

Writers' Libraries in Genetic Editions

For more than a decade, one of the recurring questions in theoretical debates on digital scholarly editing has been the distinction between digital archives and digital editions. My hypothesis is that they are not mutually exclusive, but enabling readers to turn a digital archive into a digital edition involves a crucial editorial task: making connections. This implies a theoretical model that implements a continuum between 'digital archive' and 'digital edition'. If the digital archive offers, for instance, scans with transcriptions, this digital archive can be turned into an edition by incorporating and thus fleshing out connections between these data, to be activated by users if they so desire. Providing these connections is an important task of the editor. While there are several ways of making connections, this article focuses on one of them: the inclusion of writers' libraries in digital scholarly editions.

Writers' libraries confront us with a number of questions, such as: Where does an author's oeuvre end and where does it begin? Are marginalia in a writer's personal library only reactions to what they are reading, or rather beginnings of their writing? What does a writer's library tell us about the writing process? Can it even tell us something about the cognitive processes behind writing? Can the library inform our interpretation of literature? Does it open up new hermeneutic potential or does it actually limit our interpretation? Does an author's library belong to their oeuvre? How does it relate to the author's canon? How should an editor deal with this material? Does it belong in a scholarly edition?

To answer a few of these questions, I would like to make use of Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck's notion of 'cultural negotiation' as a structural principle: "[The reader] is continually trying to find a balance between all the elements that influence the reading – the text, the context, his own dispositions, and the author's self-presentation. This balancing act is what we call negotiation."¹ In the study of narrative, at least four elements are part of this cultural negotiation: the text, the context, the reader and the author's self-presentation. These four elements translate into six possible combinations taken two two at a time, determining this article's structure: 1. reader – author; 2. text – author; 3. text – reader; 4. text – context; 5. author – context; 6. context – reader. For reasons of scope, not all of these combinations will be discussed comprehensively.

¹ Luc Herman, Bart Vervaeck: The Implied Author. A Secular Excommunication. In: *Style* 45, 2011, p. 11–28, here p. 19.

1. reader – author

In epistemological terms, it is very difficult for a reader to know anything about an author, beyond some biographical information. For decades, we have been discussing the notion of authorial intention, and the ‘intentional fallacy’. This has led to what John Bryant has called the “Intentional Fallacy Fallacy”,² a rather dogmatic way of banishing anything that had to do with intentions. It is true that it is hard to retrieve what authors think, but to some extent readers can get to know more about authors’ thought processes by *reverse-engineering* their process of revision. Vermeer’s *Milkmaid* (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum) is a good example: the painting originally showed several objects in the background, such as a laundry basket and a shelf with jugs, until Vermeer decided to cover them with the brightness of a bare wall, creating a great visual effect of stillness. This reverse-engineering process follows the ‘pentimenti’ principle.

The term ‘pentimenti’ is derived from the Italian ‘pentirsi’. Paisley Livingston defines it as follows:

A *pentimento* is, first of all, an artist’s *intentional action* of non-trivially reworking, replacing, or covering over some expressive or representational feature of an artifact or design that had previously and provisionally been established, *either intentionally or not*, by that artist as part of a work in progress.³

As Livingston’s definition indicates, the study of pentimenti involves the notion of ‘authorial intention’. In literary studies, this charged notion usually relates to the question: what did the author mean, what did they want to say with their work? In Livingston’s definition, however, the notion of ‘intention’ relates, on the one hand, to the purposeful reworking of something that had previously been established; and, on the other hand, to an act in the past, which may have been intentional *or not*. In other words, in the examination of pentimenti the key question is not so much what the artist wanted to convey or intended to *mean*, but also and especially what the artist *did* and intended to *do*. Likewise, the remit of genetic criticism is to investigate not so much what the writer intended to mean, but what they did, ‘undid’ or intended to do (in the limited sense of the intention to write a sequence of characters or words).⁴ While a certain scepticism about genetic criticism’s limited abilities to retrospectively retrieve information about the cognitive processes behind creative writing is justified, the pentimenti principle does enable us to determine a certain *degree* of intentionality and therefore to infer a certain degree of cognitive activity, even posthumously.

² John Bryant: *The Fluid Text. A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor 2002, p. 8.

³ Paisley Livingston: *Pentimento*. In: *The Creation of Art: New Essays in Philosophical Aesthetics?* Ed. by Berys Gaut and Paisley Livingston. Cambridge 2003, p. 89–115, here p. 92, emphasis added.

