

Nina Doejen

## How Was It Made, Why Does It Work?

### Approaching Texts by Combining Narratology and Scholarly Editing

Report on the Conference “Produktion des Erzählens, Varianten des Erzählten. Narratologische, editionswissenschaftliche und literarhistorische Perspektiven auf die Genese von Erzähltexten,” organized by Matthias Grüne and Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth, November 17–19, 2022, University of Wuppertal (Germany)

The conference *Production of Narrative, Variants of the Narrated* [“Produktion des Erzählens, Varianten des Erzählten”], organized by Matthias Grüne and Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth (both from University of Wuppertal) from November 17–19, 2022 opened up a dialogue between narratology and scholarly editing, prominent research foci at the CNR (Center for Narrative Research) and the IZED (Interdisciplinary Center for Scholarly Editing and Document Processing) in Wuppertal. In connecting these two fields, the aim of the conference was to evaluate how an interdisciplinary approach can be beneficial for both narratology and scholarly editing.

Up until now, scholarship of these disciplines has not converged extensively. Apart from the theory of critique génétique, which emerged from research on the works of Heinrich Heine in 1970s France (Hay 1979), there are only a few approaches that combine aspects of scholarly editing with narratological questions, such as Lars Bernaerts’ and Dirk van Hulle’s essay “Narrative across Versions: Narratology and Genetic Criticism,” published in 2013. Bernaerts and van Hulle apply narratological views to the genesis of Samuel Beckett’s texts and locate the approach of combining narratology and genetic criticism within post-classical narratology. Dirk van Hulle has continued his work on the interdisciplinary approach and very recently published his monograph *Genetic Criticism. Tracing Creativity in Literature* (2022). In this work, he introduces genetic criticism not only as a method to study literary writing processes but also as a reading strategy, assuming that an understanding of how a text was *made* contributes to better understanding how it *works*. Michael Scheffel and Gabriele Radecke focus on a specific author’s oeuvre when connecting genetic criticism with narratology. In his recent essay on genetic narratology, Michael Scheffel (2021) illustrates one way of approaching the genesis of Schnitzler’s works from a narratological perspective. He applies Wolf Schmid’s (2010) narratological theory of the four stages of narrative constitution to the genesis of Schnitzler’s works, particularly *Fräulein Else*. Another author-focused approach is adopted by Gabriele Radecke in her book on the genesis of Theodor Fontane’s *L’Adultera* (2002).

As identified by this interdisciplinary conference, the chief difference between the methods of narratology and scholarly editing lies in the ways in which literary texts are approached. The editing perspective focuses primarily on aspects of production while narratology's focus lies either on the text itself or its receptive side. Accordingly, the following questions were posed at the conference's outset: How do texts emerge? Which alterations or rearrangements lead to certain narrative products and strategies? How, in turn, can this perspective on the texts' production help narratologists to better understand texts? In engaging with these questions, panelists discussed the possibilities of intertwining theories, shared case studies, and addressed consequences for future research, one being to propose a terminology that can build bridges between both fields. The conference thus identified limits as well as potentials of its interdisciplinary approach by following a four-stage structure, starting with a systematic introduction (I), moving on to narratological perspectives (II) and case studies (III), and concluding with consequences for literary history (IV).

## I. Systematic Introduction

*Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth* (University of Wuppertal) opened the conference with his paper on "The Almost Unknown Relationship between Narratology and Scholarly Editing" and demonstrated the potentials of this relationship by providing a range of examples from texts by Kafka, Goethe, and Droste-Hülshoff. According to Nutt-Kofoth, editing can help solve narratological questions by offering insight into the texts' constitution ("the *making* of texts"), considering aspects like the text's general order as well as potential mistakes that are often found in earlier text versions. Narratology, in turn, can provide a new angle when focusing on the production of texts, for instance when it comes to the creation of a certain narrative perspective, character and plot development, as well as the classification within a certain genre.

