

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

Notebooks and other manuscripts

**Reference:**

van Hulle Dirk.- Notebooks and other manuscripts

Samuel Beckett in context / Uhlmann, Anthony [edit.] - ISBN 978-1-107-01703-0 - Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 417-427

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1082080151162165141>

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

## **Notebooks and Other Manuscripts: Beckett and Genetic Criticism**

Dirk Van Hulle<sup>1</sup>

In the second half of the twentieth century, an implicit hierarchy insinuated itself into literary studies, suggesting that 'theory' was the real intellectual part of literary studies, whereas philological scholarship was regarded as merely preparatory spadework. In David Hayman's introduction to a collection of essays on 'Genetic Studies in Joyce', this implicit hierarchy shone through: 'Those who limit themselves to the philological tasks may perhaps see themselves as doing necessary spadework for which we others may be grateful, but we should not confuse this sort of activity with criticism. Unless the implications of such findings are used to disclose something about the text and its procedures, theirs is an endstopped activity' (Hayman 1995, 8). Although Hayman acknowledged that philological spadework, including 'source hunting', is 'a first step toward genetic criticism at its best' (8), he did create a dividing line between 'scholars' and 'critics', 'they' versus 'we'.

Joyce studies were very early in responding to French genetic criticism; the response in Beckett studies was more gradual. The 1980s did see the publication of pioneering studies on the writing process of Beckett's plays, combining 'spadework' with 'criticism', such as S. E. Gontarski's *The Intent of Undoing* and Rosemary Pountney's *Theatre of Shadows*, but these studies did not explicitly use genetic criticism as a theoretical framework. In contrast to Joyce studies, Beckett studies' delayed reply to French *critique génétique* had the advantage that the encounter was less burdened by the legacy of late twentieth-century academic politics, dichotomies and hierarchies.

These hierarchies do continue to make themselves felt, but a twenty-first-century approach to genetic criticism within Beckett studies may choose to build bridges instead of overemphasizing the dichotomy between scholarship and criticism. As Pierre-Marc de Biasi indicated in his seminal essay 'Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work', genetic criticism consists of two components. (1) The main aim of the 'genetic' part is to decipher, to render visible and readable what is observed on the page. (2)

---

<sup>1</sup> The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 31360911.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

The 'critical' component involves the reconstruction of the genesis from a chosen perspective (42). Both these aspects crucially complement each other, and both have at least one element in common: they start from material traces of the writing process, such as marginalia, notes, manuscripts, typescripts, galleys and proofs.

In Beckett's case, many of the surviving documents are publicly accessible, to a large extent thanks to donations by the author himself, notably to Trinity College, Dublin and to the University of Reading. On 2 July 1969, W. O'Sullivan, Keeper of Manuscript at Trinity College, Dublin, sent a typed letter to Samuel Beckett to thank him most heartily for his great kindness to the Manuscript Room: 'Very different indeed from the "scraps" you promised R. B. D. [Robert B. D. French] were the items you sent us. As far as I can judge they seem to give a pretty wide sampling of your writing over the years, 1954 to 1963' (TCD 4664a/1). Six days later, Beckett replied that he was glad to hear the odds and ends – as he called them this time – gave the keeper of manuscripts pleasure, and he promised him that if any other manuscripts turned up he would give them to him with the same heart and a half. With the same heart and a half, however, he also generously gave manuscripts to James Knowlson when he organized his Beckett exhibition in Reading in 1972. With regular intervals, Beckett gave him more 'items', as he tended to refer to them. He seldom wrote the word manuscripts in full, but either abbreviated them as MSS or simply referred to them as stuff (UoR JEK 3 March 1973, 1 March 1976, 14 June 1977).

In the meantime, however, several manuscripts had already been bought and sold again by antiquarians or collectors such as Jake Schwartz (Van Hulle & Nixon 2007). As a result, Beckett's manuscripts are now dispersed over several holding libraries on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1979, Richard L. Admussen undertook a meritorious attempt to catalogue *The Samuel Beckett Manuscripts* on a global scale. The catalogue is not exhaustive, but it describes the documents relating to Beckett's works as a whole, rather than the holdings of one particular archive.

