

8-31-2013

## Divergent Authenticities: Editing Scottish Literary Texts: Introduction: How Editorial Theories Have Changed

Patrick G. Scott

*University of South Carolina - Columbia*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Scott, Patrick G. (2013) "Divergent Authenticities: Editing Scottish Literary Texts: Introduction: How Editorial Theories Have Changed," *Studies in Scottish Literature*: Vol. 39: Iss. 1, 3–14.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol39/iss1/3>

This Symposium is brought to you by the Scottish Literature Collections at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Studies in Scottish Literature* by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [digres@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:digres@mailbox.sc.edu).

---

## **Divergent Authenticities: Editing Scottish Literary Texts: Introduction: How Editorial Theories Have Changed**

### **Cover Page Footnote**

This essay is the Introduction to the SSL Symposium, 2013: Divergent Authenticities: Editing Scottish Literary Texts.

## **The SSL Symposium, 2013**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **How Editorial Theories Have Changed**

One of the major developments in Scottish literary studies in recent decades has been the increased prominence and professionalism of textual editing. In surveying the growth of the field for *SSL* 38, Murray Pittock noted both the long tradition of Scottish editorial work and the important role that new multivolume editions of Scott, Hogg, and now Burns and Stevenson, have played in stimulating research on those authors.<sup>1</sup> Yet, as Alison Lumsden points out in her opening position paper for this symposium, textual editing is far too often treated as merely technical and preliminary, rather than as itself involving interpretative engagement. The contributions that follow illustrate also how much approaches to editing have changed. It seems worthwhile by way of background sketching out the variety of editorial approaches that scholars might now encounter in different modern scholarly editions.

Of course, many of the editions we use for teaching or even research are not based on new textual research. Often, their primary concern has been on getting a work (back) into the critical canon, or on the paratextual elements, introduction or annotation, that directly address interpretation. Sometimes, especially for novels, a conveniently-available “new” edition reproduces an earlier typesetting, allowing no opportunity for new work on the text itself.<sup>2</sup> For a twentieth-century writer still in copyright, as Ian Campbell discusses, though there may be opportunities to edit

---

<sup>1</sup> Murray Pittock, “Setting a Stoot Hert to a Stey Brae: Fifty Years of the Study of Scottish Literature,” *SSL* 38 (2012): 6-12, esp. pp. 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> To avoid any implied criticism of other scholars, I instance only the *Signet Treasure Island* (New York: Penguin/NAL, 2008, with at least six reprintings 2008-2012), for which the publishers commissioned a new introduction and updated bibliography, but recycled a previous page setting.

unpublished works from scratch, neither a living author nor an author's estate is likely to sanction full-scale reediting that substitutes early versions for later published versions.<sup>3</sup>

Debate centres on approaches to editing out-of-copyright texts that survive in variant forms. Behind any editorial theory lies an editorial back story about how literary texts develop, and the back story for Scottish editing has one important strand largely absent from other editorial traditions. Most traditional editing is aimed at one of two goals: the romantic (and literary-historical) goal of recovering "the" original text, and the classical goal of preserving or uncovering the text in its final perfect(ed) form. In Burns's "The Cotter's Saturday Night," line 73, the earlier manuscripts exclaim about the teenage lovers, "O happy love! where such love is found," but the Kilmarnock edition has "where love like this is found."<sup>4</sup> One reading shows the poem's origin in eighteenth-century pastoral, the other shows Burns tinkering to make the voice more natural. Two lines down in the same poem, most manuscripts compare youthful love-making to "a draught of Heavenly pleasure," but in one manuscript it is abbreviated (distilled?) to a "drop of heavenly pleasure." When an editor chooses one authorial reading rather than the other, is the goal the original text, the final text, or (covertly) the editor's aesthetic preference? Can an editor be eclectic, jumping one way for one line (the original reading) and the other way elsewhere (the author's final perfect choice), or must there be a consistent approach to editorial choice?