⁴ Cf. Dirk Van Hulle: *Genetic Criticism: Tracing Creativity in Literature*. Oxford 2022, p. 127.

2. text – author

The nexus 'text – author' is often the starting point for writing studies or cognitive writing studies. Alamargot and Lebrave propose a collaboration between genetic criticism and cognitive psychology. In cognitive psychology, a distinction is made between semantic and episodic memory: whereas semantic memory stores general items of knowledge, episodic memory is used to *recall personally experienced or witnessed events*, to index all the writing processes that have been implemented so far, and to indicate which processes still have to be implemented. Alamargot and Lebrave suggest that an interaction between the disciplines of cognitive psychology and genetic criticism "would make it easier to pinpoint the role of episodic memory in the unfolding of writing processes".⁵ Of course, it is very difficult to reconstruct how a writer recalls personally experienced events. But a reading experience, for instance, is such an event. That is one of the reasons why including writers' marginalia in scholarly editions may be of help in reconstructing reading experiences that are typically meaningful in writers' careers.

3. text – reader

Writers' libraries complicate the notion of 'intertextuality'. Ever since the term 'intertextuality' was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1966, it has been made to mean numerous different things by various researchers, to such an extent that Kristeva herself took a distance from the notion less than a decade after she had introduced it.⁶ In the 1980s and 1990s, theorists such as Gérard Genette and Michael Riffaterre recalibrated the notion of 'intertextuality', Genette by framing it as a relation of «coprésence»⁷ in an elaborate categorization of what he termed 'transtextuality', and Riffaterre by insisting that intertextuality is less a matter of writing than a matter of reading.

Riffaterre defined intertextuality as the *reader's* perception of the links between one work and others, which preceded or followed it («la perception par le lecteur, de rapports entre une œuvre et d'autres qui l'ont précédée ou suivie»)⁸. So, in this definition, intertextuality is in the first place a matter of the connection 'text – reader'. The reader can basically read into the text whatever they want, whether this was intended by the author or not.

⁵ Denis Alamargot, Jean-Louis Lebrave: The Study of Professional Writing: A Joint Contribution from Cognitive Psychology and Genetic Criticism. In: *European Psychologist* 15, 2010, p. 12–22, here p. 19.

⁶ Julia Kristeva: *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris 1974, p. 59–60.

⁷ Gérard Genette: *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris 1982, p. 8.

⁸ Michael Riffaterre: La trace de l'intertexte. In: *La Pensée. Revue du rationalisme moderne* 215, Octobre 1980, p. 4–18, here p. 4.

But ‘the’ reader in this definition is a generalisation. When we are dealing with writers’ libraries, we need to replace ‘the’ reader by a specific reader, a reader who was also a writer. If we are interested in this reading writer, we might want to know how they read the books in their library. That means, trying to reconstruct what this particular reader read into a particular text. It also means trying to make a distinction between that reader at different stages of their development as a reader and writer. Take for instance Samuel Beckett: he was only six years old when he received a Bible as a prize for ‘diligence and attendance at Tullow Sunday School’.⁹ That little boy had to read passages by heart, as the marginalia “LEARN” next to Corinthians 12:4–11 testify.¹⁰ This practice of memorizing the archaic language of the King James Bible has undoubtedly had an impact on Beckett’s style of writing. But Beckett as a little boy is not the same reader as the university student who studied French literature and who had to read the poem *Moïse* by Alfred de Vigny, and who was so diligent that he looked up the relevant passages about Moses in his old Bible and wrote in the margin: «LAISSEZ-MOI M’ENDORMIR DU SOMMEIL DE LA TERRE» (“let me sleep the sleep of the earth”).¹¹ So, from that moment onwards, the Moses passage had a new intertextual meaning for Beckett as a reader. He was no longer the same reader he used to be.