One of the practical difficulties of genetic research is that the documents pertaining to one particular work are often divided over several archives. Beckett's publicly available manuscripts are held at various holding libraries (in the following list – a preliminary part of the Centre for Manuscript Genetics' ongoing work on an online catalogue of Beckett's manuscripts – the abbreviations are mainly based on Admussen 1979 and Cohn 2001):

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

- BC: The John J. Burns Library at Boston College (Chestnut Hill, MA) has numerous manuscripts and typescripts, located among the papers of Calvin Israel, Barney Rosset, Robert Pinget and Alan Schneider.
- BnF: The Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris) notably keeps the copybook with the complete first draft of *En attendant Godot* (also correspondences such as Beckett's letters to Jacoba van Velde).
- CU: The Columbia University Rare Book & Manuscript Library recently acquired the Barney Rosset papers.
- HRC: The Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (Austin, Texas) holds the second largest Beckett collection (mainly among the Samuel Beckett papers, but also in the Carlton Lake Collection), described by Carlton Lake in *No Symbols Where None Intended: Samuel Beckett at the Humanities Research Center* (Lake 1984).
- HU: The Houghton Library at Harvard University holds some Beckett material, such as manuscripts and typescripts of *Cascando*, several versions of an English translation of *Fragment de théâtre*, a one-page typescript fragment of *Waiting for Godot* and an early manuscript of *Embers*.
- ICU: The University of Chicago Library, Illinois, holds typed copies of 'Yoke of Liberty' ('Moly'), 'Enueg I', 'Dortmunder' ('Cassel Revisited') and 'Echo's Bones' among the Morton Dauwen Zabel papers.
- IMEC: The *Institut mémoires de l'édition contemporaine* (IMEC, Caen) holds the papers of publishing houses, such as Les Éditions de Minuit and John Calder.
- InU: The Lilly Library at Indiana University, Bloomington, has papers of Breon Mitchell, Richard Seaver and Calder & Boyars and a large collection of Beckett material, including an incomplete manuscript and galleys of *Molloy*; marked proofs of the trilogy; manuscripts, galleys and proofs of *How It Is*, *Come and Go*, *Imagination Dead Imagine*, *Lessness*, *The Lost Ones*, *Mercier and Camier*.
- MBU: The Howard Gotlieb Archival Research Center at Boston University (Boston, MA) holds carbon typescripts with autograph corrections of the Grove Press typescript of *How It Is*.
- McM: McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, holds the Merlin files and also some

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

manuscript material, including typescripts of 'Dortmunder' and 'Whoroscope'.

MoSW: Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, acquired its first Beckett typescript (*All That Fall*) in 1965, through the book dealer, Henry Wenning, and gradually built an important collection with numerous manuscripts and typescripts, especially of Beckett's shorter works (such as *Bing*, *Cascando*, *Imagination Dead Imagine*, *Eh Joe*, *Le Dépeupleur*) and of translations, catalogued by Sharon Bangert (1986).

NhD: Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, holds the Lawrence Harvey archive, including material relating to *Dream of Fair to middling Women*, *Mercier et Camier*, *Eleutheria* and several shorter pieces.

NSyU: Syracuse University, NY, holds not only miscellaneous Beckett material, but also the Grove Press records.

NYP: The New York Public Library keeps a typescript of *Embers*, a corrected copy of *Echo's Bones and Other Precipitates*, two notebooks, two typescripts and galley proofs of *The Lost Ones*.

OSU: The Ohio State University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library has a large collection, comprising the so-called Tara MacGowran notebook; an annotated English edition of *Watt*; notebooks, typescripts and page proofs of the French *Watt*; a playscript of *Waiting for Godot*; manuscripts and typescripts of *Fin de partie* and of Beckett's translation, *Endgame*; a notebook and typescripts of *Happy Days*; notebooks, typescripts, galleys and page proofs of *How It Is*.