Scottish editing nearly always has an additional goal, of cultural (linguistic, national) authenticity. The master-narrative for Scottish editing often involves a text that has been misread, normalized, or Anglicized by printers and editors. In Burns's "To a Haggis," where a

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *Complete Poems of Edwin Muir*, ed. Peter Butter (Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1991), xiv, for Butter's reluctant reliance on the posthumous *Collected Poems* (1984), edited by Muir's widow and John Hall. Hugh MacDiarmid, *Complete Poems*, ed. Michael Grieve and W. R. Aitken, gen. ed. Alan Riach, 2 vols. (Manchester: Carcanet, 1993), reuses the last text MacDiarmid sanctioned before his death, *Complete Poems*, ed. Grieve and Aitken, 2 vols. (London: Martin Brian & O'Keefe, 1978). Aitken notes, for instance, that MacDiarmid declined to restore the original title for a short political poem, "British Leftist Poetry 1930-1940," instead endorsing as definitive the 1957 typo, "British Leftish Poetry ...": "On Editing MacDiarmid's *Complete Poems*," *SSL* 28 (1993): 75-80 <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol28/iss1/7/>

<sup>4</sup> James Kinsley, ed., *Poems and Songs of Robert Burns*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), I:148.

resetting in the 1787 Edinburgh edition changed Burns's condemnation of other food from "skinking" to "stinking," every editor will print "skinking," not just because the similarity suggests a misprint, but because "skinking" is more distinctively Scots (*Poems* I:312, l. 45). But there is also the less-discussed counter-narrative where an editor prefers an author's later revisions because of linguistic authenticity. In John Galt's *Annals of the Parish*, when fire breaks out at the big house and Miss Grizy ("Lady Skim-milk") is trapped upstairs, the first edition has her appear at a window, "with her gold watch in one hand and the silver tea-pot in the other, ... searching for a ladder," while the second has her "skreighing for a ladder;" the distinctive word-choice suggests the change was authorial, but for editors and readers alike authenticity clinches the decision.<sup>5</sup>

Perhaps because of this distinctive editorial concern, Scottish editors and editors of Scottish texts were notably skeptical even in its heyday about the dominant mid-twentieth-century approach, the copy-text theory sketched out by Sir Walter Greg and developed by Fredson Bowers, which in its original form (like most previous scholarly editing) emphasized the author's final revisions, but with a twist.<sup>6</sup> The Greg-Bowers theory mandated taking the earliest full version of a text (first edition, or maybe author's final manuscript) as the base text or copytext, and adding into it, one by one, later authorial revisions from subsequent editions, while excluding the misprints that had crept in unnoticed each time the text was reprinted. The result, a "critical edition," aimed to get as close as possible to the author's original spelling and punctuation of the work ("accidentals"), while incorporating the author's later revisions

---

<sup>5</sup> John Galt, *Annals of the Parish*, ed. James Kinsley (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967), 36; cf. Galt's similar revisions, consistently accepted by Kinsley, of "harried" to "herried" (102), "paddock" to "puddock" (120), "goose" to "grozet" (124), "little" to "wee" (205). For an example of revision towards Scottish forms, but of editors rejecting the revisions as incompatible with their preconceptions about the poet concerned, see Mary Jane Scott and Patrick Scott, "The Manuscript of James Thomson's Scots Elegy," *SSL* 17 (1982): 135-141, at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol17/iss1/11/>.

<sup>6</sup> W.W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-text," *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 (1950-51): 19-36; a concise overview of the approach is Fredson Bowers, "Textual Criticism," in *Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. James Thorpe (New York: MLA, 1963) 23-42.

to wording (“substantives”). Greg-Bowers works on the premise that printers alter punctuation and spelling silently during reprinting but that distinctive changes of wording (other than misprints) are likely to have been at the author’s behest. Subsequently, Bowers and others applied the basic copy-text method to allow stopping the clock on authorial revision much earlier in a text’s development, so that in principle using Greg-Bowers one could equally well create a purified ideal version of Burns’s poems as they ought to have been in 1786, or even 1787, rather than the end of his life.<sup>7</sup>

