into « fair copies », established elegant presentation copies for the patrons, and proposed to the readers « scribal editions » according to Harold Love's expression<sup>15</sup>.

The decisive role of the scribes in the process of publication is one of the reasons for the loss of authorial manuscripts in early modern times. In Golden Age Castile, manuscripts sent to the Royal Council for receiving « *aprobación* » and « *privilegio* », license and privilege were never autograph copies but always « *copias en limpio* », or fair copies, written by professional amanuensis and often corrected by the authors who desired to change some words or sentences, to introduce additions in the margins, to cross-out some lines, or even to attach fly leaves to the manuscript. Once approved and eventually corrected by the censors, the manuscript was given to the publisher and then to the printer. This printing copy was called in Spanish "*original*" and submitted the text to a first series of transformations either in the spelling or the punctuation. Whereas the authorial manuscripts had generally very few punctuation marks and showed a great irregularity in spelling, the scribe's « originals » (which in fact were not at all original) needed to give better legibility to the text addressed to the censors and the compositors.

Once entered in the printing shop the scribal copy of the autograph manuscript was prepared by the correctors, who added accents, capital letters, punctuation and casting-off marks which made possible to set the sheets by *formes* and not *seriatim*. Thus prepared and corrected, the manuscript copy was composed and printed. After these textual interventions, made by the copyist,

---

<sup>14</sup> Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, in Ben Jonson, *Three Comedies*, London, Penguin Books, 1966, p. 42.

<sup>15</sup> Harold Love, « Thomas Middleton : Oral Culture and the Manuscript Economy », in *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture*, pp. 98-109.

the censor, the copy editor and the compositors, the autograph manuscript lost all importance. And after the printing of the text, the printer's copy shared the same fate and was generally destroyed. This is why only a limited number of the copies used in the printing shops have survived<sup>16</sup> - with the exception however of Spain, where the *Biblioteca Nacional* in Madrid keeps several hundreds of « *originales* » dated from the mid-sixteenth century to the end of the eighteenth century, perhaps because in Spain once printed the book had to be collated with the licensed manuscript by a secretary of the Royal Council.<sup>17</sup>

2. So why since the mid-eighteenth century were autograph manuscripts kept and preserved? This fact makes evident that the constitution of literary archives cannot be separated from the construction of philosophical, aesthetic and juridical categories that defined a new regime for the composition, publication, and appropriation of texts. The lawsuits that developed in England following the Statute of Queen Anne in 1710 led to the original association between the notions of individual singularity, aesthetic originality, and copyright. The defense of the traditional rights of London booksellers and printers, which had been undermined by this new legislation that limited the duration of the copyright to fourteen years, assumed that ownership of the manuscript implied a perpetual patrimonial right once the publisher acquired it from the author, and hence that the author possessed previously an imprescriptible but transmissible property on his composition.

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the census of printers' copies in J. K. Moore, *Primary Materials Relating to Copy and Print in English Books of the the Sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998, and Paolo Trovato, *L'ordine dei tipografi. Letteri, stampatori, correttori tra Quattro e Cinquecento*, Roma, 1998.

<sup>17</sup> Pablo Andrés Escapa and al., « El original de imprenta » and Sonia Garza Merino, « La cuenta del original », in *Imprenta y crítica textual en el Siglo de Oro*, Francisco Rico (ed.), Valladolid, Centro para le Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2000, pp. 29-64 and pp. 65-95, and Francisco Rico, *El texto del « Quijote ». Preliminares a una ecdótica del Siglo de Oro*, Barcelona, Ediciones Destino, 2006, pp. 55-93.

The object of this primary property was the work as composed by its author in its immaterial existence, « invisible and intangible » in the words of William Enfield in 1774.<sup>18</sup> Defined by the fundamental and perpetual identity given to it by its author's mind, the work transcended any possible material embodiment. According to Blackstone, who defended the cause of the London booksellers: « The identity of a literary composition consists intirely in the *sentiment* and the *language*; the same conceptions, cloathed in the same words, must necessarily be the same composition: and whatever method be taken of conveying that composition to the ear or the eye of another, by recital, by writing, or by printing, in any number of copies or at any period of time, it is always the identical work of the author which is so conveyed; and no other man can have a right to convey or transfer it without his consent, either tacitly or expressly given »<sup>19</sup>.