4. text – context

Sometimes these intertextual connections only relate to the author’s *reading* and have no, or no direct, impact on their *writing*. But it can also happen that they do have an *invisible* impact in the sense that an element from a book in their library left some traces in the early stages of one of their writings, but disappeared along the way, so it’s no longer present in the published text. A particularly illustrative example is Paul Verlaine: Beckett had to read Verlaine’s poetry as a student. There is no explicit reference to Verlaine in the published work, but there is a reference to one of Verlaine’s poems in a draft version of Beckett’s novel *Molloy*, alluding to the last lines of one of the *Poèmes Saturniens*, the sonnet called *Mon rêve familial*, opening with the lines «Je fais souvent ce rêve»:

Je fais souvent ce rêve étrange et pénétrant
D’une femme inconnue, et que j’aime, et qui m’aime,
Et qui n’est, chaque fois, ni tout à fait la même

⁹ Beckett Digital Library: The Holy Bible. Containing the Old and New Testaments, Translated out of the Original Tongues and with the former Translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty’s special command. Oxford n. d. <https://www.beckettarchive.org/library/HOL-BIB-1.html> (seen 12.5.2023).

¹⁰ The Holy Bible (n. 9), p. 940.

¹¹ The Holy Bible (n. 9), p. 137.

Ni tout à fait une autre, et m'aime et me comprend.

[...]

Son regard est pareil au regard des statues,

Et, pour sa *voix*, *lointaine*, et calme, et grave, elle a

L'inflexion des *voix chères* qui se sont *tues*.¹²

In *Molloy*, the eponymous protagonist is first talking about what he calls 'the voice'. Originally, he said «J'écoute et m'entends [...] dicter un monde figé» ("I listen and I hear *myself* dictate a fictitious world"), suggesting that the voice is actually his own voice. But it is a voice that comes from far away or deep within: «~~cette chère voix~~ ce cher souffle lointaine, depuis longtemps tue (on dirait du Verlaine)». ¹³ The words «voix», «lointaine», «chère» and «tue» indicate the allusion, which is even made explicit between brackets («Verlaine»). But gradually Beckett hides and finally undoes the reference to Verlaine. First, in the French edition, the words «chère» and «voix», and the name «Verlaine» are eliminated. And in the English translation, the allusion has become nothing more than a "far whisper": "And if I went on listening to that far whisper, silent long since and which I still hear".¹⁴ Still, as we have seen, the manuscript clearly indicated a reference to Verlaine. In other words, even though the link may have become invisible as an intertextual reference, it does still exist as part of the exogenesis – the connection between the text and the context, which the editor can make explicit. So, that is an instance where editing is connecting.

Another example is Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal*. The opening poem famously ends with the line «Hypocrite lecteur, – mon semblable, – mon frère!»¹⁵ In the published text of the novel *Malone meurt*, Malone says that he has never met a fellow being: «Je n'ai jamais rencontré de semblable». ¹⁶ In and of itself, the isolated word «semblable» is hardly enough textual evidence to build a case about a potential intertextual link with Baudelaire. But when the reader is able to compare all the textual variants (in this case with the automatic collation tool CollateX), they discover that between the manuscript and the published version the word was changed from «frère»¹⁷ to «semblable». Beckett thus appears to be making a literary allusion *across versions*. In other words, if intertextuality is the *reader's* perception of the links

¹² Paul Verlaine: *Œuvres poétiques complètes*. Paris 1968 (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade), p. 63–64, emphasis added.

¹³ Samuel Beckett: *Molloy*. A Digital Genetic Edition. Ed. by Edouard Magessa O'Reilly, Dirk Van Hulle and Pim Verhulst. Brussels 2016 (Beckett Digital Manuscript Project. 4), <http://www.beckettarchive.org, FN2, fol. 24v> (consulted 25.5.2023).

¹⁴ Samuel Beckett: *Molloy*. Paris 1955, p. 53.

¹⁵ Charles Baudelaire: *Les Fleurs du mal*. Paris 1928. See Beckett Digital Library, www.beckettarchive.org/library/BAU-FLE-1.html (consulted 25.5.2023).

¹⁶ Samuel Beckett: *Malone meurt*. Paris 1951, p. 37.

¹⁷ Samuel Beckett: *Malone meurt / Malone Dies*. A Digital Genetic Edition. Ed. by Dirk Van Hulle and Pim Verhulst. Brussels 2017 (Beckett Digital Manuscript Project. 5), <http://www.beckettarchive.org, FN1, fol. 75r> (consulted 25.5.2023).

between one work and others, it is not likely that «semblable» will be seen as an intertextual reference, and yet the genesis suggests that there is a connection. Again, I see it as the editor's task to show these connections.