SB: The Donald C. Davidson Library at the University of California, Santa Barbara, California, holds thermofax typescripts of *Eleuthéria*, *Mercier et Camier* and *Premier amour* with annotations.

TCD: Trinity College, Dublin, keeps many of Beckett's reading notes on philology and psychology (discussed by Matthew Feldman in *Beckett's Books*), and several notebooks with drafts, such as the Kilcool fragments, manuscripts of (preparatory stages of) *Fin de partie*, *Rough for Radio II*, *Imagination Dead Imagine*, catalogued by Everett Frost and Jane Maxwell in *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 16 (2006).

UoR: The *Beckett International Foundation* at the University of Reading (UoR), which grew out of the exhibition organized by James Knowlson in 1971, holds the largest

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

collection of Beckett manuscripts in the world, catalogued in *Beckett at Reading* (Bryden, Garforth and Mills 1998)

YU: Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut, has notes, manuscripts, typescripts, galleys and page proofs of *Sans (Lessness)*.

Ruby Cohn mentions several of these holding libraries in *A Beckett Canon*. They are briefly discussed in the footnotes, which reflects the perceived difference between the published versions of the works, discussed in the main body of the text, and their manuscripts; or between the canon and what S. E. Gontarski has called 'the grey canon'. But the fact that the manuscripts are discussed at all in *A Beckett Canon* shows that the canon is gradually 'greying' (Gontarski 2006), more recently also thanks to the edition of the letters and initiatives such as the Beckett Digital Manuscript Project (BDMP, [www.beckettarchive.org](http://www.beckettarchive.org)), which aims to reunite the dispersed manuscripts, in the form of digital facsimiles and transcriptions.

To the list of libraries, at least one other library should be added: Beckett's own library in his apartment at the Boulevard Saint Jacques in Paris, for the earliest inception of Beckett's own texts often took place in the margins of other authors' texts.

### **Margins: reading notes**

Beckett sometimes wrote in the margins of the books he read, initially to work on his vocabulary by looking up translations, but sometimes also to comment on the content. Even if the annotation is limited to a mere pencil line in the margin, it can signal a thought that was later transformed into an idea for a passage in one of Beckett's own works. Thus, for instance the underlined sentence 'Blue-eyed cats are invariably deaf' from Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* was incorporated literally in 'What a Misfortune'. Beckett did however highlight the 'foreign' origin of the line by making the 'colossal Capper' quote Darwin's line 'for no other reason than that the phrase had been running in his mind and now here was a chance to discharge it on a wit' (MPTK 125). In *Dream of Fair to middling Women*, he similarly drew attention to textual *Fremdkörper*. For instance, when he employed Proust's metaphor of the zone of evaporation (marked in his copy of *À la Recherche du temps perdu*), the passage is followed by the metafictional comment 'We stole that one. Guess where' (*Dream* 191-92).

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This kind of 'theft' was a technique Beckett had learned from Joyce. Beckett applied it, not only to passages he marked in his books, but also to so-called non-marginalia (passages that derive from a page that was *not* marked in a book that is otherwise annotated by Beckett). Thus, in Beckett's otherwise marked copy of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, Beckett did *not* mark the sentence 'Even Ireland has a few animals, now generally regarded as varieties, but which have been ranked as species by some zoologists' in the second chapter of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, but he did incorporate it literally in his story 'Draff' (MPTK 171).