The influence of copy-text theory, and resistance to it, was apparent in several ASLS editions of the later 1970s and 80s. One slightly improbable example is Alexander Scott and Maurice Lindsay’s ASLS edition of William Tennant’s *Anster Fair* (1989), long delayed not only by Scott’s declining health but also by resistance to the series editor’s textual policies. Between the 1812 first edition and the 1814 second edition, Tennant or his printer made a number of systematic changes in presentation, as in changing some proper names to small caps; the ASLS edition takes its copytext (and so presentation) from 1812, but includes Tennant’s major substantive revisions of 1814, adding or substituting whole stanzas.<sup>8</sup> One difficulty came because, if the presentation of most of the text followed the first edition, the new stanzas would either be inconsistent or need restyling to a form that historically had never existed. The edition as eventually completed by Lindsay after Scott’s death freely violated the announced policy, preferring the 1812 text to 1814 in most shorter revised passages and sometimes printing both versions together in the text (as in the opening of Canto IV, p. 47).

Among the best recent examples of how much the Greg-Bowers approach can achieve is Rodger L. Tarr’s edition with Mark Engel of Thomas Carlyle’s *Sartor Resartus*. Along with very full explanatory annotation, and a magisterial introduction, it provides the first full reediting of Carlyle’s text. Tarr and Engel use as copy-text “the first

---

<sup>7</sup> The development of copy-text theory is accessibly charted by G. Thomas Tanselle, *Textual Criticism since Greg, A Chronicle 1950-1985* (Charlottesville; University Press of Virginia, 1987), and set in a wider context by David Greetham, “Textual Scholarship,” in *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. Joseph Gibaldi (New York, MLA, 1992), 103-137.

<sup>8</sup> William Tennant, *Comic Poems*, ed. Alexander Scott and Maurice Lindsay (Edinburgh: ASLS/Scottish Academic Press, 1989), 214.

extant version, the 1833-34 serialization in *Fraser's Magazine*," which is the version closest to Carlyle's lost handwritten manuscript, and then cull out typos from successive reprintings, as for instance when 1833's "furred beasts" become "furred breasts," and incorporate later revisions "where we have reason to believe that such revisions were ordered or intended by the author."<sup>9</sup> Bibliographical investigation discovered differences between the *Fraser's* text and the apparently identical off-prints from it in 1834, and untangled the relation between the American and British editions of 1846.<sup>10</sup> Using the 1833 text establishes the lay-out on the page for presenting the many passages quoted from Teufelsdröckh's manuscripts. The punctuation of *Sartor* had become progressively normalized as the book was reset time and again, but going back to 1833 recovers Carlyle's original semi-parodic, irregular over-capitalization as befitting his fictional German professor.<sup>11</sup> In line with Bowers's dictum that an editor must "lay all his cards on the table, face up," the edition's final 130 pages of textual apparatus include not only the standard record of emendations to copy-text, historical collation of all variants from later editions, and table of line-endings hyphenated in the copy-text, but fascinating paragraph-length discussions of why the editors identified specific later variants as being Carlyle's interventions.

Copy-text editing by definition produces an eclectic text, mixing elements from a variety of sources, and two editions of Scottish texts made important critiques of this eclecticism. In editing Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1976), where Smith's own punctuation and spelling had changed between the first edition (1759) and Smith's final sixth edition (1790), so that the earliest punctuation of original and later passages drew on different conventions, D. D. Raphael and A.L. MacFie found that "To follow the usual rule [i.e. Greg-Bowers] for this book

---

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus, the Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh in Three Books*, ed. Rodger L. Tarr, text established by Mark Engel and Rodger L. Tarr [Norman and Charlotte Strouse Edition of the Works of Thomas Carlyle] (Berkeley etc: Univ. of California Press, 2000), xcv; "furred beasts/furred breasts" occurs on p. 44. The thirty-page "Note on the Text" (xcv-xxxviii) constitutes a valuable introduction, not just to editing *Sartor*, but to the issues in editing any frequently-reprinted 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century work.

<sup>10</sup> "Note on the text," c-cii, cxvi-cxix; the essential preliminary to the edition itself was Rodger L. Tarr's *Thomas Carlyle, a Descriptive Bibliography* (Pittsburgh, PA: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1989).