But this confronts us with quite a few editorial questions, relating to what Hans Zeller called „Befund und Deutung“.¹⁸ We have copies of Baudelaire and Verlaine's poems in the writer's extant library, but the copy of Verlaine's *Oeuvres poétiques complètes* is a 1968 Pléiade edition. Beckett cannot possibly have consulted this copy to write *Molloy* (written in the 1940s). Most likely, he memorized the poem when he had to study it for his Moderator Examination in October 1927 at Trinity College Dublin. According to the College Calendars, students had to read Verlaine's *Choix de poésies* (Paris: Fasquelle 1904). Beckett therefore probably read Verlaine in that edition (possibly in a borrowed copy); memorized it; recalled it while writing *Molloy*; and later, when he had the money to purchase books, he bought a Pléiade edition of Verlaine. This raises the question if this means that we cannot connect the Pléiade edition in Beckett's library to that passage in the manuscript of *Molloy*. The dilemma for the editor here is, on the one hand, the task of making this complex connection between *Molloy* and Verlaine, and on the other hand, not making it so complicated that the reader loses interest before the editor has even been able to make the connection. And the dilemmas become even more complicated when we are dealing with books which the author took reading notes from, but which are no longer extant – as we will discuss in section 6. First, we need to take a look at the author and the context.

5. author – context

So far, we have conveniently spoken of the ‘author’, but the ‘cultural negotiation’ model only speaks of the ‘author's self-representation’. And so far, we have also assumed that a writer's library is part of the context, but to a certain extent it is also part of the author's self-presentation. Just like with authors' manuscripts, preserving their books may be an author's act of carefully curating what posterity is supposed to see and what not. The Estonian biologist Jakob von Uexküll coined the term ‘Umwelt’ to denote an organism's model of the world, consisting of those aspects of the world that are meaningful for that particular organism. This notion applies quite well to authors and their personal libraries. The marginalia are indicators of those aspects of the bookish world that are meaningful for that particular book lover. Sometimes the reading notes are not taken in the margin but in a separate notebook. That was for instance James Joyce's usual practice. He would take reading

¹⁸ Hans Zeller: Befund und Deutung. Interpretation und Dokumentation als Ziel und Methode der Edition. In: Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation. Hrsg. von Gunter Martens und Hans Zeller. München 1971, p. 45–89.

notes and cross them out with a colour crayon when he used them in his drafts, in order to make sure that he would not use any item twice. Many of these reading notes derive from copies that are no longer extant. And yet, it is often possible to find out which book it is based on, and – sometimes with some help from the correspondence – to even find out which edition, and thus reconstruct a ‘virtual’ library – which we will discuss in the last section.

6. context – reader

From an editorial perspective, the next question is of course: what is the role of the editor in this cultural negotiation? Editing is a form of interpreting. It is an epistemic operation, an operation relating to knowledge and to its validation. If you know that an author had a particular book in his library, to what extent does this enrich the reader’s experience? Or does it have a constraining effect? How does a book in the library relate to the author’s canon?

As indicated earlier, Kristeva coined the notion of intertextuality in opposition to what she called a «banal» understanding of the term in the sense of «critique des sources» or ‚Quellenforschung‘.¹⁹ What Kristeva found “banal” about this “source criticism” is probably the sort of ‘detective’ aspect and the link with traditional ‘influence studies’. “Influence”, according to the art historian Michael Baxandall, “is a curse of art criticism primarily because of its wrong-headed grammatical prejudice about who is the agent and who the patient”.²⁰ Scarlett Baron succinctly summarized the situation as “a choice between two contending paradigms: influence on the one hand, intertextuality on the other”.²¹ The big difference is the role of the reader, as Riffaterre emphasized. But we have also seen that ‘the’ reader is a generalization. For the purposes of this article, I suggest replacing them by a particular type of reader, a reader who is also a writer: James Joyce. Imagine Joyce rereading his own texts. That brings intertextuality closer to genetic criticism, which makes a distinction between exogenesis and endogenesis. In his functional typology of genetic documentation of 1996, *What is a literary draft?*, Pierre-Marc de Biasi defines exogenesis as “any writing process devoted to research, selection, and incorporation, focused on information stemming from a source exterior to the writing”.²² Although “newspaper cuttings”, “printed textual fragments and marginalia” are included, de Biasi stresses that exogenesis refers not to the “sources” of a work but “only to written or drawn documents, excluding the empirical objects or

¹⁹ Kristeva 1974 (n. 6), p. 59.

²⁰ Michael Baxandall: *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven 1985, p. 85.

²¹ Scarlett Baron: ‘Strandentwining Cable’: Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality. Oxford 2012, p. 8.