For Diderot, every work is the legitimate property of its author because a literary composition is the irreducibly singular expression of that author's thoughts and feelings. As he put it in his *Mémoire sur le commerce de la librairie*: « Quel est le bien qui puisse appartenir à un homme, si un ouvrage d'esprit, le fruit unique de son education, de ses études, de ses veilles, de son temps, de ses recherches, de ses observations; si les plus belles heures, les plus beaux moments de sa vie; si ses propres pensées, les sentiments de son cœur; la portion de lui-même la plus précieuse, celle qui ne périt point; celle qui l'immortalise, ne lui appartient pas » [« What property can a man own if a work of the mind - the unique fruit of his upbringing, his studies, his evenings, his age, his researches, his observations; if his finest hours, the most beautiful moments of his life; if his own thoughts, the feelings of his

---

<sup>18</sup> William Enfield, *Observations on Literary Property*, London, 1774.

<sup>19</sup> William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (Oxford, 1765-1769), quoted in Mark Rose, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*, Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1993, p. 89-90.

heart, the most precious part of himself, that which does not perish, which makes him immortal - does not belong to him ?»<sup>20</sup>.

After Diderot, Fichte reframed the same claim in a new way in the course of the debate about reprinting of books in Germany where piracy was especially widespread owing to the fragmentation of the Empire in many small states whose privileges were confined to the narrow territory of their sovereignty. To the classic dichotomy between the book's two natures, corporeal and spiritual, as « opus mechanicum » and discourse addressed to the public, he added a second one, located within the text itself, between the ideas expressed by a book and the form given those ideas by writing. Ideas are universal by nature, purpose, and use ; hence no personal appropriation of ideas can be justified. Literary property is legitimate only because: « Each person has his own set of ideas, his own particular way of forging concepts and relating them to one another. Since pure ideas without perceptible images cannot even be conceived, let alone presented to others, every writer must give a certain form to his thoughts and cannot give them any form but his own, since he has no other ». Consequently, « no one can appropriate another person's thoughts without changing their form. Therefore the form remains his exclusive property forever »<sup>21</sup>. The textual form, always irreducibly singular, was the sole but powerful justification for individual appropriation of the common ideas conveyed to others by printed objects. Thus, paradoxically, in order to conceptualize texts as individual property and as real estate, it was necessary to divorce them conceptually from any particular material embodiment and to locate them in the author's mind hand. The nearest that one could come to materialize such an immaterial work was

---

<sup>20</sup> Diderot, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 8, *Encyclopédie IV (Lettres M-Z). Lettre sur le commerce de la librairie*, John Lough and Jacques Proust (eds.), Paris: Hermann, 1976., pp. 509-510.

<sup>21</sup> Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Beweis der Unrechtmässigkeit der Büchernadruks. Ein Raisonement und eine Parabel*, 1791. This text is commented on by Martha Woodmansee, *The Author, Art, and the Market. Rereading the History of Aesthetics*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1994), pp. 51-53.

the trace left by the author's hand. The autograph manuscript thus became the outward and visible sign of the inward and invisible writer's genius.

This was not the case in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, when the signature could be delegated to someone either on the parish registers or for a will, and when even autograph signatures could be very different one from another - for example, the six authenticated Shakespeare's signatures. At this time the printed text could be considered as a fiction of the hand without the necessity to show it. In their address to « The great Variety of Readers », the two editors of Shakespeare's *First Folio*, John Heminges and Henry Condell, claimed that their printed edition of Shakespeare's «writings» was conveying, in fact, Shakespeare's handwriting: « His mind and hand went together. And what he thought, he uttered with that easinesse, that wee have scarce received from him a blot in his papers »<sup>22</sup>.