<sup>11</sup> On long quotations, see pp. cvi-cviii; on capitalization, cf. Carlyle's protest in 1868, "The abolition of *Capitals* ... will never do" (quoted, p. cxxiv).

would result in a curious patchwork,” and used the sixth edition as copy-text.<sup>12</sup> Shortly afterwards, contemplating James Thomson’s “five different systems of punctuation and typography” and multiple revisions, James Sambrook used the same phrase: “An editor of *The Seasons* who held to Sir Walter Greg’s classic theory of copy-text ... would produce a strange patchwork.”<sup>13</sup> Because of Thomson’s documented attention to the accidentals of his later editions, Sambrook rejected Greg-Bowers and again worked from a single late version of the text, the 1746 edition, “reproduced *literatim*, except for the correction of obvious misprints” and other local editorial emendation (lxxx).

These editors’ empirical choice of a single published exemplum was a sign of things to come, as the successive waves of critical theory and cultural studies eroded the author-centred or intentionalist basis on which Greg-Bowers had staked its case. It was a Scottish-educated academic, Ernst Honigmann of Glasgow, who made one of the first telling theoretical critiques of Greg-Bowers, in 1964, attacking the assumption by Shakespearean editors that somewhere, behind all the variation, there really was a single ideal text waiting to be recovered. To illustrate his argument, Honigmann drew on the manuscripts of later poets; working before Kinsley’s Clarendon Burns, he lined up a series of devastating examples to show that Burns himself produced variant versions of his poems in which, absent the manuscript evidence, a textual editor could not reliably have distinguished an authorial revision from a non-authorial change.<sup>14</sup>

Thirty years ago, no one could have predicted the rapidity with which the Greg-Bowers editorial method would lose its dominance to a non-authorial approach, the Social Text theory usually associated with Donald

---

<sup>12</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. D. D. Raphael and A.L. MacFie [Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith, vol. 1] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982; repr. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1982), 46; the whole discussion (pp. 46-52) is worth reading.

<sup>13</sup> James Thomson, *The Seasons*, ed. James Sambrook (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), lxxix.

<sup>14</sup> E. A. J. Honigmann, *The Stability of Shakespeare’s Text* (London: Edward Arnold, 1965), esp. 56-59, 70, 76-77. Another early critique, Morse Peckham’s “Reflections on the Foundations of Modern Textual Editing,” *Proof* 1 (1971): 122-155, in dismissing the Greg-Bowers distinction between substantives and accidentals as “grabbed from medieval theology,” puckishly argued for a more modern science method, based, via Darwin, on Dugald Stewart (p. 132).



F. Mackenzie and Jerome J. McGann.<sup>15</sup> The implications of this shift can be summed up from the interpretative methods with which each approach was initially linked. Greg-Bowers (the New Bibliography) was symbiotic with the New Criticism, inferring authorial intention about the wording itself to provide inerrant timeless texts for critics to interpret. Social Text theory was linked with the shift from author-based interpretation to modern cultural studies (and French-influenced *histoire du livre*), aiming to investigate the text as the material product of a larger socio-cultural matrix. In practice, rather than printing the author's final version, editors influenced by Social Text theory typically choose to reproduce a text from a single early published text, as with the historian Adam Budd's recent edition of John Armstrong's *Art of Preserving Health*, which reprints the 1744 first edition.<sup>16</sup>

Social Text editors are also much more interested than most earlier scholars in the physical layout or design of a text on the page (in McGann's phrasing, "bibliographical codes"), not just the wording ("linguistic codes").<sup>17</sup> Indeed some of the most persuasive examples of Social Text editing have been reproductions or facsimiles of a text in its first edition, aided by modern book production technology, where the new textual investigation shows up in the apparatus or commentary rather than in the text itself. In editing James Hogg's *Jacobite Minstrelsy*, Murray Pittcock chose to reproduce the 1819 first edition page for page, thus preserving Hogg's own textual eclecticism and giving the musical settings alongside the text, but also making visual that the historical moment of the published collection was not the same as the historical situation in which the texts Hogg collected had originated or been modified.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Editing* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983); Donald F. Mackenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of the Text* (London: British Library, 1986). Mackenzie's pivotal role is assessed by G. Thomas Tanselle, in *Textual Editing*, as in n. 7 above, 121-128, and *Bibliographical Analysis, A Historical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009), esp. 25-29.