## Notebooks

### a. intertextual notes:

Apart from the marks (pencil lines and dog-ears) in his copy of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, he also took notes from it in his so-called 'Whoroscope' Notebook (UoR MS 3000). There is a clear development in the way Beckett made notes, which is especially noticeable when one compares the 'Dream' Notebook (early 1930s) to the 'Whoroscope' Notebook (mid- to late 1930s), both preserved in Reading. In Daniel Ferrer's distinction between 'marginalists' (writing in the margins of books) and 'extractors' (writing in separate notebooks; Ferrer 2004), the second category could be subdivided into 'notesnatchers' and 'excerptors'. Beckett fits in with all of these categories, but then again, one should perhaps specify *which* Beckett one is referring to. The young Beckett is generally more of a Joycean 'notesnatcher', whereas the slightly older Beckett (in his late twenties, early thirties) is more of an 'excerptor':

- Samuel Beckett, 1. marginalist
- 2. extractor: a. 'notesnatcher'
- b. excerptor

Beckett, the notesnatcher, for instance, took notes from Pierre Garnier's *Onanisme seul et à deux sous toutes ses forms et leurs conséquences* in his 'Dream' Notebook (Pilling 1999, 59, notes 422ff.). On the verso pages, Beckett has taken notes from Jean-Baptiste Bouvier's *Dissertatio in Sextum Decalogi Praeceptum et Supplementum ad Tractatum de Matrimonio*, a copy of which still survives in his personal library.<sup>2</sup> According to Bouvier, one of the first threats to chastity was 'luxuria' (lust), or the inordinate appetite of venereal

---

<sup>2</sup> For a full account of the books and marginalia in Beckett's personal library, see Dirk Van Hulle and Mark Nixon, *Samuel Beckett's Library* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012, forthcoming).

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

pleasure. Beckett jotted down the definition in Latin, without any reference to the source text (*De luxuria in genere* [...] Rectè definitur, Appetitus inordinatus delectationis venereae'; Bouvier 1852, 9), in the manner of 'that odious and still today insufficiently malestimated notesnatcher', as Joyce described 'Shem, the Penman' in *Finnegans Wake* (Joyce 1939, 125).

Beckett, the excerptor, started taking his distance from this approach and sometimes excerpted, translated or paraphrased a longer passage, such as Bouvier's episcopal advice with regard to a question on masturbation:

*Quaeritur* 1.º ad quid teneatur homo qui evigilans advertit se pollutionem experiri. R. Debet mentem ad Deum elevare, eum invocare, signo crucis se munire, nihil ad expellendum semen positive facere, delectation voluptatis renuntiare. (Bouvier 1852, 65)

Beckett translated the passage as follows:

Quaeritur Iº What shall he do who is aware that he is about to experience pollution?  
R. He shall elevate his mind to God, invoke him, signo crucis se munire [arm himself with the sign of the cross], abstain from all voluntary exoneration, renounce the delectation of voluptuousness.' ('Dream' Notebook, note 447)

This procedure became more conspicuous in the second half of the 1930s, for instance in his *Faust* notes (UoR MS 5004-5005) or in his 'Whoroscope' Notebook, which notably contains extensive excerpts from Fritz Mauthner's *Beiträge zu einer Kritik der Sprache*, one of the books he explored for Joyce in 1938 and which 'greatly impressed' him, as he told Hans Naumann on 17 February 1954 (*LSB II* 462; 465).

## **b. conceptual notes**

The first few pages of notes in the 'Whoroscope' Notebook are of yet another nature. They could be categorized as 'conceptual notes'. In the first fifteen sections of the 'Whoroscope' Notebook, discussed by Daniela Caselli in 'The Promise of Dante in the Beckett Manuscripts' Beckett conceived of a Dantesque 'Journey through the "careers" like D. & V. along the

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

Purgatorial cornices, except that V. goes back, H goes out' ('Whoroscope' Notebook, qtd. in Caselli, 239). Apart from H (modeled after Virgil), a certain X was also mentioned. But while Beckett was making these conceptual notes, he already wrote a note to himself, comparable with what, in genetic Proust studies, is called a 'note de rédaction': 'But keep whole Dantesque analogy out of sight.' The sixteenth section ('Exordium I: X, naked, bound with silk scarves to a chair ...') can be read as prefiguring *Murphy*, and in De Biasi's typology it might even qualify as an 'initial workplan' or 'scenario' (de Biasi 1996, 34-35). But making a distinction between section 16 and the preceding ones would imply a teleological perspective: only retroactively, after having read the published version of *Murphy*, is it possible to denote section 16 as a 'scenario' that conceptually underpins the opening pages of the novel and to 'discard' the others as ideas that did not directly make it into the published text, but at the time Beckett was taking these notes, they all played a role in the conceptualization of a future work.

