

be rejected, as might emendations or contributions by other hands, because they are clearly constitutive of the very fabric of the text. Yet failing to acknowledge these debts, Coleridge fails to free his work from them, so to speak—fails to author them. Thus the plagiarized texts have no author, or, if they have one, the author is not Coleridge. This being so, the plagiarisms will necessarily continue to be a problem for any critic attempting to evaluate or interpret the prose in which they occur.

6

Pound's Waste Land

One of the more tantalizing of the unsolvable questions in literary history is the precise nature of the collaboration between Wordsworth and Coleridge—the actual processes of their interaction, the proportionate shares of responsibility—in the celebrated work of the late 1790s that so radically affected the subsequent course of English poetry. The two men met in 1795, were neighbors and constant companions in Somersetshire in 1797 and 1798, and traveled together (in Germany and Scotland) and saw each other (in the Lake District) frequently thereafter. We have an enormous accumulation of contemporary and retrospective biographical detail in letters, journals, notebooks, and records of conversations. Some of that material would seem to speak to their collaboration—Wordsworth's urgent requests for Coleridge's help with *The Recluse*, for example, and a great many statements by both men concerning the composition of *The Ancient Mariner*.

In fact, however, we have no solid documentary evidence for any aspect of their practical working relationship (in the examples given, Wordsworth never received Coleridge's ideas for *The Recluse*—Coleridge says that he sent them from Malta but that his letter was destroyed by Gibraltar authorities when the English acquaintance to whom he had consigned it died of plague!—and the details for *The Ancient Mariner*, which in any case are inconsistent with one another, are sketchy). As a consequence, even the most assured critical statement on the subject is only a hypothesis, and the opinions vary widely for many different reasons, not excluding the individual critic's imaginative identification with one or the other of the principals and the consequent projection of the critic's own personality into the interpretation. At one extreme of generalization, there is H. W. Garrod's frequently quoted remark that "Coleridge may fairly be thought of as the guardian angel of Wordsworth's poetical genius. Perhaps, indeed, Coleridge's greatest work is Wordsworth—and, like all his other

work, Coleridge left it unfinished." As an example of the other extreme, there is Norman Fruman's depiction of Coleridge's almost pathological dependence on the older poet: "whereas Wordsworth was perfectly capable of writing superbly in complete isolation, Coleridge seems scarcely to have been able to write independently at all, after separating from Wordsworth." Squarely in the middle are the descriptions by Thomas McFarland and Paul Magnuson, already mentioned in the introductory section of Chapter 4, of the Coleridge-Wordsworth intellectual relationship as a symbiosis or lyrical dialogue.² Nobody knows for sure what really went on.

It ought to be of more than passing interest, in this connection, to consider a similarly epoch-making literary collaboration between two important writers 120 years later—that of Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot in the creation of *The Waste Land*. In this case we do have documentary evidence—Eliot's manuscripts with Pound's alterations and marginal criticisms, which have been in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library since 1958 and were made widely available nearly two decades ago in a facsimile edition by Eliot's widow³—and we can thus strengthen our speculations with some detailed factual information. Both individually and as a pair, Pound and Eliot were very different persons from what we know of Wordsworth and Coleridge, to be sure. But still it is possible that our better-evidenced knowledge of the later relationship can throw light on certain aspects of the earlier. In any case, *The Waste Land* stands as a notable instance of multiple authorship of a major poem that is constantly attributed to one author alone.

I

The abundance of superficial and circumstantial similarities between Eliot and Coleridge is quite striking. They were born well outside the cultural centers in which they eventually became prominent. Each was the youngest child in a large family of middle-aged parents and dominant siblings. They were precociously intelligent, dreamy and bookish at school, developing strong philosophical and metaphysical bents that entered into practically all their intellectual activities, whatever the ostensible subject at hand. As young men they tried supporting themselves on income from periodical essays, book reviews, and public lectures; and both, beset by serious financial problems, were to an extent rescued by patrons. They made disastrous marriages and

agonizingly separated from their wives a decade or more afterward. They suffered various gruesome illnesses and physical afflictions all their lives. They drank too much. To add a few of the more bizarre coincidences (coincidences merely): both matriculated at "Cambridge" (Harvard College in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in Eliot's case; Cambridge University in Coleridge's); both at one time were sages in Highgate (Eliot taught in the junior school there); both had friends named Mary Hutchinson; both were afraid of cows!

As psychological entities, Eliot and Coleridge were prone to instability, lassitude, anxiety, and depression. There is continuous evidence of a marked lack of self-confidence in each case; they seem to have been constantly dependent on external support and esteem. They were unusually adept at imitation and assimilation, frequently turning to other writers' works as a necessary stimulus to their own (and both, in the process, at some time or other incurring charges of plagiarism). In both men's histories there is a lengthy record of books, lectures, collections, and other projects that were planned and announced but never carried out. There are elements of the trickster in both characters; they were inventors of comic pseudonyms (compare the rhythm and appearance of Eliot's "Charles Augustus Conybeare" with Coleridge's "Silas Tomkyn Comberbache").

As to their careers and general achievements, Eliot and Coleridge are important to us today for a small canon of poetic masterpieces and for a larger body of influential critical writings that made them, while they were alive, the leading theorists of their time. Their single best-known poems—*The Waste Land* and *The Ancient Mariner*—share some principal themes and symbols: sickness of soul, emotional barrenness, spiritual death, inability to connect, the terror of isolation, the arrival of life-giving rain, with only partial recovery at the end; as Florence Marsh writes in the first paragraph of an extended comparison of the two works, "both are essentially religious poems concerned with salvation. In both, the protagonist needs to recover from a living death, from spiritual dryness."⁴ In their prose, Eliot and Coleridge wrote memorably (if not always coherently) about Shakespeare, the history of literature, the functions of poetry and criticism, and organic unity and its converse, the dissociation of sensibility. Among many other activities, they both contributed plays to the London theater.

Of all the major writers of the nineteenth century, Coleridge is the one with whom Eliot should have most identified and sympathized, and there is plentiful evidence that he did make such an identification. The following, for example, from his paragraph-long

“potted biography” of Coleridge written in the 1920s (the decade of *The Waste Land*) for a National Portrait Gallery postcard is emphatically both censorious and admiring: “His life was ill-regulated; weak, slothful, a voracious reader, he contracted an unhappy marriage and much later the habit of taking laudanum. . . . The greatest English literary critic, he was also the greatest intellectual force of his time.”⁵ Something of the same sort of self-reflexivity pervades Eliot’s December 1932 Norton lecture on Wordsworth and Coleridge:

Coleridge was one of those unhappy persons . . . of whom one might say, that if they had not been poets, they might have made something of their lives, might even have had a career; or conversely, that if they had not been interested in so many things, crossed by such diverse passions, they might have been great poets. It was better for Coleridge, as poet, to read books of travel and exploration than to read books of metaphysics and political economy. He did genuinely want to read books of metaphysics and political economy, for he had a certain talent for such subjects. But for a few years he had been visited by the Muse . . . and thenceforth was a haunted man. . . . he was condemned to know that the little poetry he had written was worth more than all he could do with the rest of his life. . . . Sometimes, however, to be a “ruined man” is itself a vocation.

His identification with Coleridge is again signaled in the final sentence of the concluding Norton lecture (31 March 1933): “The sad ghost of Coleridge beckons to me from the shadows.”⁶ A few years later, Virginia Woolf noted in her diary that Eliot had acquired the habit of beginning sentences, “Coleridge and I. . . .”⁷ And in a lecture of 1955, he told his audience that “Coleridge . . . was rather a man of my own type.”⁸

While there are not nearly so many circumstantial similarities between Coleridge’s *miglior fabbro*, Wordsworth, and Ezra Pound, those that exist are fundamental. Like Wordsworth at the time of *Lyrical Ballads*, Pound was centrally concerned with the reform of poetry (especially the language of poetry). As with Wordsworth, his most important work is a long unfinished poem on (to borrow Wordsworth’s description for *The Recluse*) man, nature, and society. In standard literary history, each is a (and frequently is *the*) pioneering figure in a major movement—Romanticism and Modernism, respectively. Most to the point, however, is Pound’s personality. Egotistical and self-willed, Pound can be thought of as a twentieth-century version of what Keats called “the wordsworthian or egotistical sublime”;

his bumptious aggressiveness and strong sense of purpose contrast sharply with Eliot’s indecision and self-doubts. While actually born not quite three years before Eliot, Pound in biographical retrospect *seems* to have been much older, and must have seemed so at the time to Eliot; Wordsworth was two and a half years older than Coleridge, and one suspects a similar disparity between the real and the perceived differences in their ages (and there was more involved than just age: Coleridge in a letter of late 1801 describes himself and “W. & his sister” as “three persons . . . but one God,” the god being, of course, Wordsworth).⁹

In his 1932 Norton lecture on Wordsworth and Coleridge, Eliot comments only briefly on the question of which character was the more dominant: “Their influence upon each other was considerable; though probably the influence of Wordsworth upon Coleridge, during their brief period of intimate association, was greater than that of Coleridge upon Wordsworth.” A few paragraphs later he adds, “I doubt whether the impulse in Coleridge would have been strong enough to have worked its way out, but for the example and encouragement of Wordsworth.”¹⁰ Whether or not Eliot himself was conscious of the parallel that I am proposing here, this last statement has an uncanny appropriateness as a description of Pound’s help in the production of *The Waste Land*.

2

The complete chronology of *The Waste Land* is somewhat uncertain, but a number of facts are by now well established.¹¹ Eliot’s earliest recoverable references—to a “long poem” that he has been planning for some time and hopes to begin writing shortly—occur in letters of November and December 1919 to John Quinn (the American lawyer and arts patron) and to Eliot’s mother. By early February 1921 he had shown Wyndham Lewis some parts of it, and on 9 May he told Quinn that it was “partly on paper.”¹² Part 3, “The Fire Sermon,” seems to have been the earliest section completed, at London and perhaps also Margate in September and October 1921. The rest—the bulk of the lines of both the surviving manuscripts and the much reduced printed text—was written in a rush in London and Lausanne in November and December. Pound read and marked parts of the manuscripts on two occasions, first in the middle of November 1921, when Eliot stayed with him in Paris on his way to Lausanne for a month’s “rest

cure" in the care of the analyst Dr. Roger Vittoz, and a second time in early January 1922, when he again stopped in Paris on his way back to London.

The manuscripts extant in the Berg Collection and published in the facsimile edition of 1971 are a hodge-podge of holograph drafts, fair copies, and typescripts, fifty-four leaves in all, including a title leaf and marked and revised carbon copies of some of the typescript portions. Though Eliot called these sheets "all of the manuscript in existence" just before he shipped them off to Quinn in the fall of 1922,¹³ a great deal else has been lost or destroyed—draft versions of material that we have only in fair copy or typescript, fair copies (and American and British printer's copies) of some of the text that we have only in draft, and no doubt other manuscript materials that we now know nothing about. The main items that survive in this batch, which Eliot sent to his benefactor Quinn almost as if he were offering a private display of multiple authorship in process, are the following:

1. "He Do the Police in Different Voices: Part I. The Burial of the Dead," 130 lines on three pages of typescript (rectos of three leaves). Eliot canceled the whole of page 1 (lines 1–54 in the facsimile edition numbering) in pencil; pages 2 and 3 (55–130), which Pound marked for revision, are an early version of the printed text lines 1–76.
2. "He Do the Police in Different Voices: Part II. A Game of Chess," 98 lines on three pages of typescript (rectos of three leaves) marked by both Pound and Eliot's wife, Vivien, and a carbon copy of the typescript with some holograph notations by Eliot—the equivalent of the printed text lines 77–172.
3. "The Fire Sermon," 240 lines on five pages of typescript (rectos of five leaves) plus holograph draft on the verso of leaf 1, a carbon copy of the typescript, and further holograph draft for this section of the poem on four other leaves (*Facsimile* pp. 28, 36, 48, 50, 52)—early versions of the printed text lines 173–311. Pound marked both the original typescript and the carbon, as well as the recto of the last leaf of draft in this section (p. 50).
4. "Part IV. Death by Water," 93 lines on four rectos of holograph fair copy and again (shortened to 92 lines) on four rectos of typescript. The last 10 lines in both versions are the equivalent of the printed text lines 312–21. Pound commented on the first page of the fair copy and marked the typescript throughout.

5. "What the Thunder Said," 117 lines on six rectos of untitled pencil draft and again (shortened to 113 lines) on four rectos of typescript—the equivalent of the printed text lines 322–434. Pound commented at the top of the first page of draft and made a few markings in the typescript.
6. Twelve additional leaves of lyrics and fragments, some dating from as early as 1914 to 1916, that contributed toward, or (in the case of the three typescript items) were once considered for inclusion in, the early text of the poem (*Facsimile* pp. 90–122): a holograph draft and fair copy of "The Death of Saint Narcissus" (containing early versions of the printed text lines 26–29); typescripts of "Song" (originally "Song for the Opherion"), "Exequy" (with draft of part of an additional stanza on the verso), and "The Death of the Duchess" (containing early versions of the printed text lines 108–10, 136–38), all three marked by Pound; a 13-line draft beginning "After the turning of the inspired days" (containing a version of the printed text line 322); a 5-line holograph fragment beginning "I am the Resurrection and the Life"; a 33-line draft fragment beginning "So through the evening, through the violet air" (containing early versions of the printed text lines 378–85); holograph drafts of short poems entitled "Elegy" and "Dirge"; a fair copy of "Dirge," with a comment by Pound; and a 5-line draft fragment beginning "Those are pearls that were his eyes. See!" (which became the printed text line 48).

These are the main materials, amounting to a thousand lines of verse (not counting the carbon copies and some other repetitions of passages), out of which Pound and Eliot excavated the world-famous *Waste Land*, published in both the *Criterion* (in London) and the *Dial* (in New York) in the middle of October 1922. It is of course impossible to consider the drafts objectively. Many readers know the printed poem by heart (indeed, one can almost collate the manuscripts against the standard text without book); the discarded passages of the manuscripts, some 300 lines in items 1–5 in the preceding list and another 260 in item 6, cannot be other than decidedly unfamiliar by comparison. Though every now and then a critic professes to admire, and even prefer, the flatter, more sprawling version of the manuscripts,¹⁴ the majority view is that the 434 lines of *The Waste Land* as we know it were lying hidden from the beginning in the 1000 lines of draft, rather in the manner of one of Michelangelo's slumbering figures waiting to be rescued from the block of marble. But Michelan-

gelo, in this analogy, was both artist and reviser simultaneously. In the case of *The Waste Land*, it took one poetic genius to create those 434 lines in the first place, and another to get rid of the several hundred inferior lines surrounding and obscuring them.

Part 1 in the manuscripts begins with a 54-line monologue on pub-crawling and Boston low life:

First we had a couple of feelers down at Tom's place,
 There was old Tom, boiled to the eyes, blind,
 (Don't you remember that time after a dance,
 Top hats and all, we and Silk Hat Harry,
 And old Tom took us behind, brought out a bottle of fizz,
 With old Jane, Tom's wife; and we got Joe to sing
 "I'm proud of all the Irish blood that's in me,
 "There's not a man can say a word agin me").
 Then we had dinner in good form, and a couple of Bengal lights.
 When we got into the show, up in Row A,
 I tried to put my foot in the drum, and didn't the girl squeal,
 She never did take to me, a nice guy—but rough;
 The next thing we were out in the street, Oh was it cold! . . .

This is "language really used by men" in a way that Wordsworth never dreamed of. The descriptions and dialogue are tedious throughout; there is nothing of the earthy liveliness of the ladies discussing Albert and Lil in the pub scene of part 2 (printed text lines 139–72), and no telling point achieved by the unrelieved inanity of the passage. Eliot made deletions and marginal revisions in several lines and then canceled the entire page (and passage) with vertical strokes in pencil. In this instance it is uncertain whether the wholesale deletion was his or Pound's idea. In tonal inaccuracy and uselessness to the project as a whole, the passage is very much like some others that we know Pound objected to in later parts of the manuscripts; since Eliot was thoroughly dependent on Pound at this time in matters of literary judgment, the better likelihood is that the decision was Pound's.¹⁵

With the next two pages of the opening section, beginning with "April is the cruellest month, breeding / Lilacs out of the dead land," we are on solid and very familiar ground, the seventy-six lines that, after minor revisions by Pound and Eliot (and then by Eliot or an editor at a later stage), became part 1 of the printed poem. Pound marked, underlined, circled, queried, and deleted several lines in the six paragraphs and wrote "Marianne," "J.J." (for James Joyce), and "Blake. Too often used" in the margins. Eliot kept (or restored) three

lines that Pound deleted—the printed text's lines 48, 67–68—and dropped two others: the parenthetical "I John saw these things, and heard them" between lines 56 and 57, and "I have sometimes seen and see" following "Unreal City" in line 60.

In the extant typescript of part 2, "A Game of Chess," Pound changed Eliot's original wording in nineteen lines. He commented marginally on the regularity of the meter ("3 lines too tum-pum at a stretch," "too penty"), ridiculed the phrasing in Eliot's original "one tender Cupidon" (" 'one' wee red mouse," Pound scrawled), seemingly faulted the overly accurate realism of several lines of speech ("photography," "photo."), objected to certain vaguenesses ("had is the weakest point," "dogmatic deduction but wobbly as well"), and again, as in part 1, noted echoes of other writers ("Beddoes," "J.J."). Pound's deletions and revisions are responsible for the printed text's wording in lines 80, 91–92, 94, 105, 109, 121–22, and comments and other markings by him brought about changes in lines 78, 98, 103–4, 106–7, 125, 136, 139, 149–50. Vivien Eliot, whose marginal pencilings show that she especially liked this section of the poem ("WONDERFUL," "Splendid last lines"), contributed the printed text's lines 153 and 164 and part of 159.

Part 3, "The Fire Sermon," originally opened with seventy lines of Popian couplets (plus an additional seventeen lines of couplets and triplets on an inserted sheet) describing a Belinda-like Fresca at her toilet:

Admonished by the sun's inclining ray,
 And swift approaches of the thievish day,
 The white-armed Fresca blinks, and yawns, and gapes,
 Aroused from dreams of love and pleasant rapes.
 Electric summons of the busy bell
 Brings brisk Amanda to destroy the spell;
 With coarsened hand, and hard plebeian tread,
 Who draws the curtain round the lacquered bed,
 Depositing thereby a polished tray
 Of soothing chocolate, or stimulating tea. . . .



It is extremely shallow imitation, as Pound indicated by his comments on the carbon copy—"Too loose," "rhyme drags it out to diffuseness," "trick of Pope etc not to let couple[t] diffuse 'em"—and by his cancellation of the entire passage in the original typescript. Pound also worked over the rest of this section in both the typescript and the

carbon, censuring Eliot's tentativeness ("dam per'apsez," "Perhaps be damned," "make up yr. mind," "you Tiresias if you know know damn well or else you dont"), commenting on circumlocutions ("B—ll—S," presumably for "Bullshit," beside Eliot's "London, the swarming life you kill and breed, / Huddled between the concrete and the sky," and "Palmer Cox's brownies" as a humorous illustration of Eliot's "Phantasmal gnomes, burrowing in brick and stone and steel"), and finding fault with most of the lines describing the typist and the clerk ("verse not interesting enough as verse to warrant so much of it," "inversions not warranted by any real exegience of metre," "Too easy," "mix up of the couplet & grishkin not good," "probaly over the mark").

Besides canceling the seventy-odd lines at the beginning of the section, Pound deleted twenty lines after the printed text's 214, single lines after 217 and 229, two lines after 248, and three lines after 258. His markings and comments prompted Eliot to reduce twelve lines describing the typist to half that number in the final text (222–27) and twenty lines describing the clerk to a mere four (231–34). Other markings produced (or helped produce) the final version of lines 207, 208, 212, 214, 215, 251, 252, 254. All told, in one way or another Pound changed more than 130 lines of Eliot's draft in this section.

On the first page of Eliot's holograph fair copy of part 4, "Death by Water," ninety-three lines describing a fisherman's voyage and shipwreck off the New England coast, Pound wrote, "Bad—but cant attack until I get typescript." When he subsequently had the typescript in hand (it was typed on his own typewriter in Paris), Pound marked through the first eighty lines so vigorously that Eliot considered removing the entire section. "Perhaps better omit Phlebas also???" he asked Pound, referring to the final ten lines, to which Pound replied: "I DO advise keeping Phlebas. In fact I more'n advise. Phlebas is an integral part of the poem; the card pack introduces him, the drowned phoen. sailor, and he is needed ABSolootly where he is. Must stay in."¹⁶ In this case, while Eliot is demonstrably the author of part 4 of the printed text, Pound is responsible both for the continuing existence of the Phlebas lines that constitute this part and for the deletion of the eighty-plus lines that originally preceded them.

In part 5, "What the Thunder Said," the errant and indecisive Eliot suddenly attained a degree of self-assurance nowhere evident in the preceding parts, and the lines, even in first draft, flowed in near-perfect form. No further excavation was needed. Pound, reading both the holograph draft and the typescript (again typed on his own

typewriter—in this instance, scholars have suggested, possibly by Pound himself), made only a handful of markings—"OK from here on I think" at the top of the first page of draft, and small markings that altered the typescript to produce the final text in lines 337 and 392.

As for the rest, principally the three poems that Pound read and marked in typescript at the end of the manuscripts ("Song," "Exequy," and "The Death of the Duchess," *Facsimile* pp. 98–106), Pound's role was mainly to say no. "I think your instinct had led you to put the remaining superfluities at the end," he wrote to Eliot; "I think you had better leave 'em, abolish 'em altogether or for the present. . . . The thing now runs from April . . . to shantih without [a] break. . . . Dont try to bust all records by prolonging it three pages further." Eliot did as he was told ("Certainly omit miscellaneous pieces," he replied),¹⁷ and *The Waste Land* as we know it was the sensational result. In the process of shaping the poem, Pound had altered or stripped away some 350 to 400 of Eliot's lines (either 2 or 56 in part 1; 19 in part 2; 130 or so in part 3; 83 in part 4; 2 in part 5; and 118 in the three separate pieces at the end). Eliot in return, when he included the poem in his first collected edition, *Poems 1909–1925* (1925), added a dedication that has been part of the work ever since: "For Ezra Pound / *il miglior fabbro*." The Italian phrase, from *Purgatorio* 26.117, is Dante's tribute to a Provençal troubadour whom Pound also admired and translated, Arnaut Daniel—"the better poet" (*fabbro*, or "maker," the literal meaning of Greek *poiētēs*) in both love songs and prose romances ("versi d'amore e prose di romanzi").

3

While he shows considerable ambivalence about the survival of the manuscripts and the consequent possibility of public exposure of his rough drafts as well as Pound's markings, Eliot's private and public statements concerning the extent of Pound's contribution to the poem are forthright and generous. Writing on 21 September 1922, he tells Quinn,

In the manuscript of *The Waste Land* which I am sending you, you will see the evidences of [Pound's] work, and I think that this manuscript is worth preserving in its present form solely for the reason that it is the

only evidence of the difference which his criticism has made to this poem.¹⁸

In an article in the April/June 1938 issue of *Purpose*, explaining the wording of his dedication to Pound, he says that he meant to "honour the technical mastery and critical ability manifest in [Pound's] own work, which had also done so much to turn *The Waste Land* from a jumble of good and bad passages into a poem."¹⁹ His best-known remark on the matter is a parenthetical aside in a September 1946 essay on Pound in *Poetry*:

It was in 1922 that I placed before him in Paris the manuscript of a sprawling, chaotic poem called *The Waste Land* which left his hands, reduced to about half its size, in the form in which it appears in print. I should like to think that the manuscript, with the suppressed passages, had disappeared irrecoverably: yet on the other hand, I should wish the blue penciling on it to be preserved as irrefutable evidence of Pound's critical genius.²⁰

This last sentiment is reiterated in a comment by Valerie Eliot in an interview published in *Esquire* in 1972: "We never thought [the manuscript] would turn up, but Tom told me that if it did, I was to publish it. 'It won't do me any good,' he added, 'but I would like people to realize the extent of my debt to Ezra.'"²¹

Recognition of that debt has come rather slowly and grudgingly. In her 1971 transcription of the manuscripts, Valerie Eliot printed Pound's markings and comments in red ink, thus highlighting them as the most prominent feature of the facsimile edition. On the face of it, in Eliot's words of 1938, Pound turned "a jumble of good and bad passages into a poem." Yet a large contingent of Eliot scholars, even with this plain evidence before them, have insisted on minimizing Pound's contribution. Here is a brief sampling of assessments, mostly from the years immediately following publication of the facsimile:

... the author of "The Waste Land" knew from the beginning *exactly* what he wanted to express, even if at times the poetic persona was unsure of the voice by which to express it. ... The manuscripts, of course, show how little Pound altered the poem and that his role of "il miglior fabbro" was mainly to advise on stylistic, technical improvements, as any good teacher might comment on a pupil's work. (Gertrude Patterson, 1972)

Eliot . . . exercised full control over that [published] text. . . . Since the publication of the facsimiles, there can be no doubt that *The Waste Land* was controlled by Eliot's architectonic skill at every stage of composition: Eliot responded to Pound's criticisms by modifying the text, not by altering his own purpose. (Grover Smith, 1972)

Much of Pound's advice Eliot himself had in mind anyhow. (D. E. S. Maxwell, 1972)

For both Pound and Eliot, the business of revision seems to have been largely a matter of surface craftsmanship. (Richard Sheppard, 1972)

Pound's criticism tightened the poem, but did not otherwise alter its movement. (Denis Donoghue, 1974)

Eliot evidently conceived *The Waste Land* from the start as an "ideogrammic" collage, and any obstetrics Pound may have performed did nothing to change the original nature of the brainchild. . . . Not only must we conclude that the "editorial policy" in the composition of *The Waste Land* was Eliot's and not Pound's, but we must also seriously question whether Pound had a sympathetic understanding of Eliot's ultimate intentions. . . . Eliot is scrupulously independent in his judgment of Pound's advice. (Gareth Reeves, 1975)

[Pound] *edited* the poem, he did not determine or influence the poem's basic form and content: in concept and expression it is distinctly Eliot's own. Pound freed the drafts of weak, at times poor lines; he tightened the poem's dramatic structure and rhythmic flow and speeded its movement. He suggested changes, drew attention to weaknesses, but always left the final decision to Eliot. (Ruth Pulik, 1977)

As it turned out, Pound altered [the poem] relatively little. . . . In his revision Pound concentrated on local infelicities more than on the integrity of the whole and kept Eliot from brooding about his lack of outline for several crucial days or weeks. (Ronald Bush, 1983)

I do not . . . believe that Pound was responsible for the innovations in *The Waste Land*. An examination of the manuscript shows that, apart from a few minor revisions in diction, Pound's contributions were the removal of two long sections beginning "The Fire Sermon" and "Death by Water" and rather extensive revisions of the teatime episode in "The Fire Sermon." . . . But the strategy of the poem and the most powerful passages in the poem are not disturbed by Pound. (Harriet Davidson, 1985)²²

Patterson's "exactly . . . of course" and Smith's "there can be no doubt" are clues to the precariousness of their positions; each had published a substantial book on Eliot, and naturally they were resistant to the idea of a second author for the most famous and influential poem in their poet's canon. Maxwell is indulging in mind reading. And the rest of the critics cited here, from Sheppard through Davidson, concur in the opinion that the poem represented in Eliot's manuscripts was *essentially* unchanged by Pound's deletion of several hundred of its lines and significant alteration of many others. Phrases like "surface craftsmanship," "did nothing to change the original nature," "always left the final decision to Eliot," "concentrated on local infelicities"—demonstrably wrong according to the biographical and textual evidence—are typical of their rhetoric.

Critics who argue that Pound's contribution made an essential difference are proportionately fewer. Glauco Cambon, in one of the earliest reactions to publication of the facsimiles, speaks of Pound's "radical abridgment" and "drastic excisions, so instrumental to the attainment of *The Waste Land's* final shape," and adds a personal anecdote:

I remember Austin Warren's remark, in a conversation we had many years ago in Ann Arbor, that but for "violent" Pound, basically "academic" Eliot might have missed out on his high goal of literary achievement. Thirteen years ago one had few hopes of ever recovering the original drafts of *The Waste Land*, but now that they have been unearthed, they bear Austin Warren out. Nobody can deny that Pound's aggressiveness managed to bring forth a deeper coherence from Eliot's own creative resources.

Bernard Bergonzi's summary comment in his short biography of 1972 strikes a kindred note: "All in all, Pound's treatment of *The Waste Land* showed his intense feeling for what Eliot was trying to do. . . . Without Pound's attentions *The Waste Land* would still have been impressive, but it would have appeared, and remained, much more clearly a group of separate poems." Russell Kirk, another writer of 1972, says that "Pound mightily improved the poem. . . . Pound's taste was then superior to Eliot's, and what was deleted would have diminished the explosion of this bomb. . . . All of Pound's smaller changes . . . were for the better." The strongest statement of Pound's share in the collaboration is Lewis Turco's of 1979:

If anything is clear about *The Waste Land*, it is that the poem had two authors, not one. Pound had as much to do with the making of the poem as did Eliot. . . . we ought at least to insist that all future editions of the work bear the names of both authors.²³

Writers of the 1980s have tended to give Pound the credit that Eliot (in the remarks quoted at the beginning of this section) said he deserved. In his 1983 book devoted to the poem, Grover Smith has somewhat revised his earlier estimate of Pound's importance: "Without [Pound] this poem would have been impossible: this *Waste Land* is the best of all possible *Waste Lands*. . . . It did require Ezra Pound to bring it to conclusion." The 1984 standard biography by Peter Ackroyd gives a reasonably balanced account of the effect of Pound's changes:

When Ezra Pound began working on it, he removed most of the elements of stylistic reproduction—he considered the sequence in the manner of Pope to be simply parodic—and curbed the tendency of the poem towards dramatic and fictional exposition. Pound was, perhaps, the purer poet of the two; certainly he was never much interested in Eliot's skill as a dramatist. . . . And it might fairly be said in retrospect that he quite misunderstood the essential nature of Eliot's genius. . . . But Pound had an extraordinarily good ear, and he located in the typescripts of *The Waste Land* the underlying rhythm of the poem—the music of which Eliot was so distrustful and which he surrounded with more deliberate and dramatic kinds of writing. Pound heard the music, and cut away what was for him the extraneous material which was attached to it. . . . In other words, Pound mistook or refused to recognize Eliot's original *schema* and as a result rescued the poetry.

Whether Pound mistook Eliot's genius or (like Keats's helpers) to some degree ignored it in pursuit of his own goals, Ackroyd's description makes clear that *The Waste Land* without Pound would not have been the "same" poem. And the 1985 and 1989 editions of the most standard of American literature anthologies have already informed thousands of undergraduate and graduate students that Eliot "cut huge chunks out of the poem on Pound's advice. Indeed . . . study of the manuscript before and after Pound's suggestions were incorporated has led some critics to suggest that we should think of *The Waste Land* as jointly authored."²⁴

I would offer three brief points by way of provisional conclusion to this example of multiple authorship. The first concerns my opening speculation that the Eliot-Pound collaboration, for which we have detailed evidence in the manuscripts in the Berg Collection, might by analogy throw light on the less solidly documented collaboration 120 years earlier between Coleridge and Wordsworth. The conclusion has to be, I think, that the later relationship cannot illuminate the earlier in any way that a majority of scholars could agree on. Indeed, as a more particular examination of the scholarship would show, the Eliot and Pound critics disagree with one another concerning the two writers' responsibility for nearly every aspect of *The Waste Land*—structure, style, tone, dramatic voice, themes, philosophy—even with the evidence of the manuscripts before their eyes. There is no reason to think that Coleridge and Wordsworth scholars would be any closer to unanimity, and every reason to think that if we had, say, a set of manuscripts of *The Ancient Mariner* with Wordsworth's comments and revisions, the critics would just as avidly declare Coleridge's independence of Wordsworth, or, conversely, his heavy indebtedness to Wordsworth, according to their subjective interpretations of the documentary evidence. Although I still think that the Eliot-Pound and Coleridge-Wordsworth parallels are interesting and suggestive, I would not use the one case to prove anything about the other.

More generally, or theoretically, just as it is historically inappropriate to assume a single author for a single text, so it is inappropriate to assume a given form of multiple authorship for a text. In every instance, recovery of the circumstances of literary production can proceed only on the assumption that each case is historically specific. Although Coleridge was something like Eliot, and Wordsworth something like Pound, it is virtually certain that no poem in *Lyrical Ballads* was constructed by Wordsworth carving out something from a mass of lines presented to him by Coleridge.

The second point concerns the fragility and elusiveness of any concept of authorial intention in *The Waste Land*. In spite of the confidence of some of the pro-Eliot critics quoted above ("knew . . . exactly what he wanted to express," "exercised full control"), the biographical evidence—especially the letters and other documents quoted by Valerie Eliot in her introduction to the facsimiles—shows

Eliot to have been in the most precarious of mental states during the year in which he produced the drafts that he handed over to Pound (Ackroyd's chapter covering 1921 and 1922 is titled "The Collapse"). He wrote the greater part of the manuscript text while undergoing psychiatric treatment in Switzerland, and not least among the many elements of pure chance that had their effect were the facts that Paris lay between London and Lausanne, that Pound was in Paris, and that Eliot therefore would see Pound both going and returning just at the time when he was writing large passages of the poem. Eliot seems to have been entirely dependent on, and to have followed in every major detail, Pound's advice concerning what to keep and what to get rid of in the manuscripts. We know that there were fundamental differences between the two writers' aims, tastes, and ideas in poetry, but on this occasion Pound had his own way, with Eliot first acquiescing and then objectively admiring the result.²⁵

The drafts that Pound worked over were unquestionably the product of genius; nobody has ever suggested that Eliot did not write the great lines and passages for which he is most famous. But the biographical evidence raises serious doubts about Eliot's consciousness of what he was doing, apart from the basic business of writing great passages and hoping for Pound's approval. Ackroyd makes a good point about the openness of the finished product:

Pound imposed an order on it which it did not originally possess; as a result of his removal of the original context of the poem, it has become much easier for readers and critics to provide their own—to suggest a "theme" which the abbreviated sequences might be claimed to fit. *The Waste Land* provided a scaffold on which others might erect their own theories; so it is that it has been variously interpreted as personal autobiography, an account of a collapsing society, an allegory of the Grail and spiritual rebirth, a Buddhist meditation. Thus *The Waste Land* began a process of which Eliot has been the principal beneficiary, or victim. In the absence of philosophical or religious certainties, his poetry has been invested with a gnomic or moral force which it can hardly carry. A thin wash of "great truths" has been placed over *The Waste Land* and over Eliot's succeeding work. The poet himself was to be treated as a kind of seer, a position most unsuited to him.²⁶

And several critics have quoted a remark from Eliot's 1953 National Book League Lecture, "The Three Voices of Poetry," as the poet's reflection on the way in which *The Waste Land* took shape:

In a poem which is neither didactic nor narrative, and not animated by any other social purpose, the poet may be concerned solely with expressing in verse—using all his resources of words, with their history, their connotations, their music—this obscure impulse. He does not know what he has to say until he has said it; and in the effort to say it he is not concerned with making other people understand anything. He is not concerned, at this stage, with other people at all: only with finding the right words or, anyhow, the least wrong words. He is not concerned whether anybody else will ever listen to them or not, or whether anybody else will ever understand them if he does. He is oppressed by a burden which he must bring to birth in order to obtain relief.²⁷

In the drafts of *The Waste Land* Eliot may have been expressing just such an “obscure impulse”—not knowing “what he has to say until he has said it”—and Pound, far from helping Eliot find out what he had to say, may have further obscured the impulse so that it is no longer evident or recoverable. Who, then, is the author of *The Waste Land* published in October 1922? Eliot wrote the drafts; Pound is responsible for the principal revisions. But the *authorship* underlying any particular sequence, or passage, or detail is still very much up in the air.

My third point concerns the extent to which the myth of single authorship enters into the critical analysis of this obvious collaboration: *The Waste Land*, if it were perceived to be a jointly authored poem, would inevitably become a lesser work than it is now taken to be. At present, critical appreciation of a masterwork requires it to be the product of a single organizing mind. If multiple authorship were accepted as the norm of literary production, then no critic would need to appropriate a work for one or another author; indeed, the multiplicity of contributors to a work could even be considered a mark of its significance!

7

American Novels: Authors, Agents, Editors, Publishers

With the novel and (in the next chapter) plays and films, we at last encounter literature as commercial enterprise. Apart from timely loans from his publishers, Keats never received a penny from his poetry (and neither did the publishers). Mill and Wordsworth supported themselves as civil servants, offering their works principally for the edification of readers—then and, they hoped, for all time. Coleridge, who survived mainly on donations from patrons and friends, actually lost several hundred pounds when he published *Sibylline Leaves* and *Biographia Literaria* with the firm of Rest Fenner, which went bankrupt two years afterward. Eliot received all of \$150, plus a prize of \$2000, for the first publication of *The Waste Land*. To be sure, Eliot later became a shrewd businessman of letters, driving a hard bargain as a director of the London publisher Faber and Faber; but when he produced *The Waste Land*, he and his publishers were still operating in a nineteenth-century tradition of poetry writing and publishing primarily for the sake of art and fame.

Of course, there have been best-sellers all along in English and other literatures. Shakespeare, nowadays chief presider over the immortals “among the English Poets,” was in his own time a reckonable figure at the box office. Pope and the mid-century novelists—Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett—came closest to being best-selling, or at least self-supporting, British authors in the eighteenth century, and among the Romantics Byron and Scott are obvious examples. But it was with the rise of the novel in the nineteenth century, intimately connected with the development and growth of a mass readership—itsself the product of accelerated growth in population, widespread educational reform, the increase of literacy, the institution

of commercial and public lending libraries, and a host of technological improvements in printing and publishing—that literature for the first time became big business.¹ Just as one would expect, commercial considerations more overtly began mixing with the artistic, and, as publishers turned an eye toward consumer response and sales figures, collaborative production became a frequent practice of authorship.

J. A. Sutherland has documented a number of early collaborations (and collaborative situations) between publishers and writers in Victorian fiction. They include, among others, Richard Bentley's offer to Melville to have *Pierre* rewritten by a "judicious literary friend . . . in a style to be understood by the great mass of readers"; Longman's alterations of the manuscript of Trollope's *Barchester Towers* to get rid of "vulgarity" and "exaggeration"; Bentley's persuading Anne Manning to enhance sales appeal by adding two chapters to *The Ladies of Bever Hollow* ("to give each volume a respectable girth"); George Smith's more pervasive influence, ultimately for the same reason, on the structure of Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*; the Macmillans' detailed advice to Charles Kingsley affecting the point of view, style, and tone of *Westward Ho!* ("I am aiming altogether at popularity," wrote Kingsley, "and am willing to alter or expunge wherever aught is likely to hurt the sale of the book"); and Dickens's revisions (in his capacity as editor of *All the Year Round*) to make the serialized version of Bulwer Lytton's *A Strange Story* more conformable to readers' expectations.²

These are, for the most part, famous names, but while the quality of the output may vary, the Victorian practices that Sutherland describes are not categorically different from a great deal of book production today. Take, as an extreme modern example, the activities of Lyle Kenyon Engel, founder in 1973 of Book Creations, Inc., a "fiction factory" in Canaan, New York, that has "created" several thousand books in the last dozen or so years, with over 100 million copies in print. According to his *New York Times* obituary (13 August 1986),

Engel originated ideas for series of books, usually about a family or community through many generations, prepared a detailed outline, hired writers to flesh out the characters and plot, then sold publication rights to paperback houses. . . . A close friend of Pearl S. Buck, he created a series of hard-cover nonfiction books by the Nobel Prize-winning author, including "Tales of the Orient," "People of Japan," an Oriental cookbook, Bible stories and a Christmas book.³

Engel and Book Creations were themselves not publishers, but their role in authorship has obvious parallels both with that of the Victorian publishers in some of Sutherland's examples and with what has become standard practice of editors working for twentieth-century publishers.

Probably the routine presence of multiple authorship in the novel and film is so well known as to make rehearsal of details somewhat superfluous. Maxwell Perkins is already sufficiently famous as the editor and in effect collaborator in the works of Thomas Wolfe, Hemingway, Fitzgerald, and others; Hollywood screenwriters are in general decidedly *not* famous as authors of the films that their names are sometimes attached to. But some reminders, here and in the next chapter, of the collaborative character of modern commercial literature may be appropriate nevertheless. The present chapter will deal mostly with editors, though agents and others, as I show in the final section, also get into the business. Let us begin with the creation of a couple of twentieth-century best-sellers, Grace Metalious's *Peyton Place* and Jacqueline Susann's *Valley of the Dolls*.