<sup>16</sup> John Armstrong's *The Art of Preserving Health: Eighteenth-century Sensibility in Practice*, ed. Adam Budd (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

<sup>17</sup> McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1991), 13-14, and cf. McGann, *Black Riders: The Visible Language of Modernism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993).

<sup>18</sup> James Hogg, *The Jacobite Relics of Scotland*, ed. Murray G. H. Pittcock [Stirling/South Carolina Edition, vols. 10, 12] (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ.

The obvious example of a recent major Scottish project liberated from Final Intention by the newer approaches might seem the Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels. In his General Introduction, the editor-in-chief David Hewitt rejects the Greg-Bowers method, which would “no longer be considered acceptable editorial practice, as it would confound versions of the text produced at different stages of the author’s career.”<sup>19</sup> Where earlier collected editions of Scott had relied on Scott’s late revised texts for the Magnum Opus edition (1829-1833), the Edinburgh edition takes as copy-text the first edition of each novel. Later revisions and Scott’s burgeoning paratext are dealt with in the apparatus and notes, not incorporated in the text. But, as Professor Hewitt points out, the support offered to this textual policy by McGann’s *Critique of Modern Textual Editing* was serendipitous (“a bonus”), rather than determinative (xiii).<sup>20</sup> Though choosing to work from the first editions, the Edinburgh editors “also recognize the failings of the first editions,” “incorporate into the base text those manuscript readings which were lost in the production process,” “introduce ... revisions found in editions published almost immediately after the first,” and “correct various kinds of error,” including “inconsistencies in the naming of characters” and “egregious errors of fact that are not part of the fiction” (xiii-xv). This is not non-interventionist reproduction of a single historic exemplar, and it rests on extensive, detailed bibliographical and archival research.

The Edinburgh Scott might be taken as showing, if not the convergence of the two major editorial theories, perhaps the subsuming of the earlier bibliographical tradition within the more recent socio-

---

Press, 2002-2003). Pittock’s introduction on Editorial Principles (10: xi) locates his approach as in contrast to Greg-Bowers and in debt to Jerome McGann.

<sup>19</sup> David Hewitt, “General Introduction [1999],” in Walter Scott, *Waverley*, edited by Peter Garside [Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels, vol. 1] (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2007), xi-xvi (p. xvi). Cf. the comments on Greg-Bowers and McGann in Douglas Mack, “The Stirling/South Carolina Edition of James Hogg: Thoughts on Editorial Policy,” *Studies in Hogg and His World* 4 (1993): 83-90, esp. p. 86-7, noting situations in which Greg-Bowers remains useful. For the rather different textual problems facing a Stevenson editor, see Penny Fielding, “The New Edinburgh Edition ...,” *Bottle Imp* 12 (November 2012): <http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/ScotLit/ASLS/SWE/TBI/TBIIssue12/Fielding.html>.

<sup>20</sup> As Hewitt notes, the basic textual strategy for the Edinburgh Edition was developed from a precursor that antedated Social Text theory: Sir Walter Scott, *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Year Since*, ed. Claire Lamont (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), xxxvi.

historical approach, or at the least significant overlap between the way serious editors from either tradition go about their textual research. Hewitt recognizes that editions based on the first published text and those based on an author's final revisions may both be intellectually legitimate, just as the Greg-Bowers tradition, when fully articulated, allowed an editor to create the author's ideal text as it might have been at an early stage, not just as it was in the author's final intention. From the other side, looking back in 1990, Tanselle qualified his earlier intentionalist emphasis, commenting "I have never regarded authorial intention as the only aspect in textual history that an editor could legitimately focus on."<sup>21</sup> The third of Tanselle's 1997 Sandars Lectures recognized many aspects of McGann's emphasis on the material book.<sup>22</sup> And the Edinburgh Scott also shows that major editing projects in the newer model must involve the same kinds of detailed primary research as the old.<sup>23</sup> At first, it seemed Mackenzie's Social Text theory might deflect researchers away from basic bibliographical analysis and textual collation to other concerns. That has not happened, though for a generation it made adequate training in textual bibliography difficult to get in many graduate programs. As Alison Lumsden suggests, and McGann has also recently argued, the huge potential of relating published editions to extensive digital archives of primary materials and variant editions has in fact made bibliographical investigation and training more crucial than ever.<sup>24</sup>