In the eighteenth century, such an affirmation was not more sufficient and the real author's hand became the guarantee of the authenticity of his works. Consequently, forging autograph manuscripts became an art of the time. In February 1795, William Henry Ireland exhibited in his father's house several recently-discovered Shakespeare's manuscripts: the autograph manuscripts of *King Lear* and two unknown plays, *Henry II* and *Vortigern and Rowena* (performed without great success and only once at Drury Lane Theatre on April 2<sup>nd</sup>), the letters exchanged by the poet and his patron, Southampton, the very protestant Shakespeare's *Profession of faith*, and a letter addressed to him by Queen Elizabeth. When the documents were published in December 1795 under the title of *Authentic Account of the Shakespearean MSS.*, Edmond Malone was the first to expose Ireland's forgeries by comparing the handwritings of the forged documents and authentic ones. His meticulous exposure of the imposture was published with

---

<sup>22</sup> Mr. William Shakespeares *Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Published according the True Originall Copies*, London, 1623, A3 recto.

the significant title of *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellanies Papers and Legal Instruments. Published Dec. 2 MDCCXCV, and Attributed to Shakespeare, Queen Elizabeth, and Henry, Earl of Southampton: Illustrated by Fac-similes of the Genuine Hand-writing of that Nobleman, and of Her Majesty; A New Fac-simile of the Handwriting of Shakespeare, Never before Exhibited; and Other Authentick Documents*, London 1795<sup>23</sup>. Genuine handwriting had become the material embodiment of the immaterial spirit and genius of the individual.

The fetishism of the author's hand led in the twentieth century to the fabrication of supposed autograph manuscript that were, in fact, fair copies of preexisting writings. This is the case, for example, for the famous *Ulysses*' «original» manuscript in Philadelphia's Rosenbach Museum and Library. It was written by Joyce as a clean copy of previous drafts (generally written in his notebooks) in order to make a legible text that a typist could read. But it was also thought of by Joyce as an object that could be sold to a collector and whose value was in its being a handwritten authorial copy. The New York lawyer and art patron John Quinn bought it from Joyce in 1919 and then sold it with its collection in 1923 in a auction where Dr. Rosenbach who was both a scholar and a book dealer acquired it. As wrote Vicki Mahaffey, the Rosenbach Manuscript of *Ulysses* is, at the same time, « a presentation manuscript and a working manuscript, a relic and a commodity »<sup>24</sup>.

The strong relation between autograph manuscripts and authenticity of the work was internalized by writers who became archivists of themselves and, before Hugo or Flaubert, constituted their own literary archives. It is the case with the draft, four autograph copies, corrected proofs and annotated

---

<sup>23</sup> S. Schenbaum, *Shakespeare's Lives*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 193-223, and Margreta De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim. The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press 1991, pp. 107-109.

<sup>24</sup> Vicki Mahaffey, « Introduction », in *Ulysses in Hand. The Rosenbach Manuscript*, Philadelphia, The Rosenbach Museum and Library, 2002, pp. 8-10.

printed copies of three different editions that Rousseau have kept for *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and which constitute a genetic « dossier » of several thousand pages<sup>25</sup>. It is also the case with Goethe's papers. In a letter written to the Chancellor Müller at the end of his life Goethe indicated: « My manuscripts, my letters and my collections deserve the greatest attention. [...] It will not be found before long so rich and varied a collection for a sole individual [...] It is the reason why I hope that its conservation will be secured »<sup>26</sup>. For both authors, not only the project of a complete or general edition of their works, but also, or mainly, a very intense autobiographical relationship with writing led them to constitute meticulously « the poet and writer's archives » according to the title that Goethe gave to one of his essays. The same relationship could sometimes be detached from any desire of transmission of the autograph manuscripts to the posterity. It is the case with Flaubert's desire as expressed in a letter to Louise Colet dated April 3rd, 1852 : « Pourvu que mes manuscrits durent autant que moi, c'est tout ce que je veux. Je les ferais enterrer avec moi, comme un sauvage fait de son cheval » [« Let's hope that my manuscripts can last as long as myself, it is all what I want. I shall make them buried with me, as a savage does with his horse »]<sup>27</sup>.