1

Though some of the people who knew her expressed doubts, including her high-school English teacher, and though on one occasion her husband publicly claimed credit as a collaborator, there is really no question about Grace Metalious's principal authorship of *Peyton Place*, which sold 104,000 copies in the first month of its publication in 1956, stayed on the *New York Times* best-seller list for twenty-six weeks, and ultimately sold more copies than Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind* and Erskine Caldwell's *God's Little Acre*, becoming one of the best-selling novels ever published. Metalious spent parts of five or six years conceiving and drafting the work, and a carbon copy of her manuscript, with the original title "The Tree and the Blossom," is extant in the library of the Pennsylvania State University. The bulk of the evidence assembled by her biographer, Emily Toth, establishes Metalious as a dedicated amateur who, through a series of lucky circumstances—the nearly random choice of an agent who sent the manuscript to an unlikely publisher whose reader happened to mention it in a job interview with another publisher—became famous (and infamous) almost in spite of her intentions.

The centrality of Metalious in the work and the seriousness of her

original effort do not, however, mean that *Peyton Place* had no coauthors. The published title of the novel (a place name intended to parallel that of Henry Bellamann's *Kings Row*, which sold well in both book and movie versions) was thought up by Aaron Sussman, head of the agency handling its advertising, who declared that "The Tree and the Blossom" was "too poetic." The text itself was substantially worked over by editors—initially by Leona Nevler, the free-lance reader who discovered the work in the first place and agreed to undertake the editing for the house that accepted it, Julian Messner, Inc., and subsequently by the publisher's president and editor-in-chief herself, Kitty Messner.

Nevler, entering critical comments, queries, and alterations directly on the manuscript, was concerned mainly to eliminate clichés and reduce scenes and descriptions that she judged were stilted, sentimental, and (as she wrote of one lovemaking episode) "unreal & a little embarrassing." Metalious was outraged at the markings, telling her agent that Nevler had turned her work into "somebody else's book. If it can't be mine, I don't want any part of it!" At this point Messner took over, treating the author more gently but actually effecting much more substantial changes than Nevler had called for. These include, among others, stylistic alterations throughout; the deletion of long philosophical passages, satirical comments, "unnecessary foreshadowings," a long anecdote, and at least one character (a minister who went insane); bowdlerizing changes in descriptions; the elimination of an incestuous rape (both as motif and as a significant element of plot); the wholesale rewriting of the unrealistic dialogue that Metalious had invented for her New York City characters; the request for an additional love scene between two of the principal characters; and some major changes in the development and career of the heroine, Allison MacKenzie, who in the manuscript text is to a considerable extent a fictional rendering of Metalious herself but in the editing, as Toth demonstrates, was stripped of most of her autobiographical features.

Oddly, but at the same time predictably, Toth prefaces her account of these alterations by saying that Messner "actually made few changes" and that though Metalious "found the editing painful, the book remained her own." Toth's recital of the details suggests otherwise, and so does her account of the author's reactions. A friend recalled that Metalious "felt her book was destroyed" by certain of the deletions (a strong statement, even when we make adjustment for

normal authorial vanity and sensitivity); and after Messner's changes in the character of the heroine, Metalious, in Toth's words, "told many people . . . that *Peyton Place* wasn't the book she had wanted to write."⁴

Jacqueline Susann had no such illusions about artistic or authorial integrity. According to her biographer, Barbara Seaman, Susann first thought of writing a "gossipy, soap-opera kind of a novel" after seeing Metalious interviewed on television by Mike Wallace (Susann herself was in the studio producing commercials for the program) and thinking that she could do a much better job of promoting a book than the "chunky, depressed, and colorless" author of *Peyton Place*.⁵ What she most wanted to accomplish as a writer was make the *New York Times* best-seller list, and with *Valley of the Dolls*, published by Bernard Geis Associates in 1966, she succeeded superlatively. The book was on the *Times* list for twenty-eight weeks and sold close to 7 million copies in the first six months of publication. To date, it is the best-selling novel of all time; according to the 1989 *Guinness Book of World Records*, cumulative sales through 26 May 1988 amounted to 29,104,000 copies.

The publisher's initial reaction to the manuscript of *Valley of the Dolls*, which Susann seems to have drafted in a few months sometime in 1964 or 1965, is that it "was a bad, bad book . . . hardly written in English."⁶ Geis's executive editor, Don Preston, reported in part as follows:

[Susann] is a painfully dull, inept, clumsy, undisciplined, rambling and thoroughly amateurish writer whose every sentence, paragraph and scene cries for the hand of a pro. She wastes endless pages on utter trivia, writes wide-eyed romantic scenes that would not make the back pages of *True Confessions*, hauls out every terrible show biz cliché in all the books, lets every good scene fall apart in endless talk and allows her book to ramble aimlessly. . . . [The book] will lend itself to lively promotion but it will be roasted by critics, not for being salacious but for being badly done, dull. . . .

If, however, the decision is to publish this book despite the great odds against it, then what can editing do? If a competent editor is given carte blanche to cut, compress, and edit (interlinear as well as surgical), some of the faults of organization can be corrected and the story can be given greater pace and sharpness. This would mean drastic cutting, since most of the first 200 pages are virtually worthless and dreadfully dull and since practically every scene is dragged out flat and stomped

on by her endless talk. Some whole scenes should be dropped, a few characters should all but vanish . . . many drawn-out explanations would be compressed into paragraphs. . . . I really don't think there is a page of this ms. that can stand in its present form.

One might suppose that the manuscript would have been rejected at this point, but Geis also sought his wife's opinion, and she told him he had to publish it: the work made her feel "as if I'd picked up the telephone and was listening to two women telling how their husbands are in bed. You can't hang up on a conversation like that." Geis turned the manuscript over to Preston—"We're going to publish this book"—and Preston, whose report almost seems to beg for the assignment ("every sentence . . . cries for the hand of a pro"), spent the next six weeks rewriting it.

According to Geis, "This was not normal editing [Preston] did. This was reconstruction." Preston says that he "worked like hell, cutting and restructuring, rewriting in spots, moving things around. Scenes weren't in proper order. A couple of key scenes weren't there at all, and I had to block them out and convince [Susann] to write them." Seaman gives as one example a pivotal scene where two women get into a fight in the powder room of a nightclub and one grabs the other's wig and tries to flush it down a toilet: "Preston rough-drafted the first version of the scene. [Susann] rewrote it, drawing heavily on a similar episode from [Clare Boothe Luce's] *The Women*. Preston rewrote her rewrite, she rewrote him, and so on. The scene was one of Preston's many contributions toward focusing *Valley's* action and strengthening its plot." Subsequently Susann came to resent the many compliments that she got for this scene, "galled by the knowledge that it wasn't pure Susann being praised, but something that was at least one-third Preston and one-third Clare Boothe Luce."

Metallous is (in intention, at least) the more serious writer in these brief examples, while Susann stands out as a genius at self-promotion—a combination of tireless energy in interviews, correspondence, and telephoning, an uncanny ability in the art of selling, and full utilization of various practical stratagems (for example, personally signing every copy in a bookstore's stock—because autographed copies could not be returned to the publisher for a refund—and repeatedly buying up all copies in the specific stores whose sales were used in the weekly compilation of the best-seller lists). Regard-

less of their different interests and personalities, however, the two writers and their editors offer epitomizing instances of the collaborative production of books that, from a commercial point of view, were immensely successful.



2

What is more to the point of the present study is that these same collaborative methods have also been used in books that are not so successful commercially, and even in works that have canonical status in American fiction.⁷ For all their cultural impact—which includes attracting large numbers of people into bookstores for the first time in their lives and creating new readers of fiction who had never before managed to get all the way through a book—*Peyton Place* and *Valley of the Dolls* have no current status in the history of American fiction. *The Oxford Companion to American Literature* and the standard literary histories ignore their existence, and one has to go to side specialties and subfields like popular culture to learn about them. But the editors who reshaped and rewrote *Peyton Place* and *Valley of the Dolls* were operating in a by-then well-established tradition in which editors routinely initiated and effected major revisions, all the while professing to be no more than practical mechanisms serving to realize their authors' intentions. Maxwell Perkins was the best-known editor in this tradition—indeed, Don Preston, Geis's editor who revised *Valley of the Dolls*, had come from Louisville to New York in the early 1950s with dreams, as he said, of becoming "the next Maxwell Perkins"⁸—and probably Perkins has been the single greatest influence of the past half-century on the way editors have worked with authors.

Perkins, ambiguously called "editor of genius" by his biographer, A. Scott Berg,⁹ served as editor, ultimately vice president and editor-in-chief, of Charles Scribner's Sons from 1914 until his death in 1947, and was the promoter of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, and Thomas Wolfe, among principal figures of modern American literature, and fosterer of a considerable list of other notable writers, including Ring Lardner, J. P. Marquand, Will James, Douglas Southall Freeman, Morley Callaghan, S. S. Van Dine, Edmund Wilson, Erskine Caldwell, Marcia Davenport, Nancy Hale, Allen Tate, Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, Sherwood Anderson, Stark Young, Hamilton

Basso, Taylor Caldwell, Alan Paton, and James Jones. For some of these writers Perkins acted primarily as acquisitions editor (talent scout, recruiter, salesman of the special virtues of the House of Scribner), while for others he was father-confessor, psychiatrist, fishing and drinking companion, cheerleader, financial manager, legal consultant, publicist, even literary executor. For many of them he was also provider of subjects, themes, plots, and titles of their books, as well as astute critic (and sometimes line-by-line reviser) of the structures, characterizations, descriptions, dialogues, and much else comprising the substance of their writings.

Perkins's most publicized accomplishment, both at the time and more recently (in connection with a dispute over scholars' use of the Thomas Wolfe manuscripts at Harvard), was the virtual creation of *Look Homeward, Angel* (1929) and *Of Time and the River* (1935) out of huge masses of manuscript that Wolfe had brought him in despair. Wolfe was an author who could produce, seemingly effortlessly but in fact uncontrollably, immense quantities of prose—frequently ten or fifteen thousand words at a time describing a scene or a character's feelings—but who never developed any sense of organization, structure, plot, or (even though he began as a dramatist) dramatic effect, and was pathologically unwilling to discard anything he had written. The saddest fact about Wolfe as a writer was his inability to remedy these shortcomings even while his teachers, his friends, and finally his editors repeatedly pointed them out to him. His characteristic response to a request for cutting was to eliminate a hundred words in one place but then add a couple of thousand words in another; his characteristic response to the demand for more plot in his works, more action and reader interest, was instead to produce more pages of description and lyricism. Here, if ever, was a writer who needed editors.

Perkins's principal task in Wolfe's first two books—not unlike that, on a much smaller scale, done by Pound on Eliot's manuscripts for *The Waste Land*—was cutting. But he was also responsible for dividing Wolfe's manuscripts into separate books (it was all one novel, from Wolfe's point of view) and for much of the restructuring and line-by-line rewriting, which, toward the end of their "collaboration" (Wolfe's term), took place at Perkins's office in two- or three-hour sessions nightly, six or seven nights a week, for several months. Here, as an example of the scope and character of Perkins's ministrings, is a set of instructions that he drafted for initial work on a series of "scenes" that became part of *Of Time and the River*:

THINGS TO BE DONE IMMEDIATELY IN FIRST REVISION

1. Make rich man in opening scene older and more middle-aged.
2. Cut out references to previous books and to success.
3. Write out fully and with all the dialogue the jail and arrest scene.
4. Use material from *Man on the Wheel* and Abraham Jones for first year in the city and University scenes.
5. Tell the story of love affair from beginning to end describing meeting with woman, etc.
6. Intersperse jealousy and madness scenes with more scenes of dialogue with woman.
7. Use description of the trip home and the boom town scenes out of the *Man on the Wheel*. You can possibly use the trip home and boom town scene to follow on to the station scene. Play up desire to go home, feelings of homesickness and unrest and then develop idea that hometown has become unfamiliar and strange to him and he sees he can no longer live there.
8. Possible ending for book with return to the city, the man in the window scenes and the passages, "some things never change."
9. On the Night Scene which precedes the station scene, write out fully with all dialogue the episodes of night including the death in the subway scene.
10. Cut out reference to daughter.
11. Complete all scenes wherever possible with dialogue.
12. Fill in memory of childhood scenes much more fully with additional stories and dialogue.¹⁰

Wolfe had strong and conflicting feelings about the way his novels were produced. He dedicated *Of Time and the River* to Perkins with an inscription recognizing "the loyal devotion and the patient care which a dauntless and unshaken friend has given to each part of it, and without which none of it could have been written," and he publicly described their work together in a lecture at the University of Colorado in 1935 and again in expanded versions of the lecture published in the *Saturday Review* (December 1935) and in book form by Scribner's as *The Story of a Novel* (1936). Such acknowledgments, since they obviously signal growing doubts about his authorial identity, unquestionably were tied up with anger and resentment. Almost at the very time that he published *The Story of a Novel* he was also actively seeking a new publisher—to prove, the novelist Marcia Davenport recalls him telling her, "that he was not, as he claimed the literary world believed, the creature of Max Perkins."¹¹ In the event, he proved nothing of the sort. Upon leaving Scribner's and signing

with Harper's in December 1937, he unloaded his crates of manuscripts on his new editor, Edward Aswell, just as he had earlier on Perkins. Aswell, after Wolfe's death in September 1938, "shaped" several posthumous books out of the remaining manuscripts—*The Web and the Rock* (1939), *You Can't Go Home Again* (1940), and *The Hills Beyond* (1941).¹² Wolfe's stories and other short pieces in print had all along been quarried from his manuscripts, and freely revised, by his agent, Elizabeth Nowell. The fact is that every one of his published works was to some extent a collaborative production.

With none of his other authors was Perkins's cumulative contribution so extensive as his work with Wolfe, but he exerted significant influence in some of the same ways on hundreds of books that were published under his editorship. His extant letters in print and in the Scribner's archives at Princeton are full of routine suggestions for omitting material that seemed to him out of place or detrimental to reader interest—four chapters amounting to 15,000 words from E. H. Sothern's reminiscences published as *The Melancholy Tale of "Me"* (1916), for instance, and more than a third of the first part of Arthur Train's novel *The World and Thomas Kelly* (1917). On other occasions he would request additions rather than cuts—several further chapters in Edward Bok's *Twice Thirty* (1925), for example. He proposed the topics and stories for works as varied as John W. Thomason, Jr.'s *Jeb Stuart* (1930), Douglas Southall Freeman's *Robert E. Lee* (1934–35), Marjorie Rawlings's *The Yearling* (1938), and several tales by Will James; persuaded Ring Lardner to write the humorous introductions that made a best-seller out of his *How to Write Short Stories* (1924); devised, arranged, and sometimes titled numerous collections of short fiction (by Hemingway and Fitzgerald, among others); and gave S. S. Van Dine substantial help with the characterization of his enduring detective hero, Philo Vance. A number of his letters to authors are considerably longer and more detailed than the list quoted above that he made for Wolfe of "things to be done immediately" in revising the scenes for *Of Time and the River*.¹³ Berg describes "a series of letters, one of them thirty pages long" to Marcia Davenport about the manuscript of *The Valley of Decision* (1942):

He started at the beginning and picked out the most important story lines, those he felt should run through the entire novel; anything that weakened those strands had no business in the book. Ignoring Mrs. Davenport's divisions, he separated the novel into three major parts and told her the principal purpose of each. Then he provided an exten-

sive chapter-by-chapter breakdown, with detailed commentary. Finally, he clarified the characters for the author, sharpening their definition in short summaries of their traits—all this for a novel he was never quite sure would prove publishable.¹⁴

Perkins's efforts with Scott Fitzgerald include prompting the thorough rewriting of the manuscript of his first novel, *This Side of Paradise* (1920), with a change from first-person to third-person narrative; the toning down of a flippant speech about the Bible in his second, *The Beautiful and Damned* (1922); some changes in the characterization of the hero in his third, *The Great Gatsby* (1925); and a basic restructuring of the fourth, *Tender Is the Night* (1934), in a revised version that Fitzgerald intended for inclusion in Random House's Modern Library series (it was ultimately published by Scribner's, with a preface by Malcolm Cowley, in 1951).¹⁵ In the case of *Gatsby*, Perkins wrote to Fitzgerald on 20 November 1924, describing a series of "actual criticisms":

One is that among a set of characters marvelously palpable and vital . . . Gatsby is somewhat vague. The reader's eyes can never quite focus upon him, his outlines are dim. Now everything about Gatsby is more or less a mystery i.e. more or less vague, and this may be somewhat of an artistic intention, but I think it is mistaken. Couldn't *he* be physically described as distinctly as the others, and couldn't you add one or two characteristics like the use of that phrase "old sport",—not verbal, but physical ones, perhaps. . . .

The other point is also about Gatsby: his career must remain mysterious, of course. But in the end you make it pretty clear that his wealth came through his connection with Wolfsheim. . . . It did occur to me . . . that you might here and there interpolate some phrases, and possibly incidents, little touches of various kinds, that would suggest that he was in some active way mysteriously engaged. You do have him called on the telephone, but couldn't he be seen once or twice consulting at his parties with people of some sort of mysterious significance, from the political, the gambling, the sporting world, or whatever it may be. . . .

There is one other point: in giving deliberately Gatsby's biography when he gives it to the narrator you do depart from the method of the narrative in some degree. . . . I thought you might find ways to let the truth of some of his claims like "Oxford" and his army career come out bit by bit in the course of actual narrative.

Fitzgerald responded with gratitude ("Your criticisms were excellent & most helpful," "With the aid you've given me I can make 'Gatsby'

perfect") and also with lengthy lists of the revisions he had made in the proofs and the admission that "*I myself didn't know what Gatsby looked like or was engaged in & you felt it. . . . But I know now—and as a penalty for not having known first . . . I'm going to tell more.*"¹⁶ The remark of Madeleine Boyd, Wolfe's first literary agent, that Perkins was "the sole and only excuse . . . for Scott Fitzgerald having been successful as he is"¹⁷ is gross exaggeration, of course, but Perkins's influence has to be reckoned considerable nonetheless.

Throughout his career, Perkins professed a philosophy of editorial self-effacement, consistently maintaining, as he remarked to a group of extension students at New York University a year before he died, that "an editor does not add to a book. At best he serves as a handmaiden to an author. Don't ever get to feeling important about yourself, because an editor at most releases energy. He creates nothing." In his work with authors, Perkins told his wife, he wanted to be "a little dwarf on the shoulder of a great general advising him what to do and what not to do, without anyone's noticing."¹⁸ But these and similar comments may be as much smoke screen as pathology. Perkins actually did much more than release energy and whisper advice. His influence in the aggregate was pervasive: virtually none of his authors would have had the same careers without him, and it is possible that some of them, like Wolfe, would hardly have had published writing careers at all. There are today, of course, very few active students of Wolfe's artistry. But *Gatsby*, to refer back to the most recent example here, is currently the most widely read American novel in our colleges and universities. Some of the good effects of plot, characterization, and description that readers attribute to Fitzgerald were in fact partly the work of Perkins. The "little dwarf" unquestionably made permanent contributions to American literature.

3

After Perkins, probably the editor exerting the most influence on our major literature was Saxe Commins, who worked at Liveright from 1931 to 1933 and then at Random House from 1933 until his death in 1958. His authors include three Nobel Prize winners—Eugene O'Neill, Sinclair Lewis, and William Faulkner—as well as such varied types as S. N. Behrman, John O'Hara, James A. Michener, Budd Schulberg, Henry Steele Commager, Robinson Jeffers,

William Carlos Williams, W. H. Auden, Irwin Shaw, Walter Van Tilburg Clark, and Isak Dinesen.¹⁹

Commins was not above ghostwriting when he had to. He wrote each of the forewords signed by O'Neill in the twelve-volume Wilderness Edition of *The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*, published by Scribner's in 1934 and 1935, and was single-handedly responsible for virtually all of Parker Morell's biography of Lillian Russell—producing some 75,000 words in less than three weeks of April and May 1940—which he had been assigned to "whip into shape." More important, he frequently provided the same kind of page-by-page response to manuscripts that Perkins gave his authors, as in this 1958 commentary on a partial draft of Behrman's biography of Max Beerbohm, the work published after Commins's death as *Portrait of Max* (1960):

Page 1. It seems to me that much more can be made of Max's and Herbert's background by elaborating on Julius, Constantia, and Eliza, more or less as you did with the forebears of Duveen.

Also on this page, could there be a little expansion of Max's attitude toward the "theatrical columnists" and why he wouldn't deign to point his silver dagger at them?

Page 2. Would it be possible to convey a little of the prevailing atmosphere in America, particularly in Chicago, when Tree put on *An Enemy of the People*. Here Max's attitude toward his brother's showmanship is clear enough, but what about Herbert and the act he was putting on.

Page 3. Harry Paine's shot at Max suggests the reaction to "In Defense of Cosmetics," but do you give enough of the flavor of the essay itself to make the reader aware of what the shooting was all about?

Page 4. Would it be out of place to write in a sentence or two about *The Yellow Book*. It had quite a history. On this page you do give a little of the flavor of the essay, but I think it would profit by a few more comments almost in Max's own vein.

Page 5. The references to Scott Fitzgerald and Ned Sheldon are dangling in midair. Unless you specify some of the similarities I'm afraid the comparison will be lost. And why not more about Aubrey Beardsley? . . .

Commins's remarks continue at length, with questions and suggestions for most pages of the manuscript.²⁰

Commins's specialty was marathon sessions with his authors, frequently in his home in Princeton, New Jersey, in which editor and author would work together over a manuscript, line by line, for days

and even weeks until the project was perfected and ready for the printer. Faulkner, whom Commins edited from 1936 (the year of *Absalom, Absalom!*) through the middle of 1958 (when they were working on *The Mansion*, published in 1960), was one of several authors who regularly showed up for such sessions. Commins's wife provides a pleasant reminiscence of the two men making revisions in the first part of the manuscript of *The Town* (1957):

The two went off for an early walk. When they got back and had some coffee, Saxe extended the large oak table in the living room, which serves as a dining table as well. Saxe then brought in his brief bag, which contained what there was of the new Snopes manuscript, soon to be given the title *The Town*. The pages of the manuscript soon covered most of the table, leaving just enough room to make notes. Many pages were already spread on the floor. What a sight that was to see Bill [Faulkner] and Saxe on their knees, moving from one page to another, marking, deleting, transferring passages here and there!

Following lunch, Bill, at Saxe's suggestion, lay down for an hour's nap. Then, in the early twilight, they went for another short walk. When they returned, we had dinner, and after that the table was quickly cleared and the work resumed. I left the room as Saxe was going over a portion of the manuscript and Bill was sitting in his favorite spot near the fireplace. Suddenly I heard Saxe pound the table with his fist.

"Bill," he said, "this won't do! You've said it before! It's redundant, and you are only weakening your premise."

Bill didn't say a word. Later, when Saxe turned in for the night, he said to me, "I wish Bill had talked back to me. He could have said, 'Goddamnit, this is my book; I want it that way!' Instead, he just sat there with his pipe."

In the morning, when I went into the kitchen, I noticed that Bill had already had his coffee and toast and that in Saxe's place at the table there were four newly typed pages with the old version pinned underneath. Evidently Bill had stayed up half the night revising the pages. When Saxe read them, he was delighted.²¹

Perkins and Commins were clearly our most distinguished twentieth-century American editors, but numerous others have contributed to the tradition as well—for example, Harold Strauss (editor-in-chief at Covici-Friede and then Alfred A. Knopf), Henry W. Simon (vice president and senior editor at Simon and Schuster), John Farrar (editor and chairman of Farrar, Straus), Pascal Covici (editor at Viking), Burroughs Mitchell (a successor to Perkins at

Scribner's), William Targ (editor at World Publishing and G. P. Putnam's Sons), Betty A. Prashker (vice president and editor-in-chief at Crown Publishers), Samuel S. Vaughan (vice president and editor-in-chief at Doubleday), Faith Sale (a senior editor at Putnam's) and, to mention a trio of magazine editors, Harold Ross (of the *New Yorker* from 1925 to 1951), Ellery Sedgwick (of the *Atlantic Monthly* from 1908 to 1938), and Edward Weeks (Sedgwick's successor from 1938 to 1966).²²

Consider, as a representative recent example of the same editorial methods used by Perkins and Commins, this account from an interview with Helen Wolff, cofounder of Helen and Kurt Wolff Books, published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Wolff is describing her work on a book that had been commissioned on the strength of an outline and a sample chapter:

It sounded like a foolproof project, and the author had a considerable reputation. Everybody in our office was excited about it. With all this excitement, the contract was signed and a sizable advance agreed upon. The final manuscript, alas, did not live up to expectation and reputation. The treatment of a rich subject turned out to be skimpy, the facts alarmingly inaccurate, the general tone one of condescending flippancy. I showed it to a colleague who had originally been the most encouraging. His reaction was crushing: "Helen, you are in deep trouble." After I had absorbed the blow, my first step was to draw up a list, chapter by chapter, of what did not work. My second, to go to the author, rather than beg her to come to me. The bearer of bad news had better be considerate. Next, I asked the author to spend another six months on a book she had considered finished. She was virtually on her way to Europe, so this was quite a blow. I also suggested that we discuss each rewritten chapter as it came out of the typewriter. In one case, a chapter was expanded from four to twenty-four pages, giving it the integrity and substance it had lacked. As we worked together, I became aware of various strengths and weaknesses—no sense of place, a great sense of people. We proceeded to discard entire chapters that had never come to life. She added some that were more in tune with her gifts. In the meanwhile, facts and names were discreetly checked. My worry throughout was how to keep her spirits up, through the tedious process of rewriting. I can still see the stacks of manuscript, corrected in various inks, cut and pasted, shuffled, reshuffled, retyped. Maddening though the work was, I considered myself lucky. I was dealing with an intelligent, cooperative professional, not with a bundle of nerves. Eventually, this book was published, was widely and favorably reviewed, and more than earned its advance, which had caused me

many nightmares. The author and I still exchange sincerely amiable Christmas greetings.²³

An editor who gives this much help to an author is ultimately responsible for the difference between the existence and the nonexistence of a book. Small wonder that numerous authors and publishers (if not literary scholars) have recognized the central importance of editors to their success. For some time now, editors' names have been appearing on title pages—"A Helen and Kurt Wolff Book," or, in the especially appropriate instance of Scott Berg's biography of Max Perkins, "Thomas Congdon Books"—in a size of type equal to that of the publishers' imprint. And not surprisingly, authors have made crucial decisions in choosing publishers on the basis of their past or anticipated relationships with editors. Joseph Heller's move from Alfred A. Knopf to G. P. Putnam's Sons is a recent prominent example. When Robert Gottlieb, Heller's editor for *Catch-22* and other novels, left Knopf to become editor of the *New Yorker* in March 1987, several rival publishers approached Heller with offers for his works in progress. Heller, in signing a two-book contract with Putnam's for a new novel plus a sequel to *Catch-22*, chose Putnam's, as he told the *New York Times*, "because the price was right" but also because he had enjoyed working with one of Putnam's editors, Faith Sale, in a book of nonfiction published the preceding year. Sale, the *Times* explains, will edit both of Heller's new novels.²⁴

The one recurring oddity in all the evidence concerning their relationships with authors is the editors' continual insistence on the supreme importance of the author and the downplaying of their own contributions to the works in which they are, in fact, collaborators. I have already mentioned Perkins's concept of editorial self-effacement at the end of the preceding section. The same idea runs like a litany through Gerald Gross's *Editors on Editing*: "a book . . . is first and last the author's"; "the author is God"; "I don't believe that an editor's part in a book is a creative act. The writer performs that act"; "all credit belongs to the authors"; "[Maxwell Perkins would] probably be shocked to hear himself classified as a virtual co-writer"; "the final responsibility for the book is the author's. It's his idea, his baby"; "I see my role as helping the writer to realize his or her intention. . . . I never want the book to be mine"; "We believe that the editor has one primary responsibility, one loyalty, and that is to the *author's book*. . . . No editor should labor under the delusion that he or she is a collaborator"²⁵—all this from a group of professionals

who in other comments in the same collection make quite clear that they are themselves initiators of many of the subjects, themes, and plots of the books they work on and of revision and improvement in virtually every aspect of the writing. It would appear that the myth of the author's preeminence is strongly cherished by the very people who have the greatest knowledge of authors' failings and needs for assistance.

One could speculate at length about the psychology involved (the "pathological" self-effacement referred to earlier), but there is one obvious practical explanation for this reiterated party line. It is that editors *have* to say such things—in letters to authors and in public statements like those in Gross's collection—in order to appease the natural vanity of their authors. However moving their professions of gratitude (in dedications, prefaces, and other forms of acknowledgment), writers almost without exception resent the idea that other people are even partially responsible for the works supposed to be the products of their unique genius. An editor who made much of a claim as collaborator would very quickly find the authors giving their manuscripts to rival publishers. The fact is that authors themselves are among the most ardent believers in the myth of single authorship.



4

Many others besides editors working with authors have played a collaborative role in the creation of literary texts. There are, in the first place, editors *not* working with authors, as in posthumous books that are put into publishable shape from authors' incomplete manuscripts—for example, Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden* (1986), a novel produced by the Scribner's editor Tom Jenks, who combined parts of three manuscripts and reduced forty-eight chapters and 200,000 words to thirty chapters and 65,000 words (fewer than 250 printed pages), and Hermann Broch's *The Spell* (1987), a mingling of draft and revised text from two manuscripts that Broch left unfinished at his death in 1951. According to Scribner's "Publisher's Note" at the front of *The Garden of Eden*, "In preparing the book for publication we have made some cuts in the manuscript and some routine copy-editing corrections. Beyond a very small number of minor interpolations for clarity and consistency, nothing has been added. In every significant respect the work is all the author's." But

one critic who has compared the printed text with the manuscripts in the Kennedy Library, Boston, strongly disagrees:

Hemingway's publisher has committed a literary crime. . . . To paraphrase the publisher, in almost no significant respect is this book its author's. With all its disfigurements and omissions, its heightening of the trivial and its diminishment of the significant, its vulgarization of the great themes of Hemingway's final years, this volume is a travesty.²⁶

Literary agents have frequently assumed some of the same duties as editors, and usually for the same practical reasons. Elizabeth Nowell, Thomas Wolfe's agent for his short fiction, routinely revised and compressed the material that she quarried from his manuscripts and sent out to periodicals.²⁷ Ben Wasson, acting as Faulkner's agent for the manuscript of his third novel—the first of the series about Yoknapatawpha County—cut out some twenty thousand words, containing significant characters and incidents, to make the work acceptable by Harcourt, Brace, which published it as *Sartoris* in 1929. The uncut version, with Faulkner's original title, "Flags in the Dust," was finally published, again with editorial help and alterations, in 1973.²⁸

Publishers (where they can be considered independently of their editors) exert influence of all sorts. Richard Wright's best-selling *Black Boy* (1945) is merely a piece of the autobiography that Wright originally wrote; the drastically truncated version, with a new title and a different ending, was dictated and shaped by the directors of the Book-of-the-Month Club.²⁹ John Barth made major changes in the original version of his first novel, *The Floating Opera* (1956), to meet the demands of the publisher, Appleton-Century-Crofts.³⁰ In the American edition of Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, published in England in 1962, W. W. Norton purposely omitted the final chapter, an unconvincing (in the publisher's view) account of the formerly vicious protagonist's sudden acceptance of morality and social responsibility.³¹ And even before agents, publishers, and editors get their hands on the works, friends and colleagues also are frequent collaborators, as (to give but a single instance) in the well-known circumstance of Fitzgerald's persuading Hemingway to drop the first fifteen pages of the original opening of *The Sun Also Rises* (1926)—two chapters of meandering biographical background for Brett Ashley and some others ("careless & ineffectual," "flat as hell," "elephantine facetiousness," wrote Fitzgerald)—so that the

novel could instead begin with Jake Barnes's description of the antagonist, Robert Cohn.³²

In this final section I wish to develop briefly, as an epitomizing example, a case of collaborative authorship involving several kinds of helpers. The work in question is Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* (1900), drafted in the first place by Dreiser; revised at various stages by Dreiser's wife, Sara, his friend Arthur Henry, and Dreiser himself; and additionally altered by typists, editors, printers, and proof-readers in the usual processes of transcription and publication. The example is of special interest because of a scholarly controversy that has arisen as a consequence of the 1981 publication of a new edition of the work by the University of Pennsylvania Press.³³ The controversy concerns a number of issues, but the principal one comes down to the question: Which, of several recoverable versions, is the "real" *Sister Carrie*?

The novel, 557 pages long in the first edition, was produced in an amazingly short time.³⁴ Dreiser started drafting it, in pencil on coarse yellow half-sheets, in September 1899, continued through the middle of October, wrote some more between the middle of December and late January, resumed again in February and made steady progress until he reached, as he noted in the draft, "The End. / Thursday, March 29—1900—2.53 P.M." All told, he appears to have spent about five months writing the initial version. He began having his draft copied (by a typing agency) when he was three-fifths of the way through the work, and, because the typists quickly caught up with him, he had a complete typed version very soon after finishing the draft and thus was able to submit it to a publisher, Harper and Brothers, almost immediately, in early April. Harper rejected it three weeks later—because it was too long, was too realistic, and would not be sufficiently interesting to "the feminine readers who control the destinies of so many novels"—and then, after further revision and cuts in reaction to Harper's criticism, the work was submitted to Doubleday, Page and Company, in May. Doubleday's first reader, the novelist Frank Norris, responded enthusiastically, and Walter Hines Page, the junior partner of the firm, accepted the work in mid-June. In the following month the senior partner, Frank Doubleday, who had been abroad, returned to New York, read the typescript with dismay, and tried to get Dreiser to withdraw it. But Dreiser stood his ground, and the firm reluctantly went ahead; galleys and pages were ready in September, bound copies by late October, and official publi-

cation was on 8 November 1900—no more than fourteen months after Dreiser first inscribed his title, "Sister Carrie," at the top of a blank sheet of draft paper.

Dreiser's pencil manuscript, which is in the New York Public Library, and the typescript, which is in the Dreiser Collection of the University of Pennsylvania Library, tell us a great deal about the successive stages of revision; the differences between the typescript and the printed text of 1900, which was set from the typescript, constitute further material concerning changes that were introduced while the work was in press. Other hands than Dreiser's—the Pennsylvania editors refer to them as "nonauthorial" (pp. 577, 578, 580)—helped shape the text almost from the beginning. When Dreiser finished the first three chapters, he handed them over to his wife for comments, criticism, and polishing, and then to Arthur Henry for further improvements. Thereafter, he routinely gave his draft to both of them for revision and editing. As the Pennsylvania editors point out,

This practice was by now habitual: during his apprentice years as a newspaper reporter, Dreiser had become accustomed to working with copy-editors and rewrite men, and he had never developed much sensitivity about his prose. He had always been a poor speller and an indifferent grammarian; Jug [Sara Dreiser's nickname], who knew the mechanics of the language from her teaching days, could correct demonstrable errors in his drafts. Henry's function was different; he was a published author with some feeling for the style and rhythm of English prose, and Dreiser allowed him to identify and revise awkward spots in the drafts. The manuscript of *Sister Carrie* therefore exhibits, in nearly every chapter, markings by both Jug and Henry. (p. 507)

The typists, who regularly added punctuation in the next manuscript version, were also responsible for substantive changes in places where they misread the original wording and Dreiser, in the process of correcting and revising, repaired the mistake by inventing new text rather than checking the draft for what he had written in the first place. Sara Dreiser and Arthur Henry continued their revising in the typescript, the former mainly attending to mechanics, factual details, the reduction of colloquialisms, and the censoring of overly physical description, the latter concerning himself with the improvement of style and syntax and the elimination of wordiness. Dreiser was also an active reviser in the typescript, sometimes rewriting in response to markings by his wife or Henry, sometimes adding and changing on his own.

When it was determined that the novel had to be cut and cleaned up (probably, as the Pennsylvania editors assume, in response to the rejection by Harper), Dreiser got Henry to do a preliminary marking of block cuts—for example, minute analyses of the heroine's thoughts, lengthy philosophical passages, factual details about the principal cities in the book, and passages of sexually offensive material—and Dreiser followed Henry's suggestions, eliminating some 36,000 words.³⁵ Other alterations were blue-penciled in the typescript by someone at Doubleday, Page—mostly the fictionalizing of real names and removal of profanity—and still more changes were made in response by Dreiser and Henry, including the addition of titles for the fifty chapters. And then numerous further revisions were introduced at proof-stage—corrections and tidying by Dreiser and his wife, additional censorings by the publisher. This elaborate process of revision, pretty much continual from September 1899 through September 1900, took more than twice as long as the original drafting.

The Pennsylvania editors present all this information with admirable clarity and an abundance of supporting detail, taking special pains to emphasize that Dreiser was an active collaborator in the revisions, that he seems to have fully approved of the help he was getting, and that he never, during the forty-five years that he lived after the original publication of *Sister Carrie*, attempted to restore any of his original text in place of the revisions, even though he retained a manuscript version (the much revised typescript) almost to the end of his life. How strange, then, in view of their command of the facts, that the Pennsylvania editors should choose Dreiser's pencil draft—and especially a hypothetical state of the draft *before* Dreiser's wife and Henry began marking it—as the base-text for their new edition.

In fact there are four, and only four, actually existing versions of *Sister Carrie* that have theoretical claims to be considered authoritative: the final text of the pencil draft, extant in New York; the final text of the typescript, extant in Philadelphia; and the texts of the first edition, published by Doubleday, Page in 1900—the direct or indirect source of all subsequent printings before the Pennsylvania edition in 1981—and the abridgment of the Doubleday edition published by Heinemann in 1901. These are authoritative in the general sense that Dreiser (with his helpers) actively produced the first three and approved the production of the fourth; the typescript could be considered more authoritative than the draft, on the grounds that it was intended to supersede an earlier, inferior version, and the earliest

printed texts could be considered more authoritative than the typescript on similar grounds, with the addition that Dreiser certainly wanted the novel to appear as a published book (and, in the case of the 1901 abridgment, hoped to make some money from British royalties). I specify "final text" for the two manuscripts because it is both theoretically and practically impossible to prove that any combination of earlier readings recoverable from one or the other manuscript ever actually existed together as a textual entity. The revising was carried on as a continual process in both manuscripts, with the text of any given part always in a more advanced or less advanced state of revision than the text of some other parts (until the revising was finally concluded, that is), and thus the reconstituting of a *single* earlier state of manuscript text can be only a hypothetical ideal, like the flat map of the entire world included in geography books or, to offer a homelier comparison, an account of how a person *would* have been dressed had he (or she) not made a great many changes of intention in the process of putting on the separate items of clothing one after another.

The Pennsylvania editors know all this. Their text, they boast, "is much more than a new version of the novel. It is in fact a new work of art, heretofore unknown" (p. 532). But tied as they are to the then-prevailing "modern copy-text principles of scholarly editing," by which they mean the theory of W. W. Greg as publicized and developed by Fredson Bowers,³⁶ they are obligated to choose an extant manuscript over an early printed version for their copy-text, and (carrying the theory to an extreme) a less revised early manuscript over a more revised later one—and thus are obligated to construct an eclectic text on the basis of Dreiser's pencil draft:

The selection of copy-text for *Sister Carrie* is simple. Dreiser's manuscript of the novel automatically becomes the base text for this edition. No other choice is possible: the typescript was corrupted by Anna Mallon's typists and was revised and cut by Sara Dreiser and Arthur Henry. The first printing was further flawed by editorial interference and censoring by Doubleday, Page and Company. Only the manuscript preserves the original text of *Sister Carrie*, the text that was most nearly under Dreiser's complete control. A further distinction must be made, however: copy-text for the Pennsylvania *Sister Carrie* is the original form of the manuscript *before* Jug and Henry made revisions in it. Some of their changes have been accepted into the text of this edition, but for theoretical reasons the copy-text must be defined as Dreiser's original manuscript, before nonauthorial alterations were introduced. (pp. 577–78)

The result is indeed a "new" *Sister Carrie*, one that rejects not only the factual, stylistic, and narrative changes initiated by Sara Dreiser and Henry but also Dreiser's revised ending of the novel, his and Henry's chapter titles, and the block cuts made by Henry and approved by Dreiser. In this expanded form, now some 36,000 words longer than the version that for eighty years was our standard, *Sister Carrie* is, in the editors' opinion, "a more somber and unresolved work of art . . . [in which] the characters assume the original clarity of the artist's design," "infinitely richer, more complex, and more tragic than it was before" (pp. ix, 532). Such opinion is highly subjective, of course. One disapproving reviewer, describing the Pennsylvania methods as "a superficial editorial romanticism," pronounces the new text "principally longer, more cumbersome, and more explicit, with some of its explicitness . . . running counter to Dreiser's final sense of his characters' natures."³⁷

There are several controversial features of the Pennsylvania edition (one could, taking sides, call them faults), not least of which is the arbitrariness with which the editors accept or reject individual revisions according to their conjectures about Dreiser's involvement in them or their critical assessment of the artistic or logical appropriateness of the readings. While totally opposed to the "nonauthorial" interference of Sara Dreiser, Henry, and the publisher, the editors are themselves at least equally nonauthorial in *their* interference, with the rather conspicuous difference that Dreiser was alive and in a position to work with his contemporary "nonauthors" but is totally removed from the possibility of influencing this posthumous picking and choosing.