To some extent even the distinction between an intertextual note and a conceptual note is an artificial imposition. For instance, the note 'Kritik des reinen Quatsches' ('Whoroscope' Notebook, 22r) may be merely a playful, pseudo-Joycean jotting referring to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. But in combination with the twist to Kant's definition of art, further in the notebook ('Zweckmässigkeit ohne Zweck' / (Kant) / Quatsch: 'Zweck ohne Zweckmässigkeit' / (?); 'Whoroscope' Notebook, 60r), the 'Kritik des reinen Quatsches' may be considered a conceptual note, indicating that, at some point in Beckett's career, 'Quatsch' may have been a shorthand term for a vague project, which later turned out to be a dead end.

### **Drafts: creation, decreation**

Conceptual notes are relatively scarce in Beckett's manuscripts, which is indicative of his writing method. Louis Hay and Almuth Grésillon have suggested two general categories of writing: 'écriture à programme' and 'écriture à processus' (Hay 1984, 307-23). Beckett writing practice is clearly less 'programmatic' than Emile Zola's or Thomas Mann's, and comes much closer to a Proustian 'écriture à processus'. Although Beckett had disapproved of the 'theory of *Correspondances*, that trusty standby of all the Romantics from Hoffmann to Proust' in the review 'Schwabenstreich' (published in the *Spectator* of 23 March 1934; *Disjecta*

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

62), he defended Proust one month later in his review (also in the *Spectator*) of Albert Feuillerat's *Comment Proust a composé son roman*. Beckett deprecated Feuillerat's attempt to stress the uniformity and cohesion, the 'stock-in-trade exactly of the naturalism that Proust abominated' (*Dis* 64). Instead, he drew attention to the 'uncontrollable agency of unconscious memory', the 'full complexity' of the book's 'clues and blind alleys', and the way Proust communicated his material 'in dribs and drabs' (65). To some extent, Beckett may have been riding a hobby-horse by emphasizing the notion of complexity, and downplaying the fact that Proust first wrote the opening and closing parts of the *Recherche* and 'filled' the *entre-deux* later on. But the recent edition of Proust's *Cahiers* does show that Proust worked with 'textual units', which he could shuffle around at any time during the process of writing.

Beckett's preference for the 'dribs and drabs' method is reflected in a tendency to work with short scenes. For instance, in one of his late copybooks, the so-called 'Super Conquérant' Notebook (UoR MS 2934, 1v-2r), Beckett tried out a scene between two people, starting from the suggestion of reading a Shakespeare sonnet to each other. The scene never developed into a published text or play, but it illustrates Beckett's practice of writing in 'scenes'. This tendency also applies to his prose. For instance, the 'scene' of an old man sitting with his head in his hands at a table in *Stirrings Still* already appears (in a rough form) in the 'Sottisier' Notebook (UoR Ms 2901). Similarly, the first so-called 'Kilcool' fragment in the 'Héraklès' exercise book TCD MS 4664, opens with a 'woman's face alone in constant light. Nothing but fixed lit face and speech' (10r; qtd. in Gontarski 1985, 135), prefiguring the lit mouth of *Not I*. The 'Kilcool' fragments are not the 'first draft' of *Not I*; they contain several elements that could just as justifiably be claimed to prefigure *That Time* or *Footfalls*. But that does not diminish the power of the initial image. In Beckett's case, such a 'scene' of inception is often visual. In *Worstward Ho*, this method of working with scenes becomes thematic. First, three scenes are suggested (presented as shades); then gradually they are 'denarrated', as Brian Richardson (87) calls this procedure. This method of denarration has a genetic equivalent, which comes close to what S. E. Gontarski has dubbed 'the intent of undoing'. This procedure is more complex than what Beckett presented as 'taking away', contrasting his method to Joyce's constant 'adding' (Knowlson 1996, 352). In order to be able to 'denarrate', he needed to narrate first. Sometimes a narrated piece is 'taken away' in a later phase, such as the sixteen-page description of Ballyba's faeces-based economy in the