3. In his famous lecture delivered in 1968 *What Is an Author?*, Foucault stated that far from being relevant to all texts or genres in all ages, the assignation of a work to a proper name is neither universal nor constant :

---

<sup>25</sup> Nathalie Ferrand, « J.-J. Rousseau, du copiste à l'écrivain. Les manuscrits de la *Nouvelle Héloïse* conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Nationale », in *Écrire aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Genèse de textes littéraires et philosophiques*, Jean-Louis Ikebrave and Almuth Grésillon (eds.), Paris, CNRS Editions, 2000, pp. 191-212.

<sup>26</sup> Karl-Heinz Hahn, *Goethe-und-Schiller-Archiv. Bestandsverzeichnis*, Weimar, 1961, p. 11., quoted by Klaus Hurlbusch, « Rarement vit-on tant de renouveau. Klopstock et ses contemporains : Tenants d'une 'esthétique du génie' et précurseurs de la littérature moderne », in *Ecrire aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, op. cit.*, pp. 169-189.

<sup>27</sup> Quoted by Jacques Neefs in his essay « Gustave Flaubert. Les aventures de l'homme-plume », in *Brouillons d'écrivains, op. cit.*, p. 68.

«The author-function is characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society». The attribution of a proper name to a discourse was for Foucault the result of « specific and complex operations » that put the unity and coherence of a work (or a set of works) into relation with the identity of a constructed subject. These operations rely on a dual process of selection and exclusion. First, the discourses assignable to the author-function - the « work » - must be separated from the « millions of traces left by someone after his death ». Second, the elements pertinent to the definition of the author's position must be picked up from the innumerable events that constitute the life of any individual<sup>28</sup>. What is transformed in these two operations when literary archives exist and when they do not? This question will be the last one in this lecture.

The presence of abundant literary archives makes more complex the delimitation of the work itself and the separation between « literary » texts recognized as such and the « millions of [written] traces left by an individual ». For Foucault « the problem is both theoretical and technical. When undertaking the publication of Nietzsche's work, for example, where should one stop? Surely everything must be published, but what is "everything"? Everything that Nietzsche himself published, certainly. And what about the rough drafts for his works? Obviously. The plans for his aphorisms? Yes. The deleted passages and the notes at the bottom of the pages? Yes. What if, within a workbook filled with aphorisms, one finds a reference, the notation of a meeting or of an address, or a laundry list: Is it a work, or not? Why not? And so on, ad infinitum »<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>28</sup> Michel Foucault, « Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur ? », (1969), in Foucault, *Dits et écrits, 1954-1988*, Daniel Defert et François Ewald (eds), Paris, Gallimard, 1994, pp. 789-821 [« What Is an Author ? », in *The Foucault Reader*, Paul Rabinow (ed.), New York, Pantheon Books, 1984, pp. 101-120].

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.

« Is it a work, or not? »: Foucault's question about the infinite « proliferation » of Nietzsche's writings must be now inverted to raise the issue of its possible or necessary « rarefaction » - to use Foucault's vocabulary in *L'ordre du discours*. As proved convincingly by Mazzino Montinari, Nietzsche's most canonical work, *Der Wille zur Macht*, was never written by himself but must be considered a « forgery » of Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche. She cut up, gathered and ordered in a book various fragments (notes, sketches, reflections) left by his brother, who himself had not any will to transform them into a book<sup>30</sup>. Therefore, does *The Will to Power* exist as a work and must be included in Nietzsche's work, or not?

Let us take another example of the textual manipulations made possible by the existence of authorial literary archives. Several times, Borges delineated himself the limits of his « work »<sup>31</sup>. He excluded from his *Obras completas* published by Emecé in 1974 three books he published between 1925 and 1928, *Inquisiciones*, *El tamaño de mi esperanza*, and *El idioma de los argentinos*, and he forbade any republishing of these three works. They were only republished in 1993 and 1994 by Maria Kodama, seven years after Borges' death – and not without a fierce controversy. Conversely, Borges selected with his editor, in this case Jean-Pierre Bernés, editor of his *Oeuvres complètes* translated into French in the Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, all the texts he considered must be included of his « oeuvre », i. e. not only books and anthologies, but also reviews, prologues, articles, chronicles, and the first printed versions of many poems or fictions kept in his personal archive. .