I have already commented on the impossibility of extracting a "purified" Dreiser from the ongoing process constituted by the successive manuscripts and the first printings. The resulting distortion—the Pennsylvania text—is similar to what might result if we tried to separate Mill from the collaborative enterprise represented by the early draft of the *Autobiography*, as described in Chapter 3. At any specific point we can demonstrate, or surmise, that Mill or Dreiser did such-and-such, but it would be quite wrong, and accord with no one's intention (save, perhaps, the intention of some modern editor), to claim that an aggregate of such pieces of information is the equivalent of a onetime extant text. As a work of textual investigation, providing an immense collection of facts about the manuscripts, composition, revision, printing, and publication of *Sister Carrie*, the Pennsylvania edition is an invaluable contribution. But its text, an essentially fanciful construct, bears little relation to that mass of textual information.

Perhaps the greatest cause for concern is the likelihood that the Pennsylvania *Sister Carrie* will permanently replace the hitherto standard text, based on the first printed edition, and that Dreiser's reputation (as principal author) and the place of the novel in the history of American fiction will be diminished accordingly. Donald Pizer and others have contrasted the 1900 *Sister Carrie*'s status as historical artifact—the version that challenged, entertained, and influenced readers at the time and for the next eight decades and that put Dreiser, as it were, among the American novelists—with the Pennsylvania text's lack of this same kind of historical validity (it has its own historical status, of course, as an example of late-twentieth-century application of Greg-Bowers textual theory!). But the problem transcends historical considerations and is much like the textual primitivists' inadvertent standardizing of Wordsworth's early texts that I discussed in Chapter 4. The Pennsylvania text has already been reprinted in the Penguin American Library edition (also 1981) and may very well become the text regularly used by readers and students from now on. Just as in the case of the unwary reader happening upon an unpolished and undistinguished version of a famous poem in the Cornell Wordsworth, the innocent seeker of *Sister Carrie* may wonder how Dreiser—all the more clumsy and long-winded in the Pennsylvania text—got to be such a big name in American literature. Somebody, this innocent seeker may think privately, should have helped Dreiser revise his prose!

8

Plays and Films: *Authors, Auteurs, Autres*

In general, plays and films are by nature more explicitly collaborative than any of the other kinds of production discussed so far in this book. They are *literally* “show business” and, as such, have to sell to audiences or they go out of existence. They involve many more people and much greater expense than books, and require the commitment of investors who expect a profit. And not only does it take enormous numbers of people to create plays and films (agents, studio executives, producers, directors, writers, actors, designers, stage and camera technicians, editors, publicists and marketing executives, to name some of the large groups who may be responsible to the backers of the enterprise), but there are potential conflicts of interest and authority among them at every crucial moment of production.

There is also the circumstance that plays and films are far more flexible than books in their processes of taking shape. A play is rehearsed for a period of trial-and-error experimentation and then, if it succeeds to the next level of production, may be performed repeatedly over months, years, or even (in the case of classics, standard repertory pieces, and revivals) centuries. Audience reactions can be (and sometimes actually are) monitored on a daily basis, and numerous revisions can be introduced in response to them. Films might be thought to be less pliable in this respect, but there is continual editing and reediting during production, and changes may be made at many different stages in response to preview audiences, rating agencies, influential reviews, and trends at the box office, not to mention the whims of producers, directors, actors, and the rest of the numerous company.

In their character as extreme types of multiple authorship, however, plays and films are theoretically different from one another in an important respect. In plays the “author” is still considered to be—

just as with poems, autobiographies, novels, and the rest of the written genres—the principal *named* writer of the work; while in films, at least for the last quarter of a century, the “author,” to the extent that there has been a need for one, has more often been identified with the director rather than with any of the actual writers. In plays, therefore, all the collaborators are (or may be thought to be) collaborating with the named author who wrote the work in the first place; in films, the collaborators are usually considered to be working with the director.

Since so much of the collaborative nature of plays and films is already well known—from the extraordinary spate of popular and academic books during the past two decades, as well as newspaper and magazine articles and behind-the-scenes television documentaries about the creation of successful works—I shall provide just a handful of representative examples to make my points.

1

It may be difficult to believe, given our long familiarity with the major writers of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century British drama, that the first playbill identifying the author of a play performed in England dates from March 1699, a full century after Shakespeare was at the height of his powers.¹ In fact, however, ordinary playgoers of the seventeenth century had no more notion of dramatic authorship than we have today when we turn on the television to watch “L.A. Law” or “thirtysomething.” Frequently playgoers did not even know the title of the play they were attending; they simply went to the playhouse to see a spectacle or a story (often both) and be entertained. The idea of the sacredness of an individual author’s text was as yet unknown, and nothing in either law or sentiment stood in the way of adapting, cutting, rearranging, and even massive rewriting in the interests of spectacle, story, and entertainment. Adapting, cutting, and rewriting were, therefore, frequent and widespread.

Consider the numerous changes made over the years in the acting texts of Shakespeare, who for the last two centuries has perfunctorily been ranked as our most esteemed writer in English. Probably the best-known alteration of a Shakespeare play is Nahum Tate’s adaptation of *King Lear*, first performed in 1680 or 1681, a version in which more than a thousand of Shakespeare’s lines are omitted, most of the remaining two thousand lines are revised and flattened, Lear’s Fool is

entirely excised, Cordelia and Edgar are made lovers, Edmund’s villainy is expanded to include an attempted rape of Cordelia, and the story ends happily with the defeat of Lear’s enemies, the retirement of Lear and Gloucester (who also survives in this version) “to some cool cell,” and the marriage of Cordelia and Edgar: “Our drooping country now erects her head,” says Edgar in the final speech, “Peace spreads her balmy wings, and Plenty blooms.”² Tate, as he explains in his dedication of the published text in 1681, viewed the original play as “a heap of jewels, unstrung and unpolished”; his aim was “to rectify what was wanting in . . . regularity and probability.” In general, the critics have roundly condemned Tate’s “rectification”: “ribald trash,” according to Charles Lamb, in his famous essay “On the Tragedies of Shakspeare”; “notorious vandalization,” in the words of a reviewer in the *New York Times* 175 years later, when it was revived (in a further freewheeling adaptation) by the Riverside Shakespeare Company in March 1985.³ Yet Tate’s was the *standard* version of “Shakespeare’s” play for nearly 160 years, from the 1680s through the 1830s, the very period in which Shakespeare rose to his present eminence among the major British writers. And Tate’s liberties, in the long history of collaborative Shakespeare performance, are just the tip (perhaps one should say the bottom) of the iceberg.⁴

Sir William Davenant, said to have been Shakespeare’s godson, played a chief role in the “improving” of Shakespeare. As director of the Duke’s Men when theatrical performances were resumed with the restoration of Charles II in 1660, Davenant built in Lincoln’s Inn Fields the first theater ever to have a scene house with proscenium arch and grooves for movable painted scenery. Originally, of course, Shakespeare’s plays were performed entirely without scenery. Davenant’s new design not only initiated the use of scenery but made possible increasingly elaborate and sensational visual displays, including machines that allowed characters (witches in *Macbeth*, spirits in *The Tempest*) to fly through the air. Ultimately it led to the suppression of some of Shakespeare’s best descriptive writing (the logical result of *showing* a scene rather than depicting it via speech).

Davenant was busy also in “reforming” and “making fit” the individual plays, as in his adaptations of *Macbeth* and (with Dryden) *The Tempest* in the mid-1660s. His *Macbeth* introduces a ghost of Duncan to balance the ghost of Banquo, builds up the role of Lady Macduff as foil to Lady Macbeth, and, in pursuing an ideal of strict logic, does away with much of Shakespeare’s distinctive poetic language. Davenant’s Lady Macbeth enjoins her husband to “Bring . . .

your courage to the fatal place" (instead of "screw your courage to the sticking place"); his sleep "locks up the senses from their care" (instead of "knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care"); and in the "To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow" speech, Shakespeare's "petty pace" becomes "stealing pace," "last syllable" becomes "last minute," and "The way to dusty death" becomes "To their eternal homes":

To-morrow, to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in a stealing pace from day to day,
To the last minute of recorded time,
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
To their eternal homes.⁵

The Davenant–Dryden *Tempest* likewise gave the audience new scenes, characters, and speeches, and a host of stage effects that not even Prospero's magic could accomplish.

Thomas Shadwell redid *Timon of Athens* (adding a love story); Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida* (turning Cressida into a romantic victim of circumstances); and Otway, *Romeo and Juliet* (emphasizing politics rather than the lovers' tragedy)—all in the late 1670s—and Colley Cibber rewrote *Richard III* (with seven additional soliloquies for the villainous principal) in 1700. Cibber's *Richard* continued to be staged well into the twentieth century and influenced (and provided part of the text of) Laurence Olivier's film of the play in 1955. There is even report of a *Romeo and Juliet* with a happy ending.⁶ Because women were now (since 1660) allowed to act on the stage, virtually all these Shakespeare adaptations had both new and much expanded female roles. And early Shakespeare scholarship introduced yet another form of collaborative improvement when Nicholas Rowe, in the first *edited* text of the plays (1709), divided the works into acts and scenes and added stage directions.

Needless to say, these and other seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century adaptations, the calculated product of the new tastes and technologies of their age, had the effect of driving (or keeping) the originals off the stage. Much of the history of Shakespeare performance in the nearly three centuries that followed—right up to our own time—is an account of professed attempts, and conspicuous failures, to restore the "true" Shakespeare to the stage. David Garrick, for example, the most influential actor–producer of the eighteenth century, claimed to stage *Macbeth*, *Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and

other plays "as written by Shakespeare" and yet, along with some partial restorations, made nearly as many changes as Davenant and the rest of the adapters had in the century just preceding. John Philip Kemble, presiding at Drury Lane in the last two decades of the eighteenth century and at Covent Garden in the first two of the nineteenth, had a reputation for scholarly accuracy in his productions but nevertheless restaged Tate's, Garrick's, and other adaptations, making his own contributions in such matters as historical costumes and stage architecture. Later in the nineteenth century, William Charles Macready advertised his efforts to "restore the true text" of Shakespeare and managed to get rid of many of the lines added by previous adapters, but, as Charles Shattuck describes it, the *Lear* that he produced was hardly closer to Shakespeare's than Tate's had been:

His *King Lear*, which he brought out in 1838, contained no Tate, but only two-thirds of Shakespeare. He suppressed all lines which he thought unintelligible or sacrilegious or obscene. He suppressed the blinding of Gloucester, which would have been too painful for his audience to endure, and Gloucester's attempt to leap from the cliff, which probably seemed too eccentric and possibly comic. He almost suppressed the Fool, fearing that it would "weary or annoy or distract the spectator," but a few weeks before the opening his stage manager convinced him that this "fragile, hectic, beautiful-faced, half-idiot-looking boy" (so Macready conceived the Fool) might be realized if a woman played it. Accordingly the role was stripped of all its indelicacies and most of its comic touches and assigned to Priscilla Horton, whose Fool was all tenderness and pathos.⁷

After Macready came "the Fechter method" (Charles Albert Fechter's turning Hamlet and Othello into Pickwickians in 1861), "spectacular" Shakespeare (later nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century productions by Henry Irving and Beerbohm Tree in which the texts had to be rearranged and cut drastically to allow time for changing the elaborate scenery), and, especially in our own century, all varieties of modern-dress Shakespeare (Hamlet in a dinner jacket, for example), "stunts-and-games" Shakespeare (*All's Well* as a comic strip, *Troilus and Cressida* as a version of the American Civil War), and downright silly Shakespeare (the zany *Hamlet* productions of Charles Marowitz and Joseph Papp). In the summer of 1989, a "star-studded" Papp production of *Twelfth Night* featured a tap-dancing Gregory Hines and Jeff Goldblum playing Malvolio as a human fly.

These details could be multiplied and elaborated at great length,

but this sketchy recital should suffice as a reminder that "Shakespeare" on the stage has been a collaborative enterprise for the last three and a half centuries. The real (historical) Shakespeare supplied plots, characters, speeches, and descriptions; and subsequent playwrights, producers, directors, designers, actors, screenwriters, and the rest have made free use of these initial materials in works that bear the same titles as Shakespeare's plays and are usually presented with some mention of Shakespeare's authorship (though occasionally with an acknowledgment of collaboration in the credits, as in the 1929 film of *The Taming of the Shrew* "Written by William Shakespeare with additional dialogue by Sam Taylor").⁸ But the works are not purely Shakespeare's any more than Shakespeare's original plays are equatable with the sources that we know Shakespeare drew on for his plots, characters, speeches, and descriptions. This is just as it should be in the performing arts, where the achievement often lies as much in the performance as in the text or score. Nobody should be surprised or alarmed by these manifestations of jointly authored "Shakespeare."

But what about the plays in Shakespeare's own time? Virtually all studies of the authorship of works written for commercial entertainment in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theaters emphasize the prevalence of collaborative authorship.⁹ Cyrus Hoy's seven-part analysis of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon, for example, demonstrates that Beaumont and Fletcher together wrote fewer than twelve of the fifty-two plays in the canon, and that most of the rest are joint efforts of Fletcher with many other colleagues (including Philip Massinger, Nathan Field, William Rowley, Thomas Middleton, and James Shirley).¹⁰ And G. E. Bentley, in his study of playwriting from 1590 to 1642, marshals abundant evidence from theater records, title pages, prefaces, and commendatory verses to support his contention that "as many as half of the plays by professional dramatists in the period incorporated the writing at some date of more than one man."¹¹ Philip Henslowe's diary (an account of financial transactions involving several companies) repeatedly records payments to two, three, four, and even five persons for the writing of a single play, and there are numerous entries of payments for rewriting, "mending," and adding to plays after they were initially purchased. A frequent practice of joint authorship was dividing up the work by individual acts; the commonest types of revision were cuts and other changes for the original production made by the prompter or "book-holder" of the company and then additions (new scenes, songs, prologues, and epilogues) made in connection with the revival of plays.¹²

Documentary evidence of this sort of collaboration is generally lacking for Shakespeare himself, who did not write for any of the companies financed by Henslowe. Still there are persuasive arguments for the likelihood of other hands besides Shakespeare's in *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Henry VIII*, *Pericles*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, among others, and of Shakespeare's hand in the complexly authored *Booke of Sir Thomas More*.¹³ Twenty-five of Shakespeare's plays show evidence of having undergone revision, and it is by no means certain that Shakespeare himself was the reviser in every instance.¹⁴ And then there is the collaborative character of Shakespeare's own interactions with his sources—North's translation of Plutarch, Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Arthur Brooke's poem on Romeo and Juliet, romances by Lodge and Greene, tales by Boccaccio and Cinthio, and the rest of the array collected and pored over by specialists. We do not regularly think of Shakespeare as a reviser of other men's works, but in some parts of his plays he is as much an adapter of earlier material as Davenant, Tate, and Cibber, in their day, were of Shakespeare, or as modern screenwriters are of the novels and plays they turn into films.

What is most to the point, as Bentley emphasizes throughout his study, is simply that Shakespeare's professional activity was by nature a collaborative enterprise involving, just as dramatic production does today, the cooperation of writers, directors (in the early form of prompters and theater managers), actors, musicians, costumers, and even audiences. Authors wrote their plays with clear ideas of the number, types, and capabilities of the specific actors in their company, the size and design of the specific theater in which they worked, and, not least, the expectations of the audiences who would pay money to see the plays. Concerning this last, Alfred Harbage, who devoted a long career to the study of Elizabethan theaters and audiences, opens one of his late essays with these striking sentences: "Shakespeare's plays would not have been enjoyed if they had offended the moral and religious sentiments prevailing in the audience for which they were designed. A basic conformity with the current system of values must be assumed."¹⁵ Understandably, no one in the interim has taken up the challenge to write a book titled *Shakespeare the Conformist*. But Harbage's words underscore the fact that Shakespeare as a professional dramatist could never in any practical sense have worked separately from the rest of the people on whom his effectiveness and success depended.

For the collaborative character of modern play production, where information is much more plentiful, consider the examples of Tom Stoppard's *Travesties*, first staged in London in the summer of 1974, and William Gibson's *Two for the Seesaw*, which opened in Washington and then went on to Philadelphia and New York in the winter of 1957/58. In the one instance, the writer accepted and responded to the help of his collaborators as a matter of course; in the other instance, the writer hated what was done to his play and wrote a passion-filled book to complain about it.

We have a sizable body of details about the production of Stoppard's *Travesties* because Philip Gaskell used the play as one of twelve chapter-long examples in his 1978 book, *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method*. For each of the first eleven examples, which range from Sir John Harington's translation of *Orlando furioso* (1591) to Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), Gaskell describes the principal manuscripts and printed texts, gives us the circumstances of composition, transmission of text, and publication, and then considers how the work might best be presented in a modern edition. For *Travesties*, Gaskell's main materials are Stoppard's "original script" of the play (actually a revised draft as fair-copied by a typing agency), a tape recording of a complete performance that Gaskell made toward the end of the first London run (24 July 1974), and the "reading" text that Stoppard published as a book in the spring of 1975. In addition, Gaskell made another recording of a performance during the second London run the following year (13 September 1975) and got further information from Stoppard himself concerning the New York production of the play in 1975 and 1976.¹⁶

After drafting and revising the script on his own, Stoppard attended rehearsals and worked with the director and the actors in making changes, which Gaskell describes as "both major and minor," to arrive at an acceptable performance text. During nine "preview" performances, further changes, partly suggested by audience response, were incorporated by agreement among author, director, and the actors. By the time that Gaskell took his first recording of the play, the text was of course considerably altered from the original script that Stoppard had handed to the company. The version that Stoppard published in 1975—"his own preferred text of *Travesties*, the version that he would like to have performed by an ideal cast," as Gaskell relates the author's comments—is yet another version, agree-

ing in some parts with the original script, in other parts with the changes introduced in the performance text, and embodying further revisions not in any of the previous texts.

The version that Gaskell taped from the second run of the play, a year later, was a version closer to the first performance text than to the published reading text, but there were, as one would expect, new changes (including the deletion of four-fifths of a lengthy political lecture at the beginning of act 2) and some additional dialogue. (Gaskell observes that unless Stoppard publishes a revised reading text, these later changes will be lost in future productions, which will have *only* the published text of 1975 to work with.) Finally, still other major changes were made for the New York production of 1975 and 1976, including a five-minute cut from act 1 to accommodate what Stoppard calls (in a letter to Gaskell) "Broadway Bladder."

At the end of his discussion, Gaskell comments on "the remarkable flexibility of the performance text when the author collaborates in the production" and the "interesting implications in all this" concerning the author's intentions and the question of what constitutes "the text of this or any other play." It would appear that Stoppard, at least, is not much worried by these questions. Asked in a June 1974 interview whether he ever felt "a conflict between literary and theatrical pressures," Stoppard replied:

I realized quite a long time ago that I was in it because of the theatre rather than because of the literature. I like theatre, I like showbiz, and that's what I'm true to. . . . I think it's vital that the theatre is run by people who like showbiz. "If a thing doesn't work, why is it there in that form?" is roughly the philosophy, and I've benefited greatly from [the director] Peter Wood's down-to-earth way of telling me, "Right, I'm sitting in J 16, and I don't understand what you're trying to tell me. It's not clear." There's none of this stuff about "When Faber and Faber bring it out, I'll be able to read it six times and work it out for myself." Too late.

Stoppard goes on to credit the director with "actually sav[ing] the play. The speech in which Joyce justifies his art wasn't in the text of *Travesties* that I gave to Peter. It was he who said it was necessary, and I now think it's the most important speech in the play."¹⁷

By contrast, William Gibson, characterizing himself as "an author who . . . had devoted an obstinate quarter of a century to an avoidance of collaborators," was frustrated by virtually every aspect

of the staging of his *Two for the Seesaw*. He offers his chronicle of the production, drafted in log form while the events were occurring, as an account of the conditions under which plays in general (and not just his in particular) were being produced in the middle of the twentieth century. It is above all, he says, a record of "harass[ment] by the complexities of group action."¹⁸

Actually, although Gibson is curiously insensitive to this point, "group action" began during his very earliest attempts at composition, when he read each scene, as it was written, to his wife and some friends (one of whom, Arthur Penn, became director of the play) and then made deletions and revisions in draft after draft in response to their criticisms. When he had a complete manuscript, he read the play to a dozen people in New York—his lawyer and agent, among others—and read it twice again, in successive revisions, to gatherings of friends at home. He also, seeking further reactions, sent a dozen copies to friends and associates around the country. Altogether, the process of writing and trial-and-error revision lasted for three years before his agent secured a producer and the play was headed for what Gibson calls, in retrospect, "the collaborative gluepot of the theater" (p. 22).

Two for the Seesaw has only two characters, who were played in the initial run by Henry Fonda and Anne Bancroft. One of Gibson's first tasks in the group effort was to rewrite the man's part, expanding it by half an hour's worth of new lines, in order to get Fonda to do the role. Thereafter, in rehearsals, Gibson and Fonda wrangled endlessly about the character and his lines. Fonda claimed not to be able to understand the role, thought that it had "too many complexes," and insisted on playing it "his way," which Gibson describes as "slickly amiable"; "what struck my eye," he says of Fonda's simplification, "was how much of what I conceived as the play's innards was not on the stage. . . . the darker material was not being acted" (pp. 40, 42). Rewriting the character to fit the actor amounted to "wrecking the structure of the play" (p. 45).

Much of Gibson's complaint here stems from his notion that "serious" art and theatrical "entertainment" are fundamentally at odds; "the theater . . . was primarily a place not in which to be serious, but in which to be likeable" (pp. 94, 140). The opening of the play in Washington was a "rendezvous with still another, final, and most implacable collaborator, the paying audience" (p. 52). When producer and director insisted on further rewriting of the man's part because it "could not hold the audience unless it were made more

appealing," Gibson acceded, but felt that he had "crossed a line between two worlds of writing: henceforth material was to be shaped less by what I had to say than by what the audience would listen to" (pp. 64–65). Every audience in the early performances "was watched like a multi-headed behemoth; when spellbound it was soundless, when not it rustled its scaly fabrics and emitted little coughs, striking terror to our hearts; and those moments were without exception changed. I often wished it would cough itself to death" (p. 84).

Because he is all on the side of serious art, he is unconsoled by the success of the play, which included rave reviews from the New York critics and sale of the film rights for \$600,000 plus a percentage of the gross. "The play grew more and more effective, and I felt less fulfilled as a writer"; the fact was "unblinkable, after such reviews, that the hammering my script and head had undergone at the hands of [the director, the producer, and Fonda] had issued in a much better play"; "I was ungratified by the compliments on the writing, as though I had won a beauty contest by appearing in a falseface . . . a rich thing but not mine own" (pp. 85, 101, 139).

This is not exactly emotion recollected in tranquillity; Gibson makes no attempt to hide his resentment. But even though he is a biased reporter—perhaps because he is one—Gibson gives us little reason to doubt that his chronicle is a reasonably accurate picture of play production in recent decades. Toward the end of his account there is a striking contrast between the feverish activity, confusion, instability, and disgruntlement behind the scenes and the expertly smooth and coherent performance that the reviewers admired out front. In the reviewers' descriptions, the play is a tidy whole made up of several discrete and smoothly articulated units: Gibson's script (as if he had submitted it by mail from his home in Massachusetts); Arthur Penn's directing (as if he had dropped in one afternoon to give advice); Fonda's and Bancroft's acting; George Jenkins's settings; and so on.¹⁹ There appears to be very little understanding of (or interest in) the *processes* of interaction leading up to the performance that they saw and enjoyed so much.

Possibly there is a lesson in this for academic critics, who, like Gibson, are also usually on the side of serious art and tend to write their interpretations as if the texts under scrutiny existed in some fixed, definitive form from the very beginning. The lesson is that, because the product comes to us as a whole entity, we have mistakenly assumed that it was created whole in the first place. In other words, the mythic author is a projection from the text that we see or

read, rather than a historical reality. To the extent that we wish to focus only on the formal whole, therefore, we should probably omit references to the author altogether!

3

Woody Allen, who undoubtedly would sympathize with Gibson's lament over loss of authorial control in *Two for the Seesaw*, is our most conspicuous example of successful single-author creativity in present-day American filmmaking. Allen is consistently the self-conscious artist and is on record, in a recent piece inveighing against colorization (or "color conversion") of black-and-white films, as believing "that no one should ever be able to tamper with any artist's work in any medium against the artist's will."²⁰ Like others in the business, Allen has his team of actors and technicians, but his position as triple threat in most of his films—writer, director, and principal actor—guarantees him a high degree of artistic control over the work; in a sense, he is a collaborator with himself. Earlier examples of such comprehensive artistic activity readily come to mind—Charles Chaplin in this country, Jacques Tati in France, Federico Fellini in Italy, Ingmar Bergman (Allen's principal model) in Sweden—and there have been many films over the years in which the same person is both writer and director (a recent instance is James L. Brooks's *Broadcast News*, which won the New York Film Critics' award for best film of 1987).

As a rule, however, the authorship of films is so complicated and diffuse as to be, for all practical purposes, unassignable. Take as a typical case *Yankee Doodle Dandy*, the life story of the Broadway showman George M. Cohan produced for Warner Brothers by Hal B. Wallis in 1942. The first screenwriter on the project was Robert Buckner, who dug into clippings, reviews, and profiles of Cohan, as well as Cohan's published autobiography. Cohan himself, then in his sixties, early became a collaborator, specifying a long list of things to be left unmentioned, dictating the story line, and responding with suggestions and revisions to a succession of drafts by Buckner. The writers Julius and Philip Epstein were brought in to enliven Buckner's script, and Edmund Joseph to tinker and add some jokes. Both the leading actor, James Cagney, and the director, Michael Curtiz, rewrote dialogue and improvised stage business during the shooting. At the end, however, only two of these half-dozen or more contributors

appeared in the credits, Buckner because he initiated the writing and Joseph reportedly because he needed the credit to boost his career.²¹ Not unreasonably, the 1981 edition of the screenplay issued by the Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research carries no author's name on the title page. Librarians catalogue it (as they do screenplays generally) by uniform title rather than by author.²²

A more complex instance, though again representative of the kind of multiple authorship I am concerned with in this section, is the writing of *Casablanca*, a quite different film made by the same studio (and same producer and director) in the same year as *Yankee Doodle Dandy*. The origins of *Casablanca* lie in a play by Murray Burnett and Joan Alison called *Everybody Comes to Rick's*. After the play had been turned down by the rest of the studios in Hollywood, Hal Wallis bought the screen rights for \$20,000 and hired the Epstein brothers to do an adaptation. Aeneas MacKenzie, who earlier had been sought as an adapter, contributed some basic ideas concerning theme and likely problems with the censor (then the Breen Office). When the Epsteins left Hollywood to work in Washington on a series of government propaganda films, Wallis hired another writer, Howard Koch, to write an alternative screenplay—"to be on the safe side," says Wallis, in the event that the Epsteins failed to complete their version. Wallis himself decided on the film's title, and he, the director, additional writers, and the actors all had a hand in revisions of a composite and piecemeal script by the Epsteins and Koch. Further changes were insisted on by the Breen Office, and at a very late stage a new scene was written (though ultimately it was dropped) in response to criticisms by the audience at a preview. Two different endings were filmed, leaving it open to the last minute which of the men got Ilsa, and there is still some question about who is responsible for the famous closing line, "Louis, I think this is the beginning of a beautiful friendship." Wallis says he thought of it, while Julius Epstein claims the credit for himself and his brother.²³

Such dispersal of authorship might be deemed appropriate in an artistic medium that approvingly calls itself an "industry." Obviously the film industry's products are different from those of assembly-line operations that turn out, say, automobiles. A major Hollywood studio of the 1930s, '40s, and '50s made perhaps fifty films a year, each one of them, for better or worse, unique. But screenwriters of the so-called Golden Age, the years between the introduction of sound and the ascendancy of television, did have a few things in common with the factory workers of Detroit.²⁴ In some studios the writers punched

time clocks, worked shifts, and were held responsible for specified quantities of production in the form of so many pages of writing per 5½-day work-week ("script factory" and "assembly line" are recurrent terms in writers' reminiscences). Like the automobile workers, writers generally concentrated on a small, detached part of a project, without knowing (and frequently, it is clear, without caring) what the rest of the workers—the other writers, the directors, the actors—were doing. Writers had no legal claim to their writing, because their contracts routinely contained a waiver of rights of authorship.²⁵ It was not uncommon for writers actually to be barred from the sets where scenes that they may or may not have written were being filmed; if they wanted to view "their" movies, they had to buy a ticket at a theater, just as the worker in Detroit, if he wanted to drive one of "his" cars, had to make a downpayment on a purchase. Often the writers did not bother to see the films they wrote for. The writing was only a job.

Everybody who comments on their status agrees that writers were at the very bottom of the industry's hierarchy of authority. The larger studios, like Warner Brothers, RKO, Twentieth Century-Fox, and MGM, employed 75 or 100 or even 150 or more writers at a time. There was extravagant duplication of effort—several writers might be assigned to the same project, each unaware of the others' involvement—and most of the writing was simply scrapped. Early in the 1930s, writers' salaries rose to impressive figures for the time, and many distinguished writers—Faulkner, Fitzgerald, Nathanael West, Lillian Hellman, Maxwell Anderson, Clifford Odets, Robert Sherwood, among them—were able to maintain careers as novelists, story writers, and playwrights by being, in effect, subsidized by stints of work in Hollywood. But their scripts, just like those of the rest of the virtually anonymous writers, were reworked, raided, cannibalized, or, most often, simply tossed aside and forgotten according to the needs or whims of the producers, directors, and actors. Julius Epstein recalls that "no matter what you wrote, original or adaptation, it never wound up the way you wanted. It was always changed by the producer, the director, or the actor. . . . So you're getting paid anyhow; what's the difference?"²⁶ As another writer puts it, "They ruin your stories. They massacre your ideas. They prostitute your art. They trample your pride. And what do you get for it? A fortune."²⁷

Most films are collaborative from the start, even before the screenwriters sit down to work, because most films begin as adaptations of "originals" in other media—novels, short fiction, plays, biog-

ographies, autobiographies, histories, newspaper stories, even television scripts—or else as original concepts or ideas or stories by people who are not primarily paid as writers. The screenwriters enter in, usually after a project is approved, by providing a series of versions that might take the form of a synopsis, a "treatment" (a short-storylike account in several pages of prose), a revised treatment (after an army of producers, executives, and staffers have reacted to the treatment), a preliminary screenplay (a kind of rough draft), a screenplay with dialogue, and a shooting script. Ordinarily several writers will have taken part in the project before completion of the shooting script, one of them specializing in treatments, another in screenplays, another in dialogue, and so on. Then, if the project has survived to this point, there follows a continual process of rewriting—again often by specialists such as (according to the needs of the project) continuity writers, "salvage and polish" workers, "troubleshooters," gag-writers, "fixer-uppers," "dialogue doctors," and "script doctors"—and also, as we have seen in the examples of *Yankee Doodle Dandy* and *Casablanca* at the beginning of this section, revision by non-writing contributors like producers, directors, and actors. A new role may be created at a late stage to accommodate the friend or spouse of a producer or an executive; dialogue may have to be drastically simplified because an actor cannot memorize or pronounce the lines; whole scenes may have to be cut or bowdlerized to meet the objections of the censors (two *reels* were dropped from *The Flame of New Orleans*, a 1941 film starring Marlene Dietrich, to get it by the Hays Office).²⁸

While it is obvious that films, at least since the invention of talking pictures, could never have existed without writers, it is also true that the screenwriter has been, and to an extent continues to be, a largely unrecognized contributor to the process of filmmaking. The notorious unreliability of screen credits bears this out. Companions and relatives of producers and directors have been assigned credit for writing they never did, while the names of others responsible for the actual writing have frequently been omitted. Donald Ogden Stewart, a writer for George Cukor and others in the 1930s and 1940s, describes some techniques for career advancement in this respect:

In those days the first thing you had to learn as a writer, if you wanted to get screen credit, was to hold off until you knew when they were going to have to start shooting. Then, your agent would suggest you might be able to help. The producers had the theory that the more writers they had to work on the scripts, the better the scripts would be.

It was the third or fourth writer that always got the screen credit. It wasn't beyond you to try to possibly screw up another writer's script so that your script would come through at the end. It became a game to be the last one before they started shooting so that you would not be eased out of the screen credit.²⁹

For most films it is impossible, given the workings of such a system, to assign authorship to individual writers.

4

But critics do need authors; and just as literary critics for the last two centuries have posited one or another concept of authorship to validate their interpretations, so film critics, once movies were accepted as a serious intellectual and academic subject, have similarly required a concept of authorship in order to focus their studies. The screenwriters would not serve as a center of authorship: there were too many of them, and it was seldom known who did the writing of any specific scene in a film. As a solution to the problem, the *auteur* theory was invented in France in the 1950s by François Truffaut and other "New Wave" writers in *Cahiers du cinéma* and domesticated and publicized in the United States about the same time by Andrew Sarris' and Eugene Archer in the journal *Film Culture*.³⁰

In the commonest application of *auteur* theory, the director rather than any writer becomes the mastermind creator of a film, the most conspicuous single *identifiable* person associated with the work. As *auteurism* took hold, other entities were tried out: the producer as *auteur*, the studio, the actor³¹—almost any individual or body who did not write the film! But the director has fairly consistently been the main focus in the last three decades. Critics have established canons for the individual directors, have made much of cross-references and allusions, thematic continuities, recurrences of character, symbol, technique in the works, and in effect have granted directors the same kind of pervasive authority as literary critics have regularly assigned to the poets and novelists of English and American (and other) literature. Orson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock, John Ford, and Howard Hawks (to name four who figured prominently early on) were routinely treated as sole authors of their films, and the movement has been so influential that virtually all films these days, whatever their quality, are identified primarily with their directors.

But the idea of director as sole author will not hold up under scrutiny; it is simply not possible for one person, however brilliant, to provide the entire creative force behind so complex a work as a motion picture. Consider, as a final example in this chapter, Orson Welles's *Citizen Kane* (1941), the film most frequently assigned and studied in college courses, the film most often written about by critics and historians, and a central focus of the *auteur* movement from the beginning. "It is, above all, the creation of one man," wrote an early biographer of Welles;³² but Robert Carringer, in his carefully researched pioneering study, *The Making of "Citizen Kane"* (1985), demonstrates conclusively that it is not. Carringer's sources include scripts, production records, letters and other documents, sketches, and storyboards from the Welles archives at RKO Pictures and the Mercury Theatre Collection now at Indiana University, as well as interviews with professionals and technicians who worked on the film, including Welles himself.³³ While respectful of Welles's genius throughout, Carringer makes clear that the film owes its eminence, and perhaps even its existence, to the combined efforts of several extraordinarily talented individuals.

Credit for the *Citizen Kane* screenplay, which won an Academy Award, was shared by Herman J. Mankiewicz and Welles (in that order), and there were other writers as well. It is not certain who first thought of doing a film about William Randolph Hearst; Welles said that it was his own idea, while others have claimed priority for Mankiewicz (who died in 1953). Mankiewicz with the help of John Houseman wrote a 268-page first draft (titled "American") between the beginning of March and the middle of April 1940, some 40 pages of revisions shortly afterward, and a complete second draft by 9 May. At this point Welles took over the script, and the individual responsibilities for writing become more difficult to sort out. Amalia Kent reworked the second draft into a continuity version that added visual and mechanical details—necessary for budget and production planning—and drafted a breakdown script containing scene designations with physical descriptions. After approval from the RKO executives and department heads, the script was further heavily revised during June and July, mostly by Welles but also by Mankiewicz, in four further drafts, the last of which was the shooting script. From his painstaking analyses of cuts and other changes from one version to the next, Carringer concludes, concerning the shares of Mankiewicz and Welles, that Mankiewicz's main contributions were the story frame (including the Rosebud gimmick), the characters, many of the individual scenes,

and much of the final dialogue, while Welles, as he says, added "narrative brilliance—the visual and verbal wit, the stylistic fluidity, and such stunningly original strokes as the newspaper montages and the breakfast table sequence." Carringer comments that *Citizen Kane* "is the only major Welles film on which the writing credit is shared. Not coincidentally, it is also the Welles film that has the strongest story, the most fully realized characters, and the most carefully sculpted dialogue. Mankiewicz made the difference."³⁴ This part of the collaboration gets us as far as the shooting script.

Subsequently, the most important contributors were Perry Ferguson, the art director, and Gregg Toland, the cinematographer, both working closely with Welles and with each other to produce brilliant technical innovations in the settings and photography. (Some of these innovations—for example, Ferguson's use of large pieces of black velvet to cover empty spaces on the sets, thereby giving the impression of extreme depth—were the result of severe financial restrictions, and thus even the studio's budget officer could be included among the collaborators involved in the film's artistic effects.) Obviously the actors, led and directed by Welles, had a part in the film's quality.³⁵ And then there were the professionals responsible for various postproduction operations: special effects; sound rerecording (mixing and dubbing); composing, orchestrating, and recording the music; and the overall editing.

Welles chose these helpers, provided suggestions and supervision all through the project, and brought out the best in them to accomplish results that he had not achieved before and never achieved afterward, as Carringer points out in his analyses of Welles's earlier *Heart of Darkness* and his later productions, especially *The Magnificent Ambersons*. The conclusion is inescapable that the excellence of *Citizen Kane* is tied to this particular nexus of people whom he assembled and worked with. Welles was not pleased when Carringer explained to him the thesis of *The Making of "Citizen Kane."* "Collaborators make contributions," he told Carringer in response, "but only a director can make a film." Carringer agrees on this point but goes on to propose a corollary:

The quality of a film is partly a measure of the quality of its collaborative talent. On *Citizen Kane*, Welles was fortunate to have collaborators ideally suited to his temperament and working methods and capable of performing at his level of ambition. The film could never have been what

it is without them. . . . Had it not been for this particular combination, we might not have *Citizen Kane* at all.³⁶

Other pantheon auteurs are under critical scrutiny these days—in the recent work on Hitchcock by Donald Spoto and Leonard Leff, for instance³⁷—but the example of *Citizen Kane* can serve to epitomize the problems inherent in attributing sole authorship of a film to the director (or to any other single individual, whether producer, screenwriter, or actor). Though there are enormous technical differences between films and plays, the problems in film criticism are much like those inherent in attributing sole authorship of a theatrical production to a professional playwright (or, again, to any other one person). The circumstances of film and play production are too complicated, require too many separate specialized abilities, and are hedged on every side with competing interests and influences: budgetary constraints, audience demands, conflicting egos of directors, actors, artists, and everybody else involved. In theory and practice alike, the auteur approach does not seem well suited to the study of films, and probably we have long been operating too simply using an auteur-like approach, without specifying "auteur," in our more traditional criticism and interpretation of the work of professional dramatists like Tom Stoppard and Shakespeare.



9

Implications for Theory

The foregoing chapters have illustrated multiple authorship in a variety of forms: the young Keats being refined, polished, and restrained by well-intentioned friends and publishers; the middle-aged Mill being spruced up by his wife for attractive autobiographical presentation; the old Wordsworth rewriting his younger self; Coleridge constructing his philosophy with lengthy extracts taken over verbatim without acknowledgment from the Germans; Eliot seizing on the revisions and excisions of his mentor; novelists routinely sharing their authorship with friends, spouses, ghostwriters, agents, editors, censors, publishers; playwrights and screenwriters disappearing in the ordinary processes of play and film production.

These illustrations are offered as representative rather than special or isolated. For some of the many others that could have been given in their place, see the Appendix. To be sure, numerous more subtle external influences also impinge on authors' authority and freedom—the simplest exigencies of genre, to mention just one class of such influences, where three-decker novels had to be three volumes in length (not two or four), a serially published part-issue of a novel had to be thirty-two pages (not thirty or thirty-four), and a movie had to be, and generally still has to be, around a hundred minutes long (not fifty or two hundred). Just as music has been composed for special circumstances—the range of a singer, the technical skills of an instrumentalist—and sculptures and paintings have been created to fill specific spaces of courtyards, rooms, walls, even ceilings (sometimes to match specific color schemes of interior decorating), so literature has been produced in response to a range of externally exerted requests, demands, and pressures, many of which in effect become intrinsic elements in the process of creation.¹ Scholars sometimes try to sort out and accommodate these influences by making a distinction between “serious” work on the one hand, viewed as stalwartly resisting such pressures, and (mere) entertainment on the other, viewed as giving

way on every side—in short, between work that is “creative or literary” and work that is “popular fare.”² But no such distinction is possible, either practically or theoretically, any more than one can draw a practical or theoretical line between “good” poems, novels, and plays and “bad” ones. Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Mill, and Dickens, who produced, or at one time or another would have been glad to produce, “popular fare,” are firmly established among the “serious” writers of our literature.

Such disclosures and reminders of the complexities of authorship have an obvious place in biography and literary history. The romantic notion of single authorship is so widespread as to be nearly universal. In contrast, the accumulation of evidence for the prevalence of multiple authorship can support a more realistic account of the ways in which literature is created and, especially when the ordinary human motives of authors, editors, publishers, booksellers, readers, and the rest are brought into the picture all together, can contribute to the ongoing efforts of new and old historicists alike to connect literary works with the social, cultural, and material conditions in which they were produced.