If editors are now much freer than they used to be in selecting the version of a work they want to edit, readers and researchers are not usually as conscious as they might be that differently-edited texts may be appropriate for different kinds of interpretative discussion. An editor of Burns's "Tam o' Shanter," for instance, might chose, as Kinsley did,

---

<sup>21</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing* (Charlottesville: Univ of Virginia Press, 1990), x.

<sup>22</sup> Tanselle, *Bibliographical Analysis*, as in n. 15 above, 61-88. As early as 1973, the Bowers-influenced Center for Editions of American Authors had a scheme to recognize as "An Approved Facsimile" page-for-page reproductions that met adequate standards.

<sup>23</sup> For an eye-opening account of the stage-by-stage process of editing, including collation of multiple copies, see "Editing the Texts," in David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature, A Critical Edition*, 2 vols., ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton [Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), II: 589-632.

<sup>24</sup> Jerome J. McGann, "The Amoderns: Towards Philology in a New Key," *Amodern 1* (2013): <http://amodern.net/article/interview-with-jerome-mcgann/>.

simply to print the last edition Burns prepared, in the two-volume *Poems* (1793). An editor following the Greg-Bowers approach would presumably have based spelling, punctuation, and section breaks on one of three early versions (one of the manuscripts, the first published text in a newspaper, or the first formal edition, in Francis Grose's 1791 *Antiquities of Scotland*), and then incorporated substantive changes from Burns's lifetime (so deleting as Kinsley also did, the four lines attacking lawyers and clergy).<sup>25</sup> A Social Text editor could in principle select almost any of the published versions, but would be most likely to select either the newspaper text or the Grose version, both including the attack, and if choosing the Grose would want to juxtapose Burns's poem (in that setting, arguably the most famous footnote in literature) to Grose's text and the familiar engraving of the roofless Alloway Kirk. Any differences of text (other than the deletion) would be relatively minimal and unlikely to affect the general reader. But a biographical researcher might want to work from the early manuscript versions of 1790, a researcher investigating Burns's ambivalent relation to the local gentry would probably chose the Grose, a critic focusing on Burns and politics would highlight the change from 1791 to 1793 (and its motivations), and a researcher interested in the immediate popular impact of Burns's poem might indeed set aside any of the "authorial" versions to discuss one of the unauthorized chapbook versions of the mid and late 1790s.

The reader or student of Hugh MacDiarmid's *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle* finds similar issues in trying to match up text with critical purpose. For many years, the standard edition was the convenient small hardback in which the poem was brought back into print in 1953, with an essay by David Daiches. Before he died, MacDiarmid had authorized and seen proof for a posthumous *Complete Poems*, edited by his son Michael Grieve and the distinguished Scottish bibliographer W. R. Aitken, and this remains the text as authorized by his estate.<sup>26</sup> In all but a

---

<sup>25</sup> On the editorial issues raised by this passage, see Gerard Carruthers, "'Tongues turn'd inside out': The Reception of 'Tam o' Shanter'," *SSL* 35-36 (2007): 454-463: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/ssl/vol35/iss1/34/> (also included in the *Roy festschrift*).

<sup>26</sup> Hugh MacDiarmid, *Complete Poems*, ed. Michael Grieve and W. R. Aitken, 2 vols. (London: Martin Brian & O'Keefe, 1978), which does not provide variant readings. Kenneth Buthlay's ASLS edition was not authorized to reedit the text, but provides a very full collation of variants: Hugh MacDiarmid, *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle, An Annotated Edition*, ed. Kenneth Buthlay (Edinburgh:

few respects (notably the correction of a place-name error that MacDiarmid had stubbornly retained in all previous editions), this followed the text as MacDiarmid had revised it for a 1969 fine-press limited edition printed in Italy for two Scottish booksellers, which was the last text on which MacDiarmid himself worked in detail.<sup>27</sup> The 1962 American *Collected Poems*, reprinted with corrections in 1967, divided the poem into separate short titled sections, which are not present in the 1969 and 1978 editions. Furthermore, in the late 1960s, MacDiarmid also authorized the American scholar John Weston to prepare a complete orthographic make-over of the poem that changed MacDiarmid's presentation of spoken Scots to fit the Lallans Society's Scots Style Sheet.<sup>28</sup> MacDiarmid, like most of his Scots readers, apparently then rejected Weston's restyling, preferring as more authentic the apostrophe-sprinkled Scots of his own generation.