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

notebook with the first manuscript of *Molloy* (HRC) or the eight-page slapstick conversation on the question whether 'it' is worthwhile (*est-ce que c'est la peine*) in the manuscript of *En attendant Godot* (BnP). Very often, however, the words are not literally 'taken away', but 'taken back', so that the genesis is driven by the tension between narration and denarration, the statement and its deletion, creation and decreation.

### **Margins revisited: rereading notes**

The 'intent of undoing' also implies that a deletion can, in its turn, also be undone again. Thus, for instance, the sentence 'Leave him or not alone again unwaiting' was first crossed out in *Stirrings Still* typescript UoR MS 2935/3/5 (*BDMP I*), and subsequently reinstated by means of the word 'stet' in the left margin. As his own first reader, Beckett was also a marginalist, writing in the margins of his own texts. And this practice did not stop at the 'pass for press' moment. Beckett also applied it in his capacities of translator and director. The prompt copy of *En attendant Godot* preserved at TCD or the annotated Grove Press and Faber editions of *Krapp's Last Tape* contain all kinds of marginal notes, additions and revisions. So do the notebooks with translations, such as the six *Mercier and Camier* notebooks (UoR MS 1396/4/17-22), and the so-called theatrical notebooks, edited under the general editorship of James Knowlson. For instance, as the last page of Beckett's theatrical notebook of the Schiller Theater production of *Waiting for Godot* shows, Beckett even wanted to 'undo' a few leaves of the tree: 'TREE / Was not right (3 branches). / Two branches only, *two* leaves / 3<sup>rd</sup> couple.' (*TNI*, 393).

Beckett's works came into being in an area of tension between composition and decomposition, through many layers of revision. From most of these layers we still have textual traces, in the form of holograph manuscripts or otherwise. Even a dog-ear can be part of the 'fossil record'. Thus, for instance, Beckett earmarked a page in Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in the chapter on the 'Imperfections of the Geological Record'. The large number of Beckett's notebooks and other manuscripts differs considerably from the scarcity of traces in Darwin's fossil record, but even the seemingly abundant manuscript record is only an imperfect record of the creative and decreative processes behind the textual genesis of Beckett's world, to which at least one of the sentences on the dog-eared page is equally

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

applicable: 'We should not forget that only a small portion of the world is known with accuracy.' (Darwin 1902, 275)

## Bibliography

### *Works by Beckett*

- BDMP I* *Stirrings Still / Soubresauts and Comment dire / what is the word*: an electronic genetic edition (Series 'The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project', module 1). Edited by Dirk Van Hulle and Vincent Neyt. Brussels: University Press Antwerp (ASP/UPA), 2011, <<http://www.beckettarchive.org>>
- CIWS* *Company / Ill Seen Ill Said / Worstward Ho / Stirrings Still*, ed. by Dirk Van Hulle (London: Faber & Faber, 2009).
- Dis* *Disjecta: Miscellaneous Writings and a Dramatic Fragment*, ed. by Ruby Cohn (London: John Calder, 1983).
- Dream* *Dream of Fair to Middling Women* (Dublin: Black Cat Press, 1992).
- LSB II* *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, vol. II, 1941–1956*, ed. by George Craig, Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn and Lois More Overbeck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- MPTK* *More Pricks than Kicks*, ed. by Cassandra Nelson (London: Faber & Faber, 2010).
- TN I* *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett*. General Editor: James Knowlson. Vol. 1. *Waiting for Godot*. Ed. Dougald McMillan and James Knowlson (New York: Grove Press, 1994).