My concern in the present chapter, however, is primarily the relation of multiple authorship to theories of interpretation and editing. Multiple authorship has implications for almost any kind of theory postulated on the existence (and possibly, in the thinking of author-banishing critics, even the *nonexistence*) of a unified mind, personality, or consciousness in or behind a text that is being studied, interpreted, or edited. Some of these implications will already have been made obvious in the discussions of individual works in Chapters 2 through 8. Here I shall offer a few summary observations concerning interpretation and editing.

1

A relevant question at the outset is whether “pure” authorship is possible under any circumstances—single authorship without any influence, intervention, alteration, or distortion whatsoever by someone other than the nominal author. William Blake might seem a likely candidate: he drafted and revised his poems, invented the “illuminations” to accompany them, etched the texts, pictures, and designs onto copper plates, printed them, hand-colored them, and stitched them into books entirely by himself. To test out this possibility, imag-

ine that I am discussing Blake in a public lecture and, in order to illustrate some fine points of my discussion, have projected on a large screen behind me a color slide of the plate containing *The Tyger* from *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*. The picture on the screen is a beautiful and at the same time slightly comical design of text, tree, and puffy smiling tiger. Here, one might think, is Blake all by himself, the author-artist free of every kind of external intervention, an epitomizing example of single authorship.

One would, of course, be wrong. The audience is looking not at a page in a small book but at a huge picture on a screen, a spectacle that Blake himself could never have produced or even foreseen (since photography and the other standard processes of enlargement had not yet been invented). In this hypothetical example, I have made my color slide using incandescent lighting but without the corrective blue filter on my camera and, further, have photographed not a Blake original but a modern printed facsimile, so that the audience is getting several kinds of distortion of Blake's colors on the screen. In addition, I and the audience alike are totally ignoring the probability that Blake meant *The Tyger* to be read in a book (not on a screen), in its designated position as one of the Songs of Experience in the 1794 volume *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*, with textual and thematic relationships not only to its Songs of Innocence counterpart, *The Lamb*, but to other plates preceding and following in the volume. What we have at my lecture, instead, is the single plate, blown up to giant size, with the colors distorted, and an academic lecturer making decidedly un-Blakean noises in the foreground (not to mention shuffling of feet and other sounds of a roomful of people attending this hypothetical occasion).

Other examples of distortion by context and audience are easy to invent. Imagine that I am teaching *The Tyger* in a course in Romantic poetry in which the class is using a text with only a black-and-white reproduction of Blake's design or, what is much more likely, a text with no picture at all, perhaps in a 2500-page anthology printed on extra-thin paper and weighing three pounds. (The absence of picture may not be a bad idea. Students occasionally point out that if the extended hind legs of Blake's tiger were brought forward to a vertical position, the animal's rear end would be raised to an absurd height above the rest of its body.) Suppose I bring in some of the commentary of Northrop Frye, David Erdman, Harold Bloom, Ronald Paulson, and John Grant. Suppose that, in spite of my best efforts, some of the students have trouble understanding Frye and the rest, or draw

a blank at "frame thy fearful symmetry," or fail to notice the difference between "Could frame" and "Dare frame" as the poem takes shape.

What kind of artistic control does Blake have over the way he is read, commented on, discussed in classes, and misunderstood two hundred years after he wrote *The Tyger*? Clearly very little, and the example may serve to suggest that, once a reader or a spectator is introduced into the transaction, no work whatsoever, even one by an artist as singly self-sufficient as Blake, is free from impingements that change and distort what the author created in the first place. There are plentiful materials in such considerations for a separate chapter (which I shall not include here) on the topic "Reader as Collaborator." No author can control every specific effect—or even, probably, a very large proportion of the specific effects—of a work in the mind of a reader. It takes at least two people, a sender and a receiver, to constitute communication; with a literary work, collaborative creative activity on the part of a reader is an absolute and unavoidable necessity. "Pure" authorship (as defined at the beginning of this section) *might* be theoretically possible when a writer's holograph manuscript is locked up unread in a library or an attic, but the "initial purity" of the text (Bowers's term)³ would immediately begin to be altered if another person were to cast eyes on it.

In any case, there is another theoretical problem—at the writer's end of the creative process, rather than the reader's—in the myriad influences exerted on Blake by his time and place. He was unquestionably an original genius, but like other original geniuses was partly a product of historical and cultural circumstances beyond his control. He was (to use the simplest possible illustrations) a revolutionary at the time of the French Revolution and would have been a different kind of revolutionary had he lived a century earlier or later; he could rail at Newton and Locke, who wrote and became major intellectual forces before he was born, but not at Charles Darwin or Freud, who came afterward; he could rewrite Milton and Swedenborg but not, say, Yeats or Eliot. To separate "pure" authorship from the circumstances of time and place, one would have to lock up not only the manuscripts but the authors themselves (and, in the process, thereby deprive them of, among many other necessities, language itself). Since no writer aims to produce unread manuscripts or wishes to be locked up in the hypothetical manner I have just suggested, "pure" authorship seems out of the question. Yet it is something very much like this idea of "pure" authorship that both the interpretive and the

editorial theorists have in mind when they think and write about authors and authorial intentions.

2

If a locked-up, unread manuscript (not to mention a locked-up author) sounds a little like Bishop Berkeley's tree in the forest, let us bring in Dr. Johnson to kick a stone or two. In our day-to-day practice—what W. J. T. Mitchell calls “slogging along in the routines of scholarship and interpretation”⁴—the facts of multiple authorship generally do not constitute an obstacle. Professional historians (by which I mean people who work in university history departments) routinely accept the composite authorship of official letters, speeches, documents, diplomatic agreements, and the like out of necessity, cheerfully attributing to single individuals (presidents, cabinet members, legislators, governors, mayors) words that they know were written by committees, staff assistants, and speechwriters.⁵ In somewhat the same way, literary “practitioners” (teachers, critics, interpreters, improvers of reading) make constant use of individual attributions—“Keats,” “Mill,” “Dreiser,” and so on—which likewise may actually be composite entities.

For practical purposes, perhaps the single most important aspect of authorship is simply the vaguely apprehended *presence* of human creativity, personality, and (sometimes) voice that nominal authorship seems to provide. Just as it would be unthinkable for a visitor to an art museum to admire a roomful of paintings without knowing the names of the individual painters and for a concertgoer to sit through a program of symphonies and concertos without knowing the names of the individual composers, so it is impossible to imagine *any* presentation of writings (even of writings in which Barthes and Foucault contest the existence of authors!) that does not prominently refer to authorship. Readers must have authors' names on the jackets, spines, and title pages of the books they read.⁶ Book advertisements in the *New York Review of Books* and the *New York Times Book Review* regularly include pictures of the authors (especially in the form of large photographs or drawings of their faces alone), as do the featured reviews in these same periodicals, which of course are as much reviews of the authors as they are of the books; and publishers are now producing videos of authors plugging their books to be shown on monitors (near the cash registers) in bookstores. *Critical Inquiry*, advertising itself (“at the forefront of critical thought”) in the pages of *New Literary History*,

makes a point of its “important contributions from such *authors* as Stanley Cavell, Jacques Derrida, Stanley Fish. . . .”

A practical corollary is that nobody is satisfied with anonymous authorship. If books without authors' names seem unacceptable (not to mention unmarketable), try imagining a Norton anthology in which the authors' names are suppressed and the works are arranged entirely by chronology or by genre or (alphabetically) by title. The authors of the few anonymous and pseudonymous works that manage to hold a place in literature have, even in their anonymity, acquired specific individual identities in our minds and our literary histories; lacking their names, we designate them by the works they wrote—the “*Pearl* poet,” “Junius,” the weather-wise “Bard . . . who made / The grand old ballad of Sir Patrick Spence.”

Obviously, the myth of single authorship is a great convenience for teachers, students, critics, and other readers, as well as for publishers, agents, booksellers, librarians, copyright lawyers—indeed, for everyone connected with the production and reception of books, starting with the authors themselves. The myth is thoroughly embedded in our culture and our ordinary practices, including the ordinary practices of criticism and interpretation, for which, I would argue, it is an absolute necessity.⁷ The countering reality of multiple authorship is no threat to the continuing existence of the myth, nor, except for deconstructionist theorists, is there any compelling reason for wanting the myth to cease to exist. Although a deconstructive approach to interpretation might take comfort in the idea of a plurally altered text, the behavior of deconstructionists as authors of their *own* texts shows that the myth is in no danger from that quarter. And for the historicist, the mythical author certainly has exerted a shaping force on literary production even when the text in question was produced by several hands.

In practical criticism, moreover, the particulars of multiple authorship can frequently be illuminating, even when one is pursuing the meanings of a mythical single author. In my first two chapters, I suggested ways in which distinguishing between Keats's contributions and those of his friends and editors tends to highlight Keats's intentions—for example, in *Isabella* and *The Eve of St. Agnes*—and some interesting situations where these intentions were in conflict with the tastes and moral ideas of people whom he depended on for help in getting the works into print. Clearly, such information may improve our understanding of Keats's poems, and the same is true of the more accurate representations we get of Mill's self-deprecation in

the canceled passages of the *Autobiography*, Wordsworth's developing concepts of self-presentation in *The Prelude*, Coleridge's methods of writing philosophy and literary theory, Eliot's and Pound's contributions to the fragmentariness of *The Waste Land*, and the numerous ways in which editors and so many others have participated in the shaping of novels, plays, and films. This is useful information at a very basic level, rather like the help we sometimes get from textual variants in an author's manuscript—the "real grass" in Keats's draft and fair copy of *Endymion* (4.622), which points up the intended symbolism of the printed text's "grass," and "Was it a vision real" in the draft of *Ode to a Nightingale* (79), which gives us a hypothesis for distinguishing between "vision" and "waking dream" in the printed text. We can still, if we wish, assign these works solely to Keats, Mill, Wordsworth, and the rest, while taking advantage of our sharper grasp of the complex processes by which the works came into being.

3

It is when we come to interpretive theory, and especially theorists' understanding of the relation of interpretation to authorial intention, that the facts of multiple authorship may cause some complications. Traditionally—rather like the fabled medieval synthesis of God, nature, and humans—author, text, and reader existed in a perfect unity: the author put meaning in a text, the text represented the author's meaning, and the reader went to the text to find out what the author meant. Authors, readers, and critics (and teachers and students) still to a large extent depend on this traditional concept. But philosophers for at least a century and literary theorists in recent decades have been posing questions and arguing over the more specific locus of meaning in this once harmonious pristine triad: Does the meaning of a work exist primarily in the author's mind? (In which case, putting the theory into practice, we go to the text to read the author's mind.) Or in the text itself? (In which case we go to the text for *its* meaning, regardless of how it got there.) Or is it in the reader's mind in the act of reading? (In which case we just read, not worrying about the prior or ultimate sources of the meanings we get.)

A major influential statement of the second of these three positions (although it is not perfectly certain that the authors themselves, at the time, meant for it to be taken as such) was W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Monroe C. Beardsley's essay "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946).⁸

Initially Wimsatt and Beardsley set out to attack an outdated convention by which a work of art or literature was evaluated in terms of what the artist or writer was trying to accomplish: one determined (as best one could) first the aim and then the extent to which the work approached fulfillment of the aim. The gist of their contention, as stated in the opening paragraph of "The Intentional Fallacy," is that "the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art." They repeat the same point in almost the same words a page later—"design or intention [will not do] as a *standard* by which the critic is to judge the worth of the poet's performance"—and go on to argue that the only possible evidence of intention is the work itself, that external facts (biography, sources, allusions) are useless if not actually detrimental, and that, even if one could put questions about a work to a living author, the author's answers would have no more bearing than anyone else's based on a reading of the text. The poem "is detached from the author at birth and goes about the world beyond his power to intend about it or control it. . . . The poem belongs to the public."

This seems clear enough but actually is full of ambiguities, and Wimsatt and Beardsley themselves are the first to become entangled in the shifting senses of "intention" and "criticism" in the essay. In their opening statement, "intention" signifies *aim, plan, purpose, goal*, while "criticism" signifies *evaluation*. But very shortly (as in a phrase that the authors quote from E. E. Stoll, "the author's meaning or intention"), "intention" starts to signify *meaning*, and by the end of the essay "criticism" has come to signify something like *understanding or interpretation*. Thus Wimsatt and Beardsley's fairly innocuous beginning—to the effect that an author's aim has no place in the evaluation of a work—has been transformed into the quite different and much more radical statement that an author's intended meaning has no place in the interpretation of a work. It is this latter formulation that constitutes our common understanding, over the years, of "intentional fallacy" (an understanding probably based more on the catchy wording of the title than on a close reading of the essay itself), and both Wimsatt and Beardsley have encouraged this view—Wimsatt saying pointedly, in a retrospective essay written twenty-two years afterward, that the "statement in our essay of [1946] should certainly have read: 'The design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging either *the meaning or the value* of a work of literary art.'"⁹

Subsequently there has grown up an enormous body of books

and essays on the concept of intention in art and literature, especially (for our purposes) on the place of authorial intention in literary criticism and interpretation. My account here is necessarily confined to a few of the more conspicuous contributions. Obviously, Wimsatt and Beardsley's essay was itself a landmark, and it continues to be a starting point for modern discussions, as in David Newton-De Molina's 1976 collection, *On Literary Intention: Critical Essays*, in which the first item is "The Intentional Fallacy" and most of the remaining fourteen essays are attacks against Wimsatt and Beardsley (and their influence), although with strikingly little agreement among the writers as to exactly where Wimsatt and Beardsley went wrong and why authorial intention should not be considered a fallacy.¹⁰

Three of the selections in *On Literary Intention* are by the preeminent opponent of Wimsatt and Beardsley, E. D. Hirsch, Jr., whose *Validity in Interpretation* (1967) is still, after more than twenty years, the centerpiece of any argument concerning authorial intention in criticism. Hirsch defends what he calls "objective interpretation" (the title of his 1960 *PMLA* article, which he includes as an appendix in *Validity*) by equating textual meaning with authorial meaning. His first chapter, "In Defense of the Author," lays the groundwork and sets the tone: "Meaning is an affair of consciousness not of words. . . . A word sequence means nothing in particular until somebody either means something by it or understands something from it." "The text [has] to represent *somebody's* meaning—if not the author's, then the critic's." "To banish the original author as the determiner of meaning was to reject the only compelling normative principle that could lend validity to an interpretation." "Re-cognitive interpretation ["rightly understanding what the author meant"] . . . is the only kind of interpretation with a determinate object, and thus the only kind that can lay claim to validity in any straightforward and practicable sense of that term."¹¹ Such "either/or" and "only" rhetoric invites dispute, of course, and Hirsch has been regularly assailed in reviews and symposia ever since *Validity in Interpretation* appeared.¹² His basic position seems, because of its persistence in the face of so much vigorous challenge, irrefutable, but the *practical* inaccessibility of an author's meaning in any sense in which it is separate from a text continues to be an obstacle to attaining the desired objectivity. Hirsch's main example of actual interpretation, a brief reading of Wordsworth's *A slumber did my spirit seal*, turns out to be of highly questionable validity.

In the early 1980s, what might be considered the third prominent wave of modern intentionalist controversy (Wimsatt and Beardsley

having initiated the first and Hirsch the second) got under way with the publication of Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels's "Against Theory" in the Summer 1982 issue of *Critical Inquiry*.¹³ Setting out to attack theory in general—"If we are right, then the whole enterprise of critical theory is misguided and should be abandoned"; "Our thesis has been that no one can reach a position outside practice, that theorists should stop trying, and that the theoretical enterprise should therefore come to an end" (pp. 12, 30)—Knapp and Michaels find their "clearest example" of the failure of theory in the ongoing debate concerning the relation of authorial intention to the meaning of texts. Both intentionalists and anti-intentionalists—that is, Hirsch and Hirsch's opponents alike—are declared guilty of a fundamental mistake: treating intention and meaning as separable entities.

Once it is seen that the meaning of a text is simply identical to the author's intended meaning, the project of *grounding* meaning in intention becomes incoherent. Since the project itself is incoherent, it can neither succeed nor fail; hence both theoretical attitudes toward intention are irrelevant. The mistake made by theorists has been to imagine the possibility or desirability of moving from one term (the author's intended meaning) to a second term (the text's meaning), when actually the two terms are the same. (p. 12)

Needless to say, since Knapp and Michaels not only faulted theorists' thinking but (in their whimsical straight-facedness) seemed to threaten theorists' very livelihood, there was quick and agitated response—seven pieces alone in the June 1983 issue of *Critical Inquiry* (to which Knapp and Michaels contributed an unrepentant "Reply to Our Critics"), two others in the March 1985 issue (to which Knapp and Michaels again replied),¹⁴ and commentary in other journals besides *Critical Inquiry*. As with the earlier intentionalist attacks against Wimsatt and Beardsley and anti-intentionalist attacks against Hirsch, the criticisms from *both* sides against Knapp and Michaels set forth a variety of arguments and positions among which there is, again, very little agreement.

The debate persists on into the 1990s. William Schroeder, for instance, marshals a comprehensive list of older and newer objections to intentionalism in "A Teachable Theory of Interpretation," the opening piece in Cary Nelson's collection entitled *Theory in the Classroom* (1986).¹⁵ And three other essays by philosophers in Anthony Cascardi's *Literature and the Question of Philosophy* (1987) also are

relevant to the issue. Denis Dutton, in "Why Intentionalism Won't Go Away," weighing the arguments of Wimsatt, Beardsley, Hirsch, and Barthes (among others), thinks that the place of authorial intention will never be settled among theorists but also that it will continue to be an indispensable element in interpretation:

Granted, to be sure, that the meanings of texts are hardly exhausted by what they meant to their authors, it remains nevertheless that, since words and texts are used by authors for myriad purposes, their intentions will never be found generally irrelevant to some of the interesting and legitimate things that critics may sometimes wish to say about some texts.

Stanley Rosen, in "The Limits of Interpretation," pursues a more radical tack, rather like that of Knapp and Michaels, maintaining that a theory of interpretation itself is impossible. "There is no theoretical substructure of reading *or* of writing; there is only the infrastructure of the reader and the writer." This allows a traditional existence to authors (in what Rosen calls "the domain of *phronēsis* or . . . the pretheoretical domain of common sense") but renders the usual question about authorial intention beside the point. Alexander Nehamas, in "Writer, Text, Work, Author," constructs in effect not one but two authors, expanding on his earlier argument for distinguishing between the historical writer outside the text and a "postulated author" speaking in the text.¹⁶

This abbreviated survey leaves out most of the argumentative detail and all of the subtlety of the handful of authors whom I have mentioned (yes, they *are* authors and, regardless of their view of authorial intention in the abstract, they insist, sometimes quite ferociously, that their own intended meanings be understood). I have been concerned mainly to suggest the scope and principal points of contention. As to the quality, there are several aspects of the discussion that might appear strange to an observer not trained in philosophy: the theorists' inability to agree on acceptable definitions of basic terms like "intention," "meaning," "significance," "understanding," "knowledge," "belief," and "theory"; their recurrent appeals, in support of abstract propositions, to concrete experience, common sense, human feeling, what "everybody knows" about authors or writing or intending; and their use of nonliterary analogies to make points about authors, texts, and interpretation—a touchdown in football, a piano concert by Vladimir Ashkenazy, a car running out of gas, Hopi Indian

pottery decoration, a road sign on the New Jersey Turnpike, the television show "What's My Line?" For literary paradigms we have mostly (but not exclusively) newspaper misprints repeated as jokes in the *New Yorker*, Mark Akenside's "plastic arm," Shakespeare's plays dictated by a parrot to an amanuensis, and Wordsworth's *A slumber did my spirit seal* produced by a computer, by a wave on a beach, and by a monkey randomly pressing keys on a typewriter. As a reviewer of several theoretical works published in 1980 observes, if we can suppose that a monkey randomly typed Wordsworth's lines, we can suppose anything.¹⁷

In the context of the present study of multiple authorship, what these theoretical writings have in common, in their quite different ways of regarding the place of authorial intention in interpretation, is their virtually universal belief in the myth of the author as a single entity.¹⁸ Anti-intentionalists like Wimsatt and Beardsley, intentionalists like E. D. Hirsch (and, if they would allow themselves to be categorized, Knapp and Michaels), and author-banishers like Barthes and Foucault all embrace or reject the traditional concept of the single author, the mastermind creator of whatever work is the occasion for thinking pro or con about authorship. And while the substitution of multiple authorship in place of the traditional concept may not disconcert the anti-intentionalists (after all, it is as easy to reject the intentions of two or three authors as it is to reject those of the more usual single author), it does quite possibly throw a cloud of uncertainty over the single-author ideal on which the intentionalists theoretically depend.

Instead of E. D. Hirsch's formulation quoted above—"the original author as the determiner of meaning"—one may have to contemplate an array of plural original authors, some of whom may be at odds with others. In Knapp and Michaels's breezy equation of "meaning of a text . . . to the author's intended meaning," one may have to accommodate a complexity of plural authors' meanings, and possibly conflicting intentions among them. We have had several chapters illustrating actual or potential discord among the authors, and the Appendix at the back of this book lists many others, including works begun according to one person's intentions and completed posthumously, after the first author's death, by another person with another set of intentions. In situations of multiple authorship, the posited ideal of single-author intention seems a shaky foundation for general theory.

In the early draft of his *Autobiography*, John Stuart Mill recalls, from the time of his twelfth or thirteenth year, his father's "indignation at my using the common expression that something was true in

theory but required correction in practice: and how, after making me vainly strive to define the word theory, he explained its meaning and shewed the fallacy of the form of speech which places practice and theory in opposition."¹⁹ If Mill's father were right, and there were never any opposition between theory and practice, then we would have no real problem about the locus of meaning. Author, text, and reader would be interrelated in such a way that a view of any one of the elements would necessarily entail a view of the other two as well, or all three together. Author-centered critics would interpret a text according to the ideal of author's intended meaning; text-centered critics would inevitably incorporate authorial intention into their interpretations; and reader-centered critics would inevitably be studying readers' attempts to re-create authorial meanings in the process of reading. In all these statements, a plural "authors" can be substituted for the singular "author"—authors and text and reader, authors-centered critics, authors' meaning, and so on—and the argument is not essentially altered.

David Hirsch remarks, concerning the claims of text versus author versus reader:

It is really a matter of little import whether a critic's rhetorical strategy is to say "The meaning of *The Waste Land* is that life is a completely joyous experience," or "In *The Waste Land* Eliot intended the meaning that life is a completely joyous experience," or "The reader responds to *The Waste Land* by feeling the sense of life as a completely joyous experience."²⁰

And one can substitute "Eliot and Pound" for "Eliot" without changing Hirsch's point that the meaning transcends the separate compartmentalizations. But then perhaps Mill's father was not right after all about the compatibility of theory and practice. In this case the theorists still have a theoretical problem with multiple authorship.

4

Interpretation and editorial work alike are concerned with some very basic questions: what constitutes a text, what constitutes meaning and significance, and the connection of these to authorial intention. In editing, however, theory and practice are much more closely linked to each other than they appear to be in interpretation. On the evidence

of the writings surveyed in the preceding section, interpretive theory rarely leads to the production (or even the theoretical validation) of actual interpretations. Editorial theory, on the other hand, is usually tied to the production of actual editions; while it is obviously possible to theorize without editing, as in general discussion of the Greg-Bowers and other theories of copy-text, most of the theorizing has been coordinated with editorial procedures in a specific project (the plays of Thomas Dekker, the novels of William Dean Howells, the poems of Keats). The theory exists primarily as justification of the practice.

Until fairly recently, all editorial theories without exception were based on a concept of single authorship and the ideal of "realizing"—approximating, recovering, (re)constructing—the author's intentions in a critical edition. Authorial "final intention," a narrowing of the broader notion of authorial intention (and sometimes further restricted with adjectives like "precise" and "exact"), is implicit or explicit in the writings of W. W. Greg, Fredson Bowers, and G. Thomas Tanselle, as well as in various official and semiofficial publications of the Modern Language Association;²¹ it is mentioned so frequently as to be virtually equated with intention in general. As one might expect from a sampling of the difficulties faced by the intentionalists among the interpreters, editorial theorists have from the beginning run up against a serious problem in their appeals to authorial intention, final or otherwise: authors' intentions are no more available to editors than they are to interpreters.

In editing a work according to the author's intentions, the principal older method, more or less the standard in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth, was to reproduce, or at least use as copy-text (the base-text of an edition), the latest version published during the author's lifetime. The method was considered appropriate for any work existing in a series of printed editions, each of which, after the first, was set from the one immediately preceding; the justification was that the author *might* have had a hand in the text of each successive printing. When a later edition showed changes in wording that could be attributed to the author, it was regularly assumed (such was the naïveté of scholars *then*) that the author had overseen and approved all the other particulars of the later text as well. A typical example is Dickens's *Little Dorrit*, which was published in monthly parts between 1855 and 1857 and in a first one-volume edition in 1857 and then reprinted in the Library Edition of 1859 (set from a copy of 1857), the Cheap Edition of 1861 (set from a copy of 1859), and the

Charles Dickens Edition of 1868 (set from an 1865 or 1866 reprint of 1861). The text of 1868, because of the accumulation of errors in the successive reprintings, is the most corrupt of all these versions, but because it was the last published before Dickens's death in 1870, it has long been deemed the most authoritative and, in consequence, has been the source of numerous texts printed in the twentieth century, including those of the Everyman, Penguin, and New Oxford Illustrated Dickens editions.

In the 1950s, textual theorists began to take a more realistic view of the relation of authors to their texts, and the result was general abandonment of the "latest text" principle. There was actually, as it turned out, very little evidence that authors supervised their texts beyond the initial printing of a work; and there was virtually no evidence that, when authors did make changes in a later version, they bothered to look over the parts of the later version that they left unchanged. On these grounds it was decided that an earlier rather than a later text was more likely to embody what the author intended to have printed, and therefore that the earlier should be considered more authoritative. The Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text—originally proposed by W. W. Greg in a 1949 paper entitled "The Rationale of Copy-Text" and championed and developed by Fredson Bowers in hundreds of books, essays, introductions, and reviews beginning in 1950²²—called for use of a first edition as copy-text, or better still, if one was available, the author's fair-copy manuscript. The wording of the first edition or manuscript could be emended where there was reason to think that the author was responsible for substantive rewriting in a later version, but the punctuation, spelling, capitalization, word-division, and paragraphing would remain those of the first edition or manuscript. Thus the most recent editor of *Little Dorrit*, following Greg-Bowers principles, chooses the first one-volume edition of 1857 for his copy-text, emending substantively in some 120 passages, usually to restore Dickens's wording from the extant draft or the proof-sheets. The resulting text, correcting the original printer's errors and avoiding the progressive deterioration in the reprints issued while Dickens was alive, is superior to the formerly standard 1868 text and the modern editions based on it in 300 passages.²³

The Greg-Bowers theory, initially developed as a method for editing sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English plays, was soon extended to the treatment of works of more recent periods—*Little Dorrit* in the example just given, the novels of Hawthorne and many others in American fiction, the philosophical writings of William

James and John Dewey—and became the subject of considerable controversy, especially where editors chose for copy-text a "prepublication" version of a work (that is, an author's manuscript). In simplest form, the essential question, which continues to be debated, is whether authorial intention is better represented in a manuscript or in a printed text. In the Centenary Edition of the works of Hawthorne (to mention a famous case), both *The Blithedale Romance* and *The Marble Faun* are edited from Hawthorne's fair-copy manuscripts rather than from printed texts. How do we know whether the manuscript or the first edition (with the publishers' house styling and other changes in printing) is closer to what Hawthorne had in mind for his contemporaries—or us—to read?²⁴ Adherents of the Greg-Bowers dogma sometimes appear overly rigid in their insistence that one side (favoring the manuscript) is right and the other (favoring the printed text) is wrong, settling the question by general rule rather than by an assessment of particular circumstances.

There is a further problem with the Greg-Bowers theory whenever we have two or more versions of a work. Early and later texts of Henry James's novels, Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, and Keats's *La Belle Dame sans Merci* are repeatedly mentioned as examples, but actually the situation is commonplace. Coleridge's *Monody on the Death of Chatterton* (a typical *unremarkable* instance) exists in at least ten distinct versions, written over a period of forty-four years, each of which is authoritatively Coleridge's.²⁵ "Final authorial intention" is usually invoked to solve the problem: Coleridge (or somebody) settled on a version for the *Poetical Works* of 1834, the year of Coleridge's death, and presumably the substantives of that text could be introduced into a matrix of punctuation, spelling, and other accidentals of an earlier version in accordance with the Greg-Bowers procedures. But it is not clear to everybody's satisfaction why final versions or latest substantives, merely because they are latest, should be considered more authoritative than any other that carry the writer's authority. Textualists of the Greg-Bowers school are geniuses at recovering the historical facts of composition, transmission, and publication but frequently are duffers in their attempts to factualize their authors' intentions. Nearly every textual history in the Greg-Bowers tradition has, at a crucial point, a weak stab at explaining what the author genuinely preferred, or actively intended, or passively accepted, or merely acquiesced in, or positively hated—matters of speculation that contrast rather sharply with the factual details everywhere else.²⁶

The newest general theory about editing, coming into promi-

nence in the 1970s and arising as a reaction to the kinds of problem just mentioned, is based on the idea that every separate version of a work has its own legitimacy. The Greg-Bowers theory generally aspired to produce, in a single text combining early accidentals and late substantives, the Platonically perfect realization of an author's final intentions in a work. But the results of this editorial eclecticism, "ideal" texts that never previously existed, came increasingly to look like the realization of editors' rather than authors' intentions; practically every advance of textual knowledge brought new evidence of works in progress rather than works perfected—evidence of revision, development by stages, authors changing their minds. As James Thorpe wrote in a pioneering essay that became chapter 1 of *Principles of Textual Criticism*, "authorial revision is embodied in multiple printed versions to an extent which seems to be almost limitless." With an impressive array of illustrations, Thorpe went on to question the much repeated notion that the goal of editing is to construct a text embodying the author's final intentions:

It is a bit puzzling to know why this dictum should for so long have passed unchallenged. For it is much like saying that an author's last poem (or novel, or play) is, as a general rule, his best one; it may be, and it may not be.

When several different works—or several versions of the same work—were written by the same author and communicated to his usual public, each is "authoritative." It is idle to . . . [talk] about which one is "the most authoritative." Likewise, any one of them might be said to "claim precedence." It all depends on where the procession is supposed to be going.²⁷

Other scholars, with or without Thorpe's help, have been working toward the same conclusion. Donald Pizer, in an essay of 1971, is sharply critical of the application of Greg-Bowers principles to American literature, arguing that each revision of a text "constitutes a distinctive work with its own aesthetic individuality and character"; "to coalesce these versions into an eclectic text and its apparatus is to blur the nature of each version." Hans Zeller, reporting in 1975 on recent developments in German editorial theory arising out of problems with the texts of Goethe, elaborately defends the concept of versions, each with its separate authorial intention. Philip Gaskell, whose *New Introduction to Bibliography* (1972) raised the hackles of Greg-Bowers disciples by advocating the use of printed texts rather

than manuscripts for copy-texts ("It would normally be wrong . . . rigidly to follow the accidentals of the manuscript, which the author would himself have been prepared—or might have preferred—to discard"), takes the line in his next book, *From Writer to Reader* (1978), that an editor "should not base his work on any predetermined rule or theory"; "every case is unique and must be approached with an open mind." Jerome McGann, in *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (1983), builds on Thorpe and Zeller in particular to make a strong case for versions. Independently of McGann, James McLaverty, in an essay of 1984, arrives at a similar position by way of the intentionalist controversy in interpretive theory.²⁸

These scholars write from a variety of motives. Thorpe and Gaskell mainly address practical problems of editing a text according to the author's intentions. Zeller and McLaverty are more interested in theory than in practice, though they too center their thinking on authorial intention; the author is guarantor of the authenticity of each separate version. Among Pizer's several concerns is the loss of historical artifacts: the Greg-Bowers eclecticism in effect obliterates (rather than preserves) the once-extant documents of the past. McGann wants to promote what he calls "a socialized concept of authorship and textual authority," a concept involving not only authors but publishers, editors, printers, booksellers, purchasers, readers, reviewers, critics, teachers, and students. "Literary production is not an autonomous and self-reflexive activity; it is a social and an institutional event." The "textual authority" of a work "rests neither with the author nor with his affiliated institution [by which McGann means the publisher]; it resides in the actual structure of the agreements which these two cooperating authorities [and, I would add, the rest of the participants as well] reach in specific cases."²⁹

It is with these theories of versions, and above all with McGann's socialized concept of literary production, that the facts of multiple authorship are most compatible. The Greg-Bowers scheme, emerging as the result of major advances in our knowledge of printing and publishing practices, ought to have found room for at least some of the elements of collaborative creativity. Instead, the proponents of the system routinely view every alteration and revision by friends, relatives, copyists, editors, printers, publishers, and censors alike as impurity or contamination. Their object is to expunge the impurity when it is possible to do so (for example, by reversion to a prepublication form of a work), and the inevitable result, in the extreme instance of the Pennsylvania *Sister Carrie*, is Dreiser in his underwear.

When it seems not possible to remove the collaborative elements—as in *The Waste Land*, where almost no one admits to preferring the text of Eliot's draft before Pound went to work on it—they devise ingenious explanations to show that the collaborator was the author's "delegated" agent and the revisions merely carried out the author's intentions.

For a variety of practical reasons, I suggest (if we have to have general principles) that we drop the concept of an ideal single text fulfilling an author's intentions and put our money instead on some theory of versions. In a theory of versions, by contrast, multiple authorship is not some embarrassing blemish to be cleaned up or hidden away. Unlike the ideal creations of the Greg-Bowers school, versions are texts that, just like authors' collaborators, actually existed. And while currently there is no agreed-on definition of the degree of difference necessary to distinguish one version of a work from another (the possibilities range from a single variant of wording or punctuation to "major revision" that results in "a changed aesthetic effect"),³⁰ it is in the nature of the concept that the text of a version includes all the words of that version, regardless of how many authors contributed to the writing. Thus in a collaboratively authored version, each contributor to the collaboration has—by definition, if for no better reason—an intrinsic rather than an extrinsic place in the text. Removing one or more of the authors (as, in our recurrent example, the revisions by Dreiser's wife, or friend, or editor, or all of them together, in *Sister Carrie*) simply produces a different version.

As Thorpe observed nearly twenty-five years ago, textual constitution by versions makes possible a more realistic recovery of authors and their activity in the production of literary works. It answers Pizer's plea for preservation of the literary artifacts of the past. It is central to McGann's socialized view of authorship and textual authority. And it is hospitable to the circumstances of multiple authorship. It downplays (or rejects outright) the concept of single authorial intention, looking instead to a harmonious or discordant network of many separate intentions, starting with one or more nominal authors but expanding out to the printers, publishers, booksellers, and everyone else involved in the business. It is an idea that appears to be gaining ascendancy (as in Donald Reiman's 1985 MLA paper and 1987 essay "Versioning" and Peter Shillingsburg's thoughtful survey of alternatives to the Greg-Bowers theory in the 1989 issue of *Studies in Bibliography*).³¹ Meanwhile, the partisans of Greg-Bowers principles, just like the single-author intentionalists among the interpreters, will continue to have a

problem—in this case, both theoretical *and* practical—with multiple authorship.

To theorize is human, and quite possibly it is theory, even more than speech, that distinguishes human beings from the other species. But theory means different things to different theorists. In the physical and biological sciences, theory is most often a concept to explain what happened in the past, or what is happening in the present, or what will happen or may happen in the future. Thus theory in the sciences has explanatory and predictive power; it may in the beginning be speculative rather than verified, but an essential characteristic is that it is, sooner or later, verifiable. By contrast, some of the interpretive and editorial theory I have been examining in this chapter is neither explanatory nor predictive but is, instead, expressive of what *ought* to have happened in the past, or what ought to be happening in the present, or what ought to happen in the future—a body of opinion in the realm of ethics, morality, rhetoric, or politics rather than knowledge. It is probably recognition of this fundamental difference from science that now and then produces books with titles like *The Politics of Interpretation* and *Hermeneutics as Politics*.³²

Interpretive and editorial theory also appears at times to confuse fact with speculation. The facts lie in such matters as the biographical circumstances of composition, the handwriting of a manuscript, the identity of a printer, the date of a first publication, the immediate source of a reprint, and so on; for example, Eliot wrote such and such, typed such and such, *and then* Pound did such and such—all matters for which there is (or can be) documentary evidence. The speculations lie in such matters as how an author felt, what an author wanted, and undocumented harmonies and conflicts among the authors, editors, revisers, publishers, and others involved in literary production; for example, Eliot desired such and such, but then Pound countered with such and such (either fulfilling or not fulfilling Eliot's intentions, or else using or not using Eliot to fulfill *his* intentions). The theorists do not treat facts as if they were speculation, but sometimes they treat speculations as if they were fact.

I cannot claim always to have avoided the appearance of this same kind of confusion myself. My (authorial) intention—the explanatory content of the present study—has been to show that multiple authorship is a frequently occurring phenomenon, one of the routine ways of producing literature all along. Because the phenomenon has occurred so frequently, my predictive content is that a piece of writing, past, present, or future, is likely to embody elements of

multiple authorship—elements that (if they are now hidden) would become clear if we had more information about the circumstances, the texts, and the people engaged in the production. The hortative content (or implication) is that critics and editors ought to be more aware of the phenomenon and that interpretive and editorial theorists ought to rethink their theories in order to accommodate a plurality of authors. At present, there is a basic contradiction between the theorists' single-author standard for interpreting and editing and the way much of our literature has been, and continues to be, produced.

Appendix: Multiple Authorship from Homer to Ann Beattie

This brief Appendix provides—in two lists, one for British writers and the other for American—a sampling of instances of unacknowledged multiple authorship during the last two centuries, the historical period corresponding to the rise of the romantic myth of the author as solitary genius. These are examples that have come to hand (rather than products of an extensive search), and the writers and works are, for the most part, “serious,” literary, and canonical.

Originally I began, and intended to present, an elaborate gathering from earliest times (represented by the vestigial “Homer” in the heading above) and from all possible literatures. But it soon became apparent that such a scope was too large and ungainly for a mere appendix. Early on, when I was explaining my project to lecture audiences, several medievalists independently of one another inquired, in tones of sympathetic concern, whether I intended to include every work originating before the invention of printing. Specialists in Renaissance drama raised the same question about an enormous quantity of early plays. Students of the long history of English prose, with or without reference to problems of the multiply authored *canon* treated in P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens's *The Canonisation of Daniel Defoe* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1988), suggested further complications connected with works published anonymously or pseudonymously. And at a late stage of the proceedings I discovered that the *MLA International Bibliography* regularly includes “collaboration” as a heading in its Subject Index. Dustin Griffin's opening remark in “Augustan Collaboration”—“Literary collaboration is surprisingly common in Restoration and eighteenth century England”—turns out

to be applicable to several centuries both before and after the Augustans (*Essays in Criticism* 37 [1987]: 1–10).