²² Pierre-Marc de Biasi: *What Is a Literary Draft? Toward a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation*. Transl. by Ingrid Wassenaar. In: *Yale French Studies* 89, 1996, p. 26–58, here p. 43.

data to which they refer”:²³ “In short, exogenetics does not designate the ‘sources’ of the work (such and such a real person, place, *literary work*, etc.), but the locatable tract of these source-referents in terms of documents (written or transposed) present in the collection of genetic evidential material.”²⁴ The exclusion of ‘sources’ such as a ‘literary work’ may give the misleading impression that the author’s copy of a book they read (as an empirical object) is not part of the genesis. To avoid going back to a practice whereby marginalia were published in print editions, separated from the text they referred to, as in the 1936 edition of the marginalia of Stendhal,²⁵ I would like to propose a slightly more inclusive approach, stressing the active role of the environment in driving cognitive processes, the leading question being what Andy Clark and David Chalmers, the founding fathers of what has become known as ‘extended cognition’, asked themselves: “Where does the mind stop and the rest of the world begin?”²⁶ If you are interested in the exogenetic process of an author, it seems difficult to make a clear-cut separation between their books with annotations on the one hand and their notes and drafts on the other. For example, the dedication copy of *Maya. Der indische Mythos* which the author, Heinrich Zimmer Jr., sent to Joyce in 1938, is still in Joyce’s extant library (his so-called ‘Paris library’, preserved in Buffalo/NY). Samuel Beckett made three pages of notes for Joyce and Joyce himself made reading notes in separate notebooks, but he also marked passages in the margin. If we want to work according to the spirit of the definition and avoid that, by an all too strict or literal application of it, one would be left with only an isolated pencil line, separated from the text it refers to, the question is if we can be more inclusive – which in its turn implies the question: when is a ‘literary work’ a ‘source’? Is it a *work*, a *text*, or a *document*? In textual scholarship, only one of these three is a physical object: a document. The other two, work and text, are abstractions. A *text* is a sequence of characters. The *work* is also an abstraction: it is the experience implied by all the authoritative versions.²⁷ Literature is an allo-graphic form of art, unlike visual arts. James McLaverty aptly paraphrased Frederick W. Bateson’s challenge to bibliographers in this regard: “if the *Mona Lisa* is in the Louvre in Paris, where are *Hamlet* and *Lycidas*?”²⁸ According to Shillingsburg’s definition, the work *Hamlet* is implied by all the authoritative versions of that text scattered all around the world.

As a consequence, when one is interested in the exogenesis of Joyce’s works and one does not wish to separate the marginalia from the passages they refer to, how

²³ De Biasi 1996 (n. 20), p. 44.

²⁴ De Biasi 1996 (n. 20), p. 45; emphasis added.

²⁵ Stendhal: *Mélanges intimes et marginalia*. Ed. by Henri Martineau. Paris 1936.

²⁶ Andy Clark, David Chalmers: *The Extended Mind* [1998]. In: *The Extended Mind*. Ed. by Richard Menary. Cambridge/MA 2010, p. 27.

²⁷ Cf. Peter Shillingsburg: *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age. Theory and Practice*. Ann Arbor 1996, p. 176.

²⁸ James McLaverty: *The Mode of Existence of Literary Works of Art: The Case of the *Dunciad Variorum**. In: *Studies in Bibliography* 37, 1984, p. 82–105, here p. 82.

does one justify the inclusion of other people's works in an edition of, say, Joyce's works? Technically, one would not include other people's 'works'; one would only include an *instantiation* of these works, a digital instantiation in the case of digital scholarly editing. The faint pencil lines in Zimmer's book do not mean much in and of themselves. Only if one combines them with the passage they refer to does it become possible to try and figure out what was 'meaningful' to Joyce. And trying to figure out what is meaningful to a human organism implies a cognitive interest.

Paul Eggert's definition of a 'work' explicitly involves the reader, and therefore cognitive activity. Since a document containing the text of a literary work constantly needs to be brought to life by means of readers, the work – according to Eggert – is a negative dialectic (in the Adornian sense) between the material medium (the documentary dimension) and meaningful experience (the textual dimension).²⁹ In the present case, Joyce is the reader who brought these books to life, and what we try to reconstruct is the dialectic between the documents of his library and the meaningful experience of his reading. The question under discussion is to what extent the 'empirical objects' in de Biasi's definition need to be separated from the genesis. Some of them do play an active role in driving the writer's cognition. Including Zimmer's dedication copy of *Maya* (as part of Joyce's personal library) in a genetic edition of Joyce's works would not imply incorporating Zimmer's work in Joyce's work. Obviously, the idea is not to present *Maya* as a work by Joyce. The 'work' *Maya* remains Zimmer's but the instantiation of it that Joyce was familiar with and annotated (both the 'document' and its 'text') was a source of traction for Joyce's cognition.