*Hans-Harald Müller* (University of Hamburg) and *Tom Kindt* (University of Fribourg) then gave a talk on "Narratology, Edition, Interpretation: Systematic and Heuristic Relations" and stressed the importance of scholarly editing for the analysis of texts, underlining that without thorough editing there are no reliable texts. Müller and Kindt approached the potential relationship between scholarly editing and narratology from a more terminological angle, questioning to what extent the terminology of narratology has to be adjusted to effectively bring it into dialogue with scholarly editing. Pointing to the difference between classical and postclassical narratology, they emphasized that terminological adjustments have to be made in order to meet the requirements of such an interdisciplinary undertaking. They therefore suggested a corpus-oriented reconceptualization of classical and postclassical narratology and stated the importance of looking at time-transcending structures for classification and interpretation of texts.

## II. Narratological Perspectives

Taking into consideration Arthur Schnitzler's texts and journals, *Michael Scheffel* (University of Wuppertal) initiated the section on narratological perspectives with his paper "‘Werk’ Between Notes and Narration. Genetic Narratology and Schnitzler's *Traumnovelle*." He showed that, for Schnitzler, the text's final edition was as important as its development, which included a playful process of creating as well as the production of various versions of a text. Scheffel stated that in terms of the critique génétique, all works tributary to a given text are equally important to consider, including notes, typescripts, etc. He subsequently raised the following central questions: What constitutes the corpus ["Werk"] that scholars should consider? Moreover, is the process of creating the text of equal interest as the product itself, as, for instance, in Schnitzler's case? Scheffel outlined the relation between the genesis of Schnitzler's *Traumnovelle* and its narration, again drawing on Wolf Schmid's (2010) theory of the four stages of narrative constitution. Scheffel here explained that Schmid's model does not suffice in some respect, since it assumes an ideal genesis. However, when applying it to the actual process of a work's production, it becomes evident that it does not cover all relevant phenomena of the production process and therefore needs to be modified and extended.

In a joint presentation on "Narratology Meets Genetic Criticism: Walter Macken's Historical Trilogy," *Katharina Rennhak* and *Eva Kerski* (University of Wuppertal) illustrated the possible relations between narratology and genetic criticism. The focus of their case study was the work of the (re)discovered Irish author Walter Macken (1915-1967), especially his historical trilogy *Seek the Fair Land* (1959), *The Silent People* (1962), and *The Scorching Wind* (1964). Macken, who had initially planned to write an autobiography about Daniel O'Connell, switched mid-work and wrote a novel instead. Rennhak showed how the genre shift from autobiography to novel led to decisions concerning the narratological design such as character development. In the second part of the presentation, Kerski introduced the importance of a media change in narrative design, highlighting the decisions that were made regarding the plot when the novel *The Scorching Wind* was adapted for the screen. Although the film has never been made, there exist typescripts and letters about the planned production in which Macken was engaged as one of the authors. In the development of the screenplay, one can identify which changes the author's writing undergoes for the purpose of adapting it for a new type of medium. Kerski hereby emphasized that genetic narratology can and should be applied across the boundaries of media genres.

In his paper "Genetic Narratology: How Genetic Criticism Can Enrich Narrative Analysis" *Dirk van Hulle* (University of Oxford) presented genetic narratology as a method to explore literary writing in prose texts. Like Müller and Kindt, he underlined the distinction between classical and postclassical narratology, situating his concept of genetic narratology in the latter field. Van Hulle

stressed the importance of knowing how a text was created in order to better understand how it works from a narratological point of view. He illustrated this by comparing varying incipits of different editions from Samuel Beckett's works, showing how they set the parameters for the novel. Using more examples by Beckett, Ian McEwan, and others, Van Hulle also drew attention to the relevance of materiality and mediality for writing literary texts. He offered insight into the consequences that the choice of media – in Beckett's case, handwritten notes – can have for the story itself, illustrating how at one point in the writing process Beckett chooses what appears to be a random ending for his novel *The Unnamable* (1953) when he reaches the last page of his notebook.

Vincent Neyt (University of Antwerp) was next in presenting his paper “Genetic Narratology and Stephen King's *IT*: Suspense, Pace, Characterization and Focalization” in which he introduced a combination of a cognitive reader-based approach and a narratological text-based approach to studying suspense. Giving an overview of the various editions and documents associated with the writing process of *IT* and demonstrating one of King's rewritings of one generic paragraph, Neyt analyzed the changes King made in order to optimize the effect on readers, categorizing these changes as suspense, pace, characterization, and focalization.