The pared-down results here are offered as representative examples that have been mentioned by scholars and for which there exists some kind of extrinsic (biographical or other documentary) evidence. The lists are chronological according to the birth dates of the nominal authors. I have used the following abbreviations in my parenthetical documentation:

- Fraistat Neil Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985)
- Madden David Madden and Richard Powers, *Writers' Revisions: An Annotated Bibliography of Articles and Books about Writers' Revisions and Their Comments on the Creative Process* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981)
- Parker Hershel Parker, *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons: Literary Authority in American Fiction* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1984)
- Sutherland J. A. Sutherland, *Victorian Novelists and Publishers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976)
- Thorpe James Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1972)
- West James L. W. West III, *American Authors and the Literary Marketplace since 1900* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988)

British

- William Wordsworth: Collaboration with Coleridge in *Lyrical Ballads* (see esp. Paul Magnuson, *Coleridge and Wordsworth: A Lyrical Dialogue* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988]); *The Three Graves* a joint work by Wordsworth and Coleridge (Magnuson, p. 69 and n., citing Wordsworth's *Poetical Works* 1:308–12, 374, and Coleridge's *Complete Poetical Works* 1:267–84); Wordsworth's use of his sister's journals; Wordsworth's self-revision (see Chapter 4)
- Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Collaboration with Wordsworth in *The Wanderings of Cain* (Magnuson, *Coleridge and Wordsworth*, pp. 69–70 n., citing Coleridge's *Complete Poetical Works* 1:285–92 and *Notebooks* 2: entry 2780 and n.); Wordsworth's contributions to *The Ancient Mariner*; collaboration with Southey in *The Fall of Robespierre* and *Joan of Arc* (Coleridge's *Collected Letters* 1:98 n., 106, 172 n.); Cole-

- ridge's appropriations from the Germans (see Chapter 5); collaborations with Joseph Henry Green and James Gillman (H. J. Jackson, "Coleridge's Collaborator, Joseph Henry Green," *Studies in Romanticism* 21 [1982]: 161–79; J. H. Haeger, "Coleridge's 'Bye Blow': The Composition and Date of *Theory of Life*," *Modern Philology* 74 [1976]: 20–41); Sara Coleridge's creative editing of *Biographia Literaria* and other writings
- Jane Austen: Other hands in the MS of *Volume the Third* (B. C. Southam, "Interpolations to Jane Austen's 'Volume the Third,'" *Notes and Queries*, n.s., 9 [1962]: 185–87)
- Lord Byron: Title of *Hours of Idleness* supplied by Byron's publisher, John Ridge (Fraistat, p. 200); most of the notes to *Childe Harold* canto 4 written by John Cam Hobhouse, who expanded them into a separate book, *Historical Illustrations to the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold* (Lord Byron: *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Jerome McGann, 2:316ff.)
- Percy Bysshe Shelley: Collaboration with Thomas Jefferson Hogg in *The Necessity of Atheism* (E. B. Murray's forthcoming edition of Shelley's prose); Mary Shelley's editing of her husband's posthumous poems
- Edward John Trelawny: Charles Brown's rewriting of *Adventures of a Younger Son* (MS at Harvard; see *The Letters of Charles Armitage Brown* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966], p. 292 and n.)
- John Clare: Extensive editing by John Taylor, who devised the title and plan for *The Shepherd's Calendar* (Tim Chilcott, *A Publisher and His Circle: The Life and Work of John Taylor, Keats's Publisher* [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972], pp. 86–128; Fraistat, p. 197, citing Ian Jack, "Poems of John Clare's Sanity," in *Some British Romantics: A Collection of Essays*, ed. James V. Logan et al. [Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1966], pp. 189–232)
- John Keats: Help from friends and publishers in *Endymion*, *Isabella*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, among others (see Chapters 1 and 2)
- Mary W. Shelley: Help from Percy Shelley in *Frankenstein* (E. B. Murray, "Shelley's Contribution to Mary's *Frankenstein*," *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin* 29 [1978]: 50–68; Anne K. Mellor, *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters* [New York: Methuen, 1988], pp. 57–69, 219–24)
- Edward Bulwer-Lytton: Dickens's editing of works in *All the Year Round* (Sutherland, pp. 180–86)
- John Stuart Mill: Collaboration with his wife in *Autobiography* and other works (see Chapter 3)
- Anne Manning: The publisher Bentley's influence on *The Ladies of Bever Hollow* (Sutherland, p. 30)
- Charles Dickens: The altered ending of *Great Expectations* influenced by Bulwer-Lytton (Sutherland, pp. 180–86)
- Charles Reade: Editorial alteration of *The Woman Hater* (Thorpe, p. 17)

- Anthony Trollope: *Barchester Towers* purged of "vulgarity" and "exaggeration" by the publisher Longman (Sutherland, p. 27)
- Charles Kingsley: Continual advice from the Macmillans during the writing of *Westward Ho!* (Sutherland, pp. 124–26)
- Thomas Hardy: Editorial alteration of novels in serialized form (Thorpe, p. 17; Dale Kramer, "Two 'New' Texts of Thomas Hardy's *The Woodlanders*," *Studies in Bibliography* 20 [1967]: 135–50, and "Revisions and Vision: Thomas Hardy's *The Woodlanders*," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 75 [1971]: 195–230, 248–82; Simon Gattrell, *Hardy the Creator: A Textual Biography* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988]); the first *Life of Hardy* (purported biography) actually coauthored by Hardy and his second wife
- George Moore: Collaboration in *Esther Waters* and other works (Barrett H. Clark, *Intimate Portraits* [New York: Dramatists Play Service, 1951], pp. 63, 90–104, 119–20, 123–24, 133–34, 146, 148–49; W. Eugene Davis, "The Celebrated Case of *Esther Waters*: Unpublished Letters of George Moore to Barrett H. Clark," *Papers on Language and Literature* 13 [1977]: 71–79, and "George Moore as Collaborator and Artist: The Making of a Later *Esther Waters: A Play*," *English Literature in Transition* 24 [1981]: 185–95)
- Oscar Wilde: Other hands in *The Importance of Being Earnest* (Thorpe, pp. 23–24; James Barron, "Premiere of Original 'Earnest,'" *New York Times*, 18 November 1985, p. C15)
- George Bernard Shaw: Early collaboration in *Widowers' Houses* (*Widowers' Houses: Facsimiles of the Shorthand and Holograph Manuscripts and the 1893 Published Text*, ed. Jerald E. Bringle [New York: Garland, 1981])
- Joseph Conrad: Collaboration with Ford Madox Ford and Edward Garnett in *Nostromo* and other works (Arthur Mizener, *The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford* [New York: World, 1971], pp. 89–91; West, p. 56)
- Ford Madox Ford: Collaboration with Conrad on various works including *The Inheritors* and *Romance* (Raymond Brebach, *Joseph Conrad, Ford Madox Ford, and the Making of "Romance"* [Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1985]; three articles by Brebach: "The Making of *Romance*, Part Fifth," *Conradiana* 6 [1974]: 171–81, "*Romance*: A Survey of Manuscripts and Typescripts," *Conradiana* 10 [1978]: 85–86, and "Conrad, Ford, and the *Romance* Poem," *Modern Philology* 81 [1983]: 169–72; Nicholas Delbanco, *Group Portrait* [New York: Morrow, 1982], pp. 98–99, 106–7, 117–18, 126–27)
- James Joyce: Publisher's censorship in *Dubliners* (Madden, p. 85, citing Robert E. Scholes, "Some Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*: 'The Dead,'" *Studies in Bibliography* 15 [1962]: 191–205, and "Further Observations on the Text of *Dubliners*," *Studies in Bibliography* 17 [1964]: 107–22); verbatim use of another writer's sermon in *Portrait*

- of the Artist as a Young Man*; other hands in the final chapter of *Ulysses*
- D. H. Lawrence: Collaboration with Frieda Lawrence, Edward Garnett, and others in *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, and *Sons and Lovers* (Charles L. Ross, *The Composition of "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love": A History* [Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1979]; Lois Palken Rudnik, *Mabel Dodge Luhan: New Woman, New Worlds* [Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984], p. 197; West, p. 56)
- Hugh MacDiarmid: Plagiarism in *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle* (Nancy K. Gish, *Hugh MacDiarmid: The Man and His Work* [London: Macmillan, 1984], pp. 59–64)
- "Bryher" (Winifred Ellerman): *Two Selves* in collaboration with H.D. (Hilda Doolittle) (Susan Stanford Friedman, *Psyche Reborn: The Emergence of H.D.* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981], p. 35)
- George Orwell: Extensive censorship by the editors of his novels (Jo Thomas, "New, Uncensored Edition of Orwell," *New York Times*, 8 March 1986, p. 13)
- Samuel Beckett: Collaboration with Jasper Johns in *Fizzles* (Carol Shloss, "*Foirades/Fizzles*: Variations on a Past Image," *Journal of Modern Literature* 12 [1985]: 153–68)
- Malcolm Lowry: Collaboration with his wife in *Under the Volcano* (Douglas Day, *Malcolm Lowry: A Biography* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1973], pp. 37, 270–73)
- Barbara Pym: Editorial creation of the posthumous *An Academic Question* from two incomplete drafts, one a first-person novel, the other a version written in the third person
- Anthony Burgess: Editorial alteration in the American issue of *A Clockwork Orange* (Edwin McDowell, "Publishing: 'Clockwork Orange' Regains Chapter 21," *New York Times*, 31 December 1986, p. C16)
- D. M. Thomas: Plagiarism from A. V. Kuznetsov's *Babi Yar* in *The White Hotel* (various writers in the *London Times Literary Supplement*, 26 March, 2, 9, 16, 23, 30 April, 16 July 1982, pp. 355, 383, 412–15, 439, 463, 487, 766)
- David Lodge: Original publisher of *Out of the Shelter* responsible for revisions and cuts amounting to 25 percent (see Lodge's introduction to the 1985 Penguin reprint).

American

- Washington Irving: Help from nephew Pierre Irving in *The Life of George Washington* and other works (Wayne R. Kime, *Pierre M. Irving and Washington Irving: A Collaboration in Life and Letters* [Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977])

- Ralph Waldo Emerson: Later lectures constructed out of his journals and notes by his daughter Ellen and James Elliot Cabot (*The Letters of Ellen Tucker Emerson*, ed. Edith E. W. Gregg [Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1982], 2:283ff.; Nancy Craig Simmons, "Arranging the Sibylline Leaves: James Elliot Cabot's Work as Emerson's Literary Executor," *Studies in the American Renaissance* [1983]: 335–89; Glen M. Johnson, "Emerson's Essay 'Immortality': The Problem of Authorship," *American Literature* 56 [1984]: 313–30)
- Nathaniel Hawthorne: Substantive contributions by his wife (Thorpe, p. 19); editorial construction of his three posthumous romances
- Herman Melville: Editorial expurgations in *Typee* (Parker, p. 48); plagiarisms in *Moby-Dick* (Howard P. Vincent, *The Trying-Out of "Moby-Dick"* [Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949]); controversial editing of the posthumous *Billy Budd*
- Low Wallace: *Ben-Hur* and other works coauthored with his wife, Susan Arnold Wallace; *Low Wallace: An Autobiography* completed by his wife
- Emily Dickinson: Editorial rewriting of the poems (Thorpe, pp. 14–15)
- Slave narratives: Numerous instances of rewriting by publishers (see, for example, *Puttin' on Ole Massa: The Slave Narratives of Henry Bibb, William Wells Brown, and Solomon Northup*, ed. Gilbert Osofsky [New York: Harper & Row, 1969]; William L. Andrews, *To Tell a Free Story: The First Century of Afro-American Autobiography, 1760–1865* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986]; and Alice A. Deck, "Whose Book Is This?: Authorial versus Editorial Control of Harriet Brent Jacobs' *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl: Written by Herself*," *Women's Studies International Forum* 10 [1987]: 33–40)
- Mark Twain: Collaboration with Charles Dudley Warner in *The Gilded Age* (Bryant Morey French, *Mark Twain and "The Gilded Age": The Book That Named an Era* [Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1965], esp. chap. 3); collaboration with William Dean Howells on at least one play; editorial changes in magazine extracts from *Huckleberry Finn* (Thorpe, p. 16); editorial completion of *The Mysterious Stranger* (Thorpe, p. 20); substantive alterations in various works influenced by Twain's wife
- William Dean Howells: Collaboration with Henry James and others in *The Whole Family*, published serially in *Harper's* in 1906 and then as a book in 1908 (reprint, New York: Ungar, 1986)
- Henry Adams: Use of his wife's letters in *Democracy and Esther* (Eugenia Kaledin, *The Education of Mrs. Henry Adams* [Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981], p. 9)
- Edward Noyes Westcott: *David Harum* fashioned out of Westcott's MS by Appleton editor Ripley Hitchcock (West, pp. 51–55)
- Thomas Nelson Page: Editorial changes in his stories (Thorpe, p. 17)
- Black Elk: *Black Elk Speaks* the product of Black Elk's dictation in Oglala

- Sioux dialect, his son's oral translation of this into English, and the poet John G. Neihardt's transcribing and editing (the work was published "as told to"—later changed to "as told through"—Neihardt), with additions by other tribal elders who interrupted to correct Black Elk or were called on by Black Elk to contribute or fill in details (see 1972 Pocket Books reissue, pp. 235–38, "About This Book and Its Author"; Arnold Krupat, "The Indian Autobiography: Origins, Type, and Function," *American Literature* 53 [1981]: 22–42; Albert E. Stone, *Autobiographical Occasions and Original Acts: Versions of American Identity from Henry Adams to Nate Shaw* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982], chap. 3, "The Soul and the Self: Black Elk and Thomas Merton," esp. pp. 61–76; G. Thomas Couser, "Black Elk Speaks with Forked Tongue," in *Studies in Autobiography*, ed. James Olney [New York: Oxford University Press, 1988], pp. 73–88)
- Theodore Dreiser: *Sister Carrie* the product of several hands (see Chapter 7); *Jennie Gerhardt* edited and altered by Ripley Hitchcock (West, p. 55); posthumous work, *The Stoic*, cut and altered by editor with the approval of Dreiser's widow (West, p. 72, citing Philip L. Gerber, "Dreiser's *Stoic*: A Study in Literary Frustration," *Literary Monographs* 7 [1975]: 85–144, 159–64)
- Stephen Crane: Other hands in *Maggie* and *The Red Badge of Courage* (Parker, pp. 39, 49, 147–79 passim—see Ripley Hitchcock in Parker's index)
- Gertrude Stein: Possible substantive contributions by Alice Toklas to Stein's *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (Catharine R. Stimpson, "Gertrude Altrude: Stein, Toklas, and the Paradox of the Happy Marriage," in *Mothering the Mind: Twelve Studies of Writers and Their Silent Partners*, ed. Ruth Perry and Martine Watson Brownley [New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984], pp. 122–39, and references there)
- Sherwood Anderson: Works edited by Maxwell Perkins (A. Scott Berg, *Max Perkins: Editor of Genius* [New York: Dutton, 1978], pp. 379–82)
- Upton Sinclair: Extensive revisions and cuts supposedly influenced by publishers and censors in *The Jungle* (new edition by Gene DeGruson—see Edwin McDowell, "Sinclair's 'Jungle' with All Muck Restored," *New York Times*, 22 August 1988, pp. C15, C20)
- Wallace Stevens: Influence of Harriet Monroe on the first published text, five stanzas long, of *Sunday Morning* (*Letters of Wallace Stevens*, ed. Holly Stevens [New York: Knopf, 1966], pp. 183–84; Joan Richardson, *Wallace Stevens: The Early Years, 1879–1923* [New York: Morrow, 1986], pp. 436–37)
- William Carlos Williams: Deletions in *Paterson* influenced by Richard Eberhart at Yaddo (Eberhart's recollection)
- Edith Summers Kelley: *Weeds* significantly altered by a trade editor (West, p. 70)
- H.D. (Hilda Doolittle): Editing of early poems (for example, *Hermes of the*

- Ways) by Ezra Pound, who also devised her literary name, "H.D., Imagiste," and submitted the poems to *Poetry* (see H.D.'s brief descriptions in *End to Torment: A Memoir of Ezra Pound*, ed. Norman Holmes Pearson and Michael King [New York: New Directions, 1979], pp. 18, 40)
- Robinson Jeffers: Saxe Commins's editing of Jeffers's final volume of poetry, *The Double Axe* (West, p. 65, citing James Shebl, *In This Wild Water: The Suppressed Poems of Robinson Jeffers* [Pasadena: Ward Ritchie Press, 1976], and a 1977 edition of Jeffers's *The Double Axe and Other Poems including Eleven Suppressed Poems*)
- T. S. Eliot: The work of Pound and others on *The Waste Land* (see Chapter 6)
- Eugene O'Neill: *More Stately Mansions* concocted from O'Neill's partially revised script by Karl Ragner Gierow (Thorpe, p. 20)
- Archibald MacLeish: The work of Elia Kazan and others on *J.B.* (Thorpe, pp. 24–25, 30–31)
- Pearl S. Buck: Several works of nonfiction, including *Fairy Tales of the Orient*, *The People of Japan*, *The Story Bible*, *Pearl S. Buck's Oriental Cookbook*, and *Pearl S. Buck's Book of Christmas* "created" by Lyle Kenyon Engel, the founder of Book Creations, Inc. (see Chapter 7)
- Dashiell Hammett: *Red Harvest* changed significantly by a trade editor (West, p. 70)
- E. E. Cummings: *The Enormous Room* changed significantly by a trade editor (West, p. 70)
- John Dos Passos: *Three Soldiers* changed significantly by a trade editor (West, p. 70)
- Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings: Subject and plot of *The Yearling* suggested by Maxwell Perkins (Berg, *Max Perkins*, pp. 297–300)
- F. Scott Fitzgerald: Maxwell Perkins's influence on *The Great Gatsby* (see Chapter 7); Malcolm Cowley's work on *Tender Is the Night* (Brian Higgins and Hershel Parker, "Sober Second Thoughts: Fitzgerald's 'Final Version' of *Tender Is the Night*," *Proof* 4 [1975]: 129–52); Edmund Wilson's doctoring of *The Last Tycoon* (Matthew J. Bruccoli, "*The Last of the Novelists*": *F. Scott Fitzgerald and "The Last Tycoon"* [Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977]); Fitzgerald's use of his wife's diaries and letters (Arthur Mizener, *The Far Side of Paradise: A Biography of F. Scott Fitzgerald* [Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951]; Nancy Milford, *Zelda: A Biography* [New York: Harper & Row, 1970], pp. 35, 44, 55, 58, 71, 76, 81, 89, 102, 177, 284–85)
- William Faulkner: *Flags in the Dust* (early version of *Sartoris*) cut drastically by agent; various hands in *Sanctuary*, *Requiem for a Nun*, *Absalom, Absalom!*, stories, and films (Madden, pp. 52–60; Parker, pp. 47–48; West, p. 64; numerous articles and editions by Noel Polk)
- Ernest Hemingway: Fitzgerald's influence on the beginning of *The Sun Also Rises* (see Chapter 7; *Antaeus*, no. 33 [Spring 1979]: 7–18; Parker, p. 43);

- Mary Hemingway's concoction of *A Moveable Feast* (Kenneth S. Lynn, *Hemingway* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987], p. 585 and n.) and *Islands in the Stream* (West, p. 72, citing Michael S. Reynolds, "Words Killed, Wounded, Missing in Action," *Hemingway Notes* 6, no. 2 [Spring 1981]: 2–9); editorial production of *The Garden of Eden* (West, p. 72; Barbara Probst Solomon, "Where's Papa?" *New Republic*, 9 March 1987, pp. 30–34)
- Thomas Wolfe: Editorial collaboration in all the works, lifetime and posthumous (see Chapter 7)
- Zora Neale Hurston: Autobiography, *Dust Tracks on a Road*, altered by editor in such a way as to make it unsatisfactory to both author and audience (Robert E. Hemenway, *Zora Neale Hurston: A Literary Biography* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977], pp. 286–90)
- Nathanael West: Collaboration with S. J. Perelman (see second item below)
- Irving Stone: Collaboration with his wife in *Lust for Life* and other works (obituary, *New York Times*, 28 August 1989, p. B6)
- S. J. Perelman: Collaboration with Nathanael West in a three-act play entitled "Even Stephen" (never produced, never published, extant in MS at Brown University—see Mel Gussow, "Perelman–West Play in New Trove at Brown," *New York Times*, 2 February 1987, p. C11)
- Moss Hart: Performance changes in *Once in a Lifetime* (Thorpe, p. 24, citing Hart's *Act One*)
- John O'Hara: Saxe Commins's editing of *A Rage to Live* and other works (West, p. 65)
- James Michener: Large novels written in part by a research team (*Texas* a recent example)
- Richard Wright: Participation of Wright's agent, editor, and others in the production of *Native Son* (Keneth Kinnamon, "How *Native Son* Was Born," in *Writing the American Classics*, ed. James Barbour and Tom Quirk [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990], pp. 209–34); Book-of-the-Month Club creation of *Black Boy* out of the longer *American Hunger* (Janice Thaddeus, "The Metamorphosis of Richard Wright's *Black Boy*," *American Literature* 57 [1985]: 199–214)
- James Agee: Editorial creation of *A Death in the Family* (West, pp. 71–72, citing Victor A. Kramer, "A *Death in the Family* and Agee's Projected Novel," *Proof* 3 [1973]: 139–54)
- Willard Motley: Editorial creation of *Knock on Any Door* (Madden, p. 103, citing Jerome Klinkowitz and Karen Wood, "The Making and Unmaking of *Knock on Any Door*," *Proof* 3 [1973]: 121–37; William Proctor Williams and Craig S. Abbott, *An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies* [New York: Modern Language Association, 1985], p. 54; West, p. 70)
- William Gibson: Performance changes in *Two for the Seesaw* (see Chapter 8)
- Shirley Jackson: Contribution of her husband, Stanley Edgar Hyman, to

- "The Lottery" (Judy Oppenheimer, *Private Demons: The Life of Shirley Jackson* [New York: Putnam, 1988], p. 130)
- Robert Lowell: Influence of friends to produce "collective poetry" (Stanley Kunitz's comment quoted in Linda Bamber, "Writers Can Be Friends," *New York Times Book Review*, 14 December 1986, pp. 1, 40-41); Randall Jarrell's hand in *Lord Weary's Castle* (Bruce Michelson, "Randall Jarrell and Robert Lowell: The Making of *Lord Weary's Castle*," *Contemporary Literature* 26 [1985]: 402-25)
- Jacqueline Susann: Editorial creation of *Valley of the Dolls* by Don Preston and *The Love Machine* by "the Simon and Schuster editorial team" (see Chapter 7, citing Barbara Seaman, *Lovely Me: The Life of Jacqueline Susann* [1987], esp. pp. 285-89, 296-98, 322-24, 375)
- James Jones: Extensive cuts and revisions by the publisher in *From Here to Eternity* (MS of the novel at the University of Illinois)
- Jack Kerouac: Collaboration of editors, agents, and friends in *On the Road* (Tim Hunt, *Kerouac's Crooked Road: Development of a Fiction* [Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1981])
- William Zinsser: Editorial contributions to various of Zinsser's works (Zinsser, *On Writing Well: An Informal Guide to Writing Nonfiction*, 3rd ed. [New York: Harper & Row, 1985], pp. 227, 234-38)
- Kurt Vonnegut, Jr.: Early book altered by editor, and then reissued in the form that Vonnegut wanted (West, pp. 70-71, citing Susan Schiefelbein, "Writers, Editors and the Shaping of Books," *Washington Post Book World*, 17 January 1982, pp. 1-2, 8)
- Joseph Heller: Title of *Catch-22* the work of Robert Gottlieb (see Chapter 7)
- Grace Metalious: Editorial rewriting of *Peyton Place* (see Chapter 7, citing Emily Toth, *Inside Peyton Place: The Life of Grace Metalious* [1981], pp. 96-109)
- Truman Capote: Editorial creation of posthumous book, *Answered Prayers*, from Capote's partially complete MS (Edwin McDowell, "Publishing Manuscripts Posthumously," *New York Times*, 10 September 1984, p. C13)
- Malcolm X: Collaboration with Alex Haley in *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (Stone, *Autobiographical Occasions and Original Acts*, chap. 7, "Two Recreate One: The Act of Collaboration in Recent Black Autobiography—Ossie Guffy, Nate Shaw, Malcolm X," esp. pp. 246-64)
- William Styron: Hiram Haydn's work on *Lie Down in Darkness* (West, p. 68, citing articles by Arthur D. Casciato and West)
- John Barth: Publisher's alterations in *The Floating Opera* (Sherry Lutz Zivley, "A Collation of John Barth's *Floating Opera*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 72 [1978]: 201-12; West, p. 70)
- John Updike: *Rabbit, Run* altered by editor in first published version, after which Updike was able to "repair the damage" in a later edition (West,

- pp. 70-71, citing Randall H. Waldron, "Rabbit Revised," *American Literature* 56 [1984]: 51-67)
- Sylvia Plath: *Ariel* posthumously produced, arranged, and published by her husband, Ted Hughes (MSS at Smith College; Marjorie Perloff, "The Two *Ariels*: The (Re)Making of the Sylvia Plath Canon," in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986], pp. 308-33)
- Louise Shivers: *Here to Get My Baby Out of Jail*, originally a 700-page MS, reduced by editor to a 125-page printed book
- Stephen King: Original publisher of *The Stand* responsible for cuts amounting to 150,000 words (Edwin McDowell, "Book Notes," *New York Times*, 31 January 1990, p. C20)
- Ann Beattie: Title of *Love Always* (criticized by reviewers as inappropriate) supplied by Roger Angell, fiction editor of the *New Yorker*

Notes

1. *What Is an Author?*

1. This authorial "disappearance" in Barthes and Foucault should not be confused with a different concept expressed in the same words by English and American critics earlier in this century—the "disappearance of the author" behind a novelist's fictitious point of view; see the citations in Norman Friedman, "Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept," *PMLA* 70 (1955): 1160–84. For Barthes's "The Death of the Author," originally published in *Manièra* 5 (1968), see *Image—Music—Text*, a collection of Barthes's essays selected and trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), pp. 142–48. Foucault's "What Is an Author?"—delivered at the Collège de France on 22 February 1969 and then published in *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie* 63 (1969)—is available both in Foucault's *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 113–38 (translation, by Bouchard and Sherry Simon, of the printed text of 1969), and in *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, ed. Josué V. Harari (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979), pp. 141–60 (translation, by Harari, of a revised version delivered at the State University of New York at Buffalo). I need hardly point out that my chapter title is intentionally taken over from Foucault, who thus at the beginning of this book becomes one of my coauthors.

2. I quote the first two definitions in *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster, 1983). The unabridged *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1961) adds several others that, taken together, read like an outline for a study of multiple authorship: "one that compiles material (as for publication)," "one (as an author's agent) having the right to make author's alterations," "a printer's customer," "a corporate author." Other definitions in the larger dictionary include "one that fathers" [*sic*], "SOURCE, CREATOR; esp. GOD," "one that prompts to an action," and "the source of an opinion."

3. This is the point of Stanley Fish's "With the Compliments of the Author: Reflections on Austin and Derrida," *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1982): 693–721.

4. James's best-known pronouncements are conveniently collected in *Theory of Fiction: Henry James*, ed. James E. Miller, Jr. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972); see esp. chap. 9, part B, "Presence of the Author," and chap. 12, "Point of View," pp. 174–80, 234–56. For Booth and Barthes, see Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), esp. part 2: "The Author's Voice in Fiction," pp. 167–266, and Barthes, "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives," in *Image—Music—Text*, pp. 79–124 (quotations from p. 111).

5. *The Letters of Emily Dickinson*, ed. Thomas H. Johnson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), 2:412.
6. Patrick Cruttwell, "Makers and Persons," *Hudson Review* 12 (1959-60): 487-507; Ralph W. Rader, "The Dramatic Monologue and Related Lyric Forms," *Critical Inquiry* 3 (1976): 131-51. W. K. Wimsatt comments on Cruttwell and a number of other writers on personae and masks in "Genesis: A Fallacy Revisited," in *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*, ed. Peter Demetz et al. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 193-225 (reprinted with a different title, "Genesis: An Argument Resumed," in Wimsatt's *Day of the Leopards: Essays in Defense of Poems* [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1976], pp. 11-39). See also Friedman, "Point of View in Fiction."
7. For comprehensive discussion of the Romantics' use of biography as a critical methodology, see Annette Wheeler Cafarelli, *Prose in the Age of Poets: Romanticism and Biographical Narrative from Johnson to De Quincey* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990). Nineteenth-century American readers' interest in authors and genius is thoroughly documented in Nina Baym, *Novels, Readers, and Reviewers: Responses to Fiction in Antebellum America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984), chap. 12, "Authors," pp. 249-69.
8. Charles Grosvenor Osgood, *The Voice of England: A History of English Literature* (New York: Harper, 1935), pp. xi, 246, 305.
9. Wimsatt and Beardsley's "The Intentional Fallacy"—discussed in Chapter 9—originally appeared in *Sewanee Review* 54 (1946): 468-88, and then was republished, in revised form, in Wimsatt's *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954), pp. 3-18. See also Wimsatt's retrospective "Genesis: A Fallacy Revisited." Frye's "Literary Criticism" is in *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. James Thorpe (New York: Modern Language Association, 1963), pp. 57-69 (quotation from p. 59). As Gerald Graff points out, Richards misinterpreted the evidence of his experiments at Cambridge; in the accounts in *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1929), it is the lack of biographical and historical contexts that caused students the greatest difficulties in reading. See Graff's *Professing Literature: An Institutional History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), pp. 174-77.
10. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1967).
11. *The Poems of John Keats*, ed. Jack Stillinger (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), pp. 363-64. The basic facts about the composition, manuscripts, and textual history of the poem are given in Stillinger, *The Texts of Keats's Poems* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 235-38, and the textual notes in *The Poems of John Keats*, pp. 646-47. For facsimiles of Keats's draft, see *Athenaeum*, 26 October 1872, p. 529, and *The Keats Letters, Papers, and Other Relics Forming the Dilke Bequest in the Hampstead Public Library*, ed. George C. Williamson (London: John Lane, 1914), plate 8.
12. See H. W. Garrod, ed., *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), pp. 330, 495-500, and J. V. Cunningham, "Classical and Medieval: Statius, On Sleep," in *Tradition and Poetic Structure* (Denver: Alan Swallow, 1960), pp. 25-39.

13. *The Letters of John Keats, 1814-1821*, ed. Hyder E. Rollins (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), 2:108.
14. See H. W. Garrod, *Keats*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), pp. 80-87; M. R. Ridley, *Keats's Craftsmanship: A Study in Poetic Development* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), pp. 196-209; Lawrence John Zillman, *John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition: A Critical and Comparative Study* (Los Angeles: Lymanhouse, 1939); and W. J. Bate, *The Stylistic Development of Keats* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1945), pp. 125-33.
15. On the language and theme of the sonnet, the most helpful critics are Claude Lee Finney, *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), 2:605-8; W. K. Thomas, "Keats' 'To Sleep,'" *Explicator* 26 (1968): item 55; and Morris Dickstein, *Keats and His Poetry: A Study in Development* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 18-28.
16. For the Burton and Dante passages, see Robert Gittings, *John Keats: The Living Year* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 126, 218, and *The Mask of Keats: A Study of Problems* (London: Heinemann, 1956), pp. 32-33, 151, 166.
17. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, pp. 71-76; Foucault, "What Is an Author?"; Kendall L. Walton, "Style and the Products and Processes of Art," in *The Concept of Style*, ed. Berel Lang, rev. ed. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 72-103; Alexander Nehamas, "The Postulated Author: Critical Monism as a Regulative Ideal," *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1981): 133-49.
18. A similar situation exists in the principal twentieth-century editions of Keats's poems, where the texts of the sonnet in H. W. Garrod's Oxford English Texts *Poetical Works* of 1939 and 1958 (based on Milnes's *Life*), Miriam Allott's Longman Annotated English Poets *Poems* of 1970 (based on Woodhouse's first transcript), and my own *Poems* of 1978 (based on Keats's album copy) again all differ substantively from one another. John Barnard's text in *Complete Poems* (Harmondsworth: Penguin) is also substantively unique in both the first edition, 1973 (based on the version in Milnes's *Life*), and the second edition, 1976 (based on Keats's album copy); Keats's "thy poppy" in line 7 is misprinted "the poppy" in both editions.
19. Keats's letter has no punctuation in line 11 and has "borrowing" (presumably a slip of the pen) for "burrowing" and "a" interlined above deleted "the" in line 12 (Keats's *Letters*, 2:105). Both of Woodhouse's transcripts have lowercase "conscience" altered to "Conscience" in line 11; his first transcript also has the pencil queries "q enshrouded" opposite "Enshaded" in line 4 and "q hoards" (written before he changed the word in his text) opposite "lords" in line 11. For facsimiles of Brown's transcript and Woodhouse's first copy, see *The Charles Brown Poetry Transcripts at Harvard* (p. 50) and *The Woodhouse Poetry Transcripts at Harvard* (pp. 276-77), both ed. Jack Stillinger (New York: Garland, 1988).
20. See the eight letters under the heading "A Line in Keats" in *Times Literary Supplement*, 8, 29 March; 12, 19 April; and 3 May 1941, pp. 117, 151, 179, 191, 215. Garrod repeats his paraphrase (along with several pieces of misinformation concerning the texts of the sonnet) in his Oxford Standard Authors edition, *The Poetical Works of John Keats* (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 467. It was not known until much later, with the publication of *The Texts of Keats's Poems* in 1974, that Keats accepted Woodhouse's "hoards" when he wrote out the poem in the lady's album in 1820.

2. *Keats and His Helpers:**The Multiple Authorship of Isabella*

1. The "little change . . . in my intellect lately" is in Keats's *Letters*, 1:214 (23 January 1818). For interpretation of the poem as antiromance, see Jack Stillinger, "Keats and Romance: The 'Reality' of *Isabella*," in *The Hoodwinking of Madeline and Other Essays on Keats's Poems* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. 31–45, and Susan Wolfson, "Keats's *Isabella* and the 'Digressions' of 'Romance,'" *Criticism* 27 (1985): 247–61. The facts concerning composition, manuscripts, and textual history are given in Stillinger, *The Texts of Keats's Poems*, pp. 182–86, and in the apparatus and textual notes in *The Poems of John Keats* (1978), pp. 245–63, 601–9.

2. Woodhouse figures prominently in four of the seven volumes of Keats facsimiles in the series *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics*: vol. 1, *Poems (1817): A Facsimile of Richard Woodhouse's Annotated Copy in the Huntington Library*; vol. 3, *Endymion (1818): A Facsimile of Richard Woodhouse's Annotated Copy in the Berg Collection*; vol. 4, *Poems, Transcripts, Letters, &c.: Facsimiles of Richard Woodhouse's Scrapbook Materials in the Pierpont Morgan Library*; and vol. 6, *The Woodhouse Poetry Transcripts at Harvard: A Facsimile of the W² Notebook, with Description and Contents of the W¹ Notebook*, all ed. Jack Stillinger (New York: Garland, 1985, 1988). There is information about Woodhouse as scholar, collector, annotator, and reader of Keats in the introductions to the four volumes; his shorthand transcript of *Isabella* is reproduced in vol. 4, pp. 265–84, and his longhand W² transcript in vol. 6, pp. 36–87. A facsimile of Keats's fair copy of the poem (with Woodhouse's suggested corrections and revisions in pencil) is available in vol. 5 of the series, *Manuscript Poems in the British Library: Facsimiles of the "Hyperion" Holograph and George Keats's Notebook of Holographs and Transcripts* (1988), pp. 59–113.

3. One other Woodhouse shorthand transcript of a Keats poem is extant, that of *The Eve of St. Mark* (in the Adelman Collection at Bryn Mawr College), and a lost shorthand copy has been hypothesized as the first of Woodhouse's transcripts of *The Eve of St. Agnes* (see *The Texts of Keats's Poems*, pp. 215–18, and *Poems* [1978], pp. 626–28). There is, however, no ready explanation as to why Woodhouse made these initial copies in shorthand. He seems to have had plenty of time in which to make other copies of long poems (and sometimes more than one duplicate) in longhand, and he obviously was in no hurry when he made the shorthand transcript of *Isabella*, since he took the trouble to pencil (and, before he could pencil, compose) a great many revisions and suggestions in the holograph that he was copying.

4. Keats's *Letters*, 1:376–77.

5. They are listed in *The Texts of Keats's Poems*, pp. 184–85, and again, slightly more accurately, in *Poems* (1978), pp. 605–6 (and in the apparatus and textual notes to *Isabella*, passim).

6. In the introduction to my "reading edition," *John Keats: Complete Poems* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), esp. pp. xxii–xxviii.

7. Quite possibly Keats got his final wording from Woodhouse as well, since it is the same as Woodhouse's penciled alteration of the line in the W² transcript (to read "Three hours they labored . . ."). See note 9.

8. See *Keats: The Critical Heritage*, ed. G. M. Matthews (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971), pp. 104, 113–14. Both reviews, in the August and April 1818 issues, respectively, actually appeared in September, about the time Keats was revising *Isabella* and getting ready to show it to Reynolds and probably to Woodhouse as well.

9. There is no clear evidence that Keats saw any of Woodhouse's queries, suggestions, and revisions in either the holograph fair copy or the W² transcript, but the two men were good friends and the markings may be taken as indications of problems that Woodhouse could have brought up in conversation. Keats did of course see the W¹ transcript when he was preparing his poems for the 1820 printer.

10. See Christopher Ricks, *Keats and Embarrassment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), and, for the *Edinburgh Magazine* notice of *Poems* in October 1817, *Keats: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Matthews, p. 71.

11. These lines are all in very faint and partially erased pencil, and some of the readings are questionable. (For another set of transcriptions, with many differences from those given here, see H. W. Garrod's Oxford English Texts edition, *The Poetical Works of John Keats*, 2nd ed. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958], pp. 217–18.) The first version in my arbitrary numbering is written above and beneath the original lines 55–56 in the transcript; versions 2–5 appear on the opposite verso, and the last is written at the end of the W² book, on fol. 241. The three versions given below from W¹, faint with age and deleted rather than erased, are similarly questionable.

12. *The Poems of John Keats*, ed. Miriam Allott (London: Longman, 1970), p. 330; *The Poetical Works and Other Writings of John Keats*, Hampstead Edition, ed. H. Buxton Forman (New York: Scribner's, 1938–39), 3:61.

13. The text of Keats's source (*The Novels and Tales of the Renowned John Boccaccio*, 5th ed. [1684], pp. 182–85) is given in the notes to *John Keats: Complete Poems*, pp. 443–45.

14. Keats's *Letters*, 1:238, 270–71. Here and in the preceding paragraph I am drawing on my introduction to *Endymion: A Facsimile of the Revised Holograph Manuscript*, vol. 2 of the Keats series of *Manuscripts of the Younger Romantics* (New York: Garland, 1985). Taylor's changes and other markings in the manuscript are categorized and listed in the notes on pp. 377–78.

15. See *The Texts of Keats's Poems*, pp. 214–20, and *Poems* (1978), pp. 625–29. The September 1819 correspondence between Woodhouse and Taylor in the next four paragraphs is quoted from Keats's *Letters*, 2:162–63, 182–83.

16. See Keats's *Letters*, 2:157–59, 183. Mention should also be made of Keats's and Charles Brown's collaborative effort at playwriting, *Otho the Great*, for which Brown supplied the plot and characters and Keats the actual writing. Scholars who treat this work usually phrase their remarks as if Keats alone were the author.

17. *The Poems of John Keats*, ed. Allott, p. 330; *The Poetical Works and Other Writings of John Keats*, ed. Forman, 3:61.

18. *Modern Language Notes* 94 (1979): 988–1032. The essay is reprinted without significant change in McGann's *The Beauty of Inflections: Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp. 15–65. My quotations in the next two paragraphs are from the latter source, pp. 32–39.

19. Majorie Levinson repeats McGann's errors and misplaced emphases in her chapter on *La Belle Dame* in *Keats's Life of Allegory: The Origins of a Style* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 45–95 passim. Her aim, however, is to demonize rather than apotheosize the author. A good corrective to McGann's argument is Theresa M. Kelley's "Poetics and the Politics of Reception: Keats's 'La Belle Dame sans Merci,'" *ELH* 54 (1987): 333–62.

20. Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 8, 42–43, 85–86. McGann cites James Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1972), p. 48.

3. Who Wrote J. S. Mill's Autobiography?

1. The basic facts concerning composition, transmission, and publication of the text are given and documented in three earlier accounts by the present author: "The Text of John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography*," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 43 (1960): 220–42, and the introductions to *The Early Draft of John Stuart Mill's "Autobiography"* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961), pp. 1–11—hereafter cited as *Early Draft*—and *Mill's Autobiography and Literary Essays*, ed. John M. Robson and Jack Stillinger, vol. 1 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), pp. xviii–xxx—hereafter cited as CW, 1. The text of the Early Draft manuscript is printed both in *Early Draft*, pp. 35ff., and—on pages facing the text of the revised manuscript at Columbia—in CW, 1:4–246 (with text of the rejected leaves on pp. 608–24).

2. Diary entry, 19 January 1854, in *The Letters of John Stuart Mill*, ed. Hugh S. R. Elliot (London: Longmans, Green, 1910), 2:361.

3. Nicholas Joukovsky, of Penn State, who has done a great deal of research in the archives of Mill's employer, the East India Company, tells me that Mill's method of drafting in the right-hand half of the page was standard practice for documents that he wrote at work. The space in the left-hand side of the page was reserved for revisions by a member of the Company's Board of Control. In the creation of the *Autobiography*, he suggests, Harriet Mill in effect became her husband's "Board of Control."

4. The two editions of the *Autobiography* most frequently cited from the 1920s through the 1960s add still more authors. Harold J. Laski's Oxford World's Classics edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), an unedited reprint of the first edition, has several additional mistakes in wording introduced by the World's Classics printer, and in issues after 1944, when some damaged type was reset, has a further substantive change made by the printer who repaired the damage; the number of authors in this version of the work has increased to nine. The Columbia University Press edition of 1924—*Autobiography of John Stuart Mill Published for the First Time without Alterations or Omissions from the Original Manuscript in the Possession of Columbia University*, with a Preface by John Jacob Coss—also, it turns out, has nine authors. Purportedly taken directly from the revised holograph manuscript, the text of the Columbia edition nevertheless incorporates readings of the same seven authors listed above (the editor used the 1873 printed text as a guide to deciphering Mill's handwriting!) and then adds further misreadings by the Columbia editor and new mistakes by the Columbia printer. ("Misreading" and "mistake" seem justifiable terms when the intent was to copy the text exactly.)

5. This has been done in the two most recent scholarly editions—that in the Riverside paperback *Autobiography*, ed. Jack Stillinger (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969), also issued in the Oxford paperbacks series (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), and that in CW, 1.