This logic applies both to source texts that have been preserved and to ones that have not. Take for instance Paul Valéry's *Le Serpent*. There is a copy of this book in Joyce's extant library. It is dedicated by Valéry to Joyce, and it contains a drawing of a snake biting its own tail. That book, as a document, is only one instantiation of this long poem by Valéry. It was published in February 1922 by Editions de la *Nouvelle Revue française (NRF)*. Four years later, a deluxe edition of it appeared with a snakeskin cover. That is another instantiation of the same work. None of these instantiations is the first edition. The work appeared for the first time in the journal *Nouvelle Revue Française* in July 1921. Here, the work has a slightly different title: *Ebauche d'un serpent* ("Draft of a snake"). And that is also how it appeared in June 1922 in the collection of poems, *Charmes*.

We have the document, the dedication copy sent to Joyce by Valéry himself. The work is Valéry's, but the book is Joyce's. It belongs in his so-called 'Extant Library' containing all his books of which a physical copy is still in existence. In addition to this extant library, we can also reconstruct a so-called 'Virtual Library' of books

²⁹ Paul Eggert: *Securing the Past. Conservation in Art, Architecture and Literature*. Cambridge 2009, p. 236–237.

which we know Joyce must have read, because he mentions them in letters or because he took notes from them, but of which – to our knowledge – no physical copy has been preserved.

We know that Joyce read Valéry and took notes, but these excerpts are not taken from his copy of *Le Serpent*. They are most probably taken from a copy of the version in *Charmes*. We know this because in notebook VI.B.5 he writes a few excerpts from one of the first poems from this collection, *Au platane*; and a long list of excerpts from *Ebauche d'un serpent*, notably one that can only be found in this version of the poem, which has an extra stanza vis à vis *Le Serpent*.³⁰ As a practical approach to editing writers' libraries, my suggestion would be to include both *Le Serpent* (Feb. 1922) as part of the Extant Library and *Ebauche d'un serpent* in *Charmes* (June 1922) as part of the Virtual Library.

Conclusion

If we return to the cultural negotiation as a balancing act between all the elements that influence the reading, the editor's role in this negotiation is in many ways that of a mediator. I tend to see editing in terms of connecting: connecting the *text* with the *context*, with the *author's self-presentation* and with the *reader*. Connecting can also be a way of turning a digital archive into a digital edition. Including a writer's library can therefore be more than just a way to add more material to the digital archive; if the editor makes the connections between the author's texts and the context of their reading, this may be a way of turning the archive into an edition, a genetic edition. After all, an edition is a ‚Gestalt‘, something that is more than, and different from, the sum of its parts. If all the pieces of a bicycle are lying on the floor of a bicycle shop, that would be useful, but it would be more of an archive than a bicycle. Only when the parts are assembled and come to take up a specific relation to each other, do they become something different, that is, a bicycle. While a digital archive lays out all the parts, a digital edition assembles them by establishing the connections. To that end, we need scholarly editors.

Abstract

Falls ein Autor eine persönliche Bibliothek hinterlassen hat, wäre es bedauerlich, diese exogenetische Information nicht in eine digitale textgenetische Ausgabe aufzunehmen. Der Beitrag geht von der Hypothese aus, dass eine solche Sachverhalte einbeziehende Form des

³⁰ Notebook VI.B.5, fol. 113–115, preserved at the Poetry/Rare Book Collection, University at Buffalo. Joyce actually did this twice, for the same excerpts also appear on a separate sheet of paper preserved at the National Library of Ireland, NLI MS 36,639/2/B.

Edierens auf einer Art des Verknüpfens beruht und dass die Herstellung von Verknüpfungen eine der wichtigen Aufgaben des Editors ist. In dieser Eigenschaft als Verknüpfer spielt der Editor eine zentrale Rolle in der kulturellen Vermittlung ('cultural negotiation') von Text, Kontext, Leser und Selbstdarstellung des Autors.