Modern literary archives that allow such manipulations are not without retroactive effects on the editorial practices devoted to works printed in the

---

<sup>30</sup> Mazzino Montinari, *La Volonté de puissance n'existe pas ?*, Texte établi et postfacé par Paolo d'Iorio, Paris, L'Eclat, 1998.

<sup>31</sup> Annick Louis, *José Luis Borges : œuvre et manœuvres*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1997.

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. On the one hand, they have inspired the quest for identifying the kind of manuscript used for the publication of printed texts. Paradoxically perhaps, the material and analytical bibliography rigorously describes and analyzes the different states (editions, issues, copies) in which a given work appeared in the hope of establishing an ideal copy text, purged of the alterations inflicted by the process of publication and representing the text as written, dictated, or imagined by its author. From this came in a discipline almost exclusively devoted to the comparison of printed texts, an obsession with lost manuscripts and a radical distinction between the essence of a work, located in its absent autograph manuscript, and the scribal or typographic accidents that have distorted or corrupted it.

On the other hand, the instable delimitation of the work introduced by the richness of literary archives inspired editorial decisions for authors who did not leave any autograph documents: for example the publication of two texts for the same work as it was the case for *King Lear* in the *Complete Oxford Shakespeare* or for *A Game at Chess* in the *Oxford Middleton's Collected Works*, or the recent and provocative inclusion by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino in Middleton's corpus of plays that are generally published under another name as are *The Life of Timon of Athens*, *The Tragedy of McBeth*, or *Measure for Measure* in which Shakespeare's hand is considered as not being the only one.

The more important consequence of the existence of literary archives and the conceptual configuration that made them possible or necessary since the mid-eighteenth century on is the relation established between the author's work and the writer's life, between Borges and I. Since the mid-eighteenth century, literary compositions were no more thought of as based on stories which were reused, commonplaces which were shared, or collaboration required by patrons or theatrical entrepreneurs, but as original creations that

expressed the most intimate sentiments and the most decisive, singular and personal experiences. The first consequence was the desire to edit the works according to the chronology of their author's life; the second was the writing of literary biographies. For Shakespeare, Edmond Malone was the first to associate the two endeavours. He based his « Life of Shakespeare » (printed only in 1821) on « originall and authentick documents », breaking with the compilations of anecdotes printed by Nicholas Rowe in his edition of 1709, and he established the first (supposed) chronology of Shakespeare's works. Consequently, the plays must be published in the order in which Shakespeare had written them and not according to their distribution in the Folio tradition between « Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies ». Boswell followed this wish in his 1821 new edition of Malone's 1790 edition - except for the histories still ordered by the chronology of the reigns, as if the kings were for ever more important than their poet.

But the task was not easy in absence of any autograph and autobiographical documents from Shakespeare – and very few about his life. For compensating for this scanty information, Malone inaugurated the fundamental requirement any literary biography : to locate the works within the life requires to find the life within the works. As Margreta De Grazia wrote: « The life gave way to the work which passed back into the life, all on a single temporal continuum. In lieu of archival documents, the plays were positioned to serve as the primary sources for information about Shakespeare's life during his years in London. The arrangement itself suggested that only by scrutinizing the plays exhaustively, as if they were archival documents, could Shakespeare's life in its entirety – from the beginning through to the end – be known »<sup>32</sup>. After Malone, all Shakespeare's biographies - even if they were coming from New Historicists

---

<sup>32</sup> Margreta de Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

- have followed this imposition onto authors without archives of an interpretive paradigm made possible only by the existence of rich literary records and by a new understanding and reading of literary compositions. A « radical incompatibility », to use Margreta de Grazia's expression, exists thus between the romantic or pre-romantic aesthetic of the work, written, as said Diderot, by the heart of its author and readable in his or her genuine hand, and a previous regime of textual production that did not consider that « literature » (a category that did not even exist in its modern sense) must be necessarily assigned to individual singularity. It is this incompatibility that explained why the *Deutsches Literaturarchiv* was well-advised to begin their quest for autograph and authorial materials in 1750. And it is with such an incompatibility in mind that we must understand the effects produced on editorial practices and textual studies by the existence of literary archives and, more fundamentally, the conceptual mutations that, from the eighteenth-century on, made them possible.