6. Parenthetical numbers of this sort refer to pages in CW, 1 (the quoted words in the present instance appear three times—in the Early Draft text, the Columbia text, and one of the Early Draft rejected leaves transcribed in CW, 1, appendix G). More elaborate references in the form "6.4" (beginning in the third paragraph below) cite both page and line number in CW, 1. In quoting directly from the Early Draft manuscript, I follow the editorial practices outlined in CW, 1:xlvi.

7. For the most important of these passages in the various texts of the *Autobiography*, see CW, 1:196–97, 234–35 n., 250–59, 620–21. The phrases "joint product" and

"joint production(s)" occur seven times at CW, 1:250, 251, 256, 257, and another seventeen times in the extant transcript of Mill's personal bibliography (see *Bibliography of the Published Writings of John Stuart Mill*, ed. Ney MacMinn et al. [Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University, 1945], pp. 59ff.).

8. The principal works include F. A. Hayek, *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); Michael St. John Packe, *The Life of John Stuart Mill* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1954); H. O. Pappé, *John Stuart Mill and the Harriet Taylor Myth* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1960); my introduction in *Early Draft*, esp. pp. 22–28; Francis E. Mineka, "The *Autobiography* and the Lady," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 32 (1963): 301–6; John M. Robson, "Harriet Taylor and John Stuart Mill: Artist and Scientist," *Queen's Quarterly* 73 (1966): 167–86; Alice S. Rossi's introduction ("Sentiment and Intellect: The Story of John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill") to her edition of the Mills' *Essays on Sex Equality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); and Phyllis Rose, *Parallel Lives: Five Victorian Marriages* (New York: Knopf, 1983), pp. 95–140, esp. pp. 127–37. See also Gertrude Himmelfarb, *On Liberty and Liberalism: The Case of John Stuart Mill* (New York: Knopf, 1974), and John C. Rees, *John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty"* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

9. The *Political Economy* letters are extracted in appendix G of *Principles of Political Economy*, ed. John M. Robson, vol. 3 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), pp. 1026–37. On the *Logic*, see Robson, "Joint Authorship' Again: The Evidence in the Third Edition of Mill's *Logic*," *Mill News Letter* 6, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 15–20. A small additional piece of physical evidence has recently come to light in the five-page draft "What Is to Be Done with Ireland?" published for the first time in *Essays on England, Ireland, and the Empire*, ed. John M. Robson, vol. 6 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982). Mill's manuscript, at the King's School, Canterbury, has several penciled revisions by Harriet Mill (detailed in Robson's textual apparatus, pp. 499–503), but in this instance he apparently never returned to the work and so never responded to her markings.

10. This and other numbers should be read as approximations. Any such tallying involves arbitrary decisions; three separate markings or alterations of a sentence, for example, could count as a single passage (her marking of the sentence) or as three passages (her markings of words and phrases in the sentence). Her pencilings in nearly two-thirds of the passages (about 185 of the 300) are recorded in the notes in *Early Draft*; a lesser number (approximately half) are described in the textual notes in CW, 1. Some 30 of the pencilings consist of erased or otherwise unintelligible markings and comments that, while they most probably were influential at the time, are no longer recoverable.

11. Mill's reference, in a letter to his wife of 10 February 1854 (quoted in CW, 1:xxi), to "passages which we marked for alteration in the early part of it [the Early Draft] which we read together" might suggest that some, most, or all of her markings and alterations actually originated with Mill while she, pencil in hand, acted as amanuensis. This does not, however, square with the evidence of the manuscript itself, where it is clear that a *written* dialogue took place in which first she marked, queried, or revised a passage and then he responded to her penciling (after which she sometimes further marked rewritten passages at left, and he sometimes further responded to her new suggestions).

12. It is not certain that every sentence of this reconstructed text stood together, in

a single version, as I am giving it here. At some point, possibly before his wife read the passage, Mill canceled the last thirty-five words of this sentence ("but all the common things . . .") and substituted a shorter conclusion at left: "but I never put even a common share of the exercise of understanding into practical things." And the fourth sentence before this ("I had hardly any use of my hands"), now canceled in the manuscript, perhaps was removed by him when he wrote the present more elaborate sentence on manual dexterity.

13. There is an analogous situation in the extant correspondence between the two, where, as I remarked in *Early Draft*, "It is notable . . . how seldom *ideas* are touched on" (p. 26). I would emphasize, however, that neither the *Early Draft* manuscript nor their letters give us much of a clue as to what they *said* to each other when they were together.

14. The "progress from private to public . . . voice" described in the introduction to *Early Draft* (p. 15) was in large part initiated by her.

15. Packe, *The Life of John Stuart Mill*, p. 33; W. H. Burston, *James Mill on Philosophy and Education* (London: Athlone Press, 1973), pp. 85–86; Peter Glassman, *J. S. Mill: The Evolution of a Genius* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1985), p. 149; Jonathan Loesberg, *Fictions of Consciousness: Mill, Newman, and the Reading of Victorian Prose* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1986), p. 49.

16. *On Liberty*, in *Essays on Politics and Society*, ed. John M. Robson, vol. 18 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), p. 216.

17. Typical examples are Himmelfarb, *On Liberty and Liberalism*, esp. pp. 239–75 (pro-Harriet, as it were), and Rees, *John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty,"* esp. pp. 12ff., 109–15 (anti-Harriet).

18. I am much obliged to Ann P. W. Robson, of the University of Toronto, for sending me a photocopy of this unpublished letter. The original is in the Russell Archives at McMaster University.

4. Multiple "Consciousnesses" in Wordsworth's Prelude

1. See Mill's *Autobiography and Literary Essays*, CW, 1:149–53, 147. I have described parallels between Wordsworth's development and Mill's in my introduction to the 1969 Riverside edition of the *Autobiography*, pp. viii–xvii, and the influence on Keats in "Wordsworth and Keats," in *The Age of William Wordsworth: Critical Essays on the Romantic Tradition*, ed. Kenneth R. Johnston and Gene W. Ruoff (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987), pp. 173–95, 357–58.

2. Neil Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), esp. p. 52.

3. See Thomas McFarland, *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin: Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Modalities of Fragmentation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), chap. 1, "The Symbiosis of Coleridge and Wordsworth," pp. 56–103, and Paul Magnuson, *Coleridge and Wordsworth: A Lyrical Dialogue* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988). Gene W. Ruoff, *Wordsworth and Coleridge: The Making of the Major Lyrics, 1802–1804* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989), interprets the relationship as a dialogue of "intertextual genetics," and Lucy Newlyn, *Coleridge, Wordsworth, and the Language of Allusion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), as a dialogue of literary allusion.

4. McFarland, citing resemblances with the discharged soldier of *The Prelude* 4, the drowned man of book 5, and the leechgatherer in *Resolution and Independence*, suggests that the Mariner is "a projection from the psycho-dramatic center of Wordsworth's fantasy more than from that of Coleridge" (*Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin*, p. 68).

5. *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. L. Griggs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956–71), 2:830. There is another relevant statement at 2:811. Wordsworth commented many years later, in a note in the manuscript of Barron Field's "Memoirs of the Life and Poetry of William Wordsworth" now in the British Library, "I never cared a straw about the theory—& the Preface was written at the request of Mr Coleridge out of sheer good nature. I recollect the very spot, a deserted Quarry in the Vale of Grasmere where he pressed the thing upon me, & but for that it would never have been thought of" (*Barron Field's Memoirs of Wordsworth*, ed. Geoffrey Little [Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1975], p. 62 n.).

6. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Early Years*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, 2nd ed., rev. Chester L. Shaver (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 289.

7. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Middle Years*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, 2nd ed., rev. Mary Moorman, part 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 298, 299, 319, 341–42. See also John E. Jordan, *De Quincey to Wordsworth: A Biography of a Relationship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp. 62–85.

8. See *Barron Field's Memoirs of Wordsworth*, pp. 39–47, 132–42, and Geoffrey Little, "A Lesson in the Art of Poetry: Barron Field and Wordsworth's Later Revisions," *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, no. 46 (November 1976): 189–205.

9. Christopher Morley, *The Middle Kingdom: Poems 1929–1944* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1944), p. 7. For some of the passages that Wordsworth seems to have drawn on, see *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Mary Moorman (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 2, 4–5, 8, 26–27, 38, 42, 92, 109, 111, 150–51, 156. Wordsworth's poetic use of the journals is discussed by Frederick A. Pottle, "The Eye and the Object in the Poetry of Wordsworth," *Yale Review* 40 (1950): 27–42 (reprinted in *Wordsworth: Centenary Studies*, ed. Gilbert T. Dunklin [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951], pp. 23–44); Rachel Mayer Brownstein, "The Private Life: Dorothy Wordsworth's Journals," *Modern Language Quarterly* 34 (1973): 48–63; W. J. Keith, *The Poetry of Nature: Rural Perspectives in Poetry from Wordsworth to the Present* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), pp. 13–14, 19–21, 31–32; Thomas R. Frosch, "Wordsworth's 'Beggars' and a Brief Instance of 'Writer's Block,'" *Studies in Romanticism* 21 (1982): 619–36; and Eric C. Walker, "Dorothy Wordsworth, William Wordsworth, and the Kirkstone Pass," *The Wordsworth Circle* 19 (1988): 116–21. In their recent biography, *Dorothy Wordsworth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), Robert Gittings and Jo Manton treat the matter circumspectly: "Several [journal] entries use almost the same words as Coleridge and William employ in their poems, and much has been written on the relation between Dorothy's journal and the poets' work. Apart from one or two instances, though, it is impossible to say which came first, or who can be said to derive one from the other. . . . The debt, as between the three friends, is practically impossible to determine" (pp. 79–80).

10. Compare Keats's remark, preserved by Woodhouse, that at times his own

verses "seemed rather the production of another person than his own" (*The Keats Circle: Letters and Papers, 1816-1878*, ed. Hyder E. Rollins [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948], 1:129). A recent example is provided by Donald Davie, who gave a reading at the University of Illinois on 11 November 1985. Speaking of his own poems written twenty years earlier, Davie remarked that their author was, to him, "a total stranger, an unknown person with the same name."

11. Unless another version is specified, my quotations of *The Prelude* are from the latest authoritative text (mainly that of MS. D) as edited by W. J. B. Owen, *The Fourteen-Book "Prelude"* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985). For the shorter poems I have generally quoted from *William Wordsworth: Selected Poems and Prefaces*, ed. Jack Stillinger (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), which gives more accurate texts from the same source that Ernest de Selincourt and Helen Darbishire used in their Oxford English Texts edition, *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940-49).

12. All writers of long poems are to some extent readers and revisers of themselves as they progress through a work. For recent discussion of a modern example, see Margaret Dickie, "Williams Reading *Paterson*," *ELH* 53 (1986): 653-71.

13. The best sources of information concerning composition of the work are the introduction to Ernest de Selincourt's edition, *The Prelude*, 2nd ed., rev. Helen Darbishire (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), esp. pp. xliii-liv; Mark L. Reed, *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Middle Years, 1800-1815* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), pp. 11-15, 628-55; the sections on "Composition and Texts" in *The Prelude, 1799, 1805, 1850*, Norton Critical Edition, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth, M. H. Abrams, and Stephen Gill (New York: Norton, 1979), pp. 512-22; and the introductions to the Cornell Wordsworth "*The Prelude*," 1798-1799, ed. Stephen Parrish (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), and *The Fourteen-Book "Prelude*," ed. Owen.

14. Mark Reed informs me that the two-part *Prelude* was put into print even earlier among selected works in an illustrated *Poems of William Wordsworth* that Jonathan Wordsworth got together for Members of the Limited Editions Club (Cambridge: University Printing House, 1973).

15. Jonathan Wordsworth, "The Five-Book *Prelude* of Early Spring 1804," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 76 (1977): 1-25.

16. The Wordsworths' *Letters: The Early Years*, p. 436.

17. Jonathan Wordsworth, "The Five-Book *Prelude* of Early Spring 1804," p. 1. Robin Jarvis has expressed reservations about the existence of this version in "The Five-Book *Prelude*: A Reconsideration," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 80 (1981): 528-51. At the least, Jonathan Wordsworth is here a collaborator with his ancestor in the production of this version.

18. Reed, *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Middle Years*, pp. 628, 635.

19. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, 2nd ed., rev. Alan G. Hill, part 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 236.

20. The passages quoted here and in the preceding paragraph occur in the original edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926) on pp. xliv, xlviii-li, liv, lvi, lix-lxii. All of them, even the most fanciful and rhetorically extravagant, are repeated verbatim in the revised 2nd ed. (1959), pp. lvii, lxi, lxiii, lxiv, lxvi, lxviii, lxxi-lxxiv, a fault that I noted in my review in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 59 (1960): 161-64. Herbert Lindenberger's wistful suggestion of "a popular, composite edition of *The Prelude*, an

edition based principally on the 1805 text" but dropping some of its weaker lines and passages and incorporating some of the better lines and passages added in revision (*On Wordsworth's "Prelude"* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963], p. 299), rather closely resembles, especially in spirit, de Selincourt's "ideal text" of nearly four decades earlier. Again it should not be overlooked—though my focus in this chapter is elsewhere—that in any such "ideal text" Wordsworth would be jointly authored by himself and his editor(s).

21. "The 'Prelude': 1805 and 1850," *Times Literary Supplement*, 29 April 1926, pp. 309-10; Leslie Nathan Broughton, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 26 (1927): 427-32; Helen Darbishire, "Wordsworth's 'Prelude,'" *Nineteenth Century and After* 99 (1926): 718-31; G. C. Moore Smith, *Modern Language Review* 21 (1926): 443-46; George McLean Harper, "Growth," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 2 October 1926, p. 154; Henry King, "Wordsworth's Decline," *Adelphi* 4 (1926): 106-15. In reprinting the substance of her review in *The Poet Wordsworth: The Clark Lectures . . . 1949* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), Darbishire changed "They generally mar the poetry; they always disguise the truth" to "they often mar the poetry; they more often disguise the truth" (p. 123).

22. Osgood, *The Voice of England*, p. 396.

23. Edith C. Batho, *The Later Wordsworth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933); Mary E. Burton, *The One Wordsworth* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942); Raymond Dexter Havens, *The Mind of a Poet: A Study of Wordsworth's Thought with Particular Reference to "The Prelude"* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941). For a more recent argument favoring a single Wordsworth, see Bernard Groom, *The Unity of Wordsworth's Poetry* (London: Macmillan, 1966).

24. For example (to select four), C. F. Stone III, "Narrative Variation in Wordsworth's Versions of 'The Discharged Soldier,'" *Journal of Narrative Technique* 4 (1974): 32-44; Richard Schell, "Wordsworth's Revisions of the Ascent of Snowdon," *Philological Quarterly* 54 (1975): 592-603; Peter J. Manning, "Reading Wordsworth's Revisions: Othello and the Drowned Man," *Studies in Romanticism* 22 (1983): 3-28; Susan J. Wolfson, "The Illusion of Mastery: Wordsworth's Revisions of 'The Drowned Man of Esthwaite,' 1799, 1805, 1850," *PMLA* 99 (1984): 917-35. For a handy guide to the recent scholarship on the *Prelude* revisions, see the index to Mark Jones and Karl Kroeber's *Wordsworth Scholarship and Criticism, 1973-1984: An Annotated Bibliography, with Selected Criticism, 1809-1972* (New York: Garland, 1985), pp. 302-4 (the *Prelude* entries that specify "revision") and 306 (the revision entries that specify "Prel.>").

25. Schell, "Wordsworth's Revisions of the Ascent of Snowdon," p. 593; Jonathan Arac, review of three recent books on Wordsworth in *Studies in Romanticism* 22 (1983): 145-46. (Arac should not, however, be numbered among the primitivists; see his *Critical Genealogies: Historical Situations for Postmodern Literary Studies* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1987], chap. 2, "The *Prelude* and Critical Revision: Bounding Lines," pp. 57-80.) Similarly, Reeve Parker, in proposing that the "literary merits [of *The Excursion* book 1] . . . have been underestimated," feels obligated to add: "As I hope will be clear, this is not the same as saying that I prefer 'later' Wordsworth or that the poem espouses a 'philosophy' I find congenial" ("Finer Distance": The Narrative Art of Wordsworth's 'The Wanderer,'" *ELH* 39 [1972]: 90).

26. Philip Hobsbaum, *Tradition and Experiment in English Poetry* (London: Macmillan, 1979), pp. 180-205 (quotations from pp. 187, 190, 191, 193).

27. Jonathan Wordsworth, *The Music of Humanity: A Critical Study of Words-*

worth's "Ruined Cottage" (London: Nelson, 1969), p. xiii. The sentence has a stirring ring to it, and has been quoted many times, but neither of its clauses comes close to being literally true.

28. Jonathan Wordsworth, *William Wordsworth: The Borders of Vision* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), chap. 10 (quotations from pp. 328–31). These passages are not in the earlier version of the chapter, published as "The Climbing of Snowdon," in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies in Memory of John Alban Finch*, ed. Jonathan Wordsworth (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970), pp. 449–74. Apparently critics are to be allowed their revisions, even while they attack poets for theirs! Jeffrey Baker has an amusing comment concerning Jonathan Wordsworth's zeal for earlier and earlier versions: "a reader who was determined to push the matter *ad absurdum* might claim that the greatest *Prelude* was probably known only to Wordsworth's dog, who heard the rambling poet's earliest, unrevised 'booings' " ("Prelude and Prejudice," *The Wordsworth Circle* 13 [1982]: 79–86 [quotation from p. 79]). After a promising start, however, Baker's essay ends up revealing just as much prejudice in the opposite direction, in favor of 1850.

29. I quote from the Wordsworth Summer Conference brochure for 1984. In *The Wordsworth Circle*, Jonathan Wordsworth reports good-humoredly on the debate: "Norman Fruman put the case for the early version, Bob Barth and Jeffrey Baker for the late. There was a large and lively audience, and a remarkably dispassionate Chairman. Both sides were clear that they had won. A transcript will be published so that readers of *TWC* may decide for themselves" (16 [1985]: 45). Subsequently the "transcript" occupied the whole of the Winter 1986 issue (17, no. 1); quite possibly readers will decide that both sides *lost*.

30. Jonathan Wordsworth's phrase (see note 27) is taken over in the title and opening sentence of Stephen Parrish's "The Worst of Wordsworth," *The Wordsworth Circle* 7 (1976): 89–91. Parrish is the originator and general editor of the Cornell Wordsworth, and this brief essay, along with his foreword to the first volume published, constitutes a rationale for the series (*The Salisbury Plain Poems* [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975], pp. ix–xiii). See also Parrish's "The Editor as Archeologist," *Kentucky Review* 4 (1983): 3–14, esp. pp. 6–7 (on the "hardening" of Wordsworth's "social, religious, and political orthodoxies") and 12–14 ("ageing Tory humanist," "orthodox piety," "hardening crust of middle and old age," "crusted layers of revision"), and "The Whig Interpretation of Literature," *TEXT* 4 (1988): 343–50, esp. p. 346 (on the early Wordsworth's being "closer to the sources of his inspiration and less inhibited by the various orthodoxies—political, social, religious, and poetical—that he succumbed to in his later years").

31. Stephen Gill, "Wordsworth's Poems: The Question of Text," *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 34 (1983): 172–90 (quotation from p. 188). Given our present-day interest in narrative technique, the role of the narrator, and self-reflexivity, critics ought to prefer the more complicated later version—tale *plus* narrator in equal proportions—and surely would have preferred it all along if the chronology of versions had not biased the issue. See Philip Cohen, "Narrative and Persuasion in *The Ruined Cottage*," *Journal of Narrative Technique* 8 (1978): 185–99.

32. Parrish, "The Worst of Wordsworth," pp. 90, 91.

33. It has worried others as well. For a recent statement of concern—though it dates from reports on the Cornell Wordsworth written for the MLA's Committee on Scholarly Editions in 1977—see Donald H. Reiman, *Romantic Texts and Contexts*

(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1987), chap. 8, "The Cornell Wordsworth and the Norton *Prelude*," esp. pp. 135, 145–46.

34. James K. Chandler, in a lengthy review of five volumes of the Cornell Wordsworth, casually mentions that "this should . . . be an edition sufficiently long-lived so that libraries will not have to replace it for a while," and "this will be the way that many students and scholars read their Wordsworth for some time to come" ("Wordsworth Rejuvenated," *Modern Philology* 84 [1986]: 207, 208). Kenneth R. Johnston and Gene W. Ruoff comment approvingly in a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education*: "The de Selincourt and Darbishire editions have been replaced, particularly by the work of the Cornell University Wordsworth project, which seeks to restore the poems to their earliest forms and to set forth for examination all the revisions and encrustations to which Wordsworth subjected his canon throughout his long life. These and other studies have reached the college classroom, with the result that today students read poems and versions of poems by Wordsworth that were unknown in 1960" ("Wordsworth: Intimations of His Immortality," 28 October 1987, p. B52; the statement is repeated, in slightly revised form, in their introduction to *The Age of William Wordsworth*, pp. x–xi).

35. Gill, "Wordsworth's Poems," p. 181. It is worth noting that a companion Oxford Authors volume, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. H. J. Jackson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), similarly offers a chronological arrangement but nevertheless prints the standard final texts throughout.

36. *The Wordsworths' Letters: The Early Years*, p. 34.

37. *The Prelude*, 2nd ed. (1959), p. lvii. I have used this edition for my quotations of the 1805 text.

38. The most extreme theorist of textual primitivism to date is Hershel Parker, who in *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons: Literary Authority in American Fiction* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1984) sounds very much like the Wordsworthian primitivists, even though he never mentions our poet: for example, "revising authors very often betray or otherwise blur their original achievements in ways they seldom intend and seldom become aware of"; "In revising or allowing someone else to revise a literary work, especially after it has been thought of as complete, authors very often lose authority, with the result that familiar literary texts at some points have no meaning, only partially authorial meaning, or quite adventitious meaning unintended by the author or anyone else" (pp. ix, 4). Parker studies the revision of works by Twain, James, Crane, and Mailer and finds the later texts vitiated by mistakes, inconsistencies, and incoherences. He uses words like "wreck," "damage," "deface," "violate," "destroy," "sabotage," and "drain" to describe the process of rewriting, and in one place contrasts "a clear and consistent" original version with a "hopelessly confusing" revision (pp. 29, 37, 39, 40, 41, 74, 173, 184, 207). Parker's basic premise, that "genuine art is coherent" (p. 23), seems extremely dubious. See Gary Davenport's review of Parker, "Necessary Fictions," *Sewanee Review* 93 (1985): 499–504.

39. Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism*, pp. 32–47; Hans Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 231–64.

40. Raymond Carney, "Making the Most of a Mess," *Georgia Review* 35 (1981): 631–42 (quotations from pp. 634–35); Robert Young, "A Reply: To 'Prelude and Prejudice,'" by Jeffrey Baker," *The Wordsworth Circle* 13 (1982): 87–88; Clifford Siskin, "Revision Romanticized: A Study in Literary Change," *Romanticism Past and Present*

7, no. 2 (Summer 1983): 1–16 (quotations from pp. 10, 7–8); Wolfson, "The Illusion of Mastery," p. 918.

5. Creative Plagiarism: The Case of Coleridge

1. Keats may again serve as the handy (and typical) example. As I have pointed out elsewhere, writers on Keats explicitly or implicitly invoke sources on practically every occasion, sometimes without awareness of doing so, as in commenting on a phrase (e.g., relating "tongueless nightingale" in *The Eve of St. Agnes* to the classical myth of Philomel), or a character (relating Angela in the same work to Juliet's Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*), or a motivation (comparing that of Isabella's brothers in Keats's poem with that in the English translation of Boccaccio that Keats used), or a style (Leigh Huntian in Keats's early *Calidore*, Miltonic in *Hyperion*, "Drydenian heroic" in *Lamia*): "Keats criticism carried on without reference to sources is almost unthinkable" ("John Keats," in *The English Romantic Poets: A Review of Research and Criticism*, ed. Frank Jordan, 4th ed. [New York: Modern Language Association, 1985], pp. 698–99).

2. *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. W. J. B. Owen and Jane W. Smyser (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 3:82.

3. *Biographia Literaria*, ed. James Engell and W. J. Bate (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983), 1:304.

4. John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu: A Study in the Ways of the Imagination* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927).

5. All quotations of the poems are taken from *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), still the standard edition.

6. *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, 3:355–61. The real subject of the letter, as becomes clear after the first four pages, is a more immediate occasion, the discovery of "coincidental" resemblances of idea and illustration between Coleridge's lectures on *Romeo and Juliet* in December 1811 and A. W. von Schlegel's lectures on Shakespeare delivered in Vienna in 1808 and published in Germany in December 1810.

7. Engell remarks in part 2 of the editors' introduction to *Biographia Literaria*, "Nothing quite like this problem, both in degree and in kind, exists for any classic comparable to the *Biographia* in importance" (1:cxv). Herman Melville "borrowed" extensively, but his practice has not been perceived as problematic in the same way, perhaps because his sources were mainly ephemera.

8. I have discussed this last in "'Kubla Khan' and Michelangelo's Glorious Boast," *English Language Notes* 23, no. 1 (September 1985): 38–42.

9. I quote E. H. Coleridge's text, which is based on the poet's latest revisions in the *Poetical Works* of 1834. The two earliest versions differ considerably in their equivalent of the last five lines of the passage, but in such expressions (recorded in the textual apparatus) as "Idle thought," "fantastic playfulness," "curious toys / Of the self-watching subtilizing mind" (quarto text of 1798) and "wilful playfulness," "Smiles, as self-scornful," "wild reliques of our childish Thought," and "subtle toys / Of the self-watching mind" (*Poetical Register* text of 1812) the elements that I wish to emphasize are there from the beginning.

10. See M. H. Abrams, "Structure and Style in the Greater Romantic Lyric"

(1965), reprinted most recently in Abrams's *The Correspondent Breeze: Essays on English Romanticism* (New York: Norton, 1984), pp. 76–108.

11. Wordsworth provides an interpretive gloss to the poem along these lines in *The Prelude* 6.264–305, especially the lines describing Coleridge's "self-created sustenance of a Mind / Debarred from Nature's living images, / Compelled to be a life unto herself" (301–3).

12. *The Poetical Works of William Cowper*, ed. H. S. Milford, 4th ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), pp. 188–89. Presumably the passage was well known to Coleridge's contemporaries. The connection between Coleridge's and Cowper's lines was first made by a scholar in Alois Brandl's "Cowpers 'Winter Evening' und Coleridges 'Frost at Midnight,'" *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 96 (1896): 341–42, and is prominently discussed by Humphry House, *Coleridge: The Clark Lectures 1951–52* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1953), pp. 71–73, 78–82, and Norman Fruman, *Coleridge, the Damaged Archangel* (New York: Braziller, 1971), pp. 305–9 (to whom I owe the reference to Brandl's 1896 note). On Coleridge's reading of Cowper more generally, see Michael J. Kelly, "'Kubla Khan' and Cowper's Task: Speculation amidst Echoes," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 78 (1975): 482–89, and Ann Matheson, "The Influence of Cowper's *The Task* on Coleridge's Conversation Poems," in *New Approaches to Coleridge: Biographical and Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Sultana (London: Vision Press, 1981), pp. 137–50.

13. "My First Acquaintance with Poets," in *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe (London: Dent, 1930–34), 17:120. Joseph Johnson, the publisher of the first printed version of *Frost at Midnight*, in the *Fears in Solitude* quarto of 1798, was also Cowper's publisher, and the verso of the final page of *Frost* in the volume contains an advertisement for a new edition of Cowper's *Poems*.

14. *Biographia Literaria*, 1:244–47. See Thomas McFarland, *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 134–36 (on Coleridge's "translation—or 'plagiarism'—verbatim from Leibniz" in the paragraph), and the review articles by Norman Fruman, "Aids to Reflection on the New *Biographia*," *Studies in Romanticism* 24 (1985): 141–73, esp. pp. 172–73, and McFarland, "So Immethetical a Miscellany: Coleridge's Literary Life," *Modern Philology* 83 (1986): 405–13, esp. pp. 410–12.

15. Fruman, "Aids to Reflection on the New *Biographia*," p. 171.

16. There is an extensive literature on Coleridge's plagiarisms. The most important works of the last two decades are McFarland's *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition*, esp. chap. 1, "The Problem of Coleridge's Plagiarisms," pp. 1–52, and excursus note 1, "Coleridge's Indebtedness to A. W. Schlegel," pp. 256–61; Fruman's *Coleridge, the Damaged Archangel*, passim (but specifically chaps. 11, 12, and 14 on Tennemann, Schelling and Steffens, and Schlegel); and the introduction and notes in the Engell–Bate edition of *Biographia Literaria* (esp. Engell's "The German Borrowings and the Issue of Plagiarism," 1:cxiv–cxxvii). McFarland discusses the borrowings from Tetens in "The Origin and Significance of Coleridge's Theory of Secondary Imagination" (1972), reprinted as chap. 4 in his *Originality and Imagination* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), pp. 90–119, esp. pp. 100–105.

17. Thomas De Quincey, "Samuel Taylor Coleridge," *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, n.s., 1 (1834): 510–11.

18. James Frederick Ferrier, "The Plagiarisms of S. T. Coleridge," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 47 (1840): 287–99; *The Works of Thomas Reid*, ed. Sir William Hamilton (Edinburgh: Maclachlan, Stewart, 1846), p. 890.

19. *Biographia Literaria*, 2nd ed., ed. H. N. Coleridge and Sara Coleridge, 2 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1847). Sara Coleridge's numerous corrections and revisions of the text in this edition (what she described in her diary, 28 October 1848, as "putting in order a literary house that otherwise would be open to censure here or there") constitute yet another kind of collaborative authorship in the Coleridge canon; see Bradford K. Mudge's recent articles, "Burning Down the House: Sara Coleridge, Virginia Woolf, and the Politics of Literary Revision," *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 5 (1986): 230-31, and "Sara Coleridge and 'The Business of Life,'" *The Wordsworth Circle* 19 (1988): 55-64, and his biography, *Sara Coleridge, a Victorian Daughter: Her Life and Essays* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989), esp. pp. 4, 14, 16, 122-33.
20. René Wellek, *Immanuel Kant in England, 1793-1838* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1931), pp. 63-135 (quotation from p. 67); "Coleridge's Philosophy and Criticism," in *The English Romantic Poets: A Review of Research*, ed. Thomas M. Raysor (New York: Modern Language Association, 1950), pp. 95-117 (revised in the 2nd ed., ed. Raysor [1956], and further expanded in the 3rd ed., ed. Frank Jordan [1972]); *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, vol. 2: *The Romantic Age* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), pp. 151-87 (quotation from p. 187).
21. Joseph Warren Beach, "Coleridge's Borrowings from the German," *ELH* 9 (1942): 36-58 (quotation from p. 42).
22. G. N. G. Orsini, *Coleridge and German Idealism: A Study in the History of Philosophy with Unpublished Materials from Coleridge's Manuscripts* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), pp. v-vi, 216, 219.
23. John Beer, ed., *Coleridge's Variety: Bicentenary Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1974), p. viii.
24. Max F. Schulz, *Modern Philology* 71 (1974): 453-55.
25. Thomas Lask, "Was He Charlatan or Genius?" *New York Times*, 24 December 1971, p. 22; Cyril Connolly, "Archangel with Feet of Clay," *London Sunday Times*, 17 September 1972, p. 39; Anthony West, "Triumphant," *New Statesman*, 20 October 1972, pp. 566-67; Paul West, "Prometheus at the Supermarket," *Book World*, 26 December 1971, p. 4; Hugh Kenner, "A Portrait of the 'Da Vinci of Literature,'" *Los Angeles Times Book Review*, 23 January 1972, p. 16; Robert E. Spiller, "Hard Evidence about Coleridge," *Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin*, 19 March 1972, sec. 2, p. 3; *Economist*, 23 September 1972, pp. 58-59; "The Deviousness of STC," *Times Literary Supplement*, 1 December 1972, p. 1463; Christopher Ricks, "The Moral Imbecility of a Would-Be Wunderkind," *Saturday Review*, 15 January 1972, pp. 31-33, 49; Geoffrey Hartman, *New York Times Book Review*, 12 March 1972, pp. 1, 36; George Steiner, "S. T. C.," *New Yorker*, 27 August 1973, pp. 77-90.
26. L. C. Knights, "Coleridge: The Wound without the Bow," *New York Review of Books*, 4 May 1972, pp. 25-26; Owen Barfield, "Abyssees of Incomprehension," *Nation*, 12 June 1972, pp. 764-65; Roy Park, "Plagiarist," *Listener*, 14 December 1972, pp. 836-37, and his review in *British Journal of Aesthetics* 13 (1973): 301-3; Richard Harter Fogle, "Coleridge in the Dock," *Virginia Quarterly Review* 48 (1972): 477-80; J. B. Beer, *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 24 (1973): 346-53; Elinor Shaffer, *Southern Humanities Review* 8 (1974): 244-46; R. A. Foakes, "Repairing the Damaged Archangel," *Essays in Criticism* 24 (1974): 423-27, referring to Basil Cottle's "Damaged," *Essays in Criticism* 23 (1973): 413-19; Thomas McFarland, "Coleridge's Plagiarisms Once More: A Review Essay," *Yale Review* 63 (1974): 252-86.

27. R. A. Foakes's two-volume edition has since appeared, *Lectures 1808-1819: On Literature* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), with discussion of Coleridge's reading of A. W. Schlegel and the plagiarism charges at 1:lix-lxiv, 172-75. Foakes's initial reference to Fruman (the first of two in the work) revives the meanspirited tone of the early 1970s: "The crude treatment of the matter by Norman Fruman . . . perhaps sufficiently betrays its own inadequacies, which have been demonstrated in the reviews of the book by John Beer . . . and by Thomas McFarland" (1:lix n.).
28. See note 24. In a recent essay on one of Coleridge's recurring themes, Schulz pointedly sidesteps the issue of originality: "Since I am making no special claims for the intellectual status of Coleridge's ideas of paradise, I see no need to raise the question of his use of others' writings" ("Coleridge and the Enchantments of Earthly Paradise," in *Reading Coleridge: Approaches and Applications*, ed. Walter B. Crawford [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979], pp. 116-59 [quotation from p. 128 n.]).
29. Dorothy Emmet, "Coleridge on Powers in Mind and Nature," in *Coleridge's Variety*, ed. Beer, p. 167.
30. Alexander Kern, "Coleridge and American Romanticism: The Transcendentalists and Poe," in *New Approaches to Coleridge*, ed. Sultana, pp. 119-20.
31. The situation nicely illustrates Gerald Graff's contention that literary criticism generally in the last three or four decades has become "a technique by which literature is actually protected from criticism," with "perfection of the now-familiar conventions by which explicators could prove and teachers could teach that any literary feature which looks like a defect is actually a virtue": "the literary work is assumed infallible and the only question for the critic is how that infallibility is best described" ("The University and the Prevention of Culture," in *Criticism in the University*, ed. Gerald Graff and Reginald Gibbons [Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1985], pp. 72-73).
32. McFarland, *Originality and Imagination*, p. 22, referring to Harold Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
33. Laurence S. Lockridge, *Coleridge the Moralizer* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), esp. pp. 270-74 and the appendix on Coleridge's plagiarisms, pp. 279-83. See also Lockridge's clearheaded "Explaining Coleridge's Explanation: Toward a Practical Methodology for Coleridge Studies," in *Reading Coleridge*, ed. Crawford, pp. 23-55.
34. Jerome Christensen, *Coleridge's Blessed Machine of Language* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981), chap. 3, "The Marginal Method of the *Biographia Literaria*," pp. 96-117 (quotations from pp. 100—the entry from Coleridge's notebook—and 105); the earlier version appeared in *PMLA* 92 (1977): 928-40.
35. *Biographia Literaria*, 1:lviii. See also Bate's sympathetic treatment of the plagiarisms in *Coleridge* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 131-38.
36. Daniel Mark Fogel, "A Compositional History of the *Biographia Literaria*," *Studies in Bibliography* 30 (1977): 219-34; Fruman, "Aids to Reflection on the New *Biographia*," pp. 160-65.
37. Fruman, *Coleridge, the Damaged Archangel*, p. 214.
38. More recently, Fruman and McFarland again appear together in the Fall 1986 *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, an issue devoted to "Coleridge's Theory of Imagination as Critical Method Today."

39. Rosemary Ashton, *The German Idea: Four English Writers and the Reception of German Thought, 1800–1860* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 27–66 (quotations from p. 28).
40. Kathleen M. Wheeler, *Sources, Processes and Methods in Coleridge's "Biographia Literaria"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 43–44, 81–106, 191–93 (quotation from p. 193); Paul Hamilton, *Coleridge's Poetics* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), p. 119.
41. Trevor H. Levere, *Poetry Realized in Nature: Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Early Nineteenth-Century Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 7, 224. Cf. Fruman, *Coleridge, the Damaged Archangel*, pp. 121–34.
42. Catherine Miles Wallace, *The Design of "Biographia Literaria"* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), pp. 2, 150, 159, 69.
43. Anthony John Harding, *Coleridge and the Inspired Word* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985), pp. 65, 69, 70. Everyone, I suppose, should agree that Schelling's own words (even in translation) are "Schellingian."
44. Raimonda Modiano, *Coleridge and the Concept of Nature* (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp. 100, 231.

6. Pound's Waste Land

1. See the Wordsworths' *Letters: The Early Years*, pp. 452, 464, 573, 607.
2. H. W. Garrod, *Wordsworth: Lectures and Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), pp. 29–30; Fruman, *Coleridge, the Damaged Archangel*, chaps. 19–20, esp. pp. 265–69, 280, 300 (quotation from p. 268); McFarland, *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin*, chap. 1, "The Symbiosis of Coleridge and Wordsworth," pp. 56–103; Magnuson, *Coleridge and Wordsworth: A Lyrical Dialogue*. Scholars have usually promoted one writer at the expense of the other. As a recent instance of overshadowing by accident, consider Rosemary Ashton's essay "How to Deal with Wordsworth," *Times Literary Supplement*, 26 August 1983, p. 913: no one could guess from the title (in forty-eight-point letters) that the piece is about Coleridge, a review of the Engell–Bate edition of *Biographia Literaria!*
3. "The Waste Land": *A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts including the Annotations of Ezra Pound*, ed. Valerie Eliot (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), hereafter cited as *Facsimile*. The manuscripts were first made public in an exhibition at the New York Public Library in November 1968 and were first described in detail in Donald Gallup's "The 'Lost' Manuscripts of T. S. Eliot," *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 November 1968, pp. 1237–40.
4. Florence Marsh, "The Ocean-Desert: *The Ancient Mariner* and *The Waste Land*," *Essays in Criticism* 9 (1959): 126–33 (quotation from p. 126). Marsha Anne McCreadie surveys likenesses in other poems by Eliot and Coleridge in "T. S. Eliot and the Romantic Poets: A Study of the Similar Poetic Themes and Methods Used by Eliot and Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Byron, and Shelley" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973), chap. 3, "Coleridge and Eliot: Self-Inquiry and Paralysis," pp. 44–84. For general treatment of Eliot's nearly lifelong interest in Coleridge, see Carlos Baker, *The Echoing Green: Romanticism, Modernism, and the Phenomena of Transference in Poetry* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 265–76.

5. Quoted in Kathleen Coburn's introduction to *Coleridge: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 1.
6. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism: Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England* (London: Faber and Faber, 1933), pp. 68–69, 156.
7. Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot: A Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 256, citing Woolf's diary entry for 25 May 1940.
8. Eliot, "The Literature of Politics" (1955), in *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1965), p. 138.
9. *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, 2:775. Curiously, Coleridge's "three persons . . . but one God" is the basis—via Alois Brandl's translation into German (1886), Lady Eastlake's mistranslation of Brandl's German back into English (1887), and a further slight alteration by subsequent scholars—for the frequently repeated statement that William and Dorothy Wordsworth and Coleridge were "three persons and one soul" (see Ruth I. Aldrich, "The Wordsworths and Coleridge: 'Three Persons,' but Not 'One Soul,'" *Studies in Romanticism* 2 [1962]: 61–63).
10. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, pp. 70, 75.
11. For chronology and descriptions of the manuscripts and of Pound's and Eliot's revisions, the most useful works are Valerie Eliot's introduction and notes in *Facsimile*; Grover Smith, "The Making of *The Waste Land*," *Mosaic* 6, no. 1 (Fall 1972): 127–41 (revised in Smith's *T. S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays: A Study in Sources and Meaning*, 2nd ed. [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974], pp. 300–314); Glauco Cambon, "The Waste Land as Work in Progress," *Mosaic* 6, no. 1 (Fall 1972): 191–200; Hugh Kenner, "The Urban Apocalypse," in *Eliot in His Time: Essays on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of "The Waste Land"*, ed. A. Walton Litz (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 23–49; Richard Ellmann, "The First Waste Land," in *Eliot in His Time*, pp. 51–66; Helen Gardner, "The Waste Land: Paris 1922," in *Eliot in His Time*, pp. 67–94; Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), chap. 5, "The Waste Land Traversed," pp. 86–119, and appendix 2, "Dating *The Waste Land* Fragments," pp. 143–46; Peter Barry, "The Waste Land Manuscript: Picking up the Pieces—in Order," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* (University of St. Andrews) 15 (1979): 237–48; and Wayne Koestenbaum, "The Waste Land: T. S. Eliot's and Ezra Pound's Collaboration on Hysteria," *Twentieth Century Literature* 34 (1988): 113–39 (revised in Koestenbaum's *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration* [New York: Routledge, 1989], pp. 112–39, 189–92). This last is especially valuable in drawing on unpublished correspondence (at Yale) of Pound, Eliot, and others.
12. *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Valerie Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1988–), 1:344, 351, 451; Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot*, p. 110.
13. Eliot's *Letters*, 1:572.
14. The most recent example is Louis Auchincloss, "The Waste Land without Pound," *New York Review of Books*, 11 October 1984, p. 46.
15. Barry suggests that the pencil canceling the page may actually have been Pound's rather than Eliot's ("The Waste Land Manuscript," p. 246).
16. Eliot's *Letters*, 1:504, 505.
17. Eliot's *Letters*, 1:497, 504.
18. Eliot's *Letters*, 1:572. Eliot goes on to say, in the same letter, "Naturally, I hope that the portions which I have suppressed will never appear in print. . . . You will find [in the papers] a great many sets of verse which have never been printed and which

I am sure you will agree never ought to be printed, and in putting them in your hands, I beg you fervently to keep them to yourself and see that they never are printed."

