Introduction: Marginalia, Manuscripts and the Modernist Mind

1. Reassessing the so-called 'inward turn' in literary modernism

Literary modernism is famous for its evocations of the fictional mind.[1] By means of techniques such as 'interior monologue' or 'stream of consciousness', modernist texts allegedly invite readers to 'enter' the minds of their characters. This notion of 'entering' the mind is based on a Cartesian model that presents the mind as an interior space, an inside that can clearly be distinguished from an outside. This inside/outside model has recently been questioned in cognitive science, notably by means of the notion of the 'extended mind', introduced by Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers. Their foundational article, 'The Extended Mind' (1998), employs the example of an Alzheimer's patient and his use of a notebook as a form of 'extended' memory (see Chapter 5.3). According to this post-Cartesian paradigm, cognitive processes do not exclusively take place 'in' the head, but in constant interaction with an external environment. This two-way interaction is regarded as a cognitive system in its own right. In a more recent essay, Andy Clark refers to an exchange between the physicist Richard Feynman and the historian Charles Weiner:

> Weiner once remarked casually that [a batch of notes and sketches] represented 'a record of [Feynman's] day-to-day work', and Feynman reacted sharply.
>
> 'I actually did the work on the paper', he said.
>
> 'Well', Weiner said, 'the work was done in your head, but the record of it is still here.'
>
> 'No, it's not a *record*, not really. It's *working*. You have to work on paper and this is the paper. Okay?' (quoted in Clark 2012: 277)

[1] 'The modernist novel is characterized by a move away from the heterodiegetic narration that is typical of the realist novel and toward an experimental and impressionistic emphasis on subjectivity, inner states of consciousness, and fragmentary and discontinuous character construction' (Palmer 2012: 184).

Feynman's (and Clark's) suggestion that the medium (the paper) is part of the 'working' (the intellectual activity) not only illustrates the notion of the 'extended mind', but also shows how relevant this notion is to the study of modern manuscripts, which is the topic of this book.

The starting point of this book is the research hypothesis that, to a large extent, the inside/outside model of the mind has been suggested by the modernists' own rhetoric. The model played an important role in their attempts to define their work by contrasting it with the previous generations' writings. Whereas the realists were said to concentrate on the external world, the modernist project was often presented as an attempt to 'enter' the characters' minds, under Virginia Woolf's motto, 'Look within' (Woolf 1972: 106).[2] Although recent criticism has punctured this rhetoric, the image of 'looking within' has been persistent. Erich von Kahler's 'Die Verinnerlichung des Erzählens' (1957–9), translated as *The Inward Turn of Narrative* (1973), has played a considerable role in this process.

It is questionable whether the modernists' own rhetoric is an adequate starting point for the literary analysis of their works. Woolf's case is particularly striking because of the discrepancy between what she *did* and what she *said* she did. What she *said* she did ('Look within') marks her efforts to distinguish 'modern fiction' from the kind of fiction produced by a previous generation. But what she *did* is often something else. For instance, her story 'The Mark on the Wall' (Woolf 2000: 53; see discussion in Chapter 6) is not just a great exercise in what is usually referred to as 'interior monologue', but it evokes a mind that is at work *thanks to* the interaction with an environment: a mark on the wall. Time and again the mind in the story 'swarms' in divergent directions, but each time the text returns to the mark on the wall, and a new hypothesis about the mark sets off a new string of thoughts. The structure of the text reflects this interactive way in which an intelligent agent negotiates opportunities for interaction with an environment. In other words, the text demonstrates an 'extended mind' at work.

This notion of the 'extended mind' is currently made operational in a branch of narrative theory, known as *cognitive narratology*. This innovative narratological approach studies the mind-relevant aspects of storytelling: '"mind-relevance"

[2] Evidently, Woolf's approach cannot be reduced to this statement. As passages in her novels and short stories such as 'The Mark on the Wall' show (see Chapter 6), her view of the mind was not strictly 'internalist', but did take the interaction with the environment into account. However, many critics have adopted the idea of an 'inward turn' that was part of a modernist rhetoric to distinguish itself from previous generations of writers.

can be studied vis-à-vis the multiple factors associated with the design and interpretation of narratives, including the story-producing activities of tellers, the processes by means of which interpreters make sense of the narrative worlds (or "storyworlds") evoked by narrative representations or artifacts, and the cognitive states and dispositions of characters in those storyworlds' (Herman 2011a). Hereafter, these three aspects will be referred to as three levels:

1. the invention and production of the storyworld;
2. the presentation of mental processes of the characters in the storyworld; and
3. the reception and interpretation of the story (the cognitive processes by means of which readers make sense of the narrative).

Levels 2 and 3 have been studied intensively in the past decade (Jackson 2005; Palmer 2004, 2010; Ryan 2001; Stockwell 2002; Zunshine 2006). The collection of essays *Stories and Minds: Cognitive Approaches to Literary Narrative* contains an excellent introduction to cognitive narrative studies (Bernaerts, De Geest Herman and Vervaeck 2013: 1–20), focusing on these two levels by 'bring[ing] together inquiries into fictional minds and the examination of the reader's mind' (13). In response to Alan Palmer's essay on 'Social Minds',[3] David Herman has recently suggested a post-Cartesian approach to cognitive narratology (Herman 2011b). This post-Cartesian narratological approach has its counterpart in philosophy, notably in what is referred to as 'enactivism' and 'radical enactivism',[4] which suggests that the mind is not just 'extended' but also 'extensive' (Hutto and Myin 2013: 135; see Chapter 7). I believe that this useful approach can benefit from input from another branch in literary studies: *genetic criticism* (the study of writing processes, based on manuscript research). I therefore suggest a method that combines genetic criticism and cognitive narratology in order to study especially the link between levels 1 and 2, that is, the production of narratives and the literary evocation of fictional minds.

[3] See also *Social Minds in the Novel* (2010), in which Palmer tends to prefer the terms 'situated or distributed cognition' (184), quoting Dennett's description of 'physically distributed cognition' as 'our habit of off-loading as much as possible of our cognitive tasks into the environment itself' (Dennett 1996: 134; Palmer 2010: 51).

[4] Hutto and Myin abbreviate their hypothesis as 'REC' for 'Radical Enactive (or Embodied) Cognition' (xii) and suggest that 'If REC is right, basic cognition is not contentful; basic minds are fundamentally, constitutively already world-involving. They are, as we say, extensive' (137). This view is presented in opposition to 'The Default Internal Mind assumption', which 'takes it for granted that, in their basic state, minds are unextended and brain-bound. If that is the case, then they become extended only when external resources are needed to complete certain cognitive tasks. On that model, what is fundamentally internal occasionally becomes extended' (137–8). REC inverts this assumption: 'Basic minds are fundamentally extensive, whereas special kinds of scaffolded practices must be mastered before anything resembling internalized … mentality appears on the scene' (138).

2. Combining genetic criticism and cognitive narratology

The fact that many twentieth-century authors preserved their manuscripts, and that they often actively donated them to public archives, is of more than merely material interest. In 1993, the then director of the manuscript department of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Florence Callu, wrote an essay on twentieth-century manuscripts in which she calls this the 'golden age of the contemporary manuscript' (Callu 1993: 65), because almost every author in this period tended to preserve her or his manuscripts and typescripts, from even the slightest note to the corrected proofs.

To the extent that manuscripts reflect the process of thinking and writing, there is a connection between the act of preserving these traces of the production of stories (level 1) and methods of evoking the characters' consciousness, characterizing the work of many modernists (level 2). The most challenging aspect of the reassessment of modernism's so-called 'inward turn' is to show *how* an analysis of the workings of the 'extended' mind on the level of the writer (1) can inform the analysis of the workings of the 'extended' mind on the level of the protagonists (2). This connection between levels 1 and 2 is the core of the book's methodological combination of genetic criticism and cognitive narratology:

1. From a post-Cartesian perspective, manuscripts are part and parcel of the 'extended mind'. Many modernists either intuitively or consciously exploited the interaction with their notebooks and manuscripts to stimulate creative cognitive processes (Menary 2007).
2. Modernist writers' awareness of this mechanism, based on their own experience as 'thinkers on paper', is part of their view on the human mind, and plays a considerable role in their methods of evoking the workings of characters' minds in their writings.

The first part of this book focuses on 1, whereas the second part analyzes the interaction between 1 and 2. Meir Sternberg has drawn attention to what in literary studies is often seen as 'that taboo called the genesis of the text' (Sternberg 1985: 13). To study the poetics of biblical narrative, he suggested a methodological combination of what he called 'source-oriented' and 'discourse-oriented inquiry' (14), and he indicated 'the need for a community or overlap rather than a division of labor' (15). In his 1985 study, Sternberg regretted that increasing specialization would tend to enforce the dichotomous state of affairs, 'with source and discourse made foreign if not inimical to each other' (21). In spite of this appeal to join forces, the two orientations still tend to insist on

their independence and although there has been some interaction between the disciplines of narrative theory and genetic criticism,[5] they have mainly continued to develop separately. This book's second part therefore combines source- and discourse-oriented examinations of modernist, late modernist and contemporary texts, focusing mainly but not exclusively on literature in English (including works by Samuel Beckett, Joseph Conrad, James Joyce, Franz Kafka, Jack Kerouac, Flann O'Brien, Bruno Schulz, Jonathan Safran Foer and Virginia Woolf) and explores the theoretical implications of the combination – genetic criticism and cognitive narratology – for the study of literary modernism, building on narratological analyses that have prepared the ground for this approach (Cohn 1978; Banfield 1982; Fludernik 1993; Palmer 2004; 2010; Herman 2011b; 2011c).

With regard to the theoretical implications for the study of modernism, Astradur Eysteinsson and Vivian Liska argue that 'renegotiations of Modernism' may entail 'reassessments of the most insightful critical and theoretical works on Modernism' (2007: 6). *Modern Manuscripts* makes suggestions for such a reassessment, starting from two observations regarding modernist novelists: their apparent preoccupation with (a) the creative process and the material traces it left in multiple drafts; and (b) methods of evoking the workings of the fictional mind.

(a) As to the *author*'s creative process, I propose to work with a dynamic author image that originates in what Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck (2009) have called 'cultural negotiation': a process of negotiation between the reader, the author's self-presentation, the text and the context. The argument is that an author's personal library, his notes and multiple drafts are a valuable aspect of both the context and the author's self-presentation, and therefore constitute an important element in this cultural negotiation.

(b) As to the evocations of fictional minds, this study incorporates the writing process in a post-Cartesian paradigm within cognitive narratology. It takes the study of manuscripts into account to refute the critical commonplace of an 'inward turn' in modernism. The nature of this reassessment is inspired by Jerome McGann's reassessment of literary romanticism. With reference to criticism of romanticism, McGann has shown to what extent critics have been influenced by the self-images of the romantics and how these critical writings have been 'dominated by a romantic ideology, by an uncritical absorption in romanticism's

[5] For a brief historical survey of interactions between these disciplines, see Bernaerts and Van Hulle 2013.

self-representations' (McGann 1983: 1). To some extent, a similar observation can be made of twentieth-century criticism of modernism. On the one hand, modernist writers themselves are responsible for insisting on the commonplace view of the mind as an interior space; on the other hand, critics of modernism have perhaps all too readily adopted this internalist image of the mind.

The proposed reassessment may be relevant to the study of literary history. Since the so-called 'inward turn' was inspired by the modernists' rhetoric to define themselves in opposition to the previous literary generation, the 'break' between realism and modernism can be shown to be somewhat artificial. To many students of literature, modernism is still seen as a deliberately 'difficult' or 'elitist' literary movement, notably because of its insistence on a seemingly self-absorbed, 'introspective' preoccupation with 'interior' mental spaces. By showing that the so-called 'inward turn' is to a large extent a rhetorical construal and that the modernist preoccupation with the workings of consciousness is much more involved with social, material and cultural circumstances than some modernist authors and scholars of modernism wished to admit, the construed difference between realism and modernism turns out to be much more of a *continuum* than a dichotomy.

3. Working definitions

'modern manuscripts'

French genetic critics employ the term 'modern manuscripts' (as in the name of the Institut des Textes et Manuscrits Modernes, ITEM, Paris) to distinguish these documents from another type of manuscript, produced by scribes. In the Middle Ages, for instance, producing manuscripts was usually a form of distributing a work, while the original rough drafts were often lost. The scribal manuscripts generally had a public function, whereas the (often missing) rough drafts served the 'private' purpose of creating the work in the first place, before it could be distributed. The implicit association of public manuscripts with a 'pre-modern' period may have led to a dichotomy that is perhaps too black-and-white. Pierre-Marc de Biasi sees the second half of the eighteenth century as a pivot,[6] roughly corresponding with the 'Geniezeit' with its battles between

[6] 'L'émergence du manuscrit comme valeur digne de considération, et matériellement comme objet méritant d'être conservé, s'inscrit dans une révolution intellectuelle de grande amplitude qui a construit notre modernité : le développement d'une idéologie du sujet qui culmine en esthétique chez Kant dans la théorie du « génie » et de l' « originalité »' (de Biasi 2000: 12).

the Ancients and the Moderns, and with an increasing emphasis on 'the mind of a man of genius' as in Edward Young's 'Conjectures on Original Composition' (1759). It is true that, for a long time, rough drafts were considered 'foul papers', a term that is still being used in textual scholarship. To some extent there is an arguable change in the status of the rough draft due to the attitude of – notably literary – authors toward their manuscripts from the moment these documents were being regarded as traces of a brilliant mind or 'genius' at work. But that does not mean that the centuries before the 'Geniezeit' did not produce any 'geniuses', nor that the traces of literary and other writings have never been preserved in earlier periods. There are remarkable examples[7] of such rough drafts in ancient and medieval history.

This book is called *Modern Manuscripts* because it deals with rough drafts of a fairly recent period in history, mainly focusing on the period of 'modernism', its precursors and its aftermath. 'Modern' in this sense relates to 'modernity' as an aesthetic programme, according to the following working definition, which makes a distinction between (a) modernity as a project involving society as a whole, and (b) modernity as an aesthetic programme:

(a) As a project involving society as a whole, modernity is often presented as the narrative of the Enlightenment and its aftermath. Within this project, Kant's 'Sapere aude' is indicative of the central roles of reason, emancipation and a focus on 'progress'. However, the project of modernity is anything but monolithic. It is constantly being questioned and criticized by at least one other form of modernity, which will be referred to as an aesthetic programme of modernity.

(b) As an aesthetic programme, modernity focuses on the multiplicity, velocity and volatility of modern, urban life. Baudelaire's 'Peintre de la vie moderne' (1863) can be regarded as a starting point of this programme, with a temporal awareness focusing on the present.[8] Arthur Rimbaud's 'Il faut être absolument moderne' (from *Une Saison en enfer*, 1873) could serve as a motto for this aesthetic programme, which – as Matei Calinescu has shown – has many faces (including for instance 'Modernism', 'Avant-Garde', 'Decadence', 'Postmodernism').

[7] See, for instance, Astrid Houthuys, *Middeleeuws kladwerk: de autograaf van de Brabantse yeesten*, boek 6 (Hilversum: Verloren, 2009).

[8] 'Il est sans doute excellent d'étudier les anciens maîtres pour apprendre à peindre, mais cela ne peut être qu'un exercice superflu si votre but est de comprendre le caractère de la beauté présente'; 'La modernité, c'est le transitoire, le fugitif, le contingent, la moitié de l'art, dont l'autre moitié est l'éternel et l'immuable' (Baudelaire, 'Le Peintre de la vie moderne' (1863), http://www.litteratura.com/ressources/pdf/oeu_29.pdf).

The *period* of modernity is variously defined by different critics in different linguistic areas. In Latin-American literature studies, the term is often problematized, whereas in the history of literature in English, for instance, Shakespeare is already seen as an exponent of what is called the 'Early Modern Period'. Others regard the invention of instruments such as the telescope as the beginning of modernity, marking the moment the human being explicitly placed an instrument between the observer and the observed. In this book, I employ a working definition of modernity that covers a slightly narrower period of roughly 150 years, starting with the moment when the second face of modernity (the aesthetic programme) becomes explicit in publications such as Baudelaire's essay (mentioned above) against the background of the project of modernity involving society as a whole – including developments and events such as the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859).

'history of the book', 'genetic criticism', 'textual criticism', 'philology', 'scholarly editing', 'textual scholarship'

Very often the genesis of a book starts in the margins of other books. To that extent, the study of modern manuscripts relates to the domain of the 'history of the book'. Within this field of research, the specific research topic of 'marginalia' is of interest to genetic critics. In *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books* (2002), Heather J. Jackson discusses – among many other viewpoints – Marcel Proust's alternative to the opinion that reading would be a kind of conversation with brilliant minds: 'Proust's revision of the "conversation" model as a "communication" model was and is refreshingly corrective; it will confirm readers' intuitive sense of the difference between live social engagement and the enchanted mental space of reading' (85). This 'mental space' is employed in a particularly interesting way by readers who are, in turn, writers themselves. Writers' libraries can therefore be the subject of research as part of genetic criticism.[9]

The notion of 'genetic criticism' can include 'all textual prehistories, ancient and modern' (Sternberg 1985: 20). In this book, I employ the term in a slightly more restricted sense as applying to the study of modern manuscripts as developed in France at the Institut des Textes et Manuscrits Modernes by critics such as Jean Bellemin-Noël (1972), Pierre-Marc de Biasi (1996; 2000; 2004), Daniel Ferrer (1998; 2002; 2004; 2011), Almuth Grésillon (1992; 1994; 2008),

[9] See, for instance, Paolo D'Iorio and Daniel Ferrer, *Bibliothèques d'écrivains* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2001); Dirk Van Hulle and Wim Van Mierlo, *Reading Notes* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004).

Louis Hay (1984; 2002) and Jean-Louis Lebrave (1992; 2010). Since modern manuscripts are regarded as the material traces of an author's creative invention, Daniel Ferrer defines genetic criticism as the science of written invention, 'la science de l'invention écrite' (Ferrer 2011: 184). In his essay 'Toward a Science of Literature', Pierre-Marc de Biasi described the tasks of genetic criticism by distinguishing its genetic component from its critical dimension. Whereas the former's aim is to make the manuscripts accessible and analyzable, the latter's purpose is to reconstruct the logic of this genesis, for which 'a selective critical procedure' is a prerequisite, according to de Biasi (2004: 42). An analysis of the documents (associated with textual criticism) and its critical evaluation (associated with literary criticism) are therefore not mutually exclusive; on the contrary. The critical procedures de Biasi suggests are 'narratological, socio-critical, semiotic, psychoanalytic, linguistic, or other kinds of observation' (42).

When 'genetic criticism' ('*critique génétique*') established itself in the mid-1960s, it defined itself in opposition to 'textual criticism', which is usually referred to as a synonym for '*philologie*' as it is understood in the French editorial tradition. In *Logiques du brouillon: Modèles pour une critique génétique* (2011), Daniel Ferrer discusses a rich variety of models for genetic criticism. Only one of them is presented as a 'counter-model' : '*philologie*'. This term is understood in the sense of 'textual criticism'. Historically, it was necessary for genetic criticism to distinguish itself from '*philologie*', because traditionally this discipline subordinated the study of manuscripts to the establishment of a critically edited text '*ne varietur*'. The fact that '*philologie*' is the only model presented as a 'counter-model' is indicative of the extent to which the identity of *critique génétique* has been determined in the past by this dichotomy with 'textual criticism'. To find out what 'textual criticism' must have meant in the period when genetic criticism established itself, Ferrer refers to a definition by Paul Maas: 'the business of textual criticism is to produce a text as close as possible to the original' (quoted in Ferrer 2011: 30).

In the meantime, textual criticism has of course evolved. Editorial schools understandably used to be very closely linked to geographical areas, resulting in German, French, Italian, Russian, Anglo-American and other traditions of scholarly editing. In the past few decades, there have been serious efforts in textual scholarship to build bridges between different schools and traditions. A good example is the exchange of ideas between Anglo-American and German traditions. Although both traditions sometimes tend to stress their respective characteristic properties, there is a growing respect for the historical singularities that have resulted in the divergent approaches. For instance, the major

literary figures in these two linguistic areas are Shakespeare and Goethe. The textual tradition of Shakespeare's works is marked by the lack of preserved manuscripts, whereas the textual tradition of Goethe's works is characterized by an abundance thereof. No wonder that the corresponding editorial traditions developed in diverging ways, the German school stressing the importance of the documents and the history of the textual traditions, the Anglo-American schools emphasizing the role of the agents involved in the production of the textual versions. In France, genetic criticism has stressed the importance of treating manuscripts as research objects in and of themselves. Textual criticism was traditionally part of scholarly editing and its function was very often to study the genesis of a work with a view to producing a critical edition, or a critically edited text. Genetic criticism tried to emancipate this kind of research from its subservient role.

'work', 'text', 'version', 'document', 'manuscript', 'genetic dossier', '*avant-texte*'

The following working definitions are based on Peter Shillingsburg's suggestion to define 'text,' 'work' and 'version' in relation to 'document': 'A document consists of the physical material, paper and ink, bearing the configuration of signs that represent a text' (1996: 51). The text is defined as 'the actual order of words and punctuation as contained in any one physical form' (1996: 46). In other words, whereas the 'document' is a material object, the 'text' is not. All the words and punctuation on the document represent one text. For example, a loose sheet of paper may contain several different short, handwritten poems. All these poems are the text of this document.

It is possible that the poems on this loose sheet are different drafts of the same poem. In that case, the 'text' consists of more than one 'version' of a 'work'. 'A version is one specific form of the work' (Shillingsburg 1996: 47) and a 'work' is 'the imagined whole implied by all differing forms of a text that we conceive as representing a single literary creation' (Shillingsburg 1996: 43).

These 'differing forms' are the multiple 'versions' of the work. For instance, Samuel Beckett has made several drafts of his play *Fin de partie* (*Endgame*). The earliest of these drafts do not have a title and feature characters with names that differ from the characters in the published version of this work. Beckett scholars therefore disagree as to whether one of these drafts (a dialogue between two characters, Ernest and Alice) is to be regarded as a 'version' of the 'work' *Fin de partie* or not (Cohn 2001: 220).

Apart from the terms 'work', 'text', 'version' and 'document', French genetic critics often additionally employ the terms 'manuscripts,' 'genetic dossier' and '*avant-texte*'. 'Manuscripts' are documents containing handwritten texts, often early versions of literary works. According to Daniel Ferrer, a manuscript is not a text but a protocol for making a text (Ferrer 1998; 2011: 43). A writer is also his first reader. His manuscripts are documents, often full of complex signs to indicate where a particular part of the text belongs or what should be omitted when – at a later stage – he rereads or tries to decipher his manuscript in order to make a new version, for instance a fair copy, or a typescript.

The 'genetic dossier' is the physical collection of documents (in the sense defined above) pertaining to the work one wishes to study, whereas the *avant-texte*[10] is the result of the critical analysis of these documents (de Biasi 2000: 30–31), that is, the chronological reconstruction of the writing process.[11] Gérard Genette suggested that the so-called 'avant-texte' can function as a paratext (Genette 1982: 11).[12]

4. Starting point: the golden age of the modern manuscript and the '*avant-texte*' of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*

This book addresses both scholars and students, interested in modern manuscripts. It explores different types of documents and discusses the creation of a genetic dossier. The case study for this exploration in Part I is the genesis of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*. One of the reasons for taking Darwin's work as a case study is that, along with important thinkers such as Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud and Ferdinand de Saussure, Charles

[10] To mark the difference, Pierre-Marc de Biasi calls the genetic dossier an 'ensemble matériel des documents' [a material collection of documents] and the *avant-texte* 'une production critique: il [l'avant-texte] correspond à la tranformation d'un ensemble empirique de documents en un dossier de pièces ordonnées et significatives' [a critical production: the *avant-texte* corresponds with the transformation of an empirical collection of documents into a dossier of ordered and meaningful items] (de Biasi 2000: 30–1).

[11] These working definitions were originally drawn up for an article in *Poetics Today* (Bernaerts and Van Hulle 2013).

[12] Genette defines the paratext as the 'entourage' of the text, including for instance the title, subtitle, epigraphs, illustrations, marginalia, blurbs. As part of the paratext, the blurb of his book 'Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation' defines the notion of paratexts as 'those liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher and reader' (Genette 1997).

Darwin is regarded as one of the intellectual precursors of modernism.[13] Apart from this central role in the intellectual context of literary modernism, there is another reason why the genesis of *On the Origin of Species* is particularly suitable for this book's topic as part of a series called 'Historicizing Modernism'. Charles Darwin preserved almost all of his manuscripts. Perhaps this was part of an occupational habit – after all, he was a professional collector. But in this capacity of 'keeper of manuscripts' he can also be regarded as an exponent of the tendency of authors to preserve their manuscripts, which Callu compared to the preservation of relics.[14]

In the period leading up to modernism, both scientific and literary authors became increasingly aware of the intellectual value of manuscripts as material traces of thought processes. In this respect, Charles Darwin's marginalia, notes and manuscripts serve as a representative corpus. Darwin's views on evolution are duly regarded as a crucial part of the intellectual climate that prepared the period of modernism. But these views – in their turn – also had to be prepared. To that end, Darwin read numerous books (including poetry and fiction), wrote marginalia, and even kept track of his reading, which Gillian Beer aptly called 'omnivorous' (Beer 1985). Being a collector by profession, Darwin also carefully preserved his own manuscripts. As a result, the genetic dossier of *On the Origin of Species* is an excellent starting point to explore the characteristics of modern manuscripts, since its famously long genesis contains almost all the various types of genetic documents, charted in Pierre-Marc de Biasi's 'Typology of Genetic Documentation', including previously collected genetic material, workplans and unfinished compositions, notebooks, marginalia, exploratory workplans, fragments of exploratory writing, updated notes on projects or ideas, initial drawings, sketches, schemata, overarching workplans or scenarios, reading notes and research notes, basic compositional rough drafts, recapitulating summaries, advanced compositional rough drafts and corrected fair copies (1996: 34–5).

[13] See, for instance, Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane in 'The Name and Nature of Modernism' (1976: 27); Childs 2008: 20; Schwarz 2005: 9.

[14] 'Commence alors l'âge d'or du manuscrit contemporain. Tout auteur – du plus modeste au plus grand – préserve la moindre note, le moindre "tapuscrit", le moindre placard corrigé comme une relique' (65). It may seem ironic that this religious metaphor should be so applicable to Darwin. Still, Callu's metaphor of relics is not inappropriate. If manuscripts are seen as traces of the workings of the mind, it is not surprising that many modernist authors kept them as relics of mental activity and tools for what Peter Childs called the 'diagnosis of the individual', which 'came to substitute for religion' (Childs 2008: 60) in the period leading up to modernism. According to Finn Fordham, this diagnosis is part of 'reformulating the self' and 'Manuscripts – broadly understood – have been underestimated as a potential scene from which such reformulations can be both provoked and described' (Fordham 2010: 35).

Apart from this material aspect, there is an intrinsic conceptual reason why the *Origin* is a suitable starting point. Darwin's view on evolution is marked by what Gillian Beer has termed 'dysteleology' (Beer 2000: 6): as opposed to the biblical notion of creation, culminating in the human species, evolution eschews preordained design. It does not 'go' anywhere in particular; it simply goes on. In that sense, Darwin's ideas prefigure a pattern characterizing many twentieth-century authors' experience of modernity and the way they gave shape to this experience. In this pattern, the notion of process (not in terms of progress, but in terms of 'going on') plays a central role.

This notion of process also applies to the process of writing. Some modernist authors (such as Proust and Musil) found it sometimes hard to finish their literary projects, and others (such as Joyce, Beckett, Michiels, Ponge) thematized or even included the production process in their literary products, which often keep hovering between completion and incompletion. Against this background, the act of preserving the traces of one's creative process can be considered part of many twentieth-century authors' view on their writing.

The analysis of the '*avant-texte*' of *On the Origin of Species* in Part I contains a few discoveries (especially with regard to Darwin's engagement with the fields of the humanities and aesthetics), but it does not pretend to bring trail-blazing new insights to the field of the history of science, in which the making of the *Origin* has been thoroughly researched (see survey in Chapter 1). Instead, to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that the exceptionally rich genetic dossier of the *Origin* is being studied as an '*avant-texte*' and presented as a suitable case study to explore the research field of genetic criticism. Apart from its structural function (preparing the ground for Part II), the purpose of the genetic analysis of Darwin's work in Part I is to learn from other disciplines and to find out how these interdisciplinary insights may broaden the perspective of literary studies.

5. Structure

As opposed to 'the Preservation of Favoured Races' in the subtitle of *On the Origin of Species*, 'The Preservation of Unfavoured Traces' is the subject of Part I, which examines the remarkable tendency (noted above) of preserving manuscripts, including the traces of creative undoing and the passages that did *not* make it into the published text. It was at the expense of these 'unfavoured' cuts that the 'favoured' passages could eventually make it into the published version.

Chapter 1, 'Prologue: the *Avant-texte* of *On the Origin of Species*', pays tribute to the pioneering work that has been done on the extraordinary treasure of Darwin's manuscripts, typically by researchers from remarkably diverse disciplines. Thanks to this invaluable work it is now possible to regard this material as an *avant-texte* and connect it to the theory and practice of genetic criticism.

Chapter 2, 'Exogenesis: Darwin's Books and Notes', examines the observations, documentation and external source texts Darwin used during the gradual composition of *On the Origin of Species*. The term 'exogenesis' was coined by Raymonde Debray Genette to denote external source texts relating to a creative process. Exogenetic research is especially useful for studies on intertextuality, notably in the case of challenging literary works such as *Finnegans Wake*. But Joyce's notebooks do not differ fundamentally from creative scientists' notebooks, such as Darwin's 'transmutation' notebooks. This chapter analyzes various reading notes (from marginalia in Darwin's library to extracted notes in separate copybooks) in order to chart the interplay of writing and/as thinking. Many of these paper fossils did not make it into publication, and yet they have been preserved, often as merely paratactic jottings (not in syntactically correct, full sentences).

Chapter 3 is titled 'Endogenesis: Drafting the *Origin of Species*'. In order to move from parataxis to syntaxis, these traces of mental processes tend to be arranged and rearranged in multiple drafts. Apart from the many reading notes, Darwin's conceptual notes are often jotted down in a paratactic, elliptical style. Together with doodles and drawings, these notes constitute a hubbub of loose thoughts that need to be organized in order to become 'narratable'. The so-called 'pencil sketch' (first draft) of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* serves as a case study to examine the combination of genetic criticism and narratology. This case study shows that the act of writing often serves as a way of (re)organizing, or more generally as a way of thinking on paper.

Chapter 4, 'Epigenesis: The Paper Fossils of Publishing', studies the continuation of the genesis after publication. Genetic criticism has traditionally focused mainly on the so-called '*avant-texte*', but the '*après-texte*' also deserves to be taken into account. This chapter therefore coins the term 'epigenesis' in addition to Debray Genette's terms 'exogenesis' and 'endogenesis'. In the case of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, the variations between the six editions published during the author's lifetime reflect Darwin's continuous effort to respond to criticism.

Chapter 5, 'Epilogue: Narrativizations of the Genesis and Dysteleology', discusses the narrativization of the genesis. With hindsight, the writing process often seems to be a fairly straight story resulting in a publication. This

teleological viewpoint is typical of any human being's memoirs toward the end of her or his life. Again, Charles Darwin is a case in point: in his short autobiography he presents the writing process of *On the Origin of Species* as a teleological process, punctuated by 'Eureka' moments, which contrasts sharply with the actual genesis of his own works as it can be reconstructed on the basis of his manuscripts. The human urge for closure, as analyzed by Frank Kermode in *The Sense of an Ending*, accounts for this retrospective omission of 'sidepaths' and 'dead ends' from the story of the genesis. This narrative peculiarity is of particular interest to genetic criticism since the reconstruction of a work's genesis is a narrative in itself. Knowing that any form of storytelling is amenable to this urge for closure necessitates a heightened degree of alertness to dysteleological aspects of the genesis. In general, modern manuscripts are marked by a tension between the teleology characterizing any human project and the dysteleological sidepaths, dead ends and reroutings that tend to mark its actual realization. The notion of 'dysteleology' therefore serves as a pivot between Parts I and II.

In the course of the twentieth century, the act of keeping manuscripts has increasingly become part of a view on writing as a dialectics between completion and incompletion, which also manifests itself in the published texts. Part II explores the possibilities of analyzing this tension between completion and incompletion by combining source-oriented and discourse-oriented research, notably genetic criticism and cognitive narratology.

Chapter 6, 'Prologue: Beyond the "Inward Turn"', focuses on the reassessment of modernism's preoccupation with evocations of the mind and the so-called 'inward turn'. According to Freud, humankind had suffered three major blows by the beginning of the twentieth century. Copernicus struck the first blow when he discovered that the earth was not the centre of the universe. Darwin struck the second blow by suggesting that the human species was not uniquely created and did not have a privileged place among other organisms. Building on the notion of man's descent from the animal kingdom and his ineradicable animal nature, Freud claimed to have struck the third blow. As a psychoanalyst, he therefore made a 'call to introspection' (Freud 1966 [1917]: 353). This 'introspection' accords with the so-called 'inward turn' of modernism. Analyzing works by Joseph Conrad, Franz Kafka and Virginia Woolf, this chapter investigates how manuscript research may be of help in reassessing this 'critical commonplace' (Herman 2011c: 249). The notions of exo-, endo- and epigenesis are further explored in chapters 7, 8 and 9, but this time in connection with modernist works of literature.

Chapter 7, 'Exogenesis: Writers' Libraries and the Extended Mind', investigates the relationship between writers and their libraries as an integral aspect of the extended mind. Three case studies will be examined: James Joyce, Flann O'Brien and Samuel Beckett. This examination concerns levels 1 and 2 as defined above: 1. the author's extended mind, and 2. its impact on the evocation of the fictional minds of characters.

Chapter 8, 'Endogenesis: Creative Undoing, Doubt and Decision Making', studies the endogenetic process of writing, paying special attention to moments of doubt and decision making as manifested in traces of creative undoing (cancellations, omissions, cuts, revisions). The awareness of manuscripts' intellectual value, which gradually increased in the course of the nineteenth century, culminates in the work of twentieth-century authors such as Paul Valéry or Samuel Beckett, who presented a new image of writers who fumble for words and therefore keep looking for them. This notion of continuous incompletion becomes even more striking if the genesis continues after publication.

Chapter 9, 'Epigenesis: The Sense of "Unending"', examines this continuation of the genesis after publication in twentieth-century literature. Samuel Beckett's work is particularly interesting in this respect, because he kept changing his texts, not only in his self-translations (from French into English or vice versa), but also in his capacity as director of his own plays. The creative undoing has left several textual scars, which require adequate editorial methods of representation, for which digital scholarly editing may offer innovative solutions. Sometimes the genesis of an author's work, including the process of creative undoing, is continued by another author. The 'allogenesis' of Bruno Schulz's *The Street of Crocodiles* and Jonathan Safran Foer's *Tree of Codes* serves as a case study.

Chapter 10, 'Epilogue: Digital Manuscripts', discusses the question how we can conceive of genetic criticism in the digital age and what has been the impact of the computer on the process of thinking and writing, examining Nietzsche's suggestion that our writing tools cooperate and assist in, but also affect and act on, our cognitive processes.