### *Other works:*

Admussen, Richard. *The Samuel Beckett Manuscripts: A Study* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1979).

Bangert, Sharon. *The Samuel Beckett Collection at Washington University Libraries: A Guide* (St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University Libraries, 1986).

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

Bouvier, Jean-Baptiste. *Dissertatio in Sextum Decalogi Praeceptum et Supplementum ad Tractatum de Matrimonio* (Paris: Facultatis Theologiae Bibliopolas, 1852).

Bryden, Mary, Julian Garforth, and Peter Mills. *Beckett at Reading: Catalogue of the Beckett Manuscript Collection at the University of Reading* (Reading: Whiteknights Press and the Beckett International Foundation, 1998).

Caselli, Daniela. 'The Promise of Dante in the Beckett Manuscripts', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 16 (2006), 237-57.

Cohn, Ruby. *A Beckett Canon* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001).

Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: Grant Richards, 1902).

de Biasi, Pierre-Marc. 'Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work', in *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*, ed. Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 36-68.

---. 'What Is a Literary Draft? Toward a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation', in *Drafts*, ed. Michel Contat, Denis Hollier and Jacques Neefs, *Yale French Studies* 89 (1996), 26-58.

Feldman, Matthew. *Beckett's Books: A Cultural History of Samuel Beckett's 'Interwar Notes'* (London: Continuum, 2006).

Ferrer, Daniel. 'Towards a Marginalist Economy of Textual Genesis', *Reading Notes*, eds. Dirk Van Hulle and Wim Van Mierlo (Rodopi, Amsterdam 2004), 7-18.

---. *Logiques du brouillon: Modèles pour une critique génétique* (Paris : Seuil, 2011).

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

Frost, Everett and Jane Maxwell. 'Catalogue of 'Notes Divers Holo[graph]', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 16 (2006), 19-181.

Gontarski, S. E. *The Intent of Undoing in Samuel Beckett's Dramatic Texts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

---. 'Greying the Canon: Beckett in Performance', *Beckett after Beckett*, eds. S. E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2006), 141-57.

Hay, Louis. 'Die dritte Dimension der Literatur: Notizen zu einer 'critique génétique'', in *POETICA* 16, no. 3-4 (1984), 307-23.

Hayman, David. 'Genetic Criticism and Joyce: An Introduction', in *Probes: Genetic Studies in Joyce*, ed. David Hayman and Sam Slote (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1995), 3-18.

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939).

Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett* (London: Bloomsbury, 1996).

Lake, Carlton. *No Symbols Where None Intended: Samuel Beckett at the Humanities Research Center* (Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, 1984).

Maxwell, Jane. 'Catalogue of the Samuel Beckett Manuscripts at Trinity College Library Dublin', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 16 (2006), 183-199

Pilling, John, ed. *Beckett's "Dream" Notebook* (Reading: Beckett International Foundation, 1999).

Pountney, Rosemary, *Theatre of Shadows: Samuel Beckett's Drama 1956-76*

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

(Gerrards Cross/Totowa, N.J.: Colin Smythe/Barnes and Noble Books, 1988).

Proust, Marcel. *Cahiers 1 à 75 de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*, general editor Nathalie Mauriac Dyer (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008-).

Richardson, Brian. *Unnatural Voices: Extreme Narration in Modern and Contemporary Fiction* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2006).

Van Hulle, Dirk. 'Beckett's *Faust* Notes', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 16 (2006), 283-97.

Van Hulle, Dirk, and Mark Nixon. "'Holo and unholo': The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project", in *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui* 18 (2007), 313-22.

This is the author's version of an article published by Cambridge University Press in *Samuel Beckett in Context*, ed. Anthony Uhlmann, 2013, pp. 417-427.  
Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.