19. Eliot, "On a Recent Piece of Criticism," *Purpose* 10, no. 2 (April/June 1938): 92-93.
20. Eliot, "Ezra Pound," *Poetry* 68 (1946): 330.
21. Timothy Wilson, "The Wife of the Father of *The Waste Land*," *Esquire*, May 1972, p. 44.
22. Gertrude Patterson, "'The Waste Land' in the Making," *Critical Quarterly* 14 (1972): 270-71; Smith, first version of "The Making of *The Waste Land*," pp. 128, 140; D. E. S. Maxwell, "'He Do the Police in Different Voices,'" *Mosaic* 6, no. 1 (Fall 1972): 178; Richard Sheppard, "Cultivating the Waste Land," *Journal of European Studies* 2 (1972): 188; Denis Donoghue, "'The Word within a Word,'" in "*The Waste Land*" in *Different Voices: The Revised Versions of Lectures Given at the University of York in the Fiftieth Year of "The Waste Land*," ed. A. D. Moody (London: Edward Arnold, 1974), p. 185; Gareth Reeves, "The Obstetrics of *The Waste Land*," *Critical Quarterly* 17 (1975): 35, 50, 51; Ruth Pulik, "Pound and 'The Waste Land,'" *Unisa English Studies* 15, no. 2 (September 1977): 16; Ronald Bush, *T. S. Eliot: A Study in Character and Style* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 71, 72; Harriet Davidson, *T. S. Eliot and Hermeneutics: Absence and Interpretation in "The Waste Land"* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), pp. 101, 102.
23. Cambon, "*The Waste Land* as Work in Progress," pp. 192, 195, 194; Bernard Bergonzi, *T. S. Eliot* (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 100; Russell Kirk, "The Waste Land Lies Unredeemed," *Sewanee Review* 80 (1972): 471; Lewis Turco, "*The Waste Land* Reconsidered," *Sewanee Review* 87 (1979): 294 (the essay is reprinted in revised form, with the title "*The Waste Land* Revisited," in Turco's *Visions and Revisions of American Poetry* [Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1986], pp. 85-94).
24. Grover Smith, *The Waste Land* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), pp. 81, 83; Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot*, pp. 119-20; Nina Baym, in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, 2nd ed., ed. Baym et al. (New York: Norton, 1985), 2:1194; 3rd ed. (1989), 2:1266.
25. Smith speculates interestingly on how the poem might have developed without Pound (the possibilities include ending up with "no poem at all") (*The Waste Land*, pp. 81-83).
26. Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot*, p. 120.
27. Eliot, *On Poetry and Poets* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957), p. 98.

7. American Novels: Authors, Agents, Editors, Publishers

1. The best general study of the development of a mass audience remains Richard D. Altick's *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957). On concurrent changes in the profession of authorship, see Victor Bonham-Carter, *Authors by Profession* (Los Altos, Calif.: William Kaufmann, 1978), which focuses on British writers; William Charvat, *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870*, ed. Matthew J. Bruccoli (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968); and James L. W. West III, *American Authors and the Literary Marketplace since 1900* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

2. J. A. Sutherland, *Victorian Novelists and Publishers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 2, 27, 30, 104-16, 124-26, 180-87.
3. Engel's Book Creations, Inc., is discussed as the most successful of the "fiction factories" in Lewis A. Coser, Charles Kadushin, and Walter W. Powell, *Books: The Culture and Commerce of Publishing* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), chap. 10, "Books without Authors," pp. 263-64.
4. Emily Toth, *Inside Peyton Place: The Life of Grace Metalious* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), pp. 96-109 (principal quotations from pp. 98, 99, 103, 105, 109).
5. Barbara Seaman, *Lovely Me: The Life of Jacqueline Susann* (New York: Morrow, 1987), pp. 239-40.
6. Seaman, *Lovely Me*, p. 285. My subsequent quotations from the readers' reports and particulars of the editing of the novel are taken from pp. 286, 287, 298. For similar details concerning work on Susann's draft of *The Love Machine* (1969) by "the Simon and Schuster editorial team," Jonathan Dolger and Michael Korda—" [We] did a terrific job of editing that book. . . . We tore it to pieces and put it back together again"—see p. 375.
7. In both my chapter title and the bulk of my examples, I am focusing on American fiction primarily as a matter of practical convenience: a considerable body of material has been made available concerning the composition procedures and editing of American writers of the last hundred years, seemingly much more than that available for British writers of the same period. Harry E. Maule, an editor of Sinclair Lewis first at Doubleday and then at Random House, says that "in America editors do a great deal more editing than they do in England" (in his contribution to *Editors on Editing*, ed. Gerald Gross [New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1962], p. 122). If this is so, there are several possible reasons, among which might be the greater commercial ambitions of even "serious" authors in the United States.
8. Seaman, *Lovely Me*, p. 271.
9. A. Scott Berg, *Max Perkins: Editor of Genius* (New York: Dutton, 1978). The other principal sources of information about Perkins are *Editor to Author: The Letters of Maxwell E. Perkins*, ed. John Hall Wheelock (New York: Scribner's, 1950); *Dear Scott/Dear Max: The Fitzgerald-Perkins Correspondence*, ed. John Kuehl and Jackson R. Bryer (New York: Scribner's, 1971); and *Ring around Max: The Correspondence of Ring Lardner and Max Perkins*, ed. Clifford M. Caruthers (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1973).
10. Berg, *Max Perkins*, p. 237. Wolfe refers to their joint effort as "collaboration" ("our work—perhaps I could better say our collaboration, although that term, I know, would embarrass [Perkins]") in the typescript version of *The Story of a Novel* (1936), which opens with description of "the work that both of us were doing, the transaction that occurred, the whole stroke and catch, the flow, the stop, the cut, the molding, the whole ten thousand meetings, gratings, changings, surrenders, triumphs, and agreeings that went into the making of the book" (see David Herbert Donald, *Look Homeward: A Life of Thomas Wolfe* [Boston: Little, Brown, 1987], p. 350, and the text of *Story* published as the first part of Wolfe's *The Autobiography of an American Novelist*, ed. Leslie Field [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983], pp. 71, 3). It is perhaps worth mentioning that Wolfe's *Story* was substantially revised and cut by Elizabeth Nowell, his agent, and was given its title by George Stevens, a friend of his who worked at the *Saturday Review* (Donald, *Look Homeward*, pp. 352-53). The printed text of 1936 omits entirely the short paragraph about "our collaboration" and,

among several alterations in the text of the other passage just quoted, omits "the transaction that occurred" and revises "ten thousand meetings" to "ten thousand fittings."

11. Berg, *Max Perkins*, p. 328.
12. See Leslie Field, *Thomas Wolfe and His Editors: Establishing a True Text for the Posthumous Publications* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), and my review of Field's work in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 88 (1989): 146-48.
13. See, for example, Perkins's letter to Marjorie Rawlings, 20 September 1940, concerning the manuscript of *Cross Creek* (1942), and that to Marcia Davenport, 28 April 1947, concerning *East Side, West Side* (1947), in *Editor to Author*, pp. 175-80, 286-94.
14. Berg, *Max Perkins*, p. 404.
15. Berg, *Max Perkins*, p. 303; Milton R. Stern, "Tender Is the Night: The Text Itself," in *Critical Essays on F. Scott Fitzgerald's "Tender Is the Night,"* ed. Stern (Boston: Hall, 1986), pp. 21-31.
16. *Dear Scott/Dear Max*, pp. 83-84, 85, 89.
17. Berg, *Max Perkins*, pp. 133-34.
18. Berg, *Max Perkins*, pp. 6, 123. Wheelock lists among Perkins's editorial qualities "a self-effacement . . . almost feminine in character" in his introduction to *Editor to Author* (pp. 3-4), and Berg mentions "Perkins's pathological self-effacement" (*Max Perkins*, p. 421).
19. The best sources of information about Commins are Dorothy Commins, *What Is an Editor? Saxe Commins at Work* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), and "Love and Admiration and Respect": *The O'Neill-Commins Correspondence*, ed. Dorothy Commins (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1986).
20. Commins, *What Is an Editor*, pp. 90-92. For Saxe Commins's ghosting of Parker Morell's *Lillian Russell: The Era of Plush* (1940), see the same work, pp. 153-69.
21. Commins, *What Is an Editor*, pp. 225-26 (and on Saxe Commins and Faulkner more generally, pp. 194-228).
22. These editors (with others) figure prominently in Gerald Gross's *Editors on Editing*, either in the original edition of 1962 or in the revised edition of 1985 (New York: Harper & Row).
23. Herbert Mitgang, "Imprint" (a profile of Helen Wolff), *New Yorker*, 2 August 1982; pp. 67-68.
24. Edwin McDowell, "'Catch-22' Sequel by Heller," *New York Times*, 8 April 1987, p. C19. Gottlieb was responsible for the title of *Catch-22*, which in Heller's original version was "Catch-18."
25. *Editors on Editing*, ed. Gross, rev. ed. (1985), pp. 40, 41, 66, 106, 114, 137, 193, 204.
26. Barbara Probst Solomon, "Where's Papa?" *New Republic*, 9 March 1987, pp. 30-34.
27. See Donald, *Look Homeward*, pp. 291, 352-53, 366-67, 407-9, 445, 549 (note to 407/35).
28. See Faulkner's *Flags in the Dust*, ed. Douglas Day (New York: Random House, 1973); Joseph Blotner, "William Faulkner's Essay on the Composition of *Sartoris*," *Yale University Library Gazette* 47 (1973): 121-24; and George F. Hayhoe, "William Faulkner's *Flags in the Dust*," *Mississippi Quarterly* 28 (1975): 370-86.
29. Janice Thaddeus, "The Metamorphosis of Richard Wright's *Black Boy*,"

American Literature 57 (1985): 199-214. The rest of the autobiography was published seventeen years after Wright's death as *American Hunger*, afterword by Michel Fabre (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

30. Sherry Lutz Zivley, "A Collation of John Barth's *Floating Opera*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 72 (1978): 201-12. After establishing his reputation as a novelist, Barth restored much of his original text in a revised edition of 1967.
31. See Edwin McDowell, "Publishing: 'Clockwork Orange' Regains Chapter 21," *New York Times*, 31 December 1986, p. C16.
32. *Correspondence of F. Scott Fitzgerald*, ed. Matthew J. Bruccoli and Margaret M. Duggan (New York: Random House, 1980), pp. 193-96. See Frederic J. Svoboda, *Hemingway and "The Sun Also Rises": The Crafting of a Style* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1983), esp. pp. 97-110, and Michael S. Reynolds, "False Dawn: A Preliminary Analysis of *The Sun Also Rises*' Manuscript," in *Hemingway: A Reevaluation*, ed. Donald R. Noble (Troy, N.Y.: Whitston, 1983), pp. 115-34.
33. *Sister Carrie*, The Pennsylvania Edition, ed. James L. W. West III et al. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981). I do not mean to suggest that my other examples in this chapter are not controversial. As early as 1936, reviewing Wolfe's *The Story of a Novel*, Bernard De Voto expressed great indignation over the lack of integrity in works "in which not the artist but the publisher has determined where the true ends and the false begins," placing the blame, in Wolfe's case, on "Mr. Perkins and the assembly line at Scribners'" ("Genius Is Not Enough," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 25 April 1936, pp. 3-4, 14-15). Scholars continue to argue over which is the "real" *Tender Is the Night* (see Stern, "Tender Is the Night: The Text Itself"), and some think that Perkins gave Fitzgerald bad advice for *Gatsby*. Questions have been raised about the textual principles underlying Noel Polk's editing of Faulkner from holograph manuscripts and typescripts rather than from printed texts—for example, the four novels in *William Faulkner: Novels 1930-1935* (New York: Library of America, 1985) (see Karl F. Zender in *American Literary Scholarship: An Annual/1985* [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1987], pp. 147-49). I have already referred to Barbara Probst Solomon's dismay at Scribner's handling of Hemingway's posthumous *The Garden of Eden*.
34. The most helpful sources concerning the composition and revision of *Sister Carrie* are the Pennsylvania edition, esp. the section "Sister Carrie: Manuscript to Print," pp. 503-41; Donald Pizer's review of this edition, *American Literature* 53 (1982): 731-37; James L. W. West III's A "Sister Carrie" Portfolio (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1985); and two articles by Stephen C. Brennan: "The Composition of *Sister Carrie*: A Reconsideration," *Dreiser Newsletter* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1978): 17-23, and "The Publication of *Sister Carrie*: Old and New Fictions," *American Literary Realism, 1870-1910* 18 (1985): 55-68. The details in Richard Lingeman's new biography, *Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates of the City, 1871-1907* (New York: Putnam, 1986), pp. 241-97 passim, are drawn mainly from the Pennsylvania edition.
35. At Dreiser's request, Henry alone made further cuts for the first British edition of *Sister Carrie*, in Heinemann's Dollar Library of American Fiction series (1901). Henry condensed the first 195 pages to about 90 (see the Pennsylvania edition, pp. 529-30).
36. The seminal essays, much referred to, interpreted, and disputed, are W. W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text" (1949), and Fredson Bowers, "Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden" (1950). The Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text is discussed (and documented) in the final section of Chapter 9. Bowers has

extended the theory to the editing of American fiction in, among other writings, "A Preface to the Text," in *The Scarlet Letter*, vol. 1 of the Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1962), esp. pp. xxxiii-xxxvi, and "Some Principles for Scholarly Editions of Nineteenth-Century American Authors," *Studies in Bibliography* 17 (1964): 223-28.

37. Pizer, review of the Pennsylvania edition of *Sister Carrie*, pp. 733, 736. Pizer has also commented valuably on the editorial problems of *Sister Carrie* in "Self-Censorship and Textual Editing," in *Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation*, ed. Jerome J. McGann (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 144-61, 227.

8. *Plays and Films: Authors, Auteurs, Autres*

1. The evidence is a letter from Dryden to Elizabeth Steward, 4 March 1699: "This Day was playd a reviv'd Comedy of Mr Congreve's calld the Double Dealer. . . . in the play bill was printed,—Written by Mr Congreve. . . . the printing an Authours name, in a Play bill, is a new manner of proceeding, at least in England" (*The Letters of John Dryden*, ed. Charles E. Ward [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1942], pp. 112-13).

2. My text is Nahum Tate's *The History of King Lear*, ed. James Black (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975).

3. *The Works of Charles and Mary Lamb*, ed. Thomas Hutchinson (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 1:134; Mel Gussow, "Theatre: Tate's 'Lear' at Riverside," *New York Times*, 13 March 1985, p. C21.

4. Charles H. Shattuck has made many distinguished contributions to the performance history of Shakespeare's plays. In this and the next five paragraphs I have drawn freely on the most compact and accessible of them, "Shakespeare's Plays in Performance from 1660 to the Present," in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. B. Evans et al. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), pp. 1799-1825 (bibliography on pp. 1896-97). A standard earlier work is Hazelton Spencer's *Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).

5. *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: William Paterson; London: H. Sotheran, 1872-74), 5:334, 338, 387-88. In Shakespeare's text, the references are 1.7.60, 2.2.34, and 5.5.19-23.

6. *The London Stage, 1660-1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces*, ed. William Van Lennep et al. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960-68), part 1, p. cxi.

7. Shattuck, "Shakespeare's Plays in Performance," pp. 1805-6.

8. Shattuck, "Shakespeare's Plays in Performance," p. 1822.

9. A number of these studies are conveniently reprinted and summarized in David V. Erdman and Ephim G. Fogel, eds., *Evidence for Authorship: Essays on Problems of Attribution* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 146-228, 427-94.

10. Cyrus Hoy, "The Shares of Fletcher and His Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon," *Studies in Bibliography* 8 (1956): 129-46; 9 (1957): 143-62; 11 (1958): 85-106; 12 (1959): 91-116; 13 (1960): 77-108; 14 (1961): 45-67; 15 (1962): 71-90. The first part of the series is reprinted in *Evidence for Authorship*, ed. Erdman and Fogel, pp. 204-23.

11. Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 199.

12. Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time*, chaps. 8 ("Collaboration") and 9 ("Revision"), pp. 197-263 passim.

13. See the summaries in *Evidence for Authorship*, ed. Erdman and Fogel, pp. 454-78, 480-94. The passages of *Sir Thomas More* ascribed to Shakespeare are given in both old and modernized spelling, along with photographs of the manuscript, in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. Evans et al., pp. 1683-1700.

14. Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time*, p. 262.

15. Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare without Words and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 3.

16. My main source in this and the next three paragraphs is Philip Gaskell's *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 245-62. *Travesties* was published in London by Faber and in New York by the Grove Press, both editions in 1975. Stoppard comments on some of the changes made in the production of the play in two interviews published in Ronald Hayman's *Tom Stoppard* (London: Heinemann, 1977), pp. 1-13, 139-40. Gaskell has also made a similar study of Stoppard's next full-length play, *Night and Day: The Development of a Play Text*, in *Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation*, ed. McGann, pp. 162-79, 227-28.

17. Hayman, *Tom Stoppard*, pp. 8-9.

18. William Gibson, *The Seesaw Log: A Chronicle of the Stage Production, with the Text, of "Two for the Seesaw"* (New York: Knopf, 1959), pp. 30, 4. Subsequent references are given parenthetically in the text. Gibson's reading version of the play (pp. 143-273), the only one in print, is a composite of preproduction script, some (but by no means all) of the revisions made during rehearsals and performances, and still later revisions made solely for this published text.

19. Here are some of the New York reviewers' comments specifically about Gibson: "Author William Gibson has a deft, buoyant, rapid-fire flair for dialogue . . . and his eye for accurately observed detail is excellent" (Walter Kerr in the *Herald Tribune*); "Gibson has made . . . a tricky task look as easy as pie" (John Chapman in the *New York Daily News*); "Gibson knows what makes people tick, and how to project it. He has a flair for speech that is accurate and flavorsome" (Robert Coleman in the *New York Mirror*); "The author has constructed his story well. . . . Mr. Gibson can really write" (John McClain in the *New York Journal American*); "It is clear that this new dramatist is both an expert craftsman and an honest and compassionate observer, with an engaging sense of humor" (Richard Watts in the *New York Post*)—all quoted from Gibson's *The Seesaw Log*, pp. 127, 128, 130, 133, 135.

20. Woody Allen, "True Colors," *New York Review of Books*, 13 August 1987, p. 38.

21. These details are taken from Patrick McGilligan's introduction to the screenplay, *Yankee Doodle Dandy*, ed. McGilligan (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981). See also Julius Epstein's comments quoted in McGilligan's *Backstory: Interviews with Screenwriters of Hollywood's Golden Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), pp. 183-85.

22. Michael Carpenter, *Corporate Authorship: Its Role in Library Cataloging* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), regards films as the epitome of "multiple and diffuse authorship" (pp. 135, 138).

23. See Hal Wallis and Charles Higham, *Starmaker: The Autobiography of Hal Wallis* (New York: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 83-92 (also the interoffice memos on pp.

208–12); Howard Koch, *As Time Goes By: Memoirs of a Writer* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), pp. 76–84; Rudy Behlmer, ed., *Inside Warner Bros. (1935–1951)* (New York: Viking, 1985), pp. 194–221; and McGilligan, *Backstory*, pp. 185–87. Casey Robinson also contributed to the writing of *Casablanca* (*Inside Warner Bros.*, ed. Behlmer, pp. 206–7, 213; McGilligan, *Backstory*, pp. 306–8).

24. Among many possible sources for the generalizations about screenwriters here and in the next three paragraphs, I have made most use of McGilligan's *Backstory*; John Brady's *The Craft of the Screenwriter: Interviews with Six Celebrated Screenwriters* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981); and Mark Litwak's *Reel Power: The Struggle for Influence and Success in the New Hollywood* (New York: Morrow, 1986), esp. chap. 9, "Writers," pp. 173–95.

25. Robert L. Carringer, *The Making of "Citizen Kane"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), quotes the waiver in Herman Mankiewicz's contract for work on the script of *Citizen Kane*: "All material composed, submitted, added or interpolated by you under this employment agreement, and all results and proceeds of all services rendered or to be rendered by you under this employment agreement, are now and shall forever be the property of Mercury Productions, Inc., who, for this purpose, shall be deemed the author and creator thereof, you having acted entirely as its employee" (p. 32).

26. McGilligan, *Backstory*, p. 182.

27. Litwak, *Reel Power*, p. 195.

28. McGilligan, *Backstory*, p. 223. On film censorship generally, see Leonard J. Leff and Jerold L. Simmons, *The Dame in the Kimono: Hollywood, Censorship, and the Production Code from the 1920s to the 1960s* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1990).

29. McGilligan, *Backstory*, pp. 341–42.

30. Andrew Sarris's landmark essay, frequently cited as the beginning of the American auteur movement, is "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962," *Film Culture* 27 (Winter 1962/63): 1–8; but Sarris and Archer had been publishing auteur criticism in the journal since the mid-1950s.

31. As in Patrick McGilligan's *Cagney: The Actor as Auteur*, rev. ed. (San Diego: Barnes, 1982), esp. chap. 12, "The Actor as Auteur," pp. 261–75.

32. Roy Fowler, *Orson Welles: A First Biography* (London: Pendulum, 1946), quoted by Carringer at the beginning of his preface to *The Making of "Citizen Kane,"* p. ix.

33. Carringer also sent Welles an earlier version of his chap. 4, "Cinematography," published as "Orson Welles and Gregg Toland: Their Collaboration on *Citizen Kane*," *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1982): 651–74, and was able to incorporate Welles's responses into his book. In addition, Carringer has published a fuller account of the successive drafts of *Citizen Kane* in "The Scripts of *Citizen Kane*," *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 369–400, and a condensed version of his chap. 2, "Scripting," as "Who Really Wrote *Citizen Kane*?" *American Film*, September 1985, pp. 42–49, 70. I am much indebted to all these publications.

34. Carringer, *The Making of "Citizen Kane,"* p. 35.

35. See the review of Carringer's book by Richard M. Gollin, "Collaborative Auteurism," *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 10 (1985): 271–75.

36. Carringer, *The Making of "Citizen Kane,"* p. 134.

37. Donald Spoto, *The Dark Side of Genius: The Life of Alfred Hitchcock* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1983), esp. pp. 108–9; Leonard J. Leff, *Hitchcock and Selznick:*

The Rich and Strange Collaboration of Alfred Hitchcock and David O. Selznick in Hollywood (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987).

9. Implications for Theory

1. At one point in his tribulations, the playwright William Gibson (see Chapter 8) tells that he "visited a painter's studio, and envied her; she was working in a medium where she alone could ruin it. This seemed to me a definition of art" (*The Seesaw Log*, p. 43). But Gibson is romanticizing: at the very least, painters are constrained by the size, shape, and materials of their various media, not to mention the tastes and whims of critics, patrons, and prospective purchasers.

2. The distinction between "creative or literary" and "popular fare" occurs in West's *American Authors and the Literary Marketplace since 1900*, p. 60. One sees the result of this kind of thinking in West's opinion that Ripley Hitchcock's wholesale editorial rewriting of Edward Noyes Westcott's *David Harum* (producing a famous best-seller) was nothing short of brilliant, while revision of Dreiser's *Jennie Gerhardt* (now canonized among the "serious" works of American literature) "blunted" the religious ideas, "muted" the philosophy, and rendered Dreiser's prose "more conventional" (cf. pp. 53 and 55).

3. Fredson Bowers, "Textual Criticism," in *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. Thorpe, p. 24. My point about the purity of an unread manuscript has been partly anticipated by Jerome McGann: "An author's work possesses autonomy only when it remains an unheard melody. As soon as it begins its passage to publication it undergoes a series of interventions which some textual critics see as a process of contamination, but which may equally well be seen as a process of training the poem for its appearances in the world" (*A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, p. 51).

4. W. J. T. Mitchell, ed., *Against Theory: Literary Studies and the New Pragmatism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 2.

5. We all share this kind of knowledge. On the day after President Bush's inauguration, for example, the *New York Times* carried an article about Peggy Noonan, a writer of major speeches for both Reagan and Bush (Maureen Dowd, "A Stirring Breeze Sparks Feelings, Then Words for a President's Vision," 21 January 1989, p. 10). The speech by Noonan that Bush delivered when he accepted his party's nomination at the Republican National Convention in August 1988 "was widely hailed as the best of his career and the one that helped change the tide for his lagging campaign." Nevertheless, in this first year of the new presidency, there is continual public reference to now-clichéd phrases from the campaign and inaugural rhetoric—"read my lips" (taken over from a Clint Eastwood film), "kinder, gentler nation," "a new breeze is blowing"—as if they had originated with Bush rather than with Noonan and her sources. Noonan describes her speechwriting in *What I Saw at the Revolution: A Political Life in the Reagan Era* (New York: Random House, 1990).

6. Readers also have to believe in the reality of the nominal authors. As an illustration, consider this comment by John Franklin Jameson, in *The History of Historical Writing in America* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1891), concerning the thirty-four-volume *History of the Pacific States of North America* published between 1882 and 1890 under the nominal authorship of Hubert Howe Bancroft: "It is obvious that a work of

such magnitude, carried through in so few years, could not possibly be written by a single hand. In fact, the books were first written by the various members of the cohort of assistants, and the person whose name they bear has simply revised, as a sort of managing editor, the productions of this highly-organized staff. Valuable as the work proves to be, some of the faults of such a plan are evident. There can be no fixing of responsibility. No one knows whom to criticise. No one can know whether the authority of this or that part of the book, or of the whole, should be much or little" (pp. 153-54). There is of course no end to the possibilities for documenting the importance of authorial identity. A novel example concerns the recent publication in facsimile of the manuscript of André Breton and Philippe Soupault's *Les Champs magnétique* (1920), the first piece of Surrealist *écriture automatique*, described by Louis Aragon as "the work of a single author with two heads." In a letter to the *New York Review of Books*, Mary Ann Caws remarks, with evident satisfaction, "The individual parts of the text were not ascribed to one or the other of the authors when it was first published, but now the different handwritings distinguish the authors" ("Automatic Writing Is Born," 16 March 1989, p. 45).

7. I am of course not alone in this opinion. Cf. Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Image—Music—Text*: "Once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. . . . Hence there is no surprise in the fact that, historically, the reign of the Author has also been that of the Critic" (p. 147).

8. Cited in Chapter 1, note 9. My quotations here and in the next paragraph are from the text in Wimsatt's *The Verbal Icon*, pp. 3-5.

9. Wimsatt, "Genesis: A Fallacy Revisited," in *The Disciplines of Criticism*, ed. Demetz et al., p. 222 (italics added). For Beardsley's later statements, see his *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958), esp. pp. 457-61, and "Textual Meaning and Authorial Meaning," *Genre* 1 (1968): 169-81, revised in Beardsley's *The Possibility of Criticism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), "The Authority of the Text," pp. 16-37.

10. *On Literary Intention: Critical Essays*, ed. David Newton-De Molina (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1976). The two most cogent essays are Frank Cioffi's "Intention and Interpretation in Criticism," pp. 55-73, 260 (reprinted from *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, n.s., 64 [1963-64]: 85-106), and Alastair Fowler's "Intention Floreat," pp. 242-55 (written especially for Newton-De Molina's volume).

11. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Validity in Interpretation*, pp. 4, 3, 5, 26-27. Hirsch has restated his position on many subsequent occasions. See, for a gathering of instances, *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976). The flinty minded refinement of Hirsch's system in P. D. Juhl's *Interpretation: An Essay in the Philosophy of Literary Criticism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980) aspires to be another landmark in the debate, but Juhl undermines himself in the first two sentences of his preface: "This book is an attempt to provide and defend an analysis of our concept of the meaning of a literary work. In undertaking to do this I am assuming that we in fact share one such concept, that one such concept underlies the practice of literary interpretation." Juhl's assumption, which in effect renders the rest of the book a tautology, is demonstrably unjustified.

12. An early example is the July 1968 issue of *Genre* (vol. 1, no. 3), "A Symposium on E. D. Hirsch's *Validity in Interpretation*," in which all eight authors, starting with Beardsley ("Textual Meaning and Authorial Meaning"), find fault with one or another aspect of Hirsch's work. The editor of the issue comments that "the objections

of our contributors are inconsistent with one another: one critic objects to a position that another accepts."

13. Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels, "Against Theory," *Critical Inquiry* 8 (1982): 723-42. My quotations are from the reprint in *Against Theory*, ed. Mitchell, pp. 11-30.

14. These are all reprinted in Mitchell's *Against Theory*. Subsequently, Knapp and Michaels have added "Against Theory 2: Hermeneutics and Deconstruction" to the fray (*Critical Inquiry* 14 [1987]: 49-68); it begins and concludes with the same refrain of their earlier piece: "a text means what its author intends it to mean."

15. William R. Schroeder, "A Teachable Theory of Interpretation," in *Theory in the Classroom*, ed. Cary Nelson (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), pp. 9-44.

16. *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*, ed. Anthony J. Cascardi (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), pp. 206 (Dutton) and 214-15, 221 (Rosen). Nehamas's earlier essay "The Postulated Author: Critical Monism as a Regulative Ideal" is cited in Chapter 1, note 17.

17. David H. Hirsch, "Penelope's Web," *Sewanee Review* 90 (1982): 124.

18. The one exception that I know of is Wimsatt, who in the 1968 "Genesis: A Fallacy Revisited" cites James Thorpe's disclosures about editorial and compositorial revision of works as a further argument against intentional reading: "it is possible and, as [Thorpe] shows, frequently is the fact that a designed work is the design of more than one head. A second completes the work of the first" (*The Disciplines of Criticism*, ed. Demetz et al., p. 206). Wimsatt cites Thorpe's "The Aesthetics of Textual Criticism," *PMLA* 80 (1965): 465-82, the essay that became, after further revision, chap. 1 of Thorpe's *Principles of Textual Criticism*.

19. *Autobiography and Literary Essays*, in *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, 1:34.

20. David H. Hirsch, "Penelope's Web," p. 125.

21. For example, G. Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Scholarship," in *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. Joseph Gibaldi (New York: Modern Language Association, 1981), esp. pp. 30, 31, 37, and William Proctor Williams and Craig S. Abbott, *An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1985), esp. pp. 57-58.

22. W. W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-51): 19-36 (first presented as a paper at the English Institute in September 1949), reprinted in Greg's *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 374-91; Fredson Bowers, "Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden," *Modern Philology* 48 (1950): 12-20, and numerous subsequent publications. Several of G. Thomas Tanselle's essays in *Studies in Bibliography* have a bearing on the Greg-Bowers theory; see his two collections, *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1979) and *Textual Criticism since Greg: A Chronicle, 1950-1985* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1987), esp. "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature" (1975), reprinted in both *Selected Studies in Bibliography*, pp. 245-307, and *Textual Criticism since Greg*, pp. 1-63.

23. *Little Dorrit*, ed. Harvey Peter Sucksmith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979). See my review in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 35 (1981): 543-47.

24. *The Blithedale Romance* and *The Marble Faun*, vols. 3 and 4 of the Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. Fredson Bowers (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1964, 1968). There is also (just as in interpretive theory) a vast

literature on the place of authorial intention in editing. The most frequently cited work is Tanselle's "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," *Studies in Bibliography* 29 (1976): 167-211 (reprinted in *Selected Studies in Bibliography*, pp. 309-53).

25. For an early account of seven of the versions, see I. A. Gordon, "The Case-History of Coleridge's *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*," *Review of English Studies* 18 (1942): 49-71.

26. A recent typical example is the Northwestern/Newberry edition of *Moby-Dick*, ed. Harrison Hayford et al. (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1988). See Peter Shillingsburg, "The Three *Moby-Dicks*," *American Literary History* 2 (1990): 119-30.

27. Thorpe, "The Aesthetics of Textual Criticism." My quotations are from the expanded version in Thorpe's *Principles of Textual Criticism*, pp. 35, 47.

28. Donald Pizer, "On the Editing of Modern American Texts," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 75 (1971): 147-53 (quotations from p. 149) (see also Pizer's later writings: review of the Pennsylvania edition of *Sister Carrie*, in *American Literature*; "Self-Censorship and Textual Editing"); Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts"; Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 339, and *From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method*, p. vii (with mention of versions on pp. 3, 76, 139); McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*; James McLaverty, "The Concept of Authorial Intention in Textual Criticism," *Library*, 6th ser., 6 (1984): 121-38.

29. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, pp. 8, 100, 54.

30. Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism*, p. 185. The subjectivity of "changed aesthetic effect" is rather like Tanselle's distinction between "vertical" and "horizontal" revisions ("The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," in *Selected Studies in Bibliography*, pp. 334-36) and open to the same objections.

31. Reiman, *Romantic Texts and Contexts*, chap. 10, " 'Versioning': The Presentation of Multiple Texts," pp. 167-80; Peter L. Shillingsburg, "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 55-79. See also Shillingsburg's discussion of versions in *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), pp. 44-55, 99-106. Stephen Parrish's recent "The Whig Interpretation of Literature" (cited in Chapter 4, note 30) is, in part at least, an eloquent defense of "the autonomy and the validity of each steady state of the text [of a work] as it changes in confused, unpredictable ways, through patterns which the author may never have foreseen, let alone 'intended' " (p. 349).

32. W. J. T. Mitchell, ed., *The Politics of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), reprinting articles from *Critical Inquiry* (1982-83), and Stanley Rosen, *Hermeneutics as Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). Rosen's book contains a revised version of his essay first published in *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*, ed. Cascardi.

Index

- Abbott, Craig S., 211, 243 n.21
 Abrams, M. H., 74, 75, 224 n.13, 228-29 n.10
 Ackroyd, Peter, 135, 137, 233 nn. 7, 12, 234 nn. 24, 26
 Adams, Henry, 208
 Adams, Marian (wife of Henry Adams), 208
 Agee, James, *A Death in the Family*, 211
 Agents as collaborators, 156
 Akenside, Mark, 193
 Aldrich, Ruth I., 233 n.9
 Alison, Joan, 175
 Allen, Woody, 174, 239 n.20
 Allott, Miriam, 21, 37, 46, 217 n.18, 219 nn.12, 17
 Altick, Richard D., 234 n.1
 Amberley, Katharine Louisa Russell, Lady, 67
 Anderson, Maxwell, 176
 Anderson, Sherwood, 145, 209
 Andrews, William L., 208
 Angell, Roger, 213
 Anonymous authorship, 10-11, 187
 Arac, Jonathan, 80, 90, 225 n.25
 Aragon, Louis, 242 n.6
 Archer, C., 21
 Archer, Eugene, 178, 240 n.30
 Ashbery, John, 48
 Ashkenazy, Vladimir, 192
 Ashton, Rosemary, 116-17, 232 nn. 39, 2
 Aswell, Edward, 148
 Auchincloss, Louis, 233 n.14
 Auden, W. H., 151
 Austen, Jane, *Volume the Third*, 205
 Austin, John, 58
 Auteur theory, 178-79, 181
 Author, banishment or "death" of, 3, 5
 Authorship, concepts of, 3-9, 16, 186-87, 193
 Bain, Alexander, 52
 Baker, Carlos, 232 n.4
 Baker, Jeffrey, 95, 226 nn.28, 29
 Bamber, Linda, 212
 Bancroft, Anne, 172-73
 Bancroft, Hubert Howe, 241-42 n.6
 Barfield, Owen, 110, 112, 230 n.26
 Barnard, John, 21, 217 n.18
 Barron, James, 206
 Barry, Peter, 233 nn.11, 15
 Barth, John, *The Floating Opera*, 156, 212, 237 n.30
 Barth, J. Robert, S.J., 226 n.29
 Barthes, Roland, 3, 5, 186, 192, 193, 215 nn.1, 4, 242 n.7
 Basso, Hamilton, 145-46
 Bate, Walter Jackson, 104, 114, 116, 217 n.14, 228 n.3, 231 n.35, 232 n.2
 Batho, Edith C., 80, 225 n.23
 Baym, Nina, 216 n.7, 234 n.24

- Beach, Joseph Warren, 106–7, 113, 118, 230 n.21
 Beardsley, Monroe C., 8, 188–92, 193, 216 n.9, 242 nn.9, 12
 Beattie, Ann, *Love Always*, 213
 Beaumont, Francis, 168
 Beckett, Samuel, *Fizzles*, 207
 Beddoes, Thomas Lovell, 129
 Beer, John B., 111, 112, 230 nn.23, 26, 231 n.27
 Beerbohm, Max, 151
 Behlmer, Rudy, 240 n.23
 Behrman, S. N., 150; *Portrait of Max*, 151
 Bellamann, Henry, *Kings Row*, 142
 Bentham, Jeremy, 59, 61, 64, 68; *Rationale of Judicial Evidence*, 67
 Bentham, Sir Samuel, 57
 Bentley, Gerald Eades, 168–69, 239 nn.11, 12, 14
 Bentley, Richard, 140, 205
 Berg, A. Scott, 145, 148–49, 154, 209, 210, 235 nn.9, 10, 236 nn.11, 14, 15, 17, 18
 Bergman, Ingmar, 174
 Bergonzi, Bernard, 134, 234 n.23
 Best-sellers, 139–41, 143
 Binyon, Laurence, 21
 Biographical approach to literature, 6–9
 Black Elk, 208–9
 Blake, William, 128, 183–85
 Bleich, David, 8
 Bloom, Harold, 113, 184, 231 n.32
 Blotner, Joseph, 236 n.28
 Boccaccio, Giovanni, 169;
 Decameron, 25–26, 38–39, 219 n.13, 228 n.1
 Bok, Edward, *Twice Thirty*, 148
 Bonham-Carter, Victor, 234 n.1
 Book-of-the-Month Club, 156, 211
 Booth, Wayne, 5, 16, 215 n.4, 217 n.17
 Bowers, Fredson, 48, 160, 185, 195, 196, 237–38 n.36, 241 n.3, 243 nn.22, 24. *See also* Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text
 Boyd, Madeleine, 150
 Brady, John, 240 n.24
 Brandl, Alois, 229 n.12, 233 n.9
 Brebach, Raymond, 206
 Breen Office, 175
 Brennan, Stephen C., 237 n.34
 Breton, André, 242 n.6
 Bringle, Jerald E., 206
 Broch, Hermann, *The Spell*, 155
 Brooke, Arthur, *Romeus and Juliet*, 169
 Brooks, James L., 174
 Broughton, Leslie Nathan, 79, 225 n.21
 Brown, Charles, 12, 17–20, 27, 28–29, 45, 47–48, 205, 217 n.19, 219 n.16
 Browning, Robert, *The Lost Leader*, 77
 Brownstein, Rachel Mayer, 223 n.9
 Bruccoli, Matthew J., 210
 “Bryher” (Winifred Ellerman), *Two Selves*, 207
 Buck, Pearl S., 140, 210
 Buckner, Robert, 174–75
 Bulwer-Lytton, Edward, 205; *A Strange Story*, 140
 Burgess, Anthony, *A Clockwork Orange*, 156, 207
 Burnett, Murray, 175
 Burston, W. H., 65, 222 n.15
 Burton, Mary E., 80, 225 n.23
 Burton, Robert, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 15–16
 Bush, George, 241 n.5
 Bush, Ronald, 133, 234 n.22
 Butler, James, 83–84
 Byron, Lord, 139; *Childe Harold*, 205; *Hours of Idleness*, 205
 Cabot, James Elliot, 208
 Cafarelli, Annette Wheeler, 216 n.7