### III. Case Studies

Barbara Hunfeld (University of Würzburg) launched section III of the conference with her talk on “No Telling. The Genesis of Jean Paul's Works.” She focused on Jean Paul's novel *Hesperus* (1795) to highlight his extraordinary use of language and the constant reflection on writing in his texts. Hunfeld introduced the project “Sprachgitter digital,” an online edition that provides insight into the author's working process. Jean Paul's texts are characterized by constant rewriting and editing. As Hunfeld claimed, this leads to the narration's refusal to provide any kind of orientation for readers, often leaving them rhetorically overwhelmed. The project provides the opportunity to reveal generic literary patterns and to underline the importance of certain passages by comparing several variations of one text. Hunfeld emphasized that besides those patterns, the edition also identifies ‘gaps’ [“Leerstellen”] – a characteristic of Jean Paul's work – which leads to coining the project's name using one of Jean Paul's own metaphors: “Sprachgitter”.

In his paper “Working on Visions: Clemens Brentano's Emmerick project” Matías Martínez (University of Wuppertal) analyzed Clemens Brentano's work with Anna Katharina Emmerick (1774-1824), a nun and visionary. Brentano recorded her visions for four years, producing about 15,000 pages of manuscripts. Focusing specifically on the aspect of authorship, Martínez observed that Brentano's strategies disguise both the textuality and mediality of the text, for example by concealing his authorship. According to Martínez, the vast difference

between Brentano's actual authorship and his covert authorship in the Emmerick texts calls for a twofold approach: a narratological analysis of the suggested covert authorship on the one hand and the editorial analysis of Brentano's actual generic authorship on the other.

*Bodo Plachta* (Münster) addressed the importance of censorship for literary texts in his paper "Censorship and Its Implications for Heinrich Heine's Writing Strategies." Heine was among the best-known victims of censorship, yet at the same time he became one of the greatest strategists against it. Heine developed a genuine grammar which became part of his author identity and style, including dense texts and satiric speech. Additionally, the use of unpopular genres and character speech disguised his political statements. Plachta demonstrated this primarily by drawing on Heine's texts and articles from his time in Paris, where he worked for the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. Plachta called for an editorial analysis of these texts that takes censorship as a means of narrative alteration into account.

In his talk "'Ich Heinrich.' The Author and His Narrator. Thoughts on 'Abgelegte Blätter,' and 'Anmerkungen während des Schreibens des Nachsommers,'" *Walter Hettche* (University of Munich) drew on letters from Adalbert Stifter to Gustav Heckenast to show how Stifter reflected on his work process. Documents from his literary estate show how the author engaged in conversations with himself on paper, discussing questions of character development and plot. Hettche thus brought into relief the importance of a text's genesis for its understanding and called for a historical-critical edition in which the author's writing and the narrator's text in the fictional work are considered side by side.

The paper "From Notes to Narration – Alfred Döblin's Aesthetics of Literary Writing" by *Gabriele Sander* (University of Wuppertal) showed how Alfred Döblin's numerous notes for his novel *Die drei Sprünge des Wang-lun* (1916) provide insights into the processes of emplotment, naming of characters, structure, and also ethnographic details that reflect the author's ongoing engagement with Chinese culture while planning and writing his novel.

In his paper "Georg Hermann's Writing Practice – Historical and Theoretical Perspectives," *Christian Klein* (University of Wuppertal) drew a link between the popularity of Georg Hermann's novel *Jettchen Gebert* (1906) and Hermann's research and writing practice. According to letters and notebooks, Hermann engaged in extensive research to portray the Biedermeier image in his novels, which resulted in very detailed descriptions and observations of everyday life, contributing to the novel's success.

*Anke Bosse* (University of Klagenfurt) approached questions of interconnections between authorial and narrative voices in her talk "Ingeborg Bachmanns *Malina* in her project 'Todesarten.' About Narrative Authorities and Their Genesis." Bosse examined the role of the first-person narrator, its development as seen in the text's genesis, and its relation to the character Malina. By looking at the genesis of the text, Bosse claimed that one can identify the process of Malina and the first-person narrator becoming a doppelgänger character. Bosse

therefore argued that the genesis has to be taken into account when analyzing the novel in order to understand the struggle underlying the narrator's development.