A traditional editor would take MacDiarmid's first edition (1926), correct misprints, and work steadily through successive versions incorporating MacDiarmid's revisions to end up with something very like 1978 or Kenneth Buthlay's ASLS text. A hardnosed Social Text editor might simply facsimile the first edition, as a document of the 1920s, and read the misprints as material evidence of MacDiarmid's cultural positioning and lack of authorial clout at that time. Other modern editors might chose to present a corrected version of 1926, the poem MacDiarmid and his first readers would have wanted. If one takes seriously McGann's concept of bibliographical codes, the cheap single-volume reprints of the 1950s are much closer to MacDiarmid's original format than any of the later editions, but a Social Text critic might also be interested in the tension between linguistic text and material text in the 1969 Duval/Hamilton edition, eliciting from MacDiarmid his (almost) final revisions, yet surely a niche publication just at the time when MacDiarmid seemed much more than a niche poet. If the reader or student wants to discuss MacDiarmid's

---

Scottish Academic Press, 1987). On MacDiarmid's reluctance to correct the place-name, see W.R. Aitken, as in n. 3 above.

<sup>27</sup> Hugh MacDiarmid, *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle* (Verona: Officina Bodoni; Falkland: Kulgin Duval and Colin Hamilton, 1969)..

<sup>28</sup> For this decision, see MacDiarmid's letter in *The Scotsman* (September 28, 1968), reprinted in Hugh MacDiarmid, *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle*, ed. John C. Weston (Amherst, MA: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1971) xi-x, and in *The Letters of Hugh MacDiarmid*, ed. Alan Bold (Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1984), 835-836.

major poem as a work of Scottish modernism, a facsimile or edition based on 1926 is perhaps the only appropriate choice.

As the title for this symposium suggests, textual editors, and the scholars who use their work, are now confronted with many more choices than in the past. The consumers of scholarly editions as well as their producers have a stake in these choices being fully debated and understood. This symposium cannot be comprehensive, and we are correspondingly grateful to the colleagues who agreed to participate. In addition to the contributions on special topics by Tricia McElroy on (re)editing Scottish Renaissance satire, by Gillian Hughes on editing letters, and by Ian Campbell on editing a 20<sup>th</sup> century Scottish novelist, Alison Lumsden's opening position paper discusses the relation between editorial and literary critical issues, and Ian Duncan provides an wide-ranging retrospective commentary on the symposium, arguing that the "authentically democratic" work of making more texts available can move us beyond the "tedious zero-sum game" of older critical debates. We chose to omit from this year's symposium the issues raised by digital and on-line-only editions, but other gaps in the symposium's coverage that we recognize and regret include consideration of the editorial traditions and modern development of the Scottish Text Society, a contribution on editing and bibliographical analysis, or a case-study of the critical implications of textual-editorial decisions for a single major work.

It is sometimes difficult for those new to textual issues, and perhaps overwhelmed by the variety of material a full scholarly edition offers, to recognize the larger editorial debates and to imagine alternative texts. Much of the available discussion of Scottish literary editing has been limited to reports, reviews or debates about particular editorial projects or newly-published editions. Nonetheless, close study of almost any Scottish literary text in a well-researched scholarly edition brings the reader or researcher up against, not just technical issues in textual transmission, but the difficult critical questions of authenticity, voice, and the relation of text to author, to printers and publishers and booksellers, and to original readership. The editorial issues that are distinctive to Scottish literature, and the interplay between recent Scottish editing and parallel developments in editorial theory on other literatures, deserve to be more fully and widely debated.

Patrick Scott