- Cagney, James, 174
 Caldwell, Erskine, 145; *God's Little Acre*, 141
 Caldwell, Taylor, 146
 Callaghan, Morley, 145
 Cambon, Glauco, 134, 233 n.11, 234 n.23
 Canon, multiply authored, 203
 Capote, Truman, *Answered Prayers*, 212
 Carlyle, Thomas, 53, 58, 62, 116
 Carney, Raymond, 95, 227 n.40
 Carpenter, Michael, 239 n.22
 Carringer, Robert, 179–81, 240 nn.25, 32–36
 Cary, Henry Francis. *See* Dante *Casablanca*, 175, 177, 240 n.23
 Cascardi, Anthony, 191, 243 n.16
 Casciato, Arthur D., 212
 Caws, Mary Ann, 242 n.6
 Censorship, 159, 175, 177
 Chandler, James K., 227 n.34
 Chaplin, Charles, 174
 Chapman, John, 239 n.19
 Charvat, William, 234 n.1
 Chatterton, Thomas, 21
 Chilcott, Tim, 205
 Christensen, Jerome, 113, 116, 117, 231 n.34
 Cibber, Colley, 166, 169
 Cinthio, Giambattista Gherardi, 169
 Cioffi, Frank, 242 n.10
Citizen Kane, 179–81
 Clare, John, *The Shepherd's Calendar*, 205
 Clark, Barrett H., 206
 Clark, Walter Van Tilburg, 151
 Clemons, Olivia Langdon (wife of Mark Twain), 208
 Coburn, Kathleen, 233 n.5
 Cohan, George M., 174
 Cohen, Philip, 226 n.31
 Coleman, Robert, 239 n.19
 Coleridge, Ernest Hartley, 228 nn.5, 9
 Coleridge, Hartley, 10, 101–2
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 24, 76, 121–25, 136, 139, 182, 183, 188, 204–5; *Biographia Literaria*, 6, 23, 97, 98, 104–8, 113–16, 117–19, 139, 205, 228 n.7, 232 n.2; *Christabel*, 98; *Conversation poems*, 70; *Dejection: An Ode*, 97, 99–100; *The Dungeon*, 70; *The Eolian Harp*, 97; *The Foster-Mother's Tale*, 70; *Frost at Midnight*, 94, 97, 100–103; *Kubla Khan*, 98, 99–100; *Love*, 70; *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*, 197; *The Nightingale*, 70; *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, 69–70, 71, 97–98, 114, 121, 123, 136, 204; *Sibylline Leaves*, 70, 139; *Theory of Life*, 105, 118, 205; *This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison*, 97; *The Wanderings of Cain*, 204
 Coleridge, Sara (STC's daughter), 106, 205, 230 n.19
 Collaborators. *See* Agents; Editors; Friends; Publishers; Reader; Sources; Spouses
 Colman, Mary Elizabeth, 52
 Commager, Henry Steele, 150
 Commins, Dorothy, 152, 236 nn.19–21
 Commins, Saxe, 150–53, 210, 211, 236 nn.19–21
 Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de, 57
 Congreve, William, 238 n.1
 Connolly, Cyril, 110, 230 n.25
 Conrad, Joseph, 206
 Copy-text theory. *See* Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text
 Cornell Wordsworth (edition). *See* Wordsworth, William
 Coser, Lewis A., 235 n.3
 Cottle, Basil, 111, 230 n.26
 Couser, G. Thomas, 209
 Covici, Pascal, 152

- Cowley, Malcolm, 149, 210
 Cowper, William, 229 nn.12, 13;
The Task, 85, 102-3
 Crane, Stephen, 227 n.38; *Maggie*,
 209; *The Red Badge of Courage*,
 209
 Croker, John Wilson, 33
 Crutwell, Patrick, 6, 216 n.6
 Cukor, George, 177
 Cummings, E. E., *The Enormous*
Room, 210
 Cunningham, J. V., 216 n.11
 Curtis, Jared, 87-89
 Curtiz, Michael, 174-75
- Daniel, Arnaut, 131
 Daniel, Samuel, 10
 Dante, 16; *Inferno* (trans. Henry
 Francis Cary), 15-16; *Purgatorio*,
 131
 Darbishire, Helen, 74, 79, 89-90,
 224 nn.11, 13, 225 n.21, 227 n.34
 Darwin, Charles, 185
 Davenant, Sir William, 165-66, 167,
 169
 Davenport, Gary, 227 n.38
 Davenport, Marcia, 145, 147; *East*
Side, West Side, 236 n.13; *The Val-*
ley of Decision, 148-49
 Davidson, Harriet, 133, 234 n.22
 Davie, Donald, 224 n.10
 Davis, W. Eugene, 206
 Davy, Humphry, 71
 Day, Douglas, 207, 236 n.28
 De Quincey, Thomas, 71, 105, 116,
 229 n.17
 de Selincourt, Ernest, 74, 77-80,
 85, 89-90, 92, 94, 224 nn.11, 13,
 225 n.20, 227 n.34
 De Voto, Bernard, 237 n.33
 Deck, Alice A., 208
 Defoe, Daniel, 203
 DeGruson, Gene, 209
 Dekker, Thomas, 195
- Delbanco, Nicholas, 206
 Dewey, John, 109, 197
 Dickens, Charles, 140, 183, 205;
Great Expectations, 205; *Little*
Dorrit, 195-96
 Dickie, Margaret, 224 n.12
 Dickinson, Emily, 6, 208
 Dickstein, Morris, 217 n.15
 Dietrich, Marlene, 177
 Dilke, Charles Wentworth, 17-18
 Dinesen, Isak, 151
 Dolger, Jonathan, 235 n.6
 Donald, David Herbert, 235 n.10,
 236 n.27
 Donoghue, Denis, 133, 234 n.22
 Doolittle, Hilda (H.D.), 207, 209-
 10
 Dos Passos, John, *Three Soldiers*,
 210
 Doubleday, Frank, 157
 Doubleday, Page and Co., 157, 159,
 160
 Dowd, Maureen, 241 n.5
 Dreiser, Sara, 157, 158-61, 200, 209
 Dreiser, Theodore, 209; *Jennie Ger-*
hardt, 241 n.2; *Sister Carrie*, 157-
 62, 199, 200, 237 nn.33-35
 Drummond, William, of Haw-
 thornden, 10
 Dryden, John, 165-66, 238 n.1
 Dutton, Denis, 192
- Eastlake, Elizabeth, Lady, 233 n.9
 Eberhart, Richard, 209
 Editorial theory, 194-201
 Editors as collaborators, 140-55
 Eliot, George, 80, 116
 Eliot, T. S., 139, 182, 185, 201; *Po-*
ems 1909-1925, 131; "The Three
 Voices of Poetry," 137-38; *The*
Waste Land, 23-24, 97, 122-38,
 146, 188, 194, 200, 210
 Eliot, Valerie (second wife of TSE),

- 122, 132, 136, 232 n.3, 233 nn.11,
 12
 Eliot, Vivien (first wife of TSE),
 126, 129
 Ellmann, Richard, 233 n.11
 Emerson, Ellen, 208
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 208
 Emmet, Dorothy, 231 n.29
 Engel, Lyle Kenyon, 140-41, 210,
 235 n.3
 Engell, James, 104-5, 114, 115-16,
 117, 228 nn.3, 7, 229 n.16, 232 n.2
 Epstein, Julius, 175-76, 239 n.21
 Epstein, Philip, 175-76
 Erdman, David V., 184, 238 nn.9,
 10, 239 n.13
- Farrar, John, 152
 Faulkner, William, 150, 152, 176,
 210, 237 n.33; *Absalom, Absa-*
lom! 152; *Flags in the Dust*, 156,
 236 n.28; *The Mansion*, 152; *Sarto-*
ris, 156; *The Town*, 152
 Fechter, Charles Albert, 167
 Fellini, Federico, 174
 Fenwick, Isabella, 70
 Ferguson, Perry, 180
 Ferrier, James Frederick, 105-6, 229
 n.18
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 98, 105
 Field, Barron, 71, 223 n.5
 Field, Leslie, 235 n.10, 236 n.12
 Field, Nathan, 168
 Fielding, Henry, 139
 Finney, Claude Lee, 217 n.15
 Fish, Stanley, 8, 215 n.3
 Fitzgerald, F. Scott, 141, 145, 148,
 156, 176, 210; *The Beautiful and*
Damned, 149; *The Great Gatsby*,
 149-50, 237 n.33; *Tender Is the*
Night, 149, 237 n.33; *This Side of*
Paradise, 149
 Fitzgerald, Zelda, 210
Flame of New Orleans, The, 177
- Fletcher, John, 168
 Foakes, R. A., 111, 112, 230 n.26,
 231 n.27
 Fogel, Daniel Mark, 114, 231 n.36
 Fogel, Ephim G., 238 nn.9, 10, 239
 n.13
 Fogle, Richard H., 110, 112, 230 n.26
 Fonda, Henry, 172-73
 Ford, Ford Madox, 206
 Ford, John, 178
 Forman, H. Buxton, 21, 37, 46, 219
 nn.12, 17
 Forman, Maurice Buxton, 21
 Foucault, Michel, 3, 16, 186, 193,
 215 n.1, 217 n.17
 Fowler, Alastair, 242 n.10
 Fowler, Roy, 240 n.32
 Fraistat, Neil, 70, 204, 222 n.2
 Freeman, Douglas Southall, 145;
Robert E. Lee, 148
 French, Bryant Morey, 208
 Freud, Sigmund, 185
 Friedman, Norman, 215 n.1, 216 n.6
 Friedman, Susan Stanford, 207
 Friends as collaborators, 29-40, 44-
 45, 69-71, 121-22, 125-38, 156,
 158-61
 Frosch, Thomas R., 223 n.9
 Fruman, Norman, 104, 105, 107,
 108-13, 114-16, 118, 121, 226
 n.29, 229 nn.12, 14-16, 231
 nn.27, 37, 38, 232 nn.41, 2
 Frye, Northrop, 8, 184, 216 n.9
 Furbank, P. N., 203
- Gallup, Donald, 232 n.3
 Gardner, Helen, 233 n.11
 Garnett, Edward, 206, 207
 Garrick, David, 166-67
 Garrod, H. W., 13, 19-20, 21, 121,
 216 n.11, 217 nn.14, 18, 20, 219
 n.11, 232 n.2
 Gaskell, Philip, 170-71, 198-99,
 239 n.16, 244 n.28

- Gatrell, Simon, 206
 Geis, Bernard (publisher), 143–44, 145
 Genre, influence of, 182
 Gerber, Philip L., 209
 Gibson, Margaret (wife of William Gibson), 172
 Gibson, William, 241 n.1; *Two for the Seesaw*, 170, 171–74, 211, 239 nn.18, 19
 Gierow, Karl Ragner, 210
 Gill, Stephen, 74–75, 82, 84, 89, 224 n.13, 226 n.31, 227 n.35
 Gillman, James, 205
 Gish, Nancy K., 207
 Gittings, Robert, 217 n.16, 223 n.9
 Glassman, Peter, 65, 222 n.15
 Goldblum, Jeff, 167
 Gollin, Richard M., 240 n.35
 Gordon, I. A., 244 n.25
 Gordon, Lyndall, 233 n.11
 Gottlieb, Robert, 154, 212, 236 n.24
 Graff, Gerald, 216 n.9, 231 n.31
 Grant, John, 184
 Gravit, Richard, 116
 Green, Joseph Henry, 205
 Greene, Robert, 169
 Greg, W. W., 160, 162, 195, 196, 237 n.36, 243 n.22. *See also* Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text
 Greg-Bowers theory of copy-text, 160, 162, 195, 196–200, 243 n.22
 Griffin, Dustin, 203–4
 Groom, Bernard, 225 n.23
 Gross, Gerald, 154–55, 235 n.7, 236 nn.22, 25
 Grote, George, 58
 Gussow, Mel, 211, 238 n.3
 H.D. *See* Doolittle, Hilda
 Haeger, J. H., 205
 Hale, Nancy, 145
 Haley, Alex, 212
 Hamilton, Paul, 117, 232 n.40
 Hamilton, Sir William, 105–6, 229 n.18
 Hammett, Dashiell, *Red Harvest*, 210
 Harbage, Alfred, 169, 239 n.15
 Harding, Anthony John, 119, 232 n.43
 Hardy, Florence (second wife of Thomas Hardy), 206
 Hardy, Thomas, 206; *The Woodlanders*, 206
 Harper, George McLean, 79, 225 n.21
 Harper's (publisher), 148, 157, 159
 Hart, Moss, *Once in a Lifetime*, 211
 Hartman, Geoffrey, 110, 230 n.25
 Havens, Raymond Dexter, 80, 225 n.23
 Hawks, Howard, 178
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 196, 208; *The Blithedale Romance*, 197; *The Marble Faun*, 197
 Hawthorne, Sophia (wife of Nathaniel Hawthorne), 208
 Haydn, Hiram, 212
 Hayek, F. A., 221 n.8
 Hayhoe, George F., 236 n.28
 Hayman, Ronald, 239 nn.16, 17
 Hays Office, 177
 Hazlitt, William, 103
 Hearst, William Randolph, 179
Heart of Darkness (film), 180
 Heller, Joseph, 154; *Catch-22*, 212, 236 n.24
 Hellman, Lillian, 176
 Hemenway, Robert E., 211
 Hemingway, Ernest, 141, 145, 148, 210–11; *The Garden of Eden*, 155–56; *The Sun Also Rises*, 156–57
 Hemingway, Mary, 211
 Henry, Arthur, 157, 158–61, 237 n.35
 Henslowe, Philip, 168–69

- Hessey, James Augustus, 27
 Higgins, Brian, 210
 Higham, Charles, 239 n.23
 Himmelfarb, Gertrude, 221 n.8, 222 n.17
 Hines, Gregory, 167
 Hirsch, David H., 194, 243 nn.17, 20
 Hirsch, E. D., Jr., 8, 190–92, 193, 216 n.10, 242 nn.11, 12
 Hitchcock, Alfred, 178, 181
 Hitchcock, Ripley, 208, 209, 241 n.2
 Hobhouse, John Cam, 205
 Hobsbaum, Philip, 80, 94, 225 n.26
 Hogg, Thomas Jefferson, 205
 Holinshed, Raphael, *Chronicles*, 169
 Holland, Norman, 8
 House, Humphry, 103, 229 n.12
 Houseman, John, 179
 Howells, William Dean, 195, 208
 Hoy, Cyrus, 168, 238 n.10
 Hughes, Ted, 213
 Hunt, Leigh, 32–33, 47–48
 Hunt, Tim, 212
 Hurston, Zora Neale, *Dust Tracks on a Road*, 211
 Hutchinson, Mary, 74, 123. *See also* Wordsworth, Mary
 Hutchinson, Sara, 71
 Hyman, Stanley Edgar, 211–12
 Influence, as type of collaboration, 69
 Intention, authorial, 46, 136–38, 171, 188–95
 Intentional fallacy, 8, 188–90
 Interpretive theory, 188–94, 201
 Intertextuality. *See* Influence; Sources
 Irving, Henry, 167
 Irving, Pierre, 207
 Irving, Washington, 207
 Iser, Wolfgang, 8
 Jack, Ian, 205
 Jackson, H. J., 205
 Jackson, Shirley, "The Lottery," 211–12
 Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich, 104, 113
 James, Henry, 5, 197, 208, 215 n.4, 227 n.38
 James, Will, 145, 148
 James, William, 196–97
 Jameson, John Franklin, 241–42 n.6
 Jarrell, Randall, 212
 Jarvis, Robin, 224 n.17
 Jeffers, Robinson, 150; *The Double Axe*, 210
 Jenkins, George, 173
 Jenks, Tom, 155
 Johns, Jasper, 207
 Johnson, Glen M., 208
 Johnson, Joseph, 229 n.13
 Johnson, Samuel, 7
 Johnston, Kenneth R., 227 n.34
 Jones, James, 146; *From Here to Eternity*, 212
 Jones, Mark, 225 n.24
 Jordan, John E., 85, 223 n.7
 Joseph, Edmund, 175–76
 Joukovsky, Nicholas, 220 n.3
 Joyce, James, 128–29, 206–7
 Juhl, P. D., 242 n.11
 Kadushin, Charles, 235 n.3
 Kaledin, Eugenia, 208
 Kant, Immanuel, 98, 105, 106, 107, 110, 119
 Kazan, Elia, 210
 Keats, George, 26, 28, 41
 Keats, John, 124, 135, 139, 182, 183, 187–88, 195, 205; *As Hermes once*, 47–48; *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, 11, 30, 47–48, 197; *Calidore*, 228 n.1; *Dear Reynolds*, 14; *Endymion*, 13, 15, 16, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 40–41, 45, 188; *The Eve of St. Agnes*, 11,

- Keats, John (*continued*)
 13-15, 22, 28, 30, 41-44, 45, 46,
 187, 228 n.1; *The Eve of St.
 Mark*, 28, 218 n.3; *The Fall of Hy-
 perion*, 13, 16, 30; *Hyperion*, 30,
 44-45, 46, 228 n.1; *If by dull
 rhymes*, 12-13; *Isabella*, 23, 25-
 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 48, 69, 187, 228
 n.1; *Lamia*, 13, 15, 16, 30, 32, 44,
 45, 228 n.1; *Lamia* volume of
 1820, 12, 25, 47; *Lines on the Mer-
 maid Tavern*, 28; *Ode on a Gre-
 cian Urn*, 13-15; *Ode on Melan-
 choly*, 13-14; *Ode to a Nightin-
 gale*, 13-15, 188; *Ode to Psyche*,
 11, 13-14; odes, 7, 28, 30; *Otho
 the Great*, 219 n.16; *Poems of
 1817*, 27, 31, 35; *Song of Four
 Fairies*, 11; *Sonnet to Sleep*, 9-22,
 25, 33; sonnets *On Fame*, 11, 13
- Keats, Tom, 26
- Keith, W. J., 223 n.9
- Kelley, Edith Summers, *Weeds*, 209
- Kelley, Theresa M., 219 n.19
- Kelly, Michael J., 229 n.12
- Kemble, John Philip, 167
- Kenner, Hugh, 110, 230 n.25, 233
 n.11
- Kent, Amalia, 179
- Kern, Alexander, 231 n.30
- Kerouac, Jack, *On the Road*, 212
- Kerr, Walter, 239 n.19
- Kime, Wayne R., 207
- King, Henry, 79, 225 n.21
- King, R. W., 21
- King, Stephen, *The Stand*, 213
- Kingsley, Charles, *Westward Ho!*
 140, 206
- Kinnamon, Keneth, 211
- Kirk, Russell, 134, 234 n.23
- Klinkowitz, Jerome, 211
- Knapp, Steven, 191, 192, 193, 243
 nn.13, 14
- Knights, L. C., 110, 111, 230 n.26
- Knox, Bernard, 109
- Koch, Howard, 175, 240 n.23
- Koestenbaum, Wayne, 233 n.11
- Korda, Michael, 235 n.6
- Kramer, Dale, 206
- Kramer, Victor A., 211
- Kroeber, Karl, 225 n.24
- Krupat, Arnold, 209
- Kunitz, Stanley, 212
- Kuznetsov, A. V., *Babi Yar*, 207
- Lamb, Charles, "On the Tragedies
 of Shakspeare," 165
- Lardner, Ring, 145; *How to Write
 Short Stories*, 148
- Lask, Thomas, 109, 230 n.25
- Lawrence, D. H., 206
- Lawrence, Frieda, 206
- Leff, Leonard J., 181, 240-41 nn.28,
 37
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 104,
 229 n.14
- Lemprière, John, *A Classical Dictio-
 nary*, 25
- Levere, Trevor H., 117-18, 232 n.41
- Levinson, Marjorie, 219 n.19
- Lewes, George Henry, 116
- Lewis, Sinclair, 150
- Lewis, Wyndham, 125
- Lindenberger, Herbert, 224-25 n.20
- Lingeman, Richard, 237 n.34
- Little, Geoffrey, 223 nn.5, 8
- Litwak, Mark, 240 nn.24, 27
- Locke, John, 185
- Lockhart, John Gibson, 32-33
- Lockridge, Laurence S., 113, 116,
 231 n.33
- Lodge, David, *Out of the Shelter*,
 207
- Lodge, Thomas, 169
- Loesberg, Jonathan, 65, 222 n.15
- Longman (publisher), 140, 206
- Lowell, Robert, 212

- Lowes, John Livingston, 97, 110,
 228 n.4
- Lowry, Malcolm, *Under the Vol-
 cano*, 207
- Lowry, Margerie (wife of Malcolm
 Lowry), 207
- Luce, Clare Booth, *The Women*, 144
- Lynn, Kenneth S., 211
- Maass, Johann Gebhard
 Ehrenreich, 98, 104, 105-6
- McClain, John, 239 n.19
- McCreadie, Marsha Anne, 232 n.4
- MacDiarmid, Hugh, *A Drunk Man
 Looks at the Thistle*, 207
- McDowell, Edwin, 207, 209, 212,
 213, 236 n.24, 237 n.31
- McFarland, Thomas, 104, 105, 107-
 9, 111-13, 116-18, 122, 222 n.3,
 223 n.4, 229 nn.14, 16, 230 n.26,
 231 nn.27, 32, 38, 232 n.2
- McGann, Jerome J., 46-49, 199,
 200, 219 nn.18-20, 241 n.3, 244
 nn.28, 29
- McGilligan, Patrick, 239 n.21, 240
 nn.23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31
- MacKenzie, Aeneas, 175
- McLaverty, James, 199, 244 n.28
- MacLeish, Archibald, *J.B.*, 210
- Macmillans (publishers), 140, 206
- Macready, William Charles, 167
- Madden, David, 204
- Magnificent Ambersons, The*, 180
- Magnuson, Paul, 122, 204, 222 n.3,
 232 n.2
- Mailer, Norman, 227 n.38
- Mankiewicz, Herman J., 179-80,
 240 n.25
- Manning, Anne, *The Ladies of
 Bever Hollow*, 140, 205
- Manning, Peter J., 225 n.24
- Manton, Jo, 223 n.9
- Marowitz, Charles, 167
- Marquand, J. P., 145
- Marsh, Florence, 123, 232 n.4
- Martin, L. C., 21
- Massinger, Philip, 168
- Matheson, Ann, 229 n.12
- Matthews, G. M., 218 n.8, 219 n.10
- Maule, Harry E., 235 n.7
- Mavor, William, *Universal Stenogra-
 phy*, 27
- Maxwell, D. E. S., 133, 134, 234
 n.22
- Maxwell, J. C., 74
- Mellor, Anne K., 205
- Melville, Herman, 208, 228 n.7;
Moby-Dick, 244 n.26; *Pierre*, 140
- Messner, Julian, Ltd. (publisher),
 142
- Messner, Kitty, 142-43
- Metalious, George (husband of
 Grace Metalious), 141
- Metalious, Grace, *Peyton Place*,
 141-43, 144-45, 212
- Meyerstein, E. H. W., 21
- Michaels, Walter Benn, 191, 192,
 193, 243 nn.13, 14
- Michelangelo, 99-100, 127-28
- Michelson, Bruce, 212
- Micheener, James A., 150, 211
- Middleton, Thomas, 168
- Milford, Nancy, 210
- Mill, Harriet (mother of JSM), 61, 65
- Mill, Harriet (wife of JSM), 23, 50-
 68, 182, 205, 220 n.3, 221 nn.9-11
- Mill, James, 53, 54-55, 57, 58, 59,
 61, 65, 67-68, 193-94
- Mill, John Stuart, 139, 182, 183;
Autobiography, 23, 50-67, 69,
 161, 187-88, 193-94, 205; *On Lib-
 erty*, 53, 66-68; *Principles of Politi-
 cal Economy*, 53, 54, 59, 63, 221
 n.9; *The Subjection of Women*, 67;
A System of Logic, 53, 54, 221 n.9
- Milnes, Richard Monckton, 47; *Life
 of John Keats*, 12, 18, 19-20, 47-
 48, 217 n.18

- Milton, John, 16, 72, 96, 185; *Paradise Lost*, 7, 11, 17, 34, 84; *Samson Agonistes*, 99–100
- Mineka, Francis E., 221 n.8
- Mitchell, Burroughs, 152
- Mitchell, Margaret, *Gone with the Wind*, 141
- Mitchell, W. J. T., 186, 241 n.4, 243 nn.13, 14, 244 n.32
- Mitgang, Herbert, 236 n.23
- Mizener, Arthur, 206, 210
- Modern Language Association, 4, 8, 48, 195, 226 n.33
- Modiano, Raimonda, 119, 232 n.44
- Monroe, Harriet, 209
- Moore, George, 206
- Moore, Sir John, 71
- Moore, Marianne, 128
- More, *The Booke of Sir Thomas*, 169, 239 n.13
- Morell, Parker, *Lillian Russell*, 151, 236 n.20
- Morley, Christopher, 72, 223 n.9
- Motley, Willard, *Knock on Any Door*, 211
- Mudge, Bradford K., 230 n.19
- Murray, E. B., 205
- Nehamas, Alexander, 16, 192, 217 n.17, 243 n.16
- Neihardt, John G., 209
- Nelson, Cary, 191
- Nevler, Leona, 142
- New Criticism, 7–8
- Newlyn, Lucy, 116, 222 n.3
- Newton, Sir Isaac, 185
- Newton-De Molina, David, 190, 242 n.10
- Noonan, Peggy, 241 n.5
- Norris, Frank, 157
- North, Sir Thomas, translation of Plutarch, 169
- Norton anthologies, 11, 18, 21, 74, 84, 135, 187
- Nowell, Elizabeth, 148, 156, 235 n.10
- Odets, Clifford, 176
- O'Hara, John, 150, 211
- Olivier, Laurence, 166
- O'Neill, Eugene, 150, 151; *More Stately Mansions*, 210
- Oppenheimer, Judy, 212
- Orsini, G. N. G., 107–9, 118, 119, 230 n.22
- Orwell, George, 207
- Osborn, Robert, 84–85
- Osgood, Charles Grosvenor, 7, 79–80, 216 n.8, 225 n.22
- Osofsky, Gilbert, 208
- Otway, Thomas, 166
- Owen, W. J. B., 75, 224 nn.11, 13
- Owen, W. R., 203
- Packe, Michael St. John, 65, 221 n.8, 222 n.15
- Page, Thomas Nelson, 208
- Page, Walter Hines, 157
- Papp, Joseph, 167
- Pappe, H. O., 221 n.8
- Park, Roy, 110, 112, 230 n.26
- Parker, Hershel, 204, 210, 227 n.38
- Parker, Reeve, 225 n.25
- Parrish, Stephen, 75, 87, 224 n.13, 226 nn.30, 32, 244 n.31
- Paton, Alan, 146
- Patterson, Gertrude, 132, 134, 234 n.22
- Paulson, Ronald, 184
- Penn, Arthur, 172, 173
- Perelman, S. J., 211
- Perkins, Maxwell, 141, 145–50, 151, 152, 153, 154, 209, 210, 237 n.33
- Perloff, Marjorie, 213
- Personae, authors and, 5–6
- Phelps, William Lyon, 7
- Pizer, Donald, 162, 198, 199, 200, 237 n.34, 238 n.37, 244 n.28

- Plagiarism, as type of collaboration, 97–99, 104–20, 123
- Plath, Sylvia, *Ariel*, 213
- Polk, Noel, 210, 237 n.33
- Pope, Alexander, 129, 139; *The Rape of the Lock*, 7
- Posthumous books, 155–56, 193
- Pottle, Frederick A., 223 n.9
- Pound, Ezra, 23–24, 122, 124–38, 146, 188, 194, 200, 201, 210
- Powell, Walter W., 235 n.3
- Powers, Richard, 204
- Prashker, Betty A., 153
- Preston, Don, 143–44, 145, 212
- Primitivism, textual, 73, 94
- Publishers as collaborators, 29–30, 34, 40–44, 140, 156
- Pulik, Ruth, 133, 234 n.22
- Purchas's *Pilgrimage*, 98
- "Pure" single authorship, 183–86
- Pym, Barbara, *An Academic Question*, 207
- Quinn, John, 125, 126, 131
- Rader, Ralph, 6, 216 n.6
- Rawlings, Marjorie Kinnan, 145; *Cross Creek*, 236 n.13; *The Yearling*, 148, 210
- Raysor, Thomas M., 108
- Reade, Charles, *The Woman Hater*, 205
- Reader as collaborator, 185
- Reader response theory, 8, 194
- Reed, Mark, 75, 76, 224 nn.13, 14, 18
- Rees, John C., 221 n.8, 222 n.17
- Reeves, Gareth, 133, 234 n.22
- Reiman, Donald H., 200, 226–27 n.33, 244 n.31
- Reynolds, John Hamilton, 26, 29, 31, 45
- Reynolds, Michael S., 211, 237 n.32
- Ricardo, David, 58
- Richards, I. A., 7–8, 10, 216 n.9
- Richardson, Joan, 209
- Richardson, Samuel, 139
- Ricks, Christopher, 35, 110, 219 n.10, 230 n.25
- Ridley, M. R., 217 n.14
- RKO Pictures, 179–80
- Robinson, Casey, 240 n.23
- Robson, Ann P. W., 222 n.18
- Robson, John M., 65, 220 n.1, 221 nn.8, 9
- Roe, Nicholas, 116
- Roebuck, John Arthur, 55, 62
- Rose, Phyllis, 221 n.8
- Rosen, Stanley, 192, 244 n.32
- Ross, Charles L., 207
- Ross, Harold, 153
- Rossi, Alice S., 221 n.8
- Rowe, Nicholas, 166
- Rowley, William, 168
- Rudnik, Lois Palken, 207
- Ruoff, Gene W., 222 n.3, 227 n.34
- Sale, Faith, 153, 154
- Sarris, Andrew, 178, 240 n.30
- Say, Jean Baptiste, 58
- Schell, Richard, 80, 225 nn.24, 25
- Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von, 98, 104, 105–6, 107–8, 110, 112, 117, 118–19, 229 n.16, 232 n.43
- Schiefelbein, Susan, 212
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm von, 98, 105, 106, 108, 110, 228 n.6, 229 n.16, 231 n.27
- Scholes, Robert E., 206
- Schroeder, William R., 191, 243 n.15
- Schulberg, Budd, 150
- Schulz, Max, 112, 116, 230 n.24, 231 n.28
- Schuyler, James, 48
- Scott, Sir Walter, 139; *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*, 98

- Seaman, Barbara, 143, 144, 212, 235 nn.5, 6, 8
- Sedgwick, Ellery, 153
- Self-revision, authorial, 72-73
- "Serious" vs. popular art and literature, 172-73, 182-83, 241 n.2
- Severn, Joseph, 27, 28
- Shadwell, Thomas, 166
- Shaffer, Elinor S., 111, 112, 118, 230 n.26
- Shakespeare, William, 16, 105, 123, 139, 164-69, 181, 183, 193; *All's Well*, 167; *Hamlet*, 7, 13, 15, 34, 167; *2 Henry IV*, 15; *Henry VIII*, 169; *King Lear*, 7, 164-65, 166-67; *Macbeth*, 85, 165-66; *The Merchant of Venice*, 14; *Othello*, 167; *Pericles*, 169; *Richard III*, 166; *Romeo and Juliet*, 166, 228 nn.1, 6; *The Taming of the Shrew*, 168, 169; *The Tempest*, 165-66; *Timon of Athens*, 166; *Troilus and Cressida*, 166, 167; *Twelfth Night*, 167; *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 169
- Shattuck, Charles H., 167, 238 nn.4, 7, 8
- Shaw, George Bernard, *Widowers' Houses*, 206
- Shaw, Irwin, 151
- Shebl, James, 210
- Shelley, Mary W., 205; *Frankenstein*, 205
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 116-17, 205; *The Necessity of Atheism*, 205
- Sheppard, Richard, 133, 234 n.22
- Sherwood, Robert, 176
- Shillingsburg, Peter L., 200, 244 nn.26, 31
- Shirley, James, 168
- Shivers, Louise, *Here to Get My Baby Out of Jail*, 213
- Shloss, Carol, 207
- Sidney, Sir Philip, 10
- Simmons, Jerold L., 240 n.28
- Simmons, Nancy Craig, 208
- Simon, Henry W., 152
- Sinclair, Upton, *The Jungle*, 209
- Siskin, Clifford, 95, 227-28 n.40
- Slatoff, Walter, 8
- Slave narratives, 208
- Smith, G. C. Moore, 79, 225 n.21
- Smith, George, 140
- Smith, Grover, 133, 134, 135, 233 n.11, 234 nn.22, 24, 25
- Smollett, Tobias, 139
- Solomon, Barbara Probst, 211, 236 n.26, 237 n.33
- Sothorn, E. H., *The Melancholy Tale of "Me,"* 148
- Soupault, Philippe, 242 n.6
- Sources, as element in collaboration, 71-72, 96-103, 169. *See also* Influence; Plagiarism
- Southam, B. C., 205
- Southey, Robert, *The Fall of Robespierre*, 204; *Joan of Arc*, 204
- Spencer, Hazelton, 238 n.4
- Spenser, Edmund, 16, 21
- Spiller, Robert E., 110, 230 n.25
- Spoto, Donald, 181, 240 n.37
- Spouses as collaborators, 50-68, 129, 158-61
- Statius, 10
- Steffens, Heinrich, 105, 106, 118, 119, 229 n.16
- Stein, Gertrude, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, 209
- Steiner, George, 110, 230 n.25
- Stern, Milton R., 236 n.15, 237 n.33
- Stevens, George, 235 n.10
- Stevens, Wallace, *Sunday Morning*, 209
- Stewart, Donald Ogden, 177-78
- Stimpson, Catharine R., 209
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar, 189
- Stone, Albert E., 209, 212
- Stone, C. F., III, 225 n.24
- Stone, Jean (wife of Irving Stone), 211

- Stone, Irving, 211
- Stoppard, Tom, 181; *Night and Day*, 239 n.16; *Travesties*, 170-71
- Strauss, Harold, 152
- Styron, William, *Lie Down in Darkness*, 212
- Susann, Jacqueline, 212; *The Love Machine*, 235 n.6; *Valley of the Dolls*, 141, 143-45
- Sussman, Aaron, 142
- Sutherland, J. A., 140-41, 204, 235 n.2
- Svoboda, Frederic J., 237 n.32
- Swedenborg, Emanuel, 185
- Tanselle, G. Thomas, 195, 243 nn.21, 22, 244 n.30
- Targ, William, 153
- Tate, Allen, 145
- Tate, Nahum, 164-65, 167, 169
- Tati, Jacques, 174
- Taylor, Helen, 52, 67
- Taylor, John (Keats's publisher), 22-23, 27, 29-30, 34, 37-38, 40-41, 43-46, 205, 219 n.14
- Taylor, John (first husband of Harriet Mill), 59-60
- Taylor, Sam, 168
- Tennemann, Wilhelm Gottlieb, 105, 110, 229 n.16
- Tetens, Johann Nicolai, 105, 119, 229 n.16
- Thackeray, William Makepeace, *Henry Esmond*, 140
- Thaddeus, Janice, 211, 236-37 n.29
- Thomas, D. M., *The White Hotel*, 207
- Thomas, Jo, 207
- Thomas, W. K., 217 n.15
- Thomason, John W., Jr., *Jeb Stuart*, 148
- Thorpe, James, 48, 94, 198, 199, 200, 204, 219 n.20, 227 n.39, 243 n.18, 244 nn.27, 30
- Toklas, Alice B., 209
- Toland, Gregg, 180
- Toth, Emily, 141, 142-43, 212, 235 n.4
- Train, Arthur, *The World and Thomas Kelly*, 148
- Tree, Herbert Beerbohm, 167
- Trelawny, Edward John, *Adventures of a Younger Son*, 205
- Trollope, Anthony, *Barchester Towers*, 140, 206
- Truffaut, François, 178
- Turco, Lewis, 134-35, 234 n.23
- Twain, Mark, 208, 227 n.38
- Updike, John, *Rabbit, Run*, 212
- Van Dine, S. S., 145, 148
- Vaughan, Samuel S., 153
- Versions, theory of, 94-95, 197-200
- Vincent, Howard P., 208
- Vittoz, Dr. Roger, 126
- Vonnegut, Kurt, Jr., 212
- Waldron, Randall H., 213
- Walker, Eric C., 223 n.9
- Wallace, Catherine Miles, 118, 232 n.42
- Wallace, Lew, 208
- Wallace, Mike, 143
- Wallace, Susan Arnold, 208
- Wallis, Hal B., 174, 175, 239 n.23
- Walton, Kendall L., 16, 217 n.17
- Warner, Charles Dudley, 208
- Warren, Austin, 134
- Warton, Thomas, 10
- Wasson, Ben, 156
- Watts, Richard, 239 n.19
- Weeks, Edward, 153
- Wellek, René, 106-7, 113, 230 n.20
- Welles, Orson, 178-80, 240 n.33
- West, Anthony, 110, 230 n.25
- West, James L. W., III, 204, 234 n.1, 237 nn.33, 34, 241 n.2

- West, Nathanael, 176, 211
 West, Paul, 110, 230 n.25
 Westcott, Edward Noyes, *David Harum*, 208, 241 n.2
 Wheeler, Kathleen M., 117, 232 n.40
 Wheelock, John Hall, 235 n.9, 236 n.18
 Wilde, Oscar, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, 206
 Wilkinson, Thomas, *Tours to the British Mountains*, 72
 Williams, William Carlos, 151; *Pater-son*, 209
 Williams, William Proctor, 211, 243 n.21
 Wilson, Edmund, 145, 210
 Wilson, John Dover, 109
 Wilson, Timothy, 234 n.21
 Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., 8, 188–92, 193, 216 nn.6, 9, 242 nn.8, 9, 243 n.18
 Wolfe, Thomas, 141, 145, 146–48, 150, 156, 211; *The Hills Beyond*, 148; *Look Homeward, Angel*, 146; *Of Time and the River*, 146–47, 149; *The Story of a Novel*, 147, 235–36 n.10, 237 n.33; *The Web and the Rock*, 148; *You Can't Go Home Again*, 148
 Wolff, Helen, 153–54
 Wolfson, Susan J., 95, 218 n.1, 225 n.24, 228 n.40
 Wood, Karen, 211
 Woodhouse, Richard, 12, 17–23, 26–47, 217 nn.18, 19, 218 nn.2, 3, 7, 219 n.9
 Woolf, Virginia, 124, 233 n.7
 Wordsworth, Christopher, 76
 Wordsworth, Dora, 71
 Wordsworth, Dorothy, 71, 74, 125; journals, 72, 204, 223 n.9
 Wordsworth, John, 90
 Wordsworth, Jonathan, 74–75, 81–82, 84, 94, 224 nn.13–15, 17, 225–26 nn.27–30

- Wordsworth, Mary, 71, 74, 76
 Wordsworth, William, 10, 16, 24, 96, 121–22, 124–25, 128, 136, 139, 162, 182, 183, 204; *Alice Fell*, 72; *A Ballad*, 85; *Beggars*, 72; *Benjamin the Waggoner*, 87; *The Borderers*, 84–85; *The Convention of Cintra*, 71; Cornell Wordsworth, 74–75, 76, 81–89, 95, 162, 226–27 nn.30, 33, 34; *Descriptive Sketches*, 87; *Dirge*, 85; *Elegiac Stanzas*, 89; “Essay, Supplementary to the Preface,” 96; *An Evening Walk*, 87; *The Excursion*, 84, 94; *Expostulation and Reply*, 70; *Goody Blake and Harry Gill*, 70; *Guilt and Sorrow*, 72; *Home at Grasmere*, 72; *I wandered lonely as a cloud*, 72, 88; *The Idiot Boy*, 70; *Lucy Gray*, 99–100; *Lyrical Ballads*, 69–71, 73, 77, 89, 124, 136, 204; *Miscellaneous Poems* (1820), 85; *My heart leaps up*, 73, 89; *Nutting*, 73; *Ode: Inimities of Immortality*, 34, 73, 89; *The Pedlar*, 83–84, 94; *Peter Bell*, 72, 85–87, 89, 94; *Poems* (1845), 86; *Poems, in Two Volumes*, 77, 87–89; *Poetical Works* (1827–50), 85–86; preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, 6, 69, 70–71; *The Prelude*, 23, 72–81, 89–95, 97, 188, 197, 223 n.4, 229 n.11; *The Recluse*, 72, 76, 121, 124; *Resolution and Independence*, 72, 88, 223 n.4; *The Ruined Cottage*, 81, 83–84, 89, 94; *The Salisbury Plain Poems*, 82; *Simon Lee*, 70; *A slumber did my spirit seal*, 190, 193; *The Solitary Reaper*, 72, 88; *The Sparrow's Nest*, 72; *The Tables Turned*, 70; *The Thorn*, 70, 85; *The Three Graves*, 204; *Tintern Abbey*, 70, 73, 94, 101; *To a Butterfly*, 73; *To*

- the Cuckoo*, 73, 88; *We Are Seven*, 70; *The world is too much with us*, 88
 Wright, Richard, 211; *American Hunger*, 237 n.29; *Black Boy*, 156
 X, Malcolm, *Autobiography*, 48, 212
 Yankee Doodle Dandy, 174–75, 177
 Yeats, William Butler, 185
 Young, Robert, 95, 227 n.40
 Young, Stark, 145
 Zeller, Hans, 94, 198–99, 227 n.39, 244 n.28
 Zender, Karl F., 237 n.33
 Zillman, Lawrence John, 217 n.14
 Zinsser, William, 212
 Zivley, Sherry Lutz, 212, 237 n.30