#### IV. Consequences for Literary History

The third section of the conference focused on the consequences that the combination of narratology and scholarly editing has for literary history. In his paper "Individual Genesis in a Literary Historical Context. Genetic Narratology and C.F. Meyer's Poetry," *Wolfgang Lukas* (University of Wuppertal) examined the genesis of the "implicit historic logic" in Conrad Ferdinand Meyer's poems, including *Cäsar Borjas Ohnmacht*, *Der tote Achill*, *Die Felswand*, *Die Füße im Feuer*, *Die Macht der Liebe*, *Stapfen*, and *Zwei Segel*. Because C.F. Meyer is known for extensively revising and re-editing his texts, Lukas revealed patterns in the poems' genesis which he categorized as "Narrativierung / Transformation," "Subjektivierung / Fokalisierung," "Materialisierung / Symbolisierung," and "Metaisierung." By highlighting changes in focalization, sentence structure, immediacy, narrative framing, rhyme, and other narratological and rhetorical devices, Lukas illustrated C.F. Meyer's journey towards a growing subjectivity in his poetry.

*Matthias Grüne* (University of Wuppertal) gave the final talk on "Working on Realism. Combining Narratology, Scholarly Editing and Literary History by Looking at Theodor Fontane's *Die Poggenpuhls*." Examining a draft from the years 1891/92, Grüne focused on Fontane's use of scenes, his extensive attention to details, and a blending of the narrator's, author's, and characters' voices. Grüne showed how links can be drawn from the various stages of text production to narratological and historical questions.

In a concluding discussion, it became clear that bridging the gap between scholarly editing and narratology is an undertaking of great promise for both disciplines since it opens up new possibilities by broadening the perspective on literary texts. In this context, the importance of the production process of texts was again emphasized. Potential ideas that were discussed included the comparison of works by different authors in different stages of the creative process. In order to make future discussions productive for both research areas, two practical needs were emphasized: on the one hand, the necessity to rethink and to adapt narratological terminology, and, on the other, the need to create a typology of text types ["Textsorten"]. The conference papers are expected to be published in a joint issue of *Beihefte zu editio* and *Narratologia*.

#### Bibliography

Bernaerts, Lars / van Hulle, Dirk (2013): "Narrative across Versions: Narratology Meets Genetic Criticism." In: *Poetics Today* 34, pp. 281–326.

- Hay, Louis (ed.) (1979): *Essais de critique génétique*. Paris.
- Radecke, Gabriele (2002): *Vom Schreiben zum Erzählen: eine textgenetische Studie zu Theodor Fontanes L'Adultera*. Würzburg.
- Scheffel, Michael (2021): "Wege zu einer genetischen Narratologie oder: Von der Geburt und dem Abenteuer der Geschichten am Beispiel von Werkgenesen des Autors Arthur Schnitzler." In: *DIEGESIS. Interdisziplinäres E-Journal für Erzähl-forschung / Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Narrative Research* 10 (No. 1), pp. 49–72.
- Schmid, Wolf (2010): *Narratology. An Introduction*. Berlin / New York, NY.
- Van Hulle, Dirk (2022): *Genetic Criticism. Tracing Creativity in Literature*. Oxford.

Nina Doejen, M.A., M.Ed.

Bergische Universität Wuppertal

Fakultät für Geistes-und Kulturwissenschaften

Germanistik / Allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft

Gaußstr. 20, 42119 Wuppertal

E-mail: [doejen@uni-wuppertal.de](mailto:doejen@uni-wuppertal.de)

URL: <https://germanistik.uni-wuppertal.de/de/teilfaecher/neuere-deutsche-literatur/personen/nina-doejen/>

**How to cite this article:**

Doejen, Nina: "How Was It Made, Why Does It Work? Approaching Texts by Combining Narratology and Scholarly Editing [Conference Report on 'Produktion des Erzählens, Varianten des Erzählten. Narratologische, editionswissenschaftliche und literarhistorische Perspektiven auf die Genese von Erzähltexten,' University of Wuppertal (Germany), November 17–19, 2022]." In: *DIEGESIS. Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Narrative Research / Interdisziplinäres E-Journal für Erzählforschung* 12.1 (2023). 115–121.

URN: [urn:nbn:de:hbz:468-20230621-141315-8](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:468-20230621-141315-8)

URL: <https://www.diegesis.uni-wuppertal.de/index.php/diegesis/article/download/